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Managers’ work-life supportive behaviors positively impact the usage of work-life programs, help reduce work-life conflict, and improve additional organizational and individual outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, turnover intentions) (Foley, Linnehan, Greenhaus, & Weer, 2006). These behaviors include helping their subordinates rearrange their work schedules and encouraging subordinates’ use of organizational work-life policies (e.g., flextime, job sharing, leave programs) (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). While the benefits of such targeted leadership have been well studied, the predictors of managerial work-life supportive behaviors have received little attention. In this research, the trait and situational approaches to effective leadership are used as the basis for a theoretical model in which two traits and five situational variables are proposed as antecedents of managerial work-life supportive behaviors. Managers’ empathetic personality and personal work-life philosophy are the two trait theoretical antecedents and the five situational antecedents are the organizations’ work-life culture, leader-subordinate exchange quality, organizational centralization of authority, organizational formality, and employees’ work-to-life conflict. To test this model, survey data from managers and their subordinates from a convenience sample of five diverse organizations were collected. Results support a hybrid leadership approach of both trait and situational factors as important predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. One trait-based antecedent, the degree to which a manager is viewed as having an empathetic personality, was significantly related to managers’ work-life
supportive behaviors. The second key predictor, the situational antecedent of a manager’s ratings of leader-subordinate exchange quality, also had a positive relationship with managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The third antecedent, the situational variable of the subordinate’s work-life conflict, had a negative relationship with managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Implications for future research and for practitioners are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH PROBLEM

The rise in dual-career and working mothers has led to an increase in the number of employees experiencing work-family conflict (Allen, 2001; Kossek & Lambert, 2005; Neal & Hammer, 2007). Work-family conflict occurs when family and work-related responsibilities interfere with each other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work-family conflict is an overarching term for the bidirectional relationships of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. In work-to-family conflict, the source of the conflict is in the workplace and the interference is in the family domain. For example, work projects requiring employees to work extended hours may interfere with an employee’s ability to attend family events or participate in weekend family activities. In family-to-work conflict, the source of the conflict is in the family domain and the interference is with the work domain. For example, a parent may need to take a child to a doctor’s appointment or put the child on a school bus and that family-related responsibility interferes with the employee’s ability to be in the office or attending to workplace responsibilities.

In addition to the demographic changes in the workplace (e.g., more women, dual career families, older workers delaying retirement), employees have changed their conceptualizations of how the workplace fits into their lives. Employees, both young and old, appear to be looking for ways to be active in their work, but also have meaningful involvement in their personal lives (Allen, 2008; Bloom & Canning, 2005; Fisher, 2009). GenMe, the most recent generation to enter the workforce, is more interested than the previous generations of GenXers and Boomers in having worklives that allow employees to pursue personal-interest activities (Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, & Lance, 2010).
This change in the conceptualization of the role of the workplace in employees’ lives suggests a corresponding change from work-family conflict to work-life conflict. The concept of work-life conflict is more inclusive than the concept of work-family conflict and also more relevant to the growing number of employees looking to be involved in both the work and non-work spheres of their lives. Like work-family conflict, work-life conflict is an overarching term for a set of bidirectional relationships in which work interferes with one’s non-work life (i.e., work-to-life conflict) and one’s non-work life interferes with work (life-to-work conflict). However, work-life conflict broadens the type of personal conflict beyond family-related responsibilities. In doing so, work-life conflict includes a broader range of employees than only those with caregiving responsibilities. Examples of work-life conflict include older employees wanting a reduced work schedule or phased retirement so that they work and simultaneously pursue other interests as well as employees committed to community work while also wanting to advance their careers.

1.1 The Research Motivation

Organizations trying to support the work and non-work aspects of their employees’ lives typically assume work-life programs will reduce work-life conflict. Examples of work-life programs include federally mandated programs such as the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), programs that focus on the family such as leave for new parents, dependent care flexible spending accounts, domestic partner benefits for same-sex or opposite sex partners, geriatric counseling and flexible benefits that appeal to family and non-family oriented employees such as flextime, telecommuting, casual dress, compressed workweeks and seasonal scheduling (SHRM, 2010). Organizational
offerings of work-life programs recently garnered the attention of the Federal Government with the White House convening a Workplace Flexibility Forum hosted by President Obama, First Lady Michelle Obama and the White House Council on Women and Girls (2010). First Lady Michelle Obama’s opening comments and President Obama’s remarks emphasized the need for the workplaces to embrace flexibility in order to meet the work and family needs of employees yet also alluded to the broader employee population as having a need for a flexible workplace to address work-life needs such as the desire for employees to advance their education.

**Problem of Lack of Informal Support**

While establishing workplace policies and programs that help employees meet their personal and workplace responsibilities is admirable and inspiring, a growing body of literature suggests that it is not sufficient (Behson, 2005; Fedblum, 2007; Hammer, Kossek, Zimmerman, & Daniels, 2007; Stone, 2007). Thompson et al. (1999), measured both work-family program availability as well as organizational work-family culture. In their regression analyses, work-family culture explained additional variance in all three dependent variables of employees’ affective commitment, intention to leave and work-to-family conflict beyond the variance explained by demographic variables and work-family program availability. In the case of intention to leave and work-to-family conflict, the additional variance explained by work-family culture (i.e., $R^2 = 13.5\%$ for intention to leave and 18.2% for work-to-family conflict) was greater than the variance that had been explained by work-family benefit availability (i.e., $R^2 = 8.7\%$ for intention to leave and 3.2% for work-to-family conflict). Thompson et al’s (1999) research supports the notion that simply having work-family programs and policies is not sufficient. Programs need
to not only be available, but employees need to be aware of the programs and policies, feel they have access to them, and can use these programs and policies without suffering negative consequences (Behson, 2005; Stone, 2007).

Behson (2005) empirically examined the relationship between *informal* support (i.e., job autonomy, managerial support, career impact concerns) and *formal* support (i.e., work schedule flexibility and work-family benefit availability) with job satisfaction, work-to-family conflict, stress and turnover intentions. For each of the dependent variables, there is evidence that informal support, in total, explains a greater amount of the variance in the dependent variable than does formal support. Stone’s (2007) qualitative interviews with 54 well-educated, professional women who “opted-out” provides further support for the belief that employee perceptions of availability and the consequences of the usage of organizational work-life policies and programs is critical to actual usage. In Stone’s (2007) research, the primary reason for these professional women leaving the workforce was not due to a lack of work-life practices but because organizational support for these women actually using work-life policies was lacking. Employees need to be aware of, have access to and feel they can use these programs without suffering negative consequences, in order for organizations and employees to realize the associated benefits attached to reducing work-life conflict (Behson, 2005; Fedblum, 2007; Hammer et al., 2007).

**Work-life supportive leadership**

Work-life supportive leadership has the potential to positively impact actual employee use of work-life programs (Kossek & Distelberg, 2007; Swody & Powell, 2007; Thompson et al., 1999; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007). Managers behave in a work-
life supportive manner by ensuring that employees are aware of and have access to organizational work-life policies and programs as well as communicating to employees the benefits (and lack of negative consequences) from work-life program usage (Swody & Powell, 2007). Work-life supportive leadership is expressed by managers who demonstrate an understanding of employees’ personal responsibilities by rearranging schedules, and encouraging the use of organizational work-life policies (e.g., flextime, job sharing, leave programs) (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). The work-life literature acknowledges managers’ key role in establishing work-life supportive arrangements (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006; Stone, 2007). Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2006) conducted a meta-analysis in which they explored five factors of a family-friendly work environment that may show evidence of a relationship with work-family conflict; supervisor support was one of the five factors. The respondents who were interviewed in Stone’s (2007) research mention the power of their manager in approving or denying work-life supportive arrangements. In Swody and Powell’s (2007) proposed models of the determinants of employees participating in family-friendly programs, both organizational level as well a manager-level models are discussed. The authors present parallel hypotheses for organizational and managerial influencers. For example, in the organizational model, “an organization’s responsiveness to work-family issues is associated with employees’ perceptions of greater organizational support” and in the manager-level model, “a manager’s responsiveness to work-family issues is associated with employees’ perceptions of greater managerial support.” While Swody and Powell (2007) do not hypothesize that one level (i.e., organization or manager) will be a greater contributor to employee participation in family-friendly programs, their
parallel development of the managerial model suggests the important role managers may play in actual employee usage of work-life programs.

1.2 Trends in Work-life Supportive Leadership Research

When Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness (1999) first developed a measure of work-family culture, the authors included managerial support as one of three dimensions. The overall construct of work-family culture was defined as “the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives” (Thompson et al., 1999). Supportive managers were regarded as a component of work-family culture due to managers’ ability to reduce work-family conflict and encourage the use of work-family programs aimed at helping employees reduce work-family conflict.

Researchers have begun to separate managers’ work-family supportive leadership from an overall work-family culture measure (Allen, 2001; Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990; Lapierre & Allen, 2006). One rationale for the separation of work-family supportive leadership from work-family culture stems from the notion that a manager’s choice to behave in a work-family supportive manner may or may not reflect the organization’s work-family culture (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). In other words, managers’ decisions to display work-life supportive behaviors may or may not be consistent with the organization’s overall work-family culture. For example, an organization may not have a work-family supportive culture but a manager may still have the authority to create an informal program (e.g., telecommuting, flextime) for his or her subordinates. In this sense, the manager’s actions are not consistent with or reflective of the organization’s work-family culture.
Most recently, Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson (2009) developed and validated a separate managerial work-family supportive leadership measure. Hammer et al (2009), label their measure work-family supportive leadership; however, the wording of items in their scale uses the terminology of “work” and “non-work” and thus their measure could also arguably be called a work-life supportive leadership measure.

1.3 Research Problem

While the positive consequences of effective work-family supportive leadership are well studied, little is known about which factors predict work-family supportive leadership (Foley et al., 2006). Similarly, while the literature acknowledges that informal, managerial-level decisions impact which employees are able to use work-life programs, there is little research on what might predict the managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

Interestingly, even with the growing efforts to isolate and define work-life supportive leadership, the literature appears to be relatively silent with respect to predictors of work-life support leadership. Given that work-life leadership can impact the usage of work-life programs, help reduce work-life conflict and improve additional organizational and individual outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, turnover intentions), a better understanding of what accounts for the presence of work-life supportive leadership is also warranted (Foley et al., 2006). Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux & Brinley’s (2005) recent meta-analysis revealed that management/manager support was a criterion variable in less than 1% of the research on work-family. The lack of understanding of the contributors to work-life supportive leadership negatively impacts the likelihood that improvements and encouragement of work-life supportive leadership will ensue.
Ultimately, without a better understanding of what factors predict work-life supportive leadership, organizations and individuals’ abilities to realize the benefits of work-life supportive policies programs will be hampered.

1.4 Research Objectives

This research aims to address the identified gap in the literature and in order to shed some light on antecedent factors associated with work-life supportive leadership behaviors. While work-family research evidence shows the importance of work-life friendly leadership, there is a lack of the work-life research applying specific leadership theories to the work-life research. In this study, the leadership theories serve as the basis for identifying the potential antecedents of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

A second purpose of this research is the focus on leader work-life supportive behaviors rather than focusing on specific work-life programs. The extant literature currently focuses on the usage or granting of specific flexible work arrangements (Lapierre & Allen, 2006). A broader conceptualization of work-life supportive leader behaviors addresses the need for a greater change in the way managers think and act towards the work-life interaction.

Finally, by exploring work-life, rather than work-family, this research aims to expand the work-family discourse to a broader, more encompassing view of employees’ work and non-work responsibilities and interests. A more inclusive work-life perspective has the potential of imparting benefits to a far greater number of employees.

1.5 Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. Chapter 2 defines and discusses work-life conflict as well as the organizational responses to, and manager’s role in, work-
life conflict. The chapter ends with a discussion of the concept of work-life leadership and the evolving literature on this topic.

Chapter 3 introduces the leadership framework that is being used to explore work-life supportive leadership. My model of work-life supportive leadership and the associated hypotheses are introduced at the end of this chapter.

Chapters 4 presents the methods used to empirically test the proposed theoretical model. It discusses the sample, procedures and measures. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the analytic plan and addresses the concept of common method variance.

Chapter 5 contains the results of the statistical analyses described in the analytic plan as well as further post-hoc analyses that were conducted.

Chapter 6 contains a discussion of the results, contributions, implications, limitations and opportunities for future research.
CHAPTER TWO:  
WORK-LIFE SUPPORTIVE LEADERSHIP  

2.1 Work-life Conflict Overview  

Changes in employee demographics over the past three to four decades have included an increase in employees who are part of dual income families, are single parents, and are responsible for family caregiving responsibilities (Allen, 2001; Kossek & Lambert, 2005; Neal & Hammer, 2007). These employee demographic changes likely contribute to a greater number of employees having considerable work and family responsibilities. A result of more employees having considerable responsibilities in both the work and family domains can be a workforce where a greater number of employees, across a range of demographics, are more likely to experience work-family conflict. In addition to the demographic changes in the workplace that have increased work-family conflict (e.g., more women, dual career families), a post-World War II increase in the average number of employee work hours (Reynolds, 2003) has also impacted the presence of work-family conflict.

Work-family conflict has been defined as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work-family conflict is an overarching term that incorporates a bidirectional relationship since work can conflict with family (i.e., work-to-family conflict) and family can conflict with work (i.e., family-to-work conflict). In work-to-family conflict, the sources of the conflict are in the workplace domain and have an impact on family life. In family-to-work conflict,
the sources of the conflict are in the family domain and have an impact on the employee’s work life. A large body of empirical research indicates that work-to-family conflict occurs more frequently than family-to-work conflict (Frone, 2003).

The employee populations that experience conflict between work and personal lives have expanded from mothers with childcare responsibilities to include almost all employee groups from those with elderly caregiving responsibilities to employees who simply want some time to develop non-work interests and personal relationships. Thus, the terminology used to describe this role conflict has evolved from a description as work-family role conflict to the use of the term work-life role conflict. A work-life perspective includes a broad array of employees (e.g., employees with and without caregiving responsibilities, male and female, young and old) who acknowledge and want to participate in both the work and non-work aspects of their lives (Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002). The concept of work-life conflict is more inclusive than work-family conflict and suggests conflict that is relevant to a greater number of employees and across a greater number of situations. Like work-family conflict, work-life conflict is an overarching term for a set of bidirectional relationships in which work can interfere with one’s non-work life (i.e., work-to-life conflict) and one’s non-work life can interfere with work (life-to-work conflict). Also, similar to work-family conflict, the sources of work-to-life conflict are in the workplace while the sources of life-to-work conflict are in the non-work sphere.

Employees have also changed their conceptualizations of how work fits into their overall lives. Employees are looking for ways to be active in their work while also having considerable involvement in their personal lives. For example, aging baby
boomers want an alternative to the traditional nine-to-five workday, five-day workweek in order to maintain their career while also spending more time pursuing personal interests or responsibilities (Friede, Kissek, Lee, & MacDermid, 2008; Hutchens & Dentinger, 2003). Individuals from the younger millennial generation express interest in building and establishing careers that enable them to be fulfilled professionally while also actively pursuing non-work interests (Allen, 2008; Fisher, 2009). This newer perspective emphasizes the duality of employees’ lives and the importance of both work and non-work aspects. All of this suggests that more employees are likely to experience conflict between work and personal lives.

Technology likely contributes to an increase in employees’ work-to-life conflict (Bailyn, 2006; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006) by reducing the physical boundaries between work and personal life and increasing the opportunities for interactions between work and personal domains. Technology and the global economy also contribute to the potential for work-related issues to enter our lives 24 hours/day (MacDermid, 2005). Computers, the internet, personal digital assistants (PDAs), emails and cell phones enable employees to get work-related information during non-work time and vice versa, both solicited and unsolicited; thus, increasing the likelihood of interactions and potential conflict between work and personal lives.

2.2 Trends in Formal Organizational Responses to Work-Life Conflict

Initially, organizational responses to employees’ conflicts between work and personal lives focused on work-family conflict and, specifically, family conflict involving childcare related responsibilities. Organizations provided assistance for employees’ family care needs but maintained a separation of employees’ work from employees’
personal lives. For example, organizations offered childcare assistance programs that helped employees find or pay for childcare services. However, the children were still cared for at an offsite location (e.g., the employee’s home) and the assumption was that childcare needs would not intrude upon nor alter the already established workday structure (e.g., nine-to-five workday conducted at the worksite). Next, organizations acknowledged and addressed family responsibilities in ways that changed the typical work structure or allowed for more work-family interaction at the worksite. For example, flexible work arrangements such as flextime allowed employees to choose the start and stopping times of the workday around a core set of hours. This was an alteration to the traditional workday structure. Onsite childcare centers allowed employees to visit their children by walking to another building or location within the corporate complex. Onsite childcare centers acknowledged and addressed the interaction between employees’ work and family responsibilities by including coverage of sick children. Even existing policies are revised to address the caregiving roles of employees. For example, some companies have revised the policy on taking sick days to not only be for when an employee is sick but also for when the employee’s children are sick (Friedman, 2002). By changing the sick leave policy to include sick children, organizations acknowledged that employees’ personal lives and professional lives are intertwined; having a sick child may result in the need for the employee to take time off from work.

In addition to changes in the types of programs offered to help employees care for children, the type of family care required also grew from focusing on childcare to also including elder care (Friedman, 2002). Examples of eldercare programs include resource and referral programs as well as educational programs on caring for the elderly. IBM is
one example of an organization transitioning from offering family care programs to also offering elder care programs. In 1987, IBM began offering elder care programs that leveraged the learning from IBM’s existing childcare offerings (Dobkin, 2010). IBM’s elder care offerings have grown from the initial resource and referral program to now also include an online course for developing caregiving skills, six hours of paid elder care support services per year, paid leave and support groups (Dobkin, 2010). Stride Rite Corporation’s on-site intergenerational day care center is a cutting edge organizational response to elder care that demonstrates leveraging child care resources (Friedman, 2002). In the Stride Rite program, employees with child and elder care responsibilities can utilize the organization’s onsite care center.

The existence of conflict between work and personal lives is also present among employees without any caregiving responsibilities. Conflict among this even broader set of employees with a variety of interests and responsibilities puts pressure on organizations to respond to work-life conflict and not just work-family conflict. For example, employees nearing retirement are looking to scale back their hours while pursuing personal interests or employees who are involved in civic activities or personal hobbies (e.g., participating in triathlons, acting in plays) are also looking for ways to better manage their personal interests and professional interest and responsibilities. Programs initially designed to meet the work-family (eldercare or childcare) needs of employees are now desired by employees to help balance their work and personal, non-family responsibilities. An employee nearing retirement may choose a part-time schedule or a younger employee may choose a compressed workweek in order to have one day a week to devote to civic activities.
Deloitte’s Mass Career Customization program encourages employees to continually assess their personal responsibilities and interests and work assignments (McClelland, Koestner, & Weinberger). For example, following the birth of a child, an employee may want to temporarily switch to a part-time position. Over time, perhaps once the child is in school full-time, that same employee may want to return to a full-time schedule with a flextime arrangement. Some years later, the employee may desire a full-time, traditional schedule working five days at the worksite. And still later in time, that employee may desire phased retirement and a switch to a part-time position.

The changes in the target audience for Deloitte’s Mass Career Customization program mirror the changes in organizations’ conceptualizing conflict as women’s work-family conflict issues to a broad array of employees having work-life conflict issues. Deloitte’s Mass Career Customization program was originally conceptualized and implemented as a way to retain female talent and improve the number of women in higher managerial positions (McClelland et al.). However, after the program was conceptualized and introduced, employees expressing interest in the program were not limited to the initially intended target of female employees with children and the greater demand prompted a plan for offering the program to all employees (Fitzpatrick, 2009). Deloitte’s focus on developing programs that address employees’ work-life needs now includes the “Personal Pursuits” program which allows employee to temporarily leave Deloitte for up to five years (LLC, 2010).

The growing importance of work-life issues is reflected in the expansion of annual organizational rankings in Fortune magazine of the 100 best companies to work for (Muse, Harris, Giles, & Feild, 2008) and not just in female/mother-oriented magazines.
such as Working Mother. The highest ranked organization in 2010 was SAS, an organization that places a priority on integrating employees work and personal lives (2010). SAS is known for its innovative work-life programs which go beyond traditional flexible work arrangements (e.g., flextime, telecommuting) and include an on-site healthcare center (e.g., physicians and nutritionists on staff), on-site massage therapist, subsidized daycare centers, subsidized cafeterias, a UPS office, family night outings (e.g., rodeo, circus) and a caring closet for borrowing items to help in caregiving responsibilities (e.g., wheelchairs) (Kaplan, 2010).

2.3 Beyond Formal Organizational Responses

While the increase in the formal organizational responses to work-life conflict is a positive attempt at reducing employees’ work-life conflict, the extant literatures suggests that changing the workplace to be truly work-life friendly, and thus reaping the benefits of a reduction in work-life conflict, requires more than just the implementation of policies and programs (Fedblum, 2007; Friedman, 2002). More research is needed to establish an expected relationship between workplace programs and policies and positive outcomes (Bond, Galinsky, Kim, & Brownfield, 2005; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006).

The few studies that have looked specifically at the relationship between work-life programs and policies and work-family conflict have found mixed results, including no relationship and a negative relationship (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006).

One way to explain the conflicting research evidence is to explore potential differences between official and unofficial policies and programs. Official organizational work-life policies and programs are documented in various Human Resource materials (e.g., HR manuals). Unofficial policies and programs are the policies and programs that
employees believe are available regardless of formal documentation. Thompson et al (1999) provides support that while work-family programs and policies can have a positive impact, they are not sufficient. As noted earlier, Thompson et al. (1999), measured both work-family program availability as well as organizational work-family culture. In their regression analyses, work-family culture explained additional variance in all three dependent variables of employees’ affective commitment, intention to leave and work-to-family conflict. Their work-family culture variable included managerial support for work-family balance, career consequences associated with using work-family benefits and organizational time expectations that may interfere with family responsibilities. These items represent the informal aspects or policies that impact the usage of formal work-life policies and programs.

Behson (2005) used data from the Families and Work Institute’s 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce to explore the relative contributions of formal (i.e., work schedule flexibility, work benefit availability) and informal (i.e., job autonomy, managerial support, career impact concerns) work-family support on job satisfaction, work-family conflict, stress and turnover intent. Not only did Behson (2005) find evidence of informal support explaining a greater amount of variance than formal support for the outcomes but he also found that managerial support shows evidence of explaining the greatest amount of variance in the four dependent variables.

2.4 The Manager’s Role in Work-to-life Conflict

Many studies now cumulatively provide strong empirical evidence that family-friendly supervision, a subcomponent of work-life supervision, is negatively related to work-family conflict (Behson, 2005; Goff et al., 1990; Ilies et al., 2007; Kossek &
The rationale is that managers help reduce work-family conflict by providing access to work-family programs, and ensuring that employees’ career progression is not derailed or hindered by involvement in work-family programs (Lapierre & Allen, 2006). Kossek and Nichols (1992) further argue that by providing the employee with resources to better manage the dual responsibilities of home and work, supportive managers help employees reduce family-to-work conflict as well (Kossek & Nichol, 1992).

In allowing and encouraging employees to use work-life policies and programs, managers are able to help employees reduce their work-to-life conflict. Golden, Viega, & Simsek (2006) found support for their hypothesis that greater employee usage of telecommuting is associated with employees experiencing a reduction in work-to-life conflict. Their research highlights the importance of separating the bidirectional components of work-family conflict (i.e., work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict) since greater usage of telecommuting was associated with decreasing levels of work-to-life conflict but increasing levels of family-to-work conflict.

2.5 Work-Life Supportive Leadership

Work-life supportive leadership may help explain how the formal policies and programs are implemented and then used by employees (Kossek & Distelberg, 2007) and the differences between formal and informal policies (Hammer et al., 2007). With formal policies and programs, managers’ work-life supportive leadership may play an important role in whether employees are aware of, have access to, and, ultimately, benefit from formal work-life programs (Swody & Powell, 2007; Thompson et al., 1999; Wang &
Walumbwa, 2007). It is only with access to and usage of work-life policies and programs that employees can realize the intended benefit of reductions in work-life conflict.

A work-family supportive manager “is sympathetic to the employee’s desire to seek balance between work and family and [is one] who engages in efforts to help the employee accommodate his or her work and family responsibilities” (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Work-family supportive managerial behaviors are “those enacted behaviors exhibited by supervisors that are supportive of families” (Hammer et al., 2007).

Expanding supportive leadership beyond family caregiving responsibilities, work-life supportive leadership is expressed when managers behave in ways that acknowledge and support employees having work as well as personal responsibilities and interests. Work-life supportive leadership is displayed to a broad range of employees including employees with and without families. Managers behave in a work-life supportive manner by ensuring that employees are aware of and have access to the organizations’ formal work-life policies and programs as well as communicating to employees the benefits (and lack of negative consequences) from work-life program usage (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006; Swody & Powell, 2007).

Work-life supportive leadership behaviors can include rearranging schedules and encouraging use of organizational work-life policies (e.g., flextime, job sharing, leave programs) (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). Managers, through their influence on career assignment and advancement, can also impact the interpretation of employee usage of formal work-life programs and any potential negative impact on an employee’s career. Similar to the relationship between work-family supportive supervision and
work-to-life conflict, work-life supportive supervision is expected to have a negative relationship with work-to-life conflict.

Managers’ work-life supportive behaviors can communicate an organization’s work-life culture to employees such that organizational work-life culture flows though the manager to the subordinate. Furthermore, managers may vary in the ways in which they interpret the organizational culture and, therefore, vary in the ways in which they display work-life supportive behaviors to employees. Thus, even within one organization, different degrees of managerial support for and agreement with organizational work-life policies and programs may result in different employees, within one organization, having different experiences and perceptions of organizational work-life support and program availability. Within workgroups, access to work-life programs may fall under the control of individual managers. These managers have the authority to make decisions within their workgroups that support or conflict with organizational policies and procedures (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). For example, subordinates often acknowledge that access to and use of flexible programs can vanish with managerial changes (Stone, 2007).

The way managers communicate work-life culture to their subordinates can influence subordinates’ experience of the organization’s work-life culture and ultimately impact the extent to which positive organization- and individual-level outcomes are realized (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999). The concept of organizational support provides an interesting analogy. Managers’ perceptions of organizational support will influence the expression of support to subordinates (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Thus, a subordinate’s perception of organizational support depends on how the subordinate’s
managers enacts or perceives supportive organizational policies. Similarly, a subordinate’s perception of organizational work-life culture can vary according to how the subordinate’s manager enacts or perceives supportive organizational work-life policies and programs.

It is interesting to note that managers may be influential in the usage of informal policies and programs aimed at reducing work-life conflict (Hammer et al., 2007). With informal policies and programs, managers may have the authority to create work-life programs for their departments or for select individuals within their departments. Meyerson (2001) describes the work-life supportive behaviors of one manager who established flexible work schedules within her department even though there wasn’t a corporate policy or program of implementing flexible work arrangements. Idiosyncratic deals (Hornung, Rousseau, & Glaser, 2008) are an expression of managers’ abilities to create and implement informal policies with direct reports to address employees conflicting personal and professional responsibilities. Idiosyncratic deals can be part of a system of informal policies and programs implemented by work-life supportive managers.

Work-life supportive leadership has the potential to influence not just individual employees but also employee workgroups. When a manager allows an individual employee within a workgroup to use work-life supportive programs and policies, that employee’s coworkers are able to watch, monitor and evaluate the resulting benefits and/or consequences. Coworkers can then make decisions about their own usage of work-life supportive programs. Managers who exhibit work-life supportive leadership may be more likely to grant usage of work-life policies and programs to multiple
individuals within the workgroup. Workgroup use of flexible work arrangements has been shown to positively impact an employee’s decision to use flexible work arrangements (Kossek, Barber, & Winters, 1999; Lambert, Marler, & Gueutal, 2008). This can have a synergistic effect whereby the use of policies and programs by some members of the workgroup encourages use by additional employees within the workgroup. The result can be a greater number of employees using the work-life policies and programs and a greater number of beneficial individual and organizational level outcomes being realized.

While the positive consequences of effective work-family supportive leadership are well studied, little is known about what factors predict work-family supportive leadership (Foley et al., 2006). In an attempt to address this gap, Foley et al. (2006) test their hypothesis that a match in demographic characteristics of the supervisor and subordinate may be predictors of family-supportive supervision. The sample for their study is a subset of respondents in the Family and Work Institute’s 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce dataset. Foley et al. (2006) hypothesize that gender and racial similarity between the manager and subordinate will have an effect on family-supportive supervision through an influence on interpersonal attraction, trust and empathy. Thus, in a dyadic relationship where manager and subordinate are of the same gender, the manager is more likely to exhibit work-family supportive behaviors than in a dyadic relationship of different genders. Similarly, in a dyadic relationship where the manager and the subordinate are of the same race, the manager is more likely to exhibit work-family supportive behaviors than in a dyadic relationship where there are different racial backgrounds. However, while Foley et al., (2006) hypothesize that interpersonal
attraction, trust and empathy are the mediating variables between gender and racial similarity and family-supportive supervision, they only test the direct relationships of gender and racial similarity with family-supportive supervision.

2.6 Evolving Literature on Work-Life Supportive Leadership

Initially, the assessment of the organization on a work-family dimension was operationalized by obtaining the number of work-family programs/benefits offered by the organization (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). Acknowledging that offering benefits is not enough, researchers started to measure constructs in addition to the number of work-family benefits offered. One variation on measuring the offering of work-family programs/benefits is to measure employees usage of work-family programs (Lapierre & Allen, 2006).

When work-life or work-family leadership was initially studied, it was predominately as an element of organizational work-family culture or family-friendly culture and was embedded within the overarching construct of a family-friendly work environment (Allen, 2001; Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). For example, Thompson et al., (1999) identify managerial support as one of three dimensions in a measure of work-family culture. Carlson (1999) included peers, managers, coworkers and general workplace attributes in their measure of a supportive workplace.

Recent research, however, is beginning to treat family supportive supervision as a distinct construct rather than treating family supportive supervision as one component or set of items within the larger construct of a family supportive culture or workplace. One explanation for the focus on family supportive managers as separate from family
supportive culture is credited to the organizational support literature which proposes that managerial support and organizational support are distinct concepts (Allen, 2001). Hammer et al. (2007) articulate another rationale for separating organization work-life culture and managerial support based on the different levels of analysis these constructs represent (i.e., organizational level versus supervisor level). Additional support for the notion of separating work-family supervision from organizational work-family culture is found when individual managers act in ways that do not support the organization’s work-family culture such as a manager who displays work-life supportive behavior within an organization that does not have a work-life supportive culture (Hammer et al., 2007; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). Clark (2001) explored the relationship between work-family culture and work-family balance. Clark’s examination focused on three specific factors of work-family culture including temporal flexibility, operational flexibility and family-supportive supervision. Relationships between each factor and work-family balance variables were separately hypothesized. That is, family-supportive supervision was hypothesized as having a relationship with each of the work-family balance dependent variables, rather than one overall work-family culture hypothesis. Lapierre & Allen (2006) use Clark’s (2001) scale for family-supportive supervision and do not include Clark’s other factors of a work-family culture in their exploration of the relationship between family supportive supervision and work-to-family conflict and Goff et al., (1990) considered family-supportive supervision as a separate antecedent of work-family conflict and absenteeism.

The operationalization of work-family supportive leadership has also varied. Some operationalizations of work-family leadership include items that do not have a manager
level focus. In the Thompson et al (1999) 10-item factor labeled managerial support, six
of the items refer to organizational support overall and not managerial support. For
example, one of the items in the managerial support factor reads “This organization is
supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons.”

In some research, the items in a work-family supportive scale are general as opposed
to specific behaviors. For example, Clark (2001) uses a three-item measure with general
items of “My supervisor understands my family demands,” “My supervisor listens when I
talk about my family,” and “My supervisor acknowledges that I have obligations as a
family member.” Most recently, Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson (2009)
developed and validated a 14-item scale that includes the general items as well as
additional, more specific behaviors such as “My supervisor asks for suggestions to make
it easier for employees to balance work and non-work demands” and “I can rely on my
supervisor to make sure my work responsibilities are handled when I have unanticipated
non-work demands.” The expanded 14-item scale (Hammer et al., 2009) is an
improvement in measurement of work-life supportive behaviors from a 3-item scale
(Clark, 2001) since supportive managerial behaviors likely need multiple items to
capture the full range of support (Rooney, Gottlieb, & Newby-Clark, 2009).

Last, while several researchers use wording that specifically focuses on work-family,
other researchers use wording that connotes work-life supportive behaviors, yet the label
is work-family supervision. For example, Thompson et al. (1999) has a family focus
with items such as “In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of
family-related needs.” In contrast, Foley et al. (2006) includes items that suggest a
broader work-life focus such as “I feel comfortable bringing up personal/family issues
with my supervisor.” Interestingly, although Hammer and colleagues refer to their measure as family supportive supervisory behaviors, the wording of each of the items suggests a broader work-life orientation. For example, items in their scale include “My supervisor takes time to learn about my personal needs” and “My supervisor is a good role model for work and non-work balance.” Item wording that includes “personal” or “non-work” suggests a manager’s work-life, rather than work-family, supportive behaviors. While this distinction may appear to be a question of simple semantics, I believe the distinction between work-family and work-life is important. As noted earlier, work-family implies the behaviors are aimed at employees with caregiving responsibilities, while work-life implies the behaviors are aimed at a more diverse employee population with both work and personal responsibilities and interests.

In the next chapter, I describe the theoretical orientation of the leadership trait and situational approaches that I used to frame my overall model for identifying the theoretical antecedents of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.
CHAPTER THREE:
LEADERSHIP THEORY FRAMEWORK

In exploring managers’ work-life supportive behaviors, I draw on the leadership literature to develop my model. In this chapter, I begin with a discussion of the area of supportive leadership behaviors overall, as well as a specific focus on integration of supportive leadership behaviors and work-life topics. I conclude the chapter with application of trait and situational leadership approaches to frame my exploration and identification of the theoretical antecedents of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

3.1 Supportive Leadership Behaviors

Supportive leadership behaviors, in general, are contained within several leading classifications of leadership behaviors (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). Supportive behaviors are actions that show a leader’s consideration, acceptance and concern for others (Yukl, 2006). Examples of these behaviors include a supervisor being willing to provide assistance with an employee’s personal problems or remembering important aspects of and being sympathetic to an employee (Yukl, 2006). In the Ohio State Leadership categories, supportive behaviors are found within the category of consideration behaviors, and within the Michigan Leadership categories, supportive behaviors are found within relations-oriented behaviors (Yukl, 2006; Yukl et al., 2002). In an effort to synthesize varied leadership behavior categories, Yukl et al. (2002) developed a three metacategory taxonomy that consists of task, relations and change-oriented behaviors. Supportive leadership behaviors along with developing, recognizing,
consulting and empowering leadership behaviors comprise the metacategory of relations behaviors.

A variety of individual research studies provide supporting evidence for the existence of a positive relationship between managers’ supportive behaviors and a variety of employees’ outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work-life balance and stress (Rooney et al., 2009). In their meta-analysis of the Consideration and Initiating Structure factors from the Ohio Leadership studies, Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies (2004) show that the factor labeled “consideration” is more strongly associated with employee satisfaction and leader effectiveness while “initiating structure” was more strongly correlated with leader performance.

3.2 Gap in Application of Leadership Concepts to Work-life Issues

While researchers have explored the benefits of work-life supportive leadership, there has been less emphasis on applying the concepts and measures from the leadership literature to the work-life domain. For example, Foley et al (2006) invoke the concept of trust between the leader and subordinate to support their hypotheses that demographic and racial similarity will lead to greater family supportive supervision. In the leadership literature, the concept of leader-member exchange would typically be involved when describing the development of trust in a dyadic relationship, however, Foley et al (2006) do not mention the leadership theory of leader-member exchange. The sparse application of leadership models and theories to the work-life issues is not surprising given that research has focused on the outcomes of supportive leadership and not the predictors of work-life supportive leadership (Eby et al., 2005).
Some recent specific applications of leadership constructs and measurement to work-life issues have centered on the concept of leader-member exchange (LMX). For example, Golden and Viega (2008) explored the moderating role of the extent of virtual work in the relationship between LMX and the dependent variables of commitment, job satisfaction and performance. Major et al. (2008) include LMX in their path model exploring the relationships between work-family culture, supportive workplaces and work-to-life conflict. Beyond LMX, Wang & Walumbwa (2007) recently applied the leadership literature to work-life issues by exploring the role of transformational leadership as a moderator of the relationship between family-friendly programs and work withdrawal and organizational commitment. Transformational leadership was hypothesized to moderate the relationship between childcare benefits and flexible work arrangements, as independent variables, employee organizational commitment and work withdrawal as outcomes. For example, the positive relationship between childcare benefits and organizational commitment depended on whether leadership was transformational. When transformational, the positive relationship was stronger than when leadership was not transformational. The hypothesized negative relationship between childcare benefits and work withdrawal was expected to be more negative under a transformational leader relationship. Three of the four moderating hypotheses showed evidence of statistical significance with transformational leadership moderating the relationships between childcare benefits and work withdrawal, flexible work arrangements and work withdrawal as well as flexible work arrangements and organizational commitment (Wang & Walumbwa, 2007).
3.3 Trait and Situational Leadership: An Overview

Since I am conceptualizing work-life supportive leadership as a subcomponent of supportive leadership, I derive my model using the leadership literature as the theoretical foundation. This research uses a “hybrid” approach (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004; Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004), which combines both trait and situational leadership theory perspectives in developing the framework for identifying the theoretical antecedents of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. In doing so, my model reflects the latest approach to leadership effectiveness research in which trait and situational perspectives are considered complementary (Zaccaro, 2007). A more detailed discussion of both the trait and situational leadership approaches follows.

Trait Approach

The trait approach is associated with the Great-Man theories and attributes effective leadership to the characteristics of the leader (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006; Zaccaro et al., 2004). The trait approach includes theories and research on effective leadership that explore skills, personality, needs, motives, values, temperament and expertise (Yukl, 2006; Zaccaro et al., 2004). Early explorations of effective leadership focused on the trait approach (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006) with an emphasis on intelligence and mental ability (Zaccaro et al., 2004). This early theoretical and empirical orientation towards traits follows the trends in discussions of leadership pre-scientific theory focused on leader traits and attributes such as intelligence and honesty (Zaccaro et al., 2004). While traits were once singularly associated with personality characteristics, the term now refers to a variety of characteristics and attributes with the common theme that these characteristics or attributes may distinguish one leader from another (Zaccaro, 2007).
The trait approach focuses on the belief that certain traits can distinguish more effective leaders from less effective leaders (Yukl, 2006). Research on traits, however, failed to consistently support this belief across different situations (Mumford, O’Connor, Clifton, Connelly, & Zaccaro, 1993; Yukl, 2006) and research on leader effectiveness moved from a trait approach to a situational perspective (Zaccaro et al., 2004).

In the 1980s, the trait approach began to regain momentum as a perspective for studying effective leadership. The momentum was attributed to a reexamination of the measures and analyses used in the earlier trait-focused leadership studies (Mumford et al., 1993; Zaccaro et al., 2004). An interest in charismatic leadership contributed to renewed interest in the trait approach since charismatic leaders are believed to be effective across a variety of situations thus supporting the trait perspective that stable traits contribute to leader effectiveness (Zaccaro et al., 2004).

In this regard, the trait approach applied to work-life supportive leadership may help us to understand why some managers exhibit work-life supportive behaviors while other managers, within the same organization, do not exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. The trait approach suggests that the differences in behavior can be explained by differences in individual characteristics and attributes of managers who are work-life supportive as compared to managers who are not supportive. Additionally, individual differences in managers within the same organization could help explain why organizational offerings of work-life policies and programs are not sufficient for individuals and organizations to encourage employees usage of work-life policies and programs.


**Situational Approach**

In the situational approach, leaders’ traits are not what determine an effective leader. Instead, the characteristics of the situation determine leader effectiveness (Ayman, 2004; Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006). Early conceptualizations and research on traits followed a definition of traits as stable and thus established an expectation that individuals with these traits would react and follow the same behavior in a variety of situations (Zaccaro et al., 2004). Interest in pursuing the situational approach to leadership was fueled by both an interest in the concept of the situation as the driver of leader effectiveness (Ayman, 2004; Zaccaro et al., 2004) and the inability of trait research to yield consistent results across situations. Situational characteristics can range from specific spatial arrangements to organizational culture (Ayman, 2004). For example, the spatial arrangement of a seat at the head of a table can impact the identification of an individual as a leader while the workplace culture can influence leader behaviors (Ayman, 2004).

The situational approach applied to work-life supportive leadership may help facilitate work-life supportive managerial behaviors by providing the situational characteristics that can encourage work-life supportive leadership behaviors. By creating the appropriate situations, work-life supportive leaders will emerge. Given the positive impact work-life supportive leadership can have on individuals and organizations, creating the appropriate situations for work-life supportive leadership behaviors to emerge seem beneficial.

**Combined Trait and Situation Approach**

The situational perspective led to the development of the leadership contingency models that have both leader traits and situational components (Ayman, 2004). Fiedler’s
contingency model is one of the earliest contingency theories of leadership (Yukl, 2006). Fiedler’s model describes the situations in which leaders possessing certain traits will be effective. The underlying premise is that leader traits are stable, yet situations change. The same leader traits that are effective in one situation may not transfer to leader success in a different situation. Other contingency models have been developed and include the path-goal theory of leadership, situational leadership theory and the multiple-linkage model (Ayman, 2004; Yukl, 2006). While differences exist amongst these theories and models, the basic premise is that situational characteristics can interact with a leader’s behavior and/or attributes to impact the outcomes (e.g., leader effectiveness).

Zaccaro (2007) offers a new perspective on conceptualizing traits and their relationship with situations and leader effectiveness. In this conceptualization, traits such as cognitive flexibility and social intelligence, which are stable across situations, fuel the leader’s ability to change his/her behavior as warranted by the situation. In other words, the trait itself allows the leader to vary behavior and actions to fit the situation and, ultimately, to achieve success across a variety of situations.

Early criticism of trait research’s inconsistent results may have inappropriately led researchers to abandon the trait approach in favor of the situational approach rather than to consider the complementary potential for these two perspectives (Zaccaro et al., 2004). In this complementary perspective, a combination of both trait and situational perspectives is used to explore and understand effective leadership (Zaccaro, 2007). Using the complementary approach, which considers both trait and situational variables as predictors of leadership effectiveness, I explore the likely trait and situational
antecedents of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. This complementary approach is depicted in Figure 1 and expanded shortly in Figure 2.

**FIGURE 1**
Application of Leadership Approaches

![Diagram](image)

**3.4 Proposed Model of Work-life Supportive Leadership**

As depicted in Figure 2, two leader traits, a manager’s empathetic personality and a manager’s personal work-life philosophy, are proposed as key dimensions of supportive work-life leadership. Within the situational context, my model identifies organizational work-life culture, leader-subordinate exchange quality, organizational centralization of authority, organizational formality and employee’s work-to-life conflict as key antecedents of work-life supportive leadership. The following sections discuss in more detail the proposed relationships depicted in Figure 2 and explain why these particular traits and situations were included in the research.
FIGURE 2
Hypotheses

Leader Traits
- Manager’s empathetic personality
  - H1 +
- Manager’s personal work-life philosophy
  - H2 +

Situational Factors
- Organization’s work-life culture
  - H3 +
- Leader-subordinate exchange quality
  - H4 +
- Organizational hierarchy
  - H5a -
- Organizational formality
  - H5b -
- Employee’s work-to-life conflict
  - H6a +
  - H6b -

Manager’s Work-life Supportive Leadership
**Traits**

Two key traits related to effective work-life supportive leadership and proposed in my model are a manager’s empathetic personality and personal work-life philosophy. Research evidence in the work-family literature guided the selection of these particular traits.\(^1\) I discuss the research opportunities this presents in the light of my findings in more detail in the closing chapter.

*Manager’s empathetic personality.* Managers who tend to understand other people’s situations, needs and concerns and exhibit greater empathy are expected to better understand employees’ work-life issues, and respond in ways that are more supportive than managers who lack this trait. Foley et al. (2006) hypothesized that the existence of empathy would be a predictor of family supportive supervision, but did not empirically test the proposed relationship. Research shows that managerial support for women’s use of flexible work arrangements is positively related to managers’ empathetic reactions to their female subordinates’ associated caregiving responsibilities (Barham, Gottlieb, & Kelloway, 2001; Powell & Mainiero, 1999). I therefore expect that managers who have a more empathetic personality will be more likely to behave in a work-life supportive manner. Thus, I predict:

\[Hypothesis 1: \text{The greater the empathetic personality of the manager, the more likely the manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors.}\]

*Manager’s personal work-life philosophy.* A complete separation between work and non-work spheres of an employee’s life is an enduring part of the ideal worker model that has become institutionalized in today’s organizations (Moen & Roehling, 2005; Rapoport

\(^1\) That said, there is a larger universe of additional traits as potential predictors of work-life supportive leadership that are not included in this research study.
et al., 2002). In organizations, ideal workers are employees who prioritize their jobs and are willing to limit non-work interests and responsibilities when work responsibilities necessitate it (Moen & Roehling, 2005; Rapoport et al., 2002). Thus, a manager who supports the concept of the ideal worker is likely to believe strongly that work should be the primary focal point in a person’s life. For these managers, a strong belief in the centrality of work responsibilities and support of the ideal worker model will result in an expectation that employees will prioritize work needs over family or personal needs. These managers are less likely to accept or facilitate employees’ pursuit of non-work interests and responsibilities. Thus, a manager whose personal philosophy supports the ideal worker model may be less likely to exhibit work-life supportive behaviors to subordinates. For example, a manager with an ideal worker orientation will strongly prioritize workplace responsibilities over non-work responsibilities and be less likely to value and support work-life programs and policies (Swody & Powell, 2007). Conversely, the more a manager’s personal philosophy values work and non-work roles, the more likely the manager will have a philosophy that integrates both work and non-work aspects of employees’ lives. Along with the manager’s greater appreciation for the value of work and non-work roles comes a greater display of managerial work-life supportive behaviors. Thus, I predict:

**Hypothesis 2:** The greater a manager’s personal work-life philosophy (i.e., the more value the manager places on employees’ work and non-work roles), the more likely the manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors.

**Situational Factors**

In the situational approach, the characteristics of the situation determine who will emerge as an effective leader (Bass, 1990). Four situational factors related to effective
work-life supportive leadership are proposed in my model. They include organizational work-life culture, leader-subordinate exchange quality, organizational structure and employee’s work-to-life conflict.²

**Organization’s work-life culture.** While previous research has shown that informal organizational support, such as supportive leadership, is a greater contributor to positive organizational and individual outcomes than formal programs and policies (Behson, 2005), the context in which a leader is situated is also likely to influence leadership behavior. Organizational culture, defined as the shared beliefs, norms and values of the members of an organization (Pinder, 2008) is likely to be an important situational variable that influences work behavior and thus the nature of work-life supportive leadership. Organizational cultures send messages to the managers within the organization about the organization’s values (Schein, 1992). A family-friendly organizational culture sends a message to leaders in the organization to support work-family balance (Major et al., 2008) and is associated with greater family supportive supervisory behaviors (Foley et al., 2006).

Managers’ perceptions of a supportive organizational work-life culture can be expected to lead to managerial expressions of work-life supportive behaviors to subordinates. Managers will interpret behavioral cues that are key elements of the organizational culture established by senior managers. The more the organizational culture is supportive of work-life balance, the greater the likelihood policies and practices are available to the manager to use in helping subordinates with work-life balance.

² Research evidence in the work-family literature guided the selection of these particular situational factors. That said, there is a larger universe of additional situational factors that are potential predictors of work-life supportive leadership that are not explored in this research.
Additionally, the more the culture is supportive of work-life balance, the more the manager will interpret work-life supportive behaviors as acceptable and perhaps even encouraged (Foley et al., 2006). Organizations that have work-life supportive cultures will likely have managers that demonstrate behaviors that reinforce the cultural values (Allen, 2001; Foley et al., 2006; Thompson et al., 1999). Thus, I predict:

_Hypothesis 3: The more supportive an organization’s work-life culture, the more likely a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors._

*Leader-subordinate exchange quality.* According to leader-member exchange theory (LMX), managers and subordinates can participate in an exchange relationship. As part of the exchange, the leader (i.e., manager) gives to the subordinates items that are desired by the subordinate and controlled by the leader (e.g., rewards, assignments) (Yukl, 2006). The subordinates offer to the leader, as their contribution to the exchange relationship, greater levels of trust, commitment, loyalty and assistance (Yukl, 2006).

Yukl, O’Donnell & Taber (2009) found evidence of a statistically significant positive relationship between subordinates’ views of managerial supportive behaviors and LMX; thus suggesting that managerial work-life supportive behaviors, when conceptualized as a subset of leader supportive behaviors, may also have a positive relationship with LMX. Applying the theory of LMX to work-life managerial support, managers may exhibit supportive work-life behaviors as their exchange contribution to employees with whom they have or wish to develop a strong LMX relationship. A subordinate’s relationship with a manager may be a positive contributor to access and usage of work-life programs (Friede et al., 2008). Subordinates to whom the manager displays work-life supportive behaviors would contribute trust, loyalty commitment as the subordinate’s contribution the LMX relationship.
Since this research focuses on the display of managerial work-life supportive behaviors, the exchange relationship is being viewed from the supervisor’s perspective in terms of assessing the subordinates with whom the supervisor should establish or grow strong LMX relationships and thus exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. A leader’s selection of subordinates with whom s/he will form a close working relationship is based on the leader’s perception of the subordinate's "(a) competence and skill, (b) extent to which they can be trusted, … (c) motivation to assume greater responsibility within the unit" (Liden & Graen, 1980, pp. 451-452). Subordinates viewed by managers as having high exchange qualities (e.g., competent, trustworthy and able to assume greater responsibility) are likely to be the recipients of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors (e.g., flexibility in work schedule). Thus, I predict:

**Hypothesis 4:** The greater a manager’s perceptions of the leader-subordinate exchange quality, the more likely the manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors with that subordinate.

**Organizational structure.** Organizational structure may serve as a predictor of leader behavior (Ford, 1981). This research considers centralization of authority and organizational formality as two components of organizational structure that can influence managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. An organization is considered to have greater centralization of authority when decision-making power is concentrated in higher organizational levels (Schminke, Ambrose, & Cropazano, 2000). Formal organizations have clearly defined roles and rules (Ford, 1981).

Organizations that have firmly established policies and procedures offer fewer opportunities for managers to make independent decisions involving procedures and rewards (Osborn & Hunt, 1975; Schminke et al., 2000). Thus, managers in formal
(Schminke et al., 2000), highly centralized work environments may lack the authority to make work-life decisions on a group and individual subordinate level. As such, managers will be less likely to consider and respond to individual subordinate’s work and non-work responsibilities. This lack of decision-making power may translate to fewer managerial work-life supportive behaviors. Formal work environments are less likely to enable employees to resolve work-life conflict (Rapoport et al., 2002) beyond stated one-size-fits-all formal policies. Managers’ lack of empowerment beyond formal, universal policies can translate to a lack of managerial work-life supportive behaviors displayed to subordinates.

Managers allowing their employees to use work-life supportive programs may need to change work processes and procedures to accommodate the work-life program. For example, managers implementing a telecommuting arrangement need to change the ways in which the telecommuting employee interacts with other employees and the manager (Meurs, Breaux, & Perrewe, 2008) as well as the evaluation criteria (e.g., work produced rather than hours in the office) (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). A manager in a highly centralized or highly formal organization that relies on set procedures and policies may have difficulty enacting the workplace changes associated with employee usage of work-life programs.

The more formal the environment, the more likely it may be that managers follow a set procedure to obtain approval for a work-life oriented change. Managers in an organization with high centralization of authority may need to get approval from more senior managers. In both cases, the presence of a strict approval procedure may reduce the likelihood of managers displaying work-life supportive behaviors.
Finally, managers’ lack of work-life supportive behaviors may be a reaction to the additional time demands placed on a manager pursuing work-life supportive programs in formal, centralized organizations.

Thus, I predict

*Hypothesis 5a*: The more the organization has centralization of authority, the less likely a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors.

*Hypothesis 5b*: The more formal an organization, the less likely a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors.

*Employee’s work-to-life conflict*. Employees’ work-to-life conflict may influence managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Employees experiencing work-to-life conflict may seek assistance from the workplace (e.g., the manager) with work-to-life conflict since the workplace is the source of conflict (Frone, 2003) and, in doing so, elicit managerial work-life supportive behaviors. In their manager-level model of predicting employee participation in family-friendly programs, Swody and Powell (2007) propose that managers’ responsiveness to employees’ work-family needs will be influenced by the degree to which managers are aware of the employees’ needs. Hall (1972) proposes three types of coping behaviors that a worker may use in response to role conflict: structural role definition, personal role redefinition and reactive role behavior. Of these three coping behaviors, only structural role definition involves the individual actively changing the environment or the expectations of others (Hall, 1972). Within the concept of structural role definition, an employee experiencing work-life conflict may proactively approach the manager and seek solutions that would reduce the employee’s work-life conflict. An employee who proactively raises work-life conflict issues with his/her manager may be the catalyst for the manager’s display of work-life behaviors (Rapoport
et al., 2002). For example, if the employee is high on work-to-life conflict (i.e., work is strongly interfering with non-work life) then the employee may seek managerial assistance and, as a result, the manager may exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. Thus, I predict:

**Hypothesis 6a:** The higher an employee’s work-to-life conflict (i.e., the more work is interfering with life), the more likely a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors.

According to attribution theory, individuals in a situation in which they are performing poorly will seek to attribute their poor performance to external factors (Steiner, Dobbins, & Trahan, 1991). Employees who experience work-to-life conflict may attribute their conflict to an external factor (e.g., their supervisor does not act in a work-life supportive manner). Therefore, employees experiencing work-to-life conflict may attribute their higher level of conflict to the lack of work-life supportive behavior from their manager. In doing so, employees can avoid assessing their work-to-life conflict or life-to-work conflict as a sign of their own poor performance (e.g., difficulty managing time, difficulty with work assignments).

A negative relationship between work-to-life conflict and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors may also exist in situations in which work-life conflict exists but at the same time the employee does not share this with his or her manager, perhaps for fear of negative career consequences. The literature cites examples of female employees leaving the workplace due a lack of supervisory support for work-life balance (Stone, 2007). A hardworking, conscientious employee with a heavy workload may work long hours and thus experience work-to-life conflict. If this employee’s supervisor is not
aware of and/or sensitive to the employee’s work-to-life conflict, work-life supportive managerial behaviors may not be elicited.

Thus, I predict an alternative hypothesis:

Hypothesis 6b: The higher an employee’s work-to-life conflict, the less likely a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors.

In this chapter I have discussed work-life supportive leadership as being a subcomponent of the broader leadership area of supportive behaviors, my application of the leadership framework of the trait and situational approaches to examine the theoretical antecedents of manager’s work-life supportive behaviors, as well as my hypotheses. A summary of the model and associated hypotheses are presented in Figure 2. The next chapter will discuss the research methods used to empirically test my hypotheses.
CHAPTER FOUR:

METHODS

4.1 Sample and Procedure

Sample of organizations

A convenience sample of five diverse organizations participated in this research, including a long-term nursing facility, an online learning management organization, an organization operating group homes for the care of developmentally-disabled adults, a not-for-profit organization aimed at improving quality of life for individuals and their community, and a division of a marketing communications company.

Procedure

An omnibus survey was developed in collaboration with MBA students as part of the students’ course requirement and included variables for this research. Students were granted permission to conduct the research at the workplace at which each MBA student was employed. The MBA students identified departments within their organization that might be willing to participate in the research. Students then met with the respective managers and subordinates within these departments. In addition to these data collected by MBA students, a convenience sample of two additional organizations was added at a later stage. The two additional organizations were selected based on the author’s access to the organizations and the organizational structure consisting of several workgroups that could meet the research needs for leader-subordinate dyads. A shorter survey with questions for this study only and not the additional questions that were part of the omnibus survey was distributed in these organizations. In the two additional organizations, managers in all departments were asked to participate in the data
collection. Managers who responded positively to the invitation to participate then provided the researcher with access to the managers’ direct reports. In departments where managers had more than ten direct reports, a convenience sample of ten direct reports was used.

The purpose of the research was described to all respondents as follows: “This questionnaire asks you to describe leadership in your work group. We are trying to learn about the things that leaders do to manage work groups effectively. Other questions ask about the work you do, your organization and opinions you have about working.”

Respondents were informed that their responses were confidential and that information from the questionnaire would be used for research purposes only. The questionnaire presented information about who was directing the research, how the researchers could be contacted in case there were any questions about the research, and the phone number and e-mail address of the University IRB to report any concerns about the research. (No concerns were reported). Participation in the questionnaire was voluntary. Subordinates at the workplaces of the MBA students received either a pencil and paper survey or were asked to participate using an online version. For the MBA students’ sample, the type of survey distributed to subordinates was determined by the practicalities of the workplace (e.g., some employees did not have internet access at the worksite). Subordinates in the two additional sites participated using paper and pencil versions. A few subordinates in the additional sites noted that the novelty of a paper survey resulted in their preference for participating in a paper format over an internet survey. At all sites, the managers received paper and pencil surveys.
Managers were assigned codes for each subordinate in the workgroup. In the second sample, for those supervisors with more than 10 direct reports, convenience samples of 10 subordinates were selected and codes were assigned to those subordinates. When completing the subordinate section of the manager survey, managers were given a coding sheet that contained the subordinate’s name and unique code. Managers transferred the unique code to the parts of the questionnaire in which they were rating individual subordinates. Managers then destroyed the coding sheet that contained the employee name and code, leaving the responses confidential.

Managers and subordinates were able to complete the surveys while at work. Respondents who received paper and pencil surveys placed their completed survey into an envelope and sealed the envelope. Sealed survey envelopes were then personally handed back to the researcher, mailed to the researcher or placed in a centralized pick up location in the office so that the researcher could personally pick up the surveys. Most respondents chose to mail the survey back to the researcher. At each site arrangements for handing back the surveys were decided before survey distribution.

A total of 84 managers and 384 subordinates received surveys; of these 76 managers (90%) and 269 subordinates (70%) completed their surveys. After matching manager and subordinate records, the final total sample consisted of 164 matching dyads. These matched dyads represented 164 subordinates (43%) and 45 managers (54%) from the five participating organizations. A summary of the number of subordinate and supervisor responses by organization is presented in Table 1.
TABLE 1
Summary of Responses by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Subordinates</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample of subordinates

Subordinate participants included professional (48%), managerial (12%), clerical (12%), sales (3%), technical (4%) and manual workers (6%). The sample included 24% male and 76% female respondents. The median age of the subordinates is 36.6. The sample included 17% of respondents having some high school or a high school diploma, 15% some college education, 16% a two-year college degree, 34% a four-year undergraduate degree, 17% a master’s degree, and 2% a doctoral degree. 59% of subordinates were married/in a committed long term relationship, and 48% have direct responsibility as a primary caregiver for dependent children or adults.

Sample of managers

The sample of managers included 16% male and 84% female respondents. The median age of the managers is 41.7. The sample included 11% of respondents having some high school or a high school diploma, 5% some college education, 22% a 2 year college degree, 26% a 4 year undergraduate degree, 30% a master’s degree, and 6% a doctoral degree. Manager participants included supervisors/office managers (15%), middle managers (56%), upper-middle managers (17%) and senior executives (13%).
4.2 Measures

Little prior empirical research has investigated the predictors of work-life supportive leadership behaviors; therefore, existing scales required some modification to meet the purposes of this research. To aid in adapting the scales, semi-structured interviews were conducted by the author among a convenience sample of four employees and five managers from a variety of organizations. These interviews focused on subordinates’ and managers’ perceptions of managerial work-life supportive behaviors and the predictors of those behaviors. The results of the interviews helped inform the revisions to existing scales and provided additional items to augment some previously validated survey scales.

**Dependent Variable**

*Manager’s work-life supportive behaviors.* Thomas and Ganster (1995) developed a nine-item scale for measuring work-family supportive behaviors. Subordinates report, on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often), how often in the past two months their manager has demonstrated the nine behaviors. Thomas and Ganster (1995) reported a coefficient alpha of .83 and Allen (2001) reported a coefficient alpha of .80 when using this scale. Lambert, Marler, Gueutal (2008) revised the scale to reflect a specific focus on flexible work arrangements by eliminating two items and including two additional items with a resulting coefficient alpha of .91.

After reviewing the originally reported scale, several of the behaviors were assessed as worded in a manner that was vague and did not clearly identify work-family supportive behaviors. Given the focus of this research on work-life supportive behaviors, the items in the original Thomas and Ganster (1995) scale were revised to more clearly
communicate work-life supportive behaviors. For example, an item originally worded as “Shared ideas or advice” was modified to read “Shared ideas or advice about balancing your work and personal responsibilities.” One managerial behavior, role modeling, was frequently mentioned in the interviews by both managers and subordinates, but not reflected in the Thomas and Ganster (1995) scale; therefore, an item was written to assess role modeling behavior and was added to the scale. The item reads, “Serves as a role model for balancing work and personal responsibilities.” Additional changes to the scale included wording the items to be present tense, using “your” instead of “my” to better fit with the wording of other items in the survey and eliminating double-barreled items when possible. The final scale had ten Likert-style items. Subordinates were asked to use a five-point scale to rate how accurately each statement described their manager’s supportive behaviors (1=Very Inaccurate, 3 = Uncertain, 5 = Very Accurate). The resulting Cronbach’s alpha was .86.

After the implementation of this research, a validated multidimensional measure of family supportive managerial behaviors was published (Hammer et al., 2009). Interestingly, the multidimensional scale includes role modeling as one of the four subordinate dimensions. Two of the subordinate dimensions (i.e., emotional support and instrumental support) were already reflected in the Thomas and Ganster (1995) measure. The inclusion of role modeling behaviors in the measure of work-life supportive behaviors used in this study, results in three of the four dimensions of the Hammer, et al (2009) scale being represented.\(^3\)

\(^3\) Hammer et al. (2009) discuss the construct of work-life supportive supervision as having four dimensions of emotional support, instrumental support, role modeling behaviors and creative work-family management. I conducted an exploratory factor
The introductory wording for the original Thomas and Ganster (1995) scale focuses on the extent to which the manager has demonstrated the listed behaviors in the past two months. Since managerial work-life supportive behaviors, as conceptualized in this research, refer to a manager’s orientation and overall behavior, the two month time horizon did not seem appropriate. Instead, the rating scale was revised to ask the respondent to rate the extent to which the items in the scale are an accurate or inaccurate description of the supportive behaviors of the manager. For example, if a manager did not listen to a subordinate’s work-life issues in the past two months, but consistently had listened four months ago, the subordinate using the original scale would give the manager a low rating of work-life supportive behaviors. However, with a revised scale, the manager could still be rated as a work-life supportive manager.

**Independent Variables**

*Manager’s empathetic personality.* A manager’s empathetic personality was measured using four items from the “Other’s Emotional Appraisal” sub-scale of the Wong-Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (Wong & Law, 2002). Items were reworded so that the rating could be assessed by the subordinates of a manager rather than a manager self-rating. Sample items include “Is a good observer of emotions in other people,” and “Is very sensitive...
to the feelings and emotions of others.” Ratings were made on the same five-point accuracy scale used to rate managers’ supportive behaviors. The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .83.

From individual subordinates’ ratings of a manager’s empathetic personality a managerial-level average rating was obtained and used in the analyses. Thus, concerns with common method variance are minimized since the independent variable of empathetic personality and the dependent variable of managerial work-life supportive behaviors are no longer both at the subordinate-level. Additionally, since manager’s empathetic personality is considered a trait and thus stable within individual managers, a managerial-level variable is more conceptually sound.

A score for each manager’s empathetic personality was obtained by taking an average of the subordinate’s ratings for each manager. In order to justify the use of an average rating, inter-rater reliability within-groups was computed using an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) (Bliese, 2000). A high ICC provides evidence that variance of the manager’s empathetic personality is explained by group membership.

Shrout and Fleiss (1979) refer to the ICC when each target (e.g., manager) is rated by a different set of judges (e.g., subordinates for that particular manager) as ICC (1,k) where k refers to the number of judges. This is also known as ICC (1) (Bliese, 2000). The ICC score is interpreted as the amount of variance in an individual’s rating of the dependent variable that can be explained by the individual belonging to a group. In general, inter-rater reliability levels of .4 - .59 are considered moderately acceptable and greater levels are associated with greater acceptability (Garson, 2010).

In this research, the ICC score will indicate the amount of variance in a subordinate’s rating of the supervisor’s empathetic personality that can be explained by the subordinate
belonging to the supervisor’s group. The higher the ICC, the more variance explained by group membership and the greater the support for using an average group rating of the focal variable. Using SPSS, I obtained the average measure ICC using an ANOVA model. The average measure ICC is appropriate since I am using the average rating from each manager’s group of subordinates for the manager’s empathetic personality rating. The ICC for the average measure was above .6 for 32 managers who each had more than one subordinate. Thus, these ICC values are above the .4 minimum levels for acceptability and thus the aggregation of scores is supported. Two managers had ICC average measures below .4 (i.e., .33, .09) and for one manager the ICC was a negative number. The negative ICC suggests that there is greater variability within the group than there is between groups (Bliese, 2000) and thus, a lack of evidence that the subordinate’s ratings can be aggregated for that group. Ten managers had only one subordinate in their group, and thus an average rating across multiple subordinates is not possible, so the single rating was used as the rating assigned for the manager’s empathetic personality.

Manager’s personal work-life philosophy. The manager’s personal philosophy of work-life balance was measured by adapting Allen’s (2001) 14-item family supportive organizational culture scale, which had a coefficient alpha of .91. For the current research, the 14 items and the associated statistics (e.g., factor loadings, item-total correlations) as reported by Allen (2001) were reviewed. Items that appeared repetitive, had lower factor loadings and/or corrected item-total correlations and/or low standard deviations and high means were removed from the scale to form a shorter 7-item scale. All items in the scale were reviewed to ensure that the wording reflected a work-life and not just a work-family focus. The shortened scale focuses on items that reflect a manager’s personal philosophy on
the interaction between one’s work and personal life. Sample items include: “Individuals who take time off to attend to personal matters are not committed to their work,” and “It is best to keep personal matters separate from work.” Managers used a 7-point scale to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that the statements described their own personal philosophy. Low scores indicate a manager whose personal philosophy supports the separation between employees’ work and personal lives and a prioritization of work over one’s personal life. High scores reflect an acknowledgment and acceptance of the interactions between an employee’s work and personal lives (e.g., taking time off for personal reasons does not negatively impact perceptions of work commitment). The seven-item scale used in this research had a Cronbach’s alpha of .72.

Organizational work-life culture. Organizational work-life culture, like a manager’s personal philosophy of work-life balance, was measured by adapting Allen’s (2001) 14-item family supportive organizational culture scale, which had a coefficient alpha of .91. Grandey et al., (2007) also used Allen’s (2001) family-supportive organizational culture measure in their study of family-supportive organizational culture’s relationship with work-family conflict and job satisfaction. As discussed earlier, in this research, the 14-item scale was reduced to 7 items. This research used the 7-item scale, with revisions to reflect the current

---

4 The 14-item scale when used by Allen (2001) had a unidimensional factor structure. However, when the same scale was used with a sample that was all male, rather than Allen’s sample that was largely female, the unidimensional structure was not supported (Grandey et al., 2007). The lack of consistent support for the unidimensional structure of the scale was interpreted as suggesting that men and women may interpret scale items differently. The one factor that had the highest reliability in Grandey, et al (2007) was labeled work-family balance and had a reliability of .74 with five items. All other factors that emerged had lower reliabilities. The seven items used in this research include four items that were part of the five item work-family balance factor in the Grandy, et al (2007) research.
work-life focus. Managers used a 7-point scale to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that the statements described their organization’s philosophy towards employees’ work and personal lives. Low scores indicate an organizational culture reflecting a traditional philosophy (i.e., work and life are separate spheres) while high scores reflect a culture in which an integrated work-life philosophy (i.e., work should be balanced with non-work life) is embraced.

Since the dependent variable in this research is managerial behavior, the manager’s actions are most likely going to be influenced by the manager’s perspective on the work-family or work-life friendliness of the organization. Therefore, organizational work-life culture was measured from the manager’s perspective. Cronbach’s alpha was .78 for the seven-item scale.

*Leader ratings of leader-subordinate exchange quality.* To assess the quality of the leader-subordinate exchange, a three-item rating scale developed by Wu and Taber (Wu & Taber, 2009) was used. Managers rated the overall effectiveness of each subordinate in carrying out his/her job responsibilities on a nine-point scale (1 = The least effective employee I have known, 5 = About average in effectiveness, 9 = The most effective employee I have known). A five-point scale (1 = Very Little, 3 = Moderate, 5 = Very Much) was used to rate the amount of trust they had in each employee. The same five-point scale was used to rate the amount of responsibility and authority they delegated to each employee. The three ratings were converted to a common metric and averaged to form an index of leader-subordinate exchange quality. Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .85.

*Organizational structure.* The two dimensions of organizational structure assessed were centralization of authority and organizational formality. Similar to the
organizational culture variable, the managers’ actions are likely to be affected by the manager’s perception of the centralization of authority and organizational formality. Therefore, ratings for centralization of authority and organizational formality were obtained from the managers. Organizational centralization was assessed using a five-item scale developed by Schminke, Ambrose, and Cropanzano (2000). Sample items include: “There can be little action here until a superior approves a decision,” and “I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.” Formality was assessed using a five-item scale developed by Oldham and Hackman (1981). Sample items include: “The organization has a large number of rules and policies,” and “The organization keeps a written record of everyone’s job performance.” Both scales were assessed on a seven-point agree-disagree scale (1 = Disagree Strongly, 4 = Neutral, 7 = Agree Strongly). Cronbach’s alpha for centralization was .90 and for formality was .75.

Employee’s work-to-life conflict. The original work-to-life scale was developed by Gutek, Searle, and Klepa (1991) and then supplemented with items developed by Carlson and Perrewé (1999). Carlson and Perrewé conducted a factor analysis on the original list of items that was termed work-family conflict and found two factors (work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict) with a Cronbach’s alpha for the full scale (i.e., both work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict) of .89. Lapierre and Allen (2006) used the scales created by Carlson and Perrewé (1999) and reported Cronbach alpha values ranging from .79 to .87.

The Carlson and Perrewé (1999) work-to-family scale was selected for this research since the wording better reflected a work-to-life rather than work-to-family orientation; nevertheless, the wording of the last item of the scale was revised to better
reflect the work-life focus of this research. The original wording of “My job or career keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend with my family” was changed to “My job or career keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend with my family or friends.” Sample items from the work-to-life scale reads, “After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I’d like to do” and “My work takes up time that I’d like to spend with family/friends.” Higher scores represent greater levels of work-to-life conflict. Cronbachs’ alpha in this study for the work-to-life conflict scale was .91.

*Control variables.* My model included several control variables I believed might influence the selected predictors to work-life supportive supervision. The leader’s gender, marital status and direct responsibility as primary caregiver for dependent children or adults were all considered control variables. Gender was measured as a binary variable (1 = “male,” 2 = “female”) as was marital status (1 = “single,” 2 = “married/partner”), and direct responsibility as primary caregiver for dependent children or adults (1 = “no,” 2 = “yes”).

Managers who are married and have direct responsibility as the primary caregiver for dependent children or adults may personally experience a need for work-life supportive supervision. These managers with a personal desire for work-life supportive supervision may be more responsive to the work-life needs of their subordinates and thus display work-life supportive managerial behaviors. Since women traditionally have been the caregivers for dependent children and adults, and thus have had more of a need for work-family supportive supervision, female managers may be more sensitive to the
employees’ work-life needs. This greater sensitivity based on traditional roles may result in a greater display of work-life supportive managerial behaviors among female managers.

4.3 Analytic Plan

Ordinary least squares regression was used to analyze the data. Control variables were entered at step 1. The independent variables were entered at Step 2. For data that were obtained from the manager, and exist at a manager level, the value given by the manager was assigned to all subordinates of that manager. Leader-member exchange quality data obtained from the manager was matched to the manager’s subordinates and thus, varies on a subordinate level. Data on the manager’s empathetic personality were obtained from subordinates and an average for each manager was calculated. This average rating of a manager’s empathy was then assigned to all subordinates who report to that manager. Work-to-life conflict ratings were obtained and entered on a subordinate level. The dependent variable was also obtained from subordinates.

Presented in Table 2 is a summary of the independent and dependent variables indicating the source from which they were obtained, the level of analysis used in the regression and the Cronbach’s alpha results.
**TABLE 2**
Summary of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s empathetic personality</td>
<td>Subordinates</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s work-life culture</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational formality</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers’ work-life supportive behaviors</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this research, individual subordinates are nested within a manager’s group and managers are then nested within the various organizations that participated in the study. Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) analysis can be used to analyze multi-level nested data (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000) in which the dependent variable is at the lowest level of analysis and the independent variables can range from the lowest level to higher levels of analysis (Hofman, Griffin, & Gavin, 2000; Jaccard & Turrisi, 2003). The dependent variable in this research is at the subordinate-level (i.e., the lowest level of analysis) and the independent variables include the lowest level (e.g., subordinate-level employee’s...
work-to-life conflict) and the highest level (e.g., manager-level personal work-life philosophy). The general sample size requirement for HLM is for 30 groups with 30 individuals per group (Hofman et al., 2000). While there is some flexibility in these sample requirements, it appears that my sample is too small for using HLM. While 45 managers (i.e., groups) are included in the research, for one manager I have data from 16 subordinates (i.e., 16 matched dyads) and for the remaining managers I have data from fewer than 10 subordinates per manager.

Due to the limitations in the sample size of the data collected, I have used ordinary least square (OLS) regression and assigned the scores of the manager level variable to each of the subordinates reporting to the manager (Hofman et al., 2000). With a manager’s empathetic personality, an average aggregated score and associated average ICC(1) score was calculated. The ICC score justified the use of the average score. The average score was then assigned to each of the subordinates reporting to that manager.

4.4 Power Analysis

I conducted a post-hoc power analysis using Soper’s (2010) online statistical power calculator. Assuming an alpha level of .05, seven predictors, my observed $R^2$ of .33 and the sample size of matched dyads of 164, the calculated power is 1.0. I then followed Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken’s (2003) suggested steps for alpha = .05. The resulting power estimate for this research study is .99.

4.5 Common Method Variance

With common method variance, a relationship between variables can be impacted by systematic error in a positive or negative direction. When this systematic error results in the relationship between an independent variable and the dependent variable being
inflated (or deflated), evidence of statistical significance could be in error (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). In this research, four remedies in the study design were used to mitigate the possibility of mono-method inflation. First, the data for the dependent variable was obtained from one source (i.e., subordinates) and the data for five of the seven independent variables (i.e., manager’s work-life philosophy, organization’s work-life culture, leader-subordinate exchange quality, organizational centrality of authority and organizational formality) was obtained from a different source (i.e., managers). Second, the variables used scales with different anchors. One of the two independent variables (i.e., work-to-life conflict) obtained from subordinates used anchor labels of strongly disagree and strongly agree versus the subordinate-obtained dependent variable which used anchors of very inaccurate to very accurate. Third, the remaining independent variable obtained from subordinates (i.e., manager’s empathetic personality) was converted to an average and thus represents an aggregated manager-level rating of empathy. Conceptually, since empathy is being viewed as a stable leader personality trait, subordinates should have similar ratings of their leader’s empathetic personality. The aggregation of ratings within a group is justified based on an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) and discussed later. As an aggregated average rating of subordinates’ perception of their manager’s empathetic personality, this variable can now be considered a manager-level variable. As such, the subordinate-level dependent variable and the manager-level independent variable of the manager’s empathetic personality now can be considered to be from two sources and the relationship between these two variables is no longer subject to common method variance concerns stemming from a single source of data. Finally, confidentiality and anonymity reduced social desirability concerns since
the researcher would not know the identity of the respondent who completed the questionnaire. In sum, there is minimal concern for common method variance.
5.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics, correlations, and internal consistency estimates are provided in Table 3. Multicollinearity does not appear to be an issue with most of the relationships between predictor variables. The correlations between a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and an organization’s work-life culture as well as an organization’s work-life culture and an organization’s centralization of authority approach .7 but still are below high levels of multicollinearity of .8 (Field, 2005). The Durbin-Watson test produces a value close to 2 (i.e., 1.997) indicating that the residuals, or error terms, are not correlated. As discussed earlier, all internal consistency estimates are above acceptable levels.

The control variable of a manager’s direct responsibility as a primary caregiver for any dependent children or adults shows evidence of statistically significant correlations with manager’s work-life supportive behaviors \( (r = .16, p<.05) \). The two remaining control variables of the manager’s gender and marital status do not show evidence of statistically significant correlations with the dependent variable of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The three control variables all show evidence of having statistically significant correlations with each other; the manager’s gender with the manager’s caregiving responsibility \( (r = -.25, p<.01) \), the manager’s gender with the manager’s marital status \( (r = -.16, p<.01) \) and the manager’s caregiving responsibility with the manager’s marital status \( (r = .25, p<.001) \).
**TABLE 3**

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Internal Consistency\( ^a \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  Manager's gender( ^b )</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Manager's caregiving responsibility( ^b )</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  Manager's marital status( ^b )</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  Empathy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  Organization's work-life culture</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  Centralization of authority</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  Organizational formality</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Work-life supportive behaviors</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a n=164. \) Cronbach's alpha (internal consistency) values are reported in italics on the diagonal for multiple-item measures.

\( ^b \) For dichotomous variables, the value shown is the percentage. For gender, it is percentage men; for marital status it is the percentage "married/partner;" caregiver responsibility it is the percentage of "yes" responses.

M = variable data analyzed at the manager level ; S = variable data analyzed at the subordinate level. This can differ from the data source listed in Table 1.

\( ^* p<.05 \)
\( ^{**} p<.01 \)
\( ^{***} p<.001 \)
5.2 Regression Analyses

Ordinary least squared regression was used to assess all hypotheses. Descriptive statistics of all variables and correlations are presented in Table 3. The regression results are presented in Table 4. In the regression analysis, control variables were entered in step 1 and then all predictor variables were entered in the subsequent step. The full model, consisting of the control variables and predictor variables, explains 33% of the variance in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The model appears to predict managers’ work-life supportive behaviors well (F = 7.690, p < .001). The predictor variables of empathy, leader-subordinate exchange quality and employees’ work-to-life conflict show evidence of being statistically significant predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Not surprisingly, the zero-order correlations of these three predictor variables with the dependent variable show evidence of statistical significance. The remaining predictor variables do not show evidence of being statistically significant predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Additionally, these remaining predictor variables do not have statistically significant zero-order correlations with the dependent variables. The regression results as well as zero-order correlations of each predictor variable with the dependent variable are presented in Table 4 and discussed below.

Traits as Predictors

Hypothesis 1 proposes the greater the empathetic personality of the manager, the more likely the manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. This hypothesis is supported. The results, shown on Table 4 show a statistically significant beta coefficient in the predicted direction (b = .43, p < .001).
Hypothesis 2 proposes the greater a manager’s personal work-life philosophy (i.e., the more value the manager places on employees’ work and non-work roles), the more likely it is that the manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. This hypothesis is not supported. In fact, as shown on Table 4, model 2, the beta coefficient for this variable is .001, suggesting that a change in a manager’s work-life supportive philosophy does not have any impact on the manager’s work-life supportive behaviors.

**Situational Variables as Predictors**

Hypothesis 3 proposes the more supportive an organization’s work-life culture, the more likely it is that a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. As shown in regression results reported in Table 4, this hypothesis is not supported. The beta coefficient was not significantly different from zero.

Hypothesis 4 proposes the greater a manager’s perceptions of the leader-subordinate exchange quality, the more likely it is that the subordinate will perceive the manager as exhibiting greater work-life supportive behaviors. This hypothesis is supported with a statistically significant beta coefficient in the predicted direction (b = .15, p < .05) shown on Table 4, Model 2. LMX theory (Yukl, 2006) would predict that leaders are likely to display different levels of work-life supportive behaviors to different employees based on the strength of the exchange relationship. My finding that leader-subordinate exchange quality is a significant positive predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors supports this concept that a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors will vary according to the strength of the LMX relationship.

Hypothesis 5a proposes the more the organization has centralized of authority, the less likely it is that a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. While
Hypothesis 5a is not supported with evidence of statistical significance, the predicted direction is supported. Hypothesis 5b proposes the more formal an organization, the less likely it is that a manager will exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. This hypothesis is not supported.

Finally, Hypotheses 6a and 6b focus on work-to-life conflict. Hypothesis 6a proposes the higher an employee’s work-to-life conflict (i.e., the more work is interfering with life), the more likely a manager is to exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. This hypothesis is not supported. Hypothesis 6b proposed the higher an employee’s work-to-life conflict, the less likely a manager will be to exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. This hypothesis is supported with a statistically significant beta coefficient in the predicted direction \( b = -0.26, p<0.001 \) as shown in Table 4, Model 2.

A summary of the regression results compared to the predictions is presented in Table 5.
### TABLE 4
Multiple Regression of Subordinates’ Ratings of Managers’ Work-life Supportive Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Zero-order</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>.16 *</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.48 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s work-life culture</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>.22 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>-.29 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.26 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Delta R^2 \]       .03          .30 ***
\[ \Delta F \]          1.88         9.870 ***
\[ R^2 \]                .03          .33
Adjusted \[ R^2 \]      .02          .29
Total \[ F \]            1.88         7.69 ***
Degrees of freedom      (3,160)     (7,153)

\( n=164 \). Standardized regression coefficients are reported.
* \( p<.05 \); ** \( p<.01 \); *** \( p<.001 \).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Predicted Relationship</th>
<th>Regression Relationship</th>
<th>Statistical Significance Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(p&lt;.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Post-hoc Analyses

Traits versus Situational Variables

A post-hoc regression analysis was conducted to explore whether one set of variables (i.e., trait or situational) is a greater predictor of the variance in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The different approaches in the leadership literature highlight the importance of traits as well as situations in predicting leader effectiveness. Using hierarchical regression, control variables were entered at step 1, trait variables at step 2 and situational variables at step 3. The results of this regression are presented in Table 6. The results suggest that trait variables explain a greater amount of the variance in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors ($\Delta R^2 = .21, p<.001$) than situational variables ($\Delta R^2 = .08, p<.01$).

I again used hierarchical regression to explore the contribution of trait versus situational variables to predicting managers’ work-life supportive behaviors by entering the situational variables at step 2 and trait variables at step 3. Since there are zero-order correlations between trait and situational variables that show evidence of statistical significance, I felt it important to change the order in which the trait and situational variables are entered in the hierarchical regression analysis. The statistically significant correlations between trait and situational variables impacts the hierarchical regression analysis since the set of variables entered in the last step are only able to explain the remaining, and therefore smaller, amount of unique variance. The results of this regression are presented in Table 7. While both trait and situational variables are still significant predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors, the contribution of trait variables in explaining unique variance above and beyond that of the situational
variables is reduced when trait variables are entered in the last step. In fact, situational
\( (\Delta R^2 = .14, p<.001) \) and trait \( (\Delta R^2 = .16, p<.001) \) variables seem to make similar
contributions in explaining the variance in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

It appears that, due to the shared variance between trait and situational variables,
the unique contribution of each type of variable is impacted by the order in which the
variables are entered in the regression analyses. The trait variables do appear to be
explain slightly more unique variance even after the unique contribution of situational
variables. The total variance explained by the combination of trait and situational
variables is approximately 30\%. It is possible that there are additional situational
variables that, if included, could result in a greater unique contribution of situational
variables to explaining the variance in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.
Table 6
Hierarchical Regression of Subordinates’ Ratings of Managers’ Work-life Supportive Behaviors with Trait Variables in Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>*** .08</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>*** .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s work-life culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>* .03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>*** .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta F )</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ( F )</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>(3,160)</td>
<td>(2,158)</td>
<td>(5,153)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n=164 \). Standardized regression coefficients are reported.
* \( p<.05 \); ** \( p<.01 \); *** \( p<.001 \).
### Table 7
Hierarchical Regression of Subordinates’ Ratings of Managers’ Work-life Supportive Behaviors with Situational Variables in Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's work-life culture</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td><strong>0.04</strong></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>*0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>*<strong>0.04</strong></td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>***0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>***0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>***0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>***0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>***0.17</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>***0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $F$</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>***0.13</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>***0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>(3,160)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,155)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,153)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n=164$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported.

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001
Does Common Method Variance Make a Difference?

Two of the independent variables (i.e., manager’s empathetic personality and employee’s work-to-life conflict) as well as the dependent variable were collected from subordinates. Collection of both independent and dependent variables from the same source can result in common method variance due to a single source (Podsakoff et al., 2003). In the initial regression analysis I conducted, an aggregated average score of the manager’s empathetic personality was used and thus I created a manager-level variable. This aggregation to a manager-level variable helps reduce the concern with common method variance due to a single source for the manager’s empathetic personality. However, since the data on a leader’s empathetic personality also exists on a subordinate-level, I am able to compute the regression results when data gathered at the subordinate level is used for the independent variable of manager’s empathetic personality as well as individual level data for the dependent variable. This allows me to explore the potential impact that common method variance from a single source might have on the regression results. Computing the regression analysis with this change only, the independent variables that show evidence of being statistically significant predictors of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors do not change. Manager’s empathetic personality ($b = .65, p < .001$), manager’s ratings of leader-subordinate exchange quality ($b = .14, p < .05$) and employee’s work-to-life conflict ($b = -.17, p < .01$) remain statistically significant predictors of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. The regression results for this analysis are presented in Table 8.
TABLE 8
Multiple Regression of Subordinates’ Ratings of Managers’ Work-life Supportive Behaviors with Individual Subordinate Perceptions of Manager’s Empathetic Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s work-life culture</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $F$</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>(3,160)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,153)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n=164$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. 
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.
Manager’s ratings of manager’s work-life supportive behaviors

While the subordinate’s ratings of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors were used as the dependent variable, I also obtained the manager’s own rating of his/her work-life supportive behaviors. The correlation between manager’s ratings of their work-life supportive behaviors and subordinate’s ratings of the manager’s work-life supportive behaviors is .23. This low correlation is not surprising because the managers provided an overall assessment of their own work-life supportive behaviors that were not associated with a particular employee. The subordinates, on the other hand, were rating the manager’s work-life supportive behaviors on an individual level (i.e., the extent to which that particular employee experienced work-life supportive behaviors from the manager).

Given that the dependent variable was also obtained at a manager level, I therefore explored the predictors of manager’s work-life supportive behaviors from the perspective of the manager’s self-reported supportive behavior, rather than the subordinates’. Using the measurement of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors as assessed by the manager, I conducted a regression analysis with the predictors from my model. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 9. Using a manager-level measure of manager’s empathetic personality, the results of the regression analysis (N=127) were that one control variable and four predictor variables show evidence of statistical significance: manager’s marital status ($b = .40, p < .01$), manager’s personal work-life philosophy ($b = .33, p < .01$), manager’s empathetic personality ($b = -.24, p < .01$), organizational work-life culture ($b = .24, p < .05$), organizational formality ($b = .44, p < .001$).
TABLE 9
Multiple Regression Analysis with Manager-Level Dependent Variable and Manager-Level Empathetic Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>** .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>** 0.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>*** .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>** 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>** 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's work-life culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>* 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>*** 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Delta R^2$                                      | .09     | **       | .43     | ***       |

$\Delta F$                                       | 4.13    | **       | 14.63   |           |

$R^2$                                           | .09     |          | .52     |           |

Adjusted $R^2$                                   | .07     |          | .48     |           |

Total $F$                                        | 4.13    | **       | 12.44   | ***       |

Degrees of freedom                               | (3,123) |           | (7,116) |           |

$n=127$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported.  
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.
Since in this latest regression analysis the dependent variable and manager’s empathetic personality are both manager-level variables, common method variance stemming from a single source of data is a concern. Thus, I also computed the regression equation using empathy as measured on an individual subordinate level. These results are shown on Table 10. The results of the regression analysis (N=127) are very similar to the results of the regression analysis when manager’s empathetic personality and the dependent variable both measured at a manager-level. In fact, the same control variable and independent variables show evidence of statistical significance: manager’s marital status ($b = .30, p < .01$), manager’s personal work-life philosophy ($b = .28, p < .01$), manager’s empathetic personality ($b = -.15, p < .05$) organizational work-life culture ($b = .26, p < .05$), and organizational formality ($b = .40, p < .001$).
TABLE 10
Multiple Regression Analysis with Manager-Level Dependent Variable and Subordinate-Level Empathetic Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>**.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>**.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>***.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s work-life culture</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆R²</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆F</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total F</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>(3,123)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,116), ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=127. Standardized regression coefficients are reported.
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.
Summary of Regression Analyses with Empathy and Managers’ Work-life Support Behaviors Measured at Different Levels

The four regression analyses presented in Tables 3, 8, 9 and 10 show the various regression results when the level of measurement of the independent variable of a manager’s empathetic personality and the dependent variable of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors vary from the individual subordinate level to the manager level. When the dependent variable of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors is measured at a subordinate level, regardless of the level of measurement of the manager’s empathetic personality, the predictor variables of a manager’s empathetic personality, leader-subordinate exchange quality, and employee’s work-to-life conflict are statistically significant. When the dependent variable of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors is measured at the manager level, regardless of the level of measurement of a manager’s empathetic personality, the predictor variables of: a) manager’s empathetic personality, b) manager’s personal work-life philosophy, c) organization’s work-life culture, and d) organizational formality are statistically significant. A manager’s empathetic personality is the only predictor that shows evidence of statistical significance across all of these analyses. A summary of the four regression analyses representing the different options for measuring the independent variable of a manager’s empathetic personality and the dependent variable of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors is presented in Table 11.
TABLE 11
Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Different Measurement Options of Empathetic Personality and Work-life Supportive Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Managers' Work-life Supportive Behaviors: Subordinate Level</th>
<th>Manager Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy: Subordinate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy: Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's work-life culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational formality</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Analysis Accounting for Suboptimal ICC Cases

When looking at the ICC results for the manager-level measure of manager’s empathetic personality, there were two managers’ ICC average measures that were below .6 and one that was a negative value. I repeated the regression in Table 3 after first removing from the analysis the dyads that included these three managers. The results of the regression analysis using the reduced sample (N=149) show evidence of statistical significance for the same three predictor variables: manager’s empathetic personality ($b = .45, p < .001$), leader-subordinate exchange quality ($b = .15, p < .05$) and work-to-life conflict ($b = -.20, p < .05$). This more conservative analytic approach still supports the leadership hybrid approach of trait and situational variables as being important predictors of leader behavior. The results of this regression are presented in Table 12.
**TABLE 12**
Multiple Regression on Managers’ Work-life Supportive Behaviors with Low and Negative ICCs Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s work-life culture</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>* 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $F$</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>(3,145)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,138)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n=149$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported.  
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.
**Moderator Analyses**

Using the logic of a contingency theory approach (Yukl, 2006) which suggests that situational variables act as moderators of the relationship between a trait variable and leader behavior, I looked at whether the situational variables were moderators of the relationship between the trait variables of a manager’s empathetic personality or a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. Before conducting the moderated regression analyses, I followed the suggestions of Jaccard & Turris (2003) and Wuensch (2009) and mean-centered each of my independent variables. I then separately computed the regression results for each of the situational variables acting as a moderator of the relationship between each trait variable and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. These results are shown on Table 13. For each moderated regression analysis, control variables are entered in step 1, centered independent variables entered in step 2, and the interaction term entered in step 3.

The only statistically significant moderator relationship is of leader-subordinate exchange quality as a moderator of the relationship between a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. The results of the regression analysis (N=164) are that a manager’s empathetic personality \((b = .43, p < .001)\), leader-subordinate exchange quality \((b = .15, p < .05)\), and employee’s work-to-life conflict \((b = -.26, p < .001)\) show statistical significance in step 2 with the interaction term for a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and leader-subordinate exchange quality \((b = .15, p < .05)\) statistically significant in step 3. The interaction term shows evidence of
statistical significance ($b = .15, p < .05$) and explains an additional 1.7% of the variance ($R^2 = .017, p < .05$) in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The results of this regression are presented in Table 13.

To further explore this moderating relationship, I graphed the interaction. Since the independent variables were centered, the x-axis units for a manager’s personal work-life philosophy range are in standard deviation units. Again following the procedures described by Jaccard & Turrisi (2003) and Wuensch (2009), I calculated the values of manager’s personal work-life philosophy and manager’s work-life supportive behaviors at different levels of leader-subordinate exchange quality. A medium rating of leader-subordinate quality was set at the mean of .01, and high leader-subordinate quality was set one standard deviation above the mean (i.e., +1.65) while low leader-subordinate quality was set one standard deviation below the mean (i.e., -1.65). The mean of leader-subordinate exchange quality ratings is 6.43 on a 9-point scale, and less than 8% of the leader-subordinate exchange quality ratings were below 4. Thus, the ratings of leader-subordinate exchange quality seem to be impacted by range restriction due to the especially small number of low leader-subordinate exchange quality ratings. Therefore, I only looked at the medium and high leader-subordinate exchange quality levels which are better represented in the data set. For high leader-subordinate exchange quality, there is a positive relationship between a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and a manager displaying work-life supportive behaviors. Thus, the greater the manager’s personal work-life philosophy, the more likely the manager is to display work-life supportive behaviors to employees with high leader-subordinate exchange quality. For medium-
level leader-subordinate exchange quality, there is a practically flat relationship between a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and a manager displaying work-life supportive behaviors. This suggests that for medium-level leader-subordinate quality exchange relationships, the display of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors is not affected by the degree to which a manager has a personal work-life philosophy. The degree to which managers display work-life supportive behaviors for high leader-subordinate exchange relationships is greater than the degree to which managers display work-life supportive behaviors for medium leader-subordinate exchange relationships. This is depicted by the high leader-subordinate exchange quality line being above the medium leader-subordinate exchange quality line for all levels of a manager’s personal work-life philosophy. This supports LMX theory (Yukl, 2006) in that supervisors will offer employees with whom there exists a high exchange relationship more opportunities and rewards (e.g., work-life supportive behaviors). Figure 3 visually depicts the relationship between a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and manager’s work-life supportive behaviors at medium and high levels of leader-subordinate exchange quality.
### TABLE 13
Multiple Regression Analysis with Leader-Subordinate Exchange Quality as the Moderator of Managers’ Personal Work-Life Philosophy and Managers’ Work-Life Supportive Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ SE</td>
<td>$\beta$ SE</td>
<td>$\beta$ SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s Gender</td>
<td>-0.01 0.17</td>
<td>-0.03 0.15</td>
<td>-0.01 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s Marital status</td>
<td>0.09 0.16</td>
<td>0.10 0.14</td>
<td>0.11 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>0.14 0.13</td>
<td>0.08 0.12</td>
<td>0.07 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.43 *** .08</td>
<td>.45 *** .08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>.00 .08</td>
<td>.05 .08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s work-life culture</td>
<td>-.10 .07</td>
<td>-.09 .08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>.23 ** .04</td>
<td>.15 .03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>-.04 .06</td>
<td>-.14 .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>.02 .06</td>
<td>.05 .06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>-.30 *** .04</td>
<td>-.26 *** .03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy x leader-subordinate exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 * .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30 ***</td>
<td>.02 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>9.87 ***</td>
<td>4.08 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $F$</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>7.69 ***</td>
<td>7.50 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>(3,160)</td>
<td>(7,153)</td>
<td>(1,152)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n=164$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported.

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

All trait and situational variables have been centered.
FIGURE 3
Leader-subordinate Exchange Quality as a Moderator of the Relationship between Managers’ Work-life Supportive Behaviors and Managers’ Personal Work-life Philosophy
**Regression Analysis by Gender**

As noted earlier, Grandey (2007) and Allen (2001) found different factor structures for the scale of family-supportive organizational perceptions. While Allen (2001) found evidence of a unidimensional factor structure, Grandey did not. The different findings were attributed to a difference in how males and females interpret the results. Given this potential gender difference, I analyzed the model for predicting managers’ work-life supportive behaviors by gender. To do so, I conducted separate regression analyses for male supervisors and for female supervisors. When the regression analysis is conducted for female supervisors (N = 138), the model explains 30.9% of the variance in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The model appears to predict managers’ work-life supportive behaviors well (F = 6.354, p<.001). The predictor variables of empathy (b = .41, p<.001) and employees’ work-to-life conflict (b = -.22, p<.01) show evidence of being statistically significant predictors of female managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. While the independent variable of leader-subordinate exchange quality was a statistically significant predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors in the original model presented in Table 3, leader-subordinate exchange quality does not show evidence of being a statistically significant predictor of female managers’ work-life supportive behaviors (p=.09). The smaller sample size of female managers (N = 138) as compared to the total sample (N = 164) may have negatively affected the emergence of leader-subordinate exchange quality in this analysis. The regression results for female managers work-life supportive behaviors are presented in Table 14. The small sample size of male managers (N = 26) limits the power of the
analysis and, not surprisingly, the model does not have a statistically significant F statistic ($F = 6.354, p = .051$).
Table 14
Multiple Regression of Female Managers’ Work-life Supportive Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Zero-order Correlation</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.14 (0.10)</td>
<td>.10 (0.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary caregiver responsibility</td>
<td>.20 (*0.17)</td>
<td>.10 (0.13)</td>
<td>.10 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.47 (**0.41)</td>
<td>.41 (***0.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's work-life culture</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-subordinate exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality</td>
<td>.17 (*0.13)</td>
<td>.13 (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
<td>.16 (*0.06)</td>
<td>-.06 (0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>-.26 (**0.22)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\Delta R^2\]  .05  .26
\[\Delta F\]  3.41  6.90 ***
\[R^2\]  0.05  0.31
Adjusted \[R^2\]  .03  .26
Total \[F\]  3.41  *  6.35 ***

Degrees of freedom  (2,135)  (7,128)

\(n=138\). Standardized regression coefficients are reported.

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.
Organization’s work-life culture and manager’s personal work-life philosophy

The variables of an organization’s work-life culture and a manager’s personal work-life philosophy were highly correlated ($r=.69, p<.001$). The high correlation between these variables may have prevented each variable from achieving statistical significance as a predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Therefore, I conducted two additional regression analyses to explore whether removing the shared variance would allow each variable to show evidence of statistical significance. First, I removed a manager’s personal work-life philosophy from the regression analysis. Even with this change, an organization’s work-life culture did not show evidence of statistical significance. In the next regression analysis, I removed an organization’s work-life culture but kept a manager’s personal work-life philosophy in the equation. In this analysis, a manager’s personal work-life philosophy did not show evidence of statistical significance as a predictor of a manager’s personal work-life philosophy.

Since the scales for both a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and an organization’s work-life culture were adapted from Allen’s (2001) family supportive organizational culture scale and the data for both was obtained from the managers, these scales may truly represent distinct concepts. To further explore this, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis using my subordinate sample of 246 respondents who completed both these scales, conforming to the 10:1 suggested ratio of respondents to items. I used common factor analysis with principal axis factoring to identify the latent constructs and an oblimin rotation since I expect my dimensions to be correlated. The scree plot suggests a one factor solution explaining approximately 37% of the variance.
However, in looking at the factor loadings, one item in each scale which reads “It is best to keep personal matters separate from work” loads on a second factor. While this appears in the factor matrix results, intuitively it does not seem that these items are conceptually different from the other listed items. Therefore, I used the scree plot results and conducted a regression analysis with a new variable that combined all the organization’s work-life culture and manager’s personal work-life culture items into one variable. The results of this regression analysis match the original regression results with a manager’s empathetic personality \((b = .44, p < .001)\), leader-subordinate exchange quality \((b = .15, p < .01)\) and employee’s work-to-life conflict \((b = -.25, p < .001)\) emerging as the three statistically significant predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

**Summary**

Using the leadership literature as a framework for the research model, I have proposed that both trait and situational factors will influence managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The results show support for a mix of trait (i.e., manager’s empathetic personality) and situational (i.e., leader-subordinate exchange quality and employee’s work-to-life conflict) variables as predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. In the next chapter I discuss these results, implications for theory and practice, and provide suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER SIX: 
DISCUSSION

Building on prior research on work-life supportive behaviors and using leadership theory, I developed a model of work-life supportive behavior in which both trait and situational are proposed predictors. The model was tested using data collected from a sample of 164 matched manager-subordinate dyads from five organizations. Results show that one trait variable, the manager’s empathetic personality, and two situational variables, leader ratings of leader-subordinate exchange quality and employee’s work-to-life conflict, significantly predict managerial work-life supportive behaviors.

6.1 Significant Trait Variable

This study provides the first empirical evidence supporting the relationship between managers’ empathetic personalities and subordinates’ perceptions of the managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Considered a trait variable, empathy’s significance in predicting managers’ work-life supportive behaviors also supports a trait approach to leadership. The finding that a manager’s display of empathy is a significant correlate of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors is consistent with prior theoretical conceptualizations (Barham et al., 2001; Foley et al., 2006). Foley et al. (2006) hypothesized that empathy would act as a mediating variable in the relationships of gender and racial similarity with family-supportive supervision. However, their hypothesized direct relationship between empathy and family-supportive supervision was not empirically tested. This research’s statistically significant results now provide
empirical evidence supporting Foley et al’s (2006) hypothesis. These results also support the findings of Barham et al. (2001) who argued that there is a relationship between manager’s empathy and support for female subordinates using flexible work arrangements. The results are also robust, holding up across a number of alternative statistical specifications in which empathy and managerial supportive behavior are measured by subordinates and by managers.

6.2 Significant Situational Variables

My results show evidence of two situational variables, leader-subordinate exchange quality and employees’ work-to-life conflict, being significant predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

**Leader-subordinate exchange quality**

My finding of a manager’s rating of leader-subordinate exchange quality as a significant predictor of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors is consistent with the logic of leader-member exchange (LMX) relationships. When a manager views a particular subordinate as being responsible, trustworthy and effective, the manager is likely to reciprocate with an exchange of work-life supportive behaviors to the same subordinate. Golden (2006) found evidence that higher quality LMX relationships are associated with greater use of telecommuting (Golden, 2006). This finding supports the notion that managers may offer work-life supportive behaviors as part of the leader-subordinate exchange relationship.

The finding of leader-subordinate exchange quality as a significant predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors also supports the notion that managers will
make idiosyncratic deals when considering work-life arrangements. Employees with stronger leader-subordinate exchange relationships may benefit from a greater likelihood of being the recipient of an idiosyncratic work-life arrangement.

**Work-to-life conflict**

The situational variable of employees’ work-to-life conflict significantly predicts work-life supportive behaviors. Theoretical arguments supporting a positive as well as negative relationship were presented earlier. The results of this research suggest that the relationship is negative. In other words, higher employee work-to-life conflict is associated with lower levels of perceived work-life supportive behaviors from the manager. According to attribution theory, individuals in a situation in which they are performing poorly will seek to attribute their poor performance to external factors; conversely, when performing well, individuals will seek to attribute their positive performance to internal factors (Steiner et al., 1991). Applying attribution theory to the empirical findings in this research, employees who experience work-to-life conflict may attribute their conflict to an external factor such as their manager not acting in a supportive manner. In doing so, employees can avoid attributing their work-to-life conflict as a sign of their own poor performance (e.g., difficulty managing time, difficulty with work assignments).

Employees who experience less work-to-life conflict would not need to make this same attribution. In other words, employees experiencing low work-to-life conflict would not make necessarily worry about whether their manager showed work-life supportive behaviors. Instead, they are more likely to attribute their success to their own
abilities. Therefore, employees high in work-to-life conflict should differ from employees low in work-to-life conflict on the degree to which they perceive and assess their managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. To further explore this notion, I conducted an ANOVA on managers’ work-life supportive behaviors by level of employees’ work-to-life conflict. Since the employee work-to-life conflict scale ranged from 1 to 7, I coded low work-to-life conflict as score ranging from 1-3 and high work-to-life conflict as scores ranging from 5-7. The results provide evidence that employees who experience higher levels of work-to-life conflict, as compared to employees who experience low work-to-life conflict, differ significantly in their perceptions of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. In fact, the mean rating of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors by employees who have high work-to-life (x = 3.71) is lower than the mean rating by employees who have lower work-to-life conflict (x = 4.0). Social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) may be useful in further explaining the negative relationship between employees’ work-to-life conflict and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. In looking to make sense of their work-to-life conflict, employees may rely on their environment and therefore their managers’ behaviors. Employees with high work-to-life conflict may use managers’ low levels of work-life supportive behaviors as an explanation for employees’ work-to-life conflict. Conversely, employees with low levels of work-to-life conflict may explain their conflict with a perception of managers’ high work-life supportive behaviors.

Alternatively, I also proposed a positive relationship between employees’ work-to-life conflict and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. This research does not
support that hypothesis. The lack of a finding that work-to-life conflict is a statistically significant predictor of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors in a positive direction conflicts with the expectation that employee’s surfacing work-to-life conflict will elicit helpful managerial responses (Hall, 1972; Rapoport et al., 2002), especially when the source of conflict is in the work domain (Frone, 2003). My measure of work-to-life conflict was the employee’s perception of their level of conflict, but did not address whether the employee had mentioned this conflict issue to the manager. A measure that specifically explores the employee initiating a discussion of the employee’s work-to-life conflict with the manager, rather than just the presence of the employee’s work-to-life conflict, might better detect the proposed positive direction of the relationship between work-to-life conflict and a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors.

Research exploring the relationship between managers’ work-life supportive behaviors and employees’ work-to-life conflict has typically placed managers’ work-life supportive behaviors as the independent variable and employees’ work-to-life conflict as the dependent variable. A statistically significant negative relationship explains managers’ work-life supportive behaviors as helping reduce work-to-life conflict. Since my research used the same measure of employees’ work-to-life conflict, rather than a measure of employees raising work-to-life conflict issues with the manager, the statistically significant negative relationship I found may be supportive of such previous research.
6.3 Non-significant Variables

I did not find significant relationships between managers’ work-life supportive behaviors and managers’ personal work-life philosophy, organizational work-life culture, organizational centrality of authority and organizational formality. There are several possible explanations for this lack of evidence, which I discuss below.

I did not find evidence of statistical significance for hypothesis 2 that a manager’s personal work-life philosophy would be a significant positive predictor of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. However, the results of the moderator analysis provide another interpretation of the relationship between managers’ personal work-life philosophies and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The absence of a main effect supporting hypothesis 2 appears to have been impacted by the moderating effect of leader-subordinate exchange quality. It seems that for high exchange relationships, the proposed hypothesis accurately depicts the relationship between managers’ personal work-life philosophies and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. In these high leader-subordinate exchange relationships, along with an increase in a manager’s personal work-life philosophy, there is an increase in a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. Following the tenets of LMX, managers will reward high exchange subordinates with rewards. Therefore, a manager who has a strong personal work-life philosophy will find work-life supportive behaviors to be of value and be more likely to display these valued behaviors to high leader-member exchange subordinates. Interestingly, in moderate leader-subordinate exchange quality, the display of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors is fairly constant and at a lower intercept than the high
leader-subordinate exchange relationship. Again, this finding seems to be supported by LMX theory. If the manager perceives the relationship to be a moderate leader-subordinate exchange quality, s/he may display work-life supportive behaviors at a lower level than the display within a relationship of high leader-subordinate quality relationship. Also, even with an increase in the manager’s personal work-life philosophy, the manager, due to the nature of the leader-subordinate exchange relationship, is lacking an incentive to provide exchange offerings and the display of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors does not increase within moderate exchange quality relationships.

Hypothesis 3, which stated that an organization’s work-life culture would be a significant positive predictor of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors, was also not supported. This finding suggests that there is a potential need for further refinement of the organizational culture concept as it relates to managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Since managers have the authority to make decisions within their workgroups that support or conflict with organizational policies and procedures (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006), work-life culture may need to be examined at a workgroup level.

While informal policies and programs have been shown to have a greater impact on usage of work-life programs (Behson, 2005; Thompson et al., 1999) the type of informal program may also be important. Informal programs at a workgroup level (e.g., manager’s empathetic personality, workgroup work-life culture) may have greater influence on work-life program usage than informal programs at an organizational level (e.g., organizational work-life culture).
I did not find evidence of statistical significance for Hypotheses 5a which stated that the organizational centrality of authority would be a significant predictor of manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. I was expecting to find a significant negative relationship such that with greater centrality of authority, managers would provide less work-life supportive behaviors. Although the findings were lacking significance, the predicted direction was supported. There are several possible explanations for this result. First, I did not obtain information on where the manager fits in the chain of authority or how much formal or informal power the particular manager wielded within the organization. Managers who occupy higher levels in the hierarchy are able to act more autonomously than lower level managers (Laurent, 1978). Managers with more formal organizational authority and power may feel more empowered to display work-life supportive behaviors than lower level managers, particularly in the absence of a formal policy.

With hypothesis 5b, I predicted that the more formal an organization, the less likely managers would be to exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. Instead, my finding was that the more formal an organization, the more likely the manager was to exhibit work-life supportive behaviors. In further analyzing the data, I found that the five organizations in the sample tended to be formal (M= 6.17; SD=.98) and were likely to have a work-life supportive culture (M = 4.90; SD=1.09). An organization with a cultural norm supporting work-life needs may have formal systems and procedures in place to support work-life issues. Thus, in this sample, formality is correlated with work-life
supportive culture and therefore also positively correlated with managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

For both hypotheses 5a and 5b, the relationship between organizational centralization of authority and organizational formality with managers’ work-life supportive behaviors may be moderated by the role of the HR department within the organization. A strong work-life-oriented HR department may provide resources to the subordinates and managers that encourage and reward managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. I had hypothesized that managers in an organization with a high organizational centrality of authority would be less likely to display work-life supportive behaviors. However, if the HR department is work-life-oriented and thus provides work-life supportive resources, managers in an organization with a high centralization of authority may be more likely to exhibit more work-life supportive behaviors as compared to an organization with high centralization of authority but a weaker HR function. Similarly, I had hypothesized that managers in very formal organizations would be less likely to display work-life supportive behaviors. The formality would inhibit managers’ subordinate-specific responses. Again, if the HR department is work-life oriented and thus provides work-life supportive resources, including various options and choices for managers to display work-life supportive behaviors, managers in a formal organization may be more likely to exhibit more work-life supportive behaviors as compared to a highly formal organization with a weaker HR function.
6.4 Limitations

As with all research, there are limitations to this study. The first is the use of a self-reported survey data, which may contribute to inflation of relationships between variables. However, I followed some of the recommendations of Podsakoff & MacKenzie et al. (2003) to counteract mono-method and mono-source bias in the design of the study. For example, I collected data from both managers and subordinates. Five of the seven independent variables were collected from managers (i.e., manager’s personal work-life philosophy, organizational work-life culture, ratings of leader-subordinate exchange quality, organizational centralization of authority, and organizational formality). While a measure of a manager’s empathetic personality was obtained from each subordinate, the final variable used in the research is an average of the subordinate’s ratings for each manager. By calculating a manager’s empathetic personality in this manner, I minimized common method variance on this variable and obtained an average personality measure that is more reliable that the individual measures as confirmed in the ICC analyses. The remaining independent variables (i.e., employee’s work-to-life conflict) used a different scale and anchors than the dependent variable.

This research is cross-sectional and, as such, cannot establish causality. This limitation has an impact on the interpretation of the results. How should we interpret the statistically significant negative relationship between work-to-life conflict and a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors? As employees experience more work-to-life conflict, do managers respond with fewer work-life supportive behaviors? Or, if we view work-to-life conflict as the dependent variable, the statistically significant finding of a
negative relationship fits with the established literature. That is, as managers display
more work-life supportive behaviors, employees experience less work-to-life conflict.
Future longitudinal research should use measures that more accurately capture a
subordinate’s discussion of conflict with the manager as an antecedent of a manager’s
work-life supportive behaviors.

The subordinates in this study are nested within managers and organizations.
Therefore, each subordinate is not completely independent from another. Additionally,
the organizational- related variables (i.e., organization’s work-life culture, organizational
centrality of authority, and organizational formality) were obtained from each manager
and assigned to each subordinate reporting to that manager. As such, they are manager
level variables, rather than organizational level variables. Additionally, managers are
nested within organizations and as such are not independent from each other. Future
analyses with a larger data set could explore utilizing hierarchical linear modeling to
explore these nested relationships.

The measures used in this research could be further refined to better reflect the
constructs of interest. Managers’ personal work-life philosophy and organizational
work-life culture were both adapted from Allen (Allen, 2001) and show evidence of
lacking distinction. The data for these measures were obtained from managers. Future
research should explore other measures of these constructs as well as sources (e.g.,
organizational culture as an aggregated average obtained from multiple managers and
subordinates within the organization). Employees’ work-to-life conflict is another
example of a measure that might benefit from more accurately reflecting the construct of
interest. Future research should explore measuring employees initiating discussions with managers on work-to-life conflict and the resulting relationship with manager’s work-life supportive behaviors (e.g., whether telling a manager about work-life conflict elicits a supportive response).

This research was conducted in five organizations. The lack of a finding of organizational-related variables such as organizational work-life culture, organizational centrality of authority and organizational hierarchy as statistically significant predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors may be due to the small sample size of organizations. Future research with a larger number of organizations should be conducted to better explore the role of these organizational-related variables in predicting managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

6.5 Theoretical and Empirical Contributions

This dissertation makes several theoretical and empirical contributions. First, in exploring the predictors of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors, this research addresses gaps in the current literature. Researchers have suggested that work-life supportive leadership contributes to the reduction of employees’ work-life conflict as well as organizational benefits (e.g., reduced turnover). The results of this theoretical and empirical investigation indicate a manager’s empathetic personality and leader-subordinate exchange quality are positively related to managerial work-life supportive behaviors.

Second, in framing my model using the leadership literature, this research integrates leadership theory with an accepted framework to the work-life literature. This is
especially relevant in exploring the topic of managerial work-life behaviors. The hybrid approach suggested by the leadership literature assumes that both trait and situational variables would be predictors of work-life supportive supervision. My results support the hybrid approach with evidence of statistical significance for a trait (i.e., empathy) and situational (i.e., leader-subordinate exchange quality, work-to-life conflict and life-to-work conflict) variables.

Third, this research contributes to a better understanding of roles that informal and formal programs play in the work-life domain. My findings that the manager’s empathetic personality and leader-subordinate exchange quality are significant predictors of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors supports the notion that informal programs and policies are critical in the perceptions and usage of organizational work-life offerings. Additionally, the finding that leader-subordinate exchange quality is a moderator of the relationship between a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors further develops the role of informal systems in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

Fourth, none of the organization-related variables (i.e., organization’s work-life culture, organizational centrality of authority, organizational formality) show evidence of being statistically significant predictors of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. This lack of significance coupled with the finding of statistical significance for the predictors of manager’s empathetic personality and leader-subordinate exchange quality highlight the critical role that manager-related traits and relationships play in the addressing employees’ work-life issues.
Fifth, in exploring work-life supportive leadership, rather than work-family supervision, this research contributes to a refinement in the discussion of work-life and not just work-family issues. A move towards using the terminology of work-life includes more employees and thus has the potential of imparting benefits to a greater number of employees and, in turn, to the organization. Additionally, a work-life focus has the potential to inform a wider group of academics and practitioners. For example, at the recent Academy of Management conference, a discussion on managerial responses to older workers seeking flexible work arrangements would benefit from the literature on managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. However, the relevance of literature framed as managers’ work-family supportive behaviors was initially overlooked by this group.

Sixth, this initial exploration of the predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors builds upon the existing discussion of the importance of these behaviors. In doing so, this research invites additional exploration and application of theory to better understand and encourage managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Additionally, the premise of employees’ work-to-life conflict as a predictor of managerial behaviors, rather than a criterion, is a new approach and the evidence of statistical significance provides support for further consideration.

Additionally, in the moderating analyses, leader-subordinate exchange quality is a moderator of the relationship between a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors. While there is a positive relationship in high leader-subordinate exchange relationships, the relationship is fairly flat in moderate leader-subordinate exchange relationships. This has implications for conceptualizing
leader-subordinate exchange relationships. Traditionally, the focus has been on high versus low relationships. Based on the moderator results, moderate relationships may warrant further exploration to better understand managers’ perceptions of the degree to which these subordinates are due rewards.

Finally, this research was conducted in five different organizations across different sectors, thus increasing its external validity, and contributes to the generalizability of these findings to different types of workplaces.

6.6 Implications for Organizational Policy

The results of this research have implications for organizations seeking to better manage work-life issues through providing work-life supportive leadership. Research has suggested that managers, by providing employees with resources to better manage work and personal responsibilities, may play an important role in the actual implementation and usage of strategic human resource policies and programs, and consequently may be important influencers of employees’ work-life conflict.

The finding that empathy is a significant predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behavior has implications for the selection, training and evaluation of managers. Effective work-life training programs need to emphasize the importance of empathy and, as such, might use exercises to help managers communicate empathy to subordinates.

My finding that leader ratings of leader-subordinate exchange relationships are a significant predictor of a manager’s work-life supportive leadership, while supportive of the theory of LMX, poses questions for managers and organizations about the universal
implementation of work-life programs versus the availability of these programs to a
select group of subordinates who have strong relationships with their managers. Senior
management and HR practitioners may need to grapple with questions such as, should
work-life supportive arrangements be available, as part of a high exchange relationship,
to a few select subordinates or should work-life support for all subordinates and be used
to build stronger exchange relationships? This finding also raises the issue of potential
equity issues among employees within one workgroup regarding the availability and
usage of work-life programs by select workgroup members.

My finding of a negative statistically significant relationship between work-to-life
conflict and a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors raises several questions for
organizations to consider. HR professionals may want to examine with employees the
best remedies for work-life conflict resolution, such as offering coaching and support for
subordinates on how to proactively address work-to-life conflict with managers. There
also may be a need for a feedback mechanism and assessment in managers’ appraisals on
the extent to which managers respond to employees’ work-to-life conflict and display
work-life supportive behaviors.

In addition to employees needing to surface work-to-life conflict with managers,
it may also be prudent for employees to cultivate high leader-subordinate exchange
relationships. The reward for the development of high leader-subordinate exchange
relationships appears linked with the display of work-life supportive behaviors. HR
professionals may need to counsel employees on the role employees can play in creating
environments that are more likely to elicit managers’ work-life supportive behaviors
(e.g., being responsible, trustworthy, effective). A career perspective that counsels employees to think of their career path and associated work-life needs, not just their current job and work-life needs, may also be warranted. In thinking of career paths, employees might develop strong relationships with managers before the employees’ needs arise for managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. The employee’s payoff for developing a strong leader-subordinate relationship may come, at a future date, when the employee’s need for manager’s work-life supportive behaviors emerge and are granted.

The research results also suggest that the factors that influence a subordinate’s perceptions of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors are more specific to the manager and less associated with the organizational culture and structure. Organizations therefore need to pay more attention to selecting, training and appraising managers than to simply developing organizational rules and regulations. Managers need to realize the important role their actions play in communicating work-life supportiveness to employees and not rely on formal documents to communicate work-life supportiveness.

6.7 Future Research

The Perspective Matters: Managers versus Subordinates

Both empathetic personality and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors were measured and self-reported by the manager and/or subordinate. In post hoc analyses, I ran different regression analyses representing the two ways of measuring a manager’s empathetic personality (i.e., individual subordinate rating or average manager rating) and the two ways of measuring the dependent variable of managers’ work-life supportive
behaviors (i.e., subordinates’ perspectives and managers’ perspectives). The results of these additional analyses produced several interesting themes.

First, in each of these regression analyses, there is consistent support for the hybrid approach discussed in the leadership literature. Second, a manager’s empathetic personality is a statistically significant predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behavior in each of the analyses. Interestingly, when managers’ work-life supportive behaviors are measured at a subordinate level, the more empathetic the manager, the greater the display of managerial work-life supportive behaviors. However, when managers’ work-life supportive behaviors are measured by managers’ perceptions of their own work-life supportive behaviors, the more empathetic the manager, the less the display of managerial work-life supportive behaviors. This finding may suggest that the relationship between managers’ empathetic personalities and managers’ displays of work-life supportive behaviors are influenced by other variables. Anecdotally, conversations with senior executives from two of the research sites provided support for finding a negative relationship between managers’ empathetic personalities and managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. In two of the organizations from which I collected data, senior executives felt that organizational pressure on the managers to deliver business results and provide outstanding service to clients may hinder managers’ abilities to display work-life supportive behaviors. One senior executive noted his belief that managers, in an effort to compensate for their inability to enact work-life supportive behaviors, may display increasing amounts of empathy to their subordinates. These senior executives believe that managers display empathy out of caring for subordinates...
and understanding subordinates’ needs, even if positive managerial work-life supportive responses are not feasible. Future research should explore a variety of work environments that present constraints to managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

It is important to interpret with caution the findings from the analyses when managers’ work-life supportive behaviors are measured from the managers’ perspective. The measure of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors from a manager’s perspective was an overall measure and not subordinate-specific. That is, each manager provided one rating for each item in the scale of managerial work-life supportive behaviors. Given the finding in this research of the importance of leader-subordinate exchange in the display of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors, subordinate-specific ratings would be more appropriate. Further supporting the notion that an overall, average managerial work-life supportive measure is not appropriate, I computed an average measure ICC(1) for the subordinate ratings of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. A high ICC provides evidence that variance of the manager’s empathetic personality is explained by group membership. In general, inter-rater reliability levels of .4 - .59 are moderately acceptable and greater levels are associated with greater acceptability (Garson, 2010).

Approximately 68% of the managers had average ICC scores that could be considered unacceptable and therefore would not warrant use of an average measure. This finding supports the notion that managers’ work-life supportive behaviors should be recorded on an individual, not managerial, level. The low ICC scores imply that the individual variance in the display of managers’ work life supportive behaviors within workgroups is too great to justify aggregation.
Lastly, the predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors vary based on how the dependent variable is measured (i.e., managers’ perspectives or subordinates’ perspectives) but do not vary according to how a manager’s empathetic personality is measured. When a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors are measured at a subordinate level, regardless of the level at which level a manager’s empathetic personality is measured, the situational variables of leader-subordinate exchange quality and employee’s work-to-life conflict are statistically significant predictors. However, when the subordinates’ descriptions of a manager’s work-life supportive behaviors are aggregated to a manager level, regardless of the level at which a manager’s empathetic personality is measured, the trait variable of a manager’s personal work-life philosophy and the situational variables of organizational work-life culture and organizational formality are statistically significant predictors. These results are summarized in Table 11. This finding suggests that managers may be influenced by organizational factors when evaluating their actions, such as displaying work-life supportive behaviors. This raises questions for future exploration. Are managers focused on how their behaviors fit in the organizational norms and structure? Are subordinates focused on how managers’ work-life supportive behaviors relate to the subordinate’s more personal world (e.g., employee’s work-to-life conflict, leader-subordinate relationship)?

**Work-life supportive behaviors and mediator relationships**

The extant literature has discussed the benefits of work-life supportive supervision, as well as the potential discrepancies between formal and informal work-life policies and programs’ impact on employees’ work-to-life conflict. However, the
literature has not explored a model in which work-life supportive supervision may serve as a mediator between formal work-life policies and programs and employees’ work-to-life conflict. That is, the absence of a strong relationship between formal work-life policies and programs and employee work-to-life conflict may be due to work-life supportive supervision serving as a mediator. Formal work-to-life programs and policies may influence work-life supportive supervisory behaviors which, in turn, influence employees’ work-to-life conflict.

**Work-group variables**

My model included leader, organization and employee related variables. However, as noted earlier, the nature of the workgroup’s function or the employee’s specific job may be a more proximal predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. Future research should explore the role of workgroup and job-specific attributes. For example, managers in workgroups that include autonomous job functions and low interdependence among job functions may be more likely to display work-life supportive behaviors. While organizational centralization of authority and hierarchy were not statistically significant predictors of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors, future research should explore these areas on a more manager-specific level. For example, managerial levels may influence the display of work-life supportive behaviors (e.g., senior manager, middle manager, first line manager). Ingram & Simons (1995) hypothesized that organizational offerings of work-family programs would be influenced by the extent to which work-family offerings are the norm within organization’s industry. The authors used data from the 1991 National Organizations Study and found support for
their hypothesis. Using similar logic, managers may be influenced in displaying work-life supportive behaviors by the extent to which successful managers within the organization display such behaviors. While organizational work-life culture is currently a measure in this research, future research focusing on the managers’ work-life supportive behaviors may want to more specifically focus on the manager’s environment.

This research shows evidence of a manager’s empathetic personality being positively related to the display of managerial work-life supportive behaviors. Applying learning from past leadership research, it is unlikely that a single trait will lead to leadership effectiveness in all situations. For example, can organizational factors (e.g., organizational culture) thwart empathetic managers in their efforts to display work-life supportive behaviors?

Work-family researchers have found that control over work, which includes job autonomy and independent work, to be an important factor in reducing work-life conflict (Kelly et al., 2008). Applying this to managers’ work-life supportive behaviors, it may be that the nature of the work performed by the workgroup or by the individual will impact the display of managers’ work-life supportive behavior, which will in turn impact employees’ work-to-life conflict. Thus, managers’ work-life supportive behaviors might mediate the relationship between employees’ job autonomy and employees’ work-to-life conflict. My measures of the managers’ perceptions of organizational centrality and formality focused on the organizational structure, but the nature of the workgroup’s function or employee’s specific job may be a more proximal predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.
**Gender**

In this research, I treated the manager’s gender as a control variable. Future research should explore the potential impact supervisors’ and subordinates’ genders may have on managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. For example, Powell and Mainero (1999) found support for managers’ attitudes towards employees’ requests for flexible work arrangements differing according to the employees’ gender. Barham et al. (2001), suggest that managers, influenced by social norms, may be more willing to grant flexible work arrangements for caregiving to women rather than men. Future research should continue to explore the role of subordinates’ gender in managers’ work-life supportive behaviors.

The independent variable of leader-subordinate exchange quality is a statistically significant predictor of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors in the original model presented in Table 3, yet not a statistically significant predictor of female managers’ work-life supportive behaviors as presented in Table 14. It may be that female managers are more responsive to the work-life needs of employees, regardless of the nature of the exchange relationship with particular employees. This may stem from female gender roles that have emphasized caregiving and the female managers’ sensitivity to employees’ fulfilling their non-work responsibilities. Future research should explore the potential for differences in the work-life supportive behaviors of male versus female managers.

Lastly, future research could look at the match between supervisor and subordinate gender and the potential impact on managers’ work-life supportive
behaviors. For example, do female managers exhibit differences in work-life supportive behaviors when the subordinate is female versus male?

6.8 Conclusions

Trait and situational factors contribute to managerial displays of work-life supportive behaviors. The degree to which a manager is viewed as having an empathetic personality and the manager’s ratings of leader-subordinate exchange quality are key predictors of a manager exhibiting more work-life supportive behaviors. This underscores the key role that managers play above and beyond the formal organizational policies and programs. It also highlights the informal nature of the implementation of organizational work-life policies and programs. Managers understanding their role in broadening employee perceptions of and access to work-life supportive programs and policies could result in greater organizational and individual benefits.

Future research should continue to explore the potential antecedents of managers’ work-life supportive behaviors. A deeper understanding of these antecedents can help organizations encourage managers’ work-life supportive behaviors and thus positively impact organizational and individual outcomes.
APPENDIX A: MEASURES

Managers’ work-life supportive behaviors

Please indicate whether each statement below is an accurate or an inaccurate description of supportive behaviors your supervisor might do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Somewhat Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write a number on each blank line using the 5-point scale above.

___  1. Switches your schedule (hours, overtime hours, vacation) to accommodate your personal responsibilities.
___  2. Listens to your personal problems.
___  3. Criticizes your efforts to combine work and personal life.
___  4. Juggles your tasks or duties to accommodate your personal responsibilities.
___  5. Shares ideas about balancing your work and personal responsibilities.
___  6. Holds your personal responsibilities against you.
___  7. Helps you figure out how to solve problems regarding your competing work and personal responsibilities.
___  8. Is understanding about your competing work and personal responsibilities.
___  9. Shows resentment of your personal responsibilities.
___ 10. Serves as a role model for balancing work and personal responsibilities.
Manager’s empathetic personality

How accurately does each statement describe your supervisor’s behaviors?

:_____________:_____________:_____________:_____________:____________:_

1  2  3  4  5
Very InaccurateSomewhat InaccurateUncertainSomewhatAccurateVery Accurate

Please write a number on each blank line using the 5-point scale above.

_____ 37. Is very aware of how other people are feeling.
_____ 38. Is a good observer of emotions in other people.
_____ 39. Has a good understanding of the emotions of people around him/her.
_____ 40. Is very sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.

Manager’s personal work-life philosophy

Part C asked you about the philosophy of your organization. The current section presents the same issues, but asks your own philosophy. How strongly do you agree or disagree that the statements describe your personal philosophy.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Disagree  Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Agree  Agree
Strongly  Moderately  Slightly  Neutral  Slightly  Moderately  Strongly

Please write a number on the blank lines using the 7-point agree-disagree scale above.

_____ 1. Work should be the primary priority in a person’s life.
_____ 2. It is best to keep personal matters separate from work.
_____ 3. Employees who are highly committed to their personal lives cannot be highly committed to their work.
_____ 4. Attending to personal needs, such as taking time off for sick children or elderly parents, is frowned upon.
_____ 5. Individuals who take time off to attend to personal matters are not committed to their work.
_____ 6. It is assumed that the most productive employees are those who put their work before their personal time.
_____ 7. Employees are given ample opportunity to perform both their job and their personal responsibilities well.
**Organization’s work-life culture**

The following statements are not about your own personal beliefs, but might describe the philosophy of your organization. How strongly do you agree or disagree that the statements describe the philosophy of your organization?

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

*Please write a number on the blank lines using the 7-point agree-disagree scale above.*

_____ 1. Work should be the primary priority in a person’s life.
_____ 2. It is best to keep personal matters separate from work.
_____ 3. Employees who are highly committed to their personal lives cannot be highly committed to their work.
_____ 4. Attending to personal needs, such as taking time off for sick children or elderly parents, is frowned upon.
_____ 5. Individuals who take time off to attend to personal matters are not committed to their work.
_____ 6. It is assumed that the most productive employees are those who put their work before their personal time.
_____ 7. Employees are given ample opportunity to perform both their job and their personal responsibilities well.
Leader-member exchange quality

Rating 1: Delegation of responsibility
Please estimate the amount of responsibility and authority you delegate to each employee. By "delegating" we mean giving the employee additional responsibility and authority for tasks or decisions you otherwise would handle yourself.

For each subordinate circle the number that best describes the amount of responsibility and authority you delegate to that subordinate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Moderate Little</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating 2: Trust in the subordinate
Please estimate the level of trust you have in each employee. By "trust" we mean that you can count on the employee to carry out any task you assign them to the best of their ability.

For each subordinate circle the number that best describes the level of trust you have in that subordinate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Moderate Little</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating 3: Overall effectiveness
Please consider the overall effectiveness of each subordinate in carrying out his/her job responsibilities. For each subordinate, select one of the following response choices and circle the number of your rating on the scale provided next to the subordinate's ID#.

1. The least effective employee I have known
2. Well below average, in the bottom 10%
3. Moderately below average, in the bottom 25%
4. A little below average, in the bottom 40%
5. About average in effectiveness
6. A little above average, in the top 40%
7. Moderately above average, in the top 25%
8. Well above average, in the top 10%
9. The most effective employee I have known
Organizational Structure

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree that the statements below generally describe your organization.

1 Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Disagree 4 Neutral 5 Agree 6 Agree 7 Agree
Strongly Moderately Slightly Slightly Moderately Strongly

Organizational Centrality of Authority

1. There can be little action here until a superior approves a decision.
2. A person who wants to make his/her own decisions would be quickly discouraged.
3. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.
4. I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.
5. Any decision I make has to have my boss’s approval.

Organizational Formality

6. The organization has a large number of written rules and policies.
7. A “rules and procedures” manual exists and is readily available within this organization.
8. There is a complete written job description for most jobs in this organization.
10. There is a formal orientation program for most new members of the organization.
Work-to-Life Conflict

How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement below?

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

Please write a number on each blank line using the 7-point scale above.

_____ 1. After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I’d like to do.
_____ 2. On the job I have so much work to do that it takes away from my personal interests.
_____ 3. My family/friends dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at not at work.
_____ 4. My work takes up time that I’d like to spend with family/friends.
_____ 5. My job or career interferes with my responsibilities at home, such as yard work, cooking, cleaning, repairs, shopping, paying the bills, or child care.
_____ 6. My job or career keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend with my family or friends.
### APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL TABLES

#### TABLE A1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations When Manager’s Empathetic Personality is Measured at a Subordinate-Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Manager's gender&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manager's caregiving responsibility&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manager's marital status&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-16**</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathy</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organization's work-life culture</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-18**</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Centralization of authority</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-23**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-44***</td>
<td>-65***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organizational formality</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Work-life supportive behaviors</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>n=164. Cronbach's alpha (internal consistency) values are reported in italics on the diagonal for multiple-item measures.

<sup>b</sup>For dichotomous variables, the value shown is the percentage. For gender, it is percentage men; for marital status it is the percentage “married/partner;”
caregiver responsibility it is the percentage of “yes” responses.

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001
TABLE A2
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations With Manager-Level Dependent Variable and Empathetic Personality at Manager-Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Manager's genderb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manager's caregiving responsibilityb</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manager's marital statusb</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathy</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal work-life philosophy</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organization's work-life culture</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-23**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leader-subordinate exchange quality</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Centralization of authority</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.60***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organizational formality</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work-to-life conflict</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Work-life supportive behaviors</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n=127.**

*bFor dichotomous variables, the value shown is the percentage. For gender, it is percentage men; for marital status it is the percentage "married/partner;” caregiver responsibility it is the percentage of "yes” responses.

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001
### TABLE A3

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations With Manager-Level Dependent Variable and Empathetic Personality at Subordinate-Level

| Variable                                      | M    | SD  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Manager's gender<sup>b</sup>              |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Manager's caregiving responsibility<sup>b</sup> | 68%  | .12 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Manager's marital status<sup>b</sup>      | 74%  |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Empathy                                   | 3.50 | .69 | .11  | .15* |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Personal work-life philosophy             | 5.08 | .95 | -.17*|      | .15* | -.01 | .14  |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. Organization's work-life culture          | 5.00 | 1.02| -.11 | .23**| -.00 | -.03 | .64***|      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Leader-subordinate exchange quality       | 6.20 | 1.74| .04  | .05  | -.00 | .01  | .33***| .24** |      |      |      |      |      |
| 8. Centralization of authority               | 2.20 | .94 | .05  | .20* | .11  | .12  | -.23**| -.60***| .10  |      |      |      |      |
| 9. Organizational formality                  | 6.30 | .58 | .06  | .08  | -.21**| .16* | .17*  | .10  | .02  | -.19*|      |      |      |
| 10. Work-to-life conflict                    | 3.12 | 1.60| .05  | .03  | .02  | -.19*| -.02  | -.03 | -.02 | .04  | -.09 |      |      |
| 11. Work-life supportive behaviors           | 4.05 | .42 | .11  | -.03 | .25**| -.03 | .38***| -.42***| .03  | -.24**| .37***| -.12 |

<sup>a</sup>n=127.

<sup>b</sup>For dichotomous variables, the value shown is the percentage. For gender, it is percentage men; for marital status it is the percentage "married/partner;" caregiver responsibility it is the percentage of "yes" responses.

*<i>p</i><.05

**<i>p</i><.01

***<i>p</i><.001
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