

Summer 2019

## Who Receives More Family Related Support in the Workplace? A Meta-Analysis of Gender Differences in Family Related Support

Daroon M. Jalil  
*Old Dominion University*, [daroonjalil@gmail.com](mailto:daroonjalil@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds)



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Jalil, Daroon M.. "Who Receives More Family Related Support in the Workplace? A Meta-Analysis of Gender Differences in Family Related Support" (2019). Master of Science (MS), thesis, Psychology, Old Dominion University, DOI: [10.25777/eewq-9w66](https://doi.org/10.25777/eewq-9w66)  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds/238](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds/238)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

**WHO RECEIVES MORE FAMILY RELATED SUPPORT IN THE WORKPLACE? A  
META-ANALYSIS OF GENDER DIFFERENCES IN FAMILY RELATED SUPPORT**

**by**

Daroon M. Jalil  
B.A. May 2017, James Madison University

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

PSYCHOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY  
August 2019

Approved by:

Xiaoxiao Hu (Director)

Xiaohong (Violet) Xu (Member)

Abby Braitman (Member)

## **ABSTRACT**

### **WHO RECEIVES MORE FAMILY RELATED SUPPORT IN THE WORKPLACE? A META-ANALYSIS OF GENDER DIFFERENCES IN FAMILY RELATED SUPPORT**

Daroon M. Jalil  
Old Dominion University, 2019  
Director: Dr. Xiaoxiao Hu

The purpose of the current study was to meta-analytically estimate if gender differences exist in the provision of family related support in the workplace. Gender differences are of particular interest in the realm of family related support in the workplace because they lie at the intersection of prescribed gender roles for both men and women at home and work. Family related support plays an integral role in an employees' willingness to utilize family friendly policies that organizations provide to meet the increasing needs of employees to balance work and family demands. Though it may seem like a simple research question, theoretical models provide conflicting predictions on the presence of gender differences and the empirical evidence is inconsistent. Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) meta-analytical procedures were employed to test for the presence of gender differences in family related support and potential moderators. Results indicate that female employees receive significantly more family related support than male employees in the workplace. Additionally, significant moderators of the gender difference were GDP, unemployment rate, masculinity, and time orientation. Theoretical and practical implications regarding the role that gender roles play in support and work-family conflict are discussed.

Copyright, 2019, by Daroon M. Jalil, All Rights Reserved.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
THE CHANGING NATURE OF FAMILIES.....	3
SUPPORT .....	5
GENDER DIFFERENCES .....	7
ROLE THEORIES .....	8
SHIFTING STANDARDS .....	10
ALTERNATIVE THEORIES .....	12
CURRENT STUDY.....	13
MODERATORS .....	14
II. METHODS .....	24
KEYWORD SEARCH .....	24
SELECTION CRITERIA .....	25
CODING .....	25
META-ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES .....	28
III. RESULTS .....	31
IV. DISCUSSION .....	37
THEORETICAL IMPLICATION .....	37
MODERATORS .....	39
GDP .....	39
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE .....	40
MASCULINITY .....	41
TIME ORIENTATION .....	42
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH .....	43
PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS .....	46
CONCLUSION .....	47
V. REFERENCES .....	54
VI. VITA .....	84

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table	Page
1. MEAN GENDER DIFFERENCE IN FAMILY RELATED SUPPORT .....	34
2. MODERATOR ANALYSES RESULTS .....	35
3. ARTICLES INCLUDED IN THE META-ANALYSIS.....	49

## **CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION**

The world of work has experienced change in terms of its workforce and the nature of work itself (Crain & Stevens, 2018; Montez, Sabbath, Glymour & Berkman, 2014; Society for Human Resource Management [SHRM], 2017). These changes have played a significant role in the prevalence of work-family conflict (WFC), a stressor that is becoming increasingly common for employees (Crain & Stevens, 2018). Organizations have attempted to address this issue by instilling family-friendly workplace policies to help their employees balance work and family demands (Allen, 2001). However, the availability of these policies has been found to be necessary but insufficient in helping employees balance work and family demands. Rather, the utilization of these family-friendly policies is, in part, contingent on the employee's perceptions of family related support in the workplace (Allen, 2001; Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2009; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999).

Thomas and Ganster (1995) break family-supportive work environments into two components: family supportive policies and family supportive supervisors. Correspondingly, supportive work environments are now typically measured with family supportive organizational perceptions (FSOP; Allen, 2001) and family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB; Hammer et al., 2009). In the current study, the term family related support encompasses both FSSB and FSOP. Family related support has shown a stronger relationship with WFC than general forms of support (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). In addition to its stronger relationship to WFC, family related support has links to increased engagement (Rofcanin, Las Heras, & Bakker, 2017), better work performance (Bagger & Li, 2014), increased organizational commitment (Allen, 2001; Choi et al., 2018), increased job satisfaction (Bagger & Li, 2014;

Behson, 2005; Breugh and Frye, 2007), and decreased turnover intentions (Kim, Las Heras, & Escribano, 2016; Las Heras, Trefalt, & Escribano, 2015). There has also been a surge in the literature looking at family related support, particularly within the past three years (Crain & Stevens, 2018).

The question of whether gender differences exist in family related support arises when considering several factors relevant to family related support, particularly the established gender roles of women as the caretakers (Eagly & Karau, 2002) and the evidence of gender discrimination against women in the workplace, including differences in wages (Economic Policy Institute, 2017) and treatment (Coombs & King, 2005). Geller and Hobfoll (1994) discuss how the provision of workplace social support can be subject to gender bias, like women receiving fewer opportunities for mentorship and fewer chances to participate in off-the job social activities. Indeed, gender is often incorporated either a moderator or control in the literatures of family related support (Ratnasingam et al., 2012; Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen, 2013) and WFC (Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002; Thompson et al., 1999), implying the differential experiences of family related support and WFC between genders.

However, to my knowledge, studies explicitly analyzing gender differences in FSSB and FSOP do not exist. Additionally, there isn't a clear consensus in the general support literature as to whether gender differences occur in the other forms of workplace support, with some studies suggesting that women receive significantly more social support than men (Mcbeey & Karakowsky, 2017; Selvarajan, Singh, & Clonigerome, 2016) some suggesting that women receive less (Behson, 2002; Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, & Zagenczyk, 2013), and others finding they receive similar amounts of support (Carvalho & Chambel, 2014; Zhang & Tu, 2016). Finally, current theories are fragmented. Theories like social role theory (Eagly, 1987),



shifting standards model (Biernat, 2003), lack of fit model (Heilman, 1983), and role enhancement theory (Barnett & Gareis, 2006; Barnett & Hyde, 2001) all provide theoretical rationale for gender differences in either direction, or none at all (discussion below).

The purpose of the current study is to meta-analytically determine if gender differences exist in family related support by looking at studies that measure FSSB, FSOP, or both. Additionally, moderators will be analyzed to determine potential contexts (age, tenure, female or male dominated fields, national culture, gender inequality, power distance) in which these differences may be exacerbated or attenuated. This study makes several contributions. First, it offers meta-analytical estimates on whether there are gender differences in family related support received in the workplace. In doing so, it tests several theories that provide conflicting predictions on gender differences in family related support. It also provides context for these differences through moderator analyses.

### **The Changing Nature of Families and Work Family Conflict**

The world of work is continuously experiencing change. In terms of the workforce, there is an increase in the number of female workers with children, an increase in workers with multiple caregiver responsibilities, more dual career couples, and a growing number of single parents in the workforce (Crain & Stevens, 2018; Montez et al., 2014; SHRM, 2017). The nature of work is also being revolutionized, particularly with the rise in technology, which has blurred the boundaries between work and non-work time (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Crain & Stevens, 2018; Hammer & Zimmerman, 2011; Montez et al., 2014; SHRM, 2017). These changes have played a significant role in the prevalence of WFC (Crain & Stevens, 2018). WFC occurs when the demands of or the participation in a role at work is incompatible with a family role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Conflict can arise when family responsibilities interfere with

work demands or when work demands interfere with the family demands (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). As of 2017, 46% of men and 43% of women report experiencing WFC on a regular basis (SHRM, 2017). WFC has a negative impact on outcomes that are related to work (e.g., work satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, burnout), to family (e.g., marital satisfaction, family satisfaction, family related stress), and to general life outcomes (e.g., life satisfaction, psychological strain, stress, depression; Allen et al., 2000; Amstad, Meier, Fasal, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011).

With WFC's impact on a plethora of outcomes across domains, organizations are increasingly providing family supportive policies to address the changing natures of the workplace and help their employees balance demands from both work and family domains. These family supportive policies include, but are not limited to, providing onsite child care, elder care, flextime, telecommuting, job sharing, family leave, resource, and referral services (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). However, offering workplace family friendly policies is not enough. These policies are necessary but insufficient in mitigating WFC (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). Instead, organizations need to provide these policies in tandem with ensuring that the culture of the workplace is one that welcomes and encourages employees to take advantage of these family friendly policies to meet their family demands (Allen, 2001; Hammer et al., 2009). If this culture is not fostered and employees feel judged or anticipate hostility for using the family friendly policies, employees are unlikely to utilize the family friendly policies and resources provided by the organization. Rather, employees are more likely use family friendly policies when they feel supported and empowered to do so (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999).

## Support

Support has been conceptualized as a buffer to the negative impact of stressors and strains (Cohen & Wills, 1985) and as a job resource that can help employees achieve their goals and stimulate personal development (Llorens, Bakker, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2006). Social support has been integrated in theoretical models such as the Buffering Hypothesis (Cohen & Wills, 1985) and the Job-Demands Resource Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) as an important factor in reducing the effects of strain and improving wellbeing and engagement. However, support is a complex construct that can vary in its source (e.g., organization, supervisor, coworker, family, spousal), its type (e.g., instrumental, emotional), and its form (e.g., behavioral and perceptions; French, Dumani, Allen, & Shockley, 2018). Meta-analytical evidence corroborates the negative relationship between support and WFC, but also shows that specific family related support is more strongly related to WFC than general organizational or supervisor support (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner & Hammer, 2011). These results indicate that family related support constructs are appropriate, relevant, and important when studying WFC.

One of the two major family related support constructs is FSSB. FSSB are a behavioral form of support from supervisors and are defined as the supervisor's ability to empathize with the employee's desire to seek balance between work and family responsibilities (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Hammer et al.'s (2009) established FSSB measure has four dimensions: *emotional support, role modeling behaviors, instrumental support, and creative work-family management*. *Emotional support* involves perceptions of understanding, care, sympathy, and feelings of comfort when discussing family related issues and concerns for how work is affecting their family (Hammer et al., 2009). *Role-modeling behavior* involves the supervisor modeling

work-life integration through modeling behaviors, while *instrumental support* refers to the supervisor's provision of day to day resources and services to meet the employee's work and family needs. These include reacting to scheduling conflicts and helping employees interpret policies and practices. Finally, *creative work-family management* is defined as "managerial initiated actions to restructure work to facilitate employee effectiveness on and off the job" (Hammer et al., 2009, p. 842). Unlike instrumental support, creative work-family management is more proactive, strategic, and innovative (Hammer et al., 2009).

FSSB have been linked to outcomes like greater engagement (Rofcanin, Las Heras, & Bakker, 2017), increased work performance (Bagger & Li, 2014; Rofcanin et al., 2017), decreased WFC (Kossek et al., 2011), increased family satisfaction (Thompson & Prottas, 2006), increased organizational commitment (Allen, 2001; Choi et al., 2018), better sleep outcomes (Crain et al., 2014), increased job satisfaction (Bagger & Li, 2014; Behson, 2005; Breugh & Frye, 2007), and reduced turnover intentions (Kim et al., 2016; Las Heras et al., 2015). Additionally, FSSB can account for variance in job satisfaction and turnover intentions above and beyond that of general support (Hammer et al., 2009).

The other family related support, FSOP, are a unidimensional construct that refer to "global perceptions that employees form regarding the extent the organization is family-supportive" (Allen, 2001, p. 416). The FSOP construct is rooted in the perceived organizational support literature, but FSOP narrows the global assessments of perceived organizational support literature to family issues in particular (Allen, 2001). Employees with high FSOP believe that the organization supports their family life. They don't feel less valuable for attending to family demands or that they have to sacrifice their careers for their families (Allen, 2001; Jennings, Sinclair, & Mohr, 2016). FSOP is positively related to organizational commitment, life

satisfaction, job satisfaction, reduced turnover intentions, and reduced WFC (Jennings et al., 2016; Las Heras et al., 2015; Ratnasingham et al., 2012; Wayne et al., 2013).

### **Gender Differences**

Gender differences are of interest in the realm of family related support because they lie at the intersection of prescribed gender roles for both men and women at home and work. Established family related gender roles include fulfilling the role of the homemaker for women and the role of the breadwinners for men (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Another factor to consider is the evidence of gender discrimination in the workplace; women are paid, on average, 22% less per hour than men (Economic Policy Institute, 2017) and have fewer high earning chances than their male counterparts (Cotter, Hermsen, Ovadia, & Vanneman, 2001). They are more likely to report unfair interpersonal treatment at work, including being held to higher performance standards, not being fairly considered for a promotion, and not being included in administrative decisions (Coombs & King, 2005). They can also find themselves at a social support disadvantage through social isolation at work, fewer opportunities in finding a mentor, and less participation in off the job social activities that can often play an important role in the acceptance and advancement in an organization (Geller & Hobfoll, 1994).

Though it may seem like a simple research question, there is not clear consensus in the general support literature about the existence of gender differences in the support received in the workplace. Some studies suggest women receive significantly more social support than men (Mcbey & Karakowsky, 2017; Selvarajan, Singh, & Clonigerome, 2016), some suggest that women receive less (Behson, 2002; Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, & Zagenczyk, 2013), and others find they receive similar amounts of support (Carvalho & Chambel, 2014; Zhang & Tu, 2016). In addition to inconsistent findings in the general support literature, to my knowledge,

there are no studies that systematically analyze gender differences in the provision of workplace family related support. Finally, different theories provide conflicting predictions on the existence and direction of gender differences in family related support.

### **Role Theories**

Social role theory (Eagly, 1987) has often been used to explain gender differences found in the workplace (Beehr, Farmer, Glazer, Gudanowski, & Nair, 2003; González-Morales, Peiró, Rodríguez, & Greenglass, 2006; Wallace, 2014). This theory invokes common gender norms and considers the consequences of acting incongruently with these norms (or roles). Norms have a descriptive and prescriptive component (Benard & Correll, 2010; Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2001). In the context of gender, descriptive norms refer to what men and women *are* or *are not*, while prescriptive norms describe what men and women *should* or *should not* do (Burgess & Borgida 1999; Eagly & Karau 2002; Heilman, 2001; Rudman, 2001). For example, the thought that women are more communal (e.g., considerate, warm, obedient, emotional, and sensitive), while men are agentic (e.g., achievement-oriented, decisive, assertive, and analytical) are descriptive norms. The idea that women would not succeed in management positions and would better serve the occupational role of nurses or counselors because they are assumed to possess greater helping and communal skills are prescriptive norms (Benard & Correll, 2010; Eagly & Karau 2002).

Gender norms are particularly salient because they have endured across time and societies (Heilman, 2012) through the different socialization experiences of men and women (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006; Fagot, Rodgers, & Leinbach, 2012). When a member of a group acts inconsistently with their prescribed role, or how society believes they should behave, the violation of these norms can result in backlash (Rudman & Glick, 2001); their evaluation is

lowered, they receive disapproval, and they are derogated (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2012). Both descriptive and prescriptive norms can motivate discrimination (Benard & Correll, 2010), which can take many forms in the workplace, including social rejection, negative characterizations (Heilman, 2001, 2012) and differences in the provision of workplace social support (Geller & Hobfoll, 1994).

While a female employee may be seen as violating the prescriptive norm of being the caretaker for their family and simultaneously infringing on prescriptive norm of males being the provider, resulting in discrimination (Benard & Correll, 2010), this line of reasoning might not be applicable when looking specifically at family related support. Female employees who attempt to meet family demands are still, to some extent, acting consistently with the prescriptive norm of being caretakers and attending to family needs. Women are expected to experience family demands because of their prescriptive norms, and thus, organizations can expect to provide workplace accommodations to female employees. Indeed, even in dual career families (Neilson & Stanfors, 2014), family responsibilities and household labor (Bartley, Blanton, & Gilliard, 2005; United Nations Panel on Women's Economic Empowerment [UNPWEE], 2016) disproportionately fall on women. Additionally, women disproportionately scale back on their careers to meet family needs (Becker & Moen, 1999). Because female employees experience oppositional social identities of parent and professional more so than men, who's role as a father and a professional share more overlap than being a mother and a professional (Hodges & Park, 2005), providing family related workplace support may mitigate the perceived norm violation of female employees.

Furthermore, these theories would predict that men receive less family related support. Men traditionally have mutually supportive work and family roles; by working, they are also

providing financially for their family (Hodges & Park, 2005; Kmec, 2010; Shockley, Shen, DeNunzio, Arvan, & Knudsen, 2017). Because working fulfills their family demands and work needs, male employees would not expect to need family related support to meet family demands, and thus receive less of it. There is some empirical support for this. When requesting a family leave, men receive more negative perceptions than women in terms of their work ethic (Wayne & Cordeiro, 2003), in recommended rewards (Allen & Russell, 1999) in suggested penalties (Rudman & Mescher, 2013), and are viewed as less masculine (Vandello, Hettinger, Bosson, & Siddiqi, 2013). These theories and evidence suggest that female employees would receive more family related support.

### **Shifting Standard Model, Lack of Fit, and The Motherhood Penalty**

While social role theory would predict that women receive more family related support, the shifting standard model (Biernat, 2003), lack of fit model (Heilman, 1983; Heilman, 2001), and the “motherhood penalty” (Benard & Correll, 2010) suggests that female employees would receive less family related support. These theories and phenomena discuss the relative disadvantage that women experience in the workplace. The shifting standards model suggests that mothers are doubly disadvantaged by gender stereotypes due to the use of different evaluative standards (Biernat & Manis, 1994; Benard, Paik, & Correll, 2007). At home, women are disadvantaged because “men are held to more lenient stereotypes about parenting behaviors” (Benard, Paik, & Correll, 2007, p. 1366). At work, female employees are disadvantaged by gender discrimination that impedes their selection, pay, promotion, and overall work experience (Benard, Paik, & Correll, 2007; Biernat & Fuegan, 2001; Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008).



The lack of fit model (Heilman, 1983; 2001) proposes that female stereotypes promote negative expectations about women's abilities, skills, and performance by creating a perceived "lack of fit" between the attributes women are thought to possess and the attributes deemed necessary to succeed on the job (Heilman, 1983; Heilman, 2001). To retain others' approval in the workplace, women must behave consistently with the descriptive norms of communality (Tyler & McCullough, 2009), while simultaneously having to demonstrate the stereotypical male attributes of being assertive and competitive to succeed in the workplace (Grant, 1988; Phelan et al., 2008).

In a series of studies looking at experiences of females in male dominated fields (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004), women were found in a double bind where they were perceived to be less competent, unless there was clear evidence of their skills, in which case they are then perceived as less likable (Hill, Corbett, & St Rose, 2010). As such, female employees can find themselves in paradoxical situations with conflicting evaluative standards. If they do not meet family demands, then they may be perceived as not fulfilling their prescriptive role as a mother, which would result in role incongruence and disapproval (Benard & Correll, 2010). However, if they put their family needs first, they are confirming the perceived lack of fit in the workplace, making their negative performance expectations (Heilman, 2012) salient. Negative performance expectations may be interpreted as a lack of support in the workplace. It may also result in fewer resources invested in the employee, because they're not seen as not having as much potential (Kierein & Gold, 2000; Rosenthal & Rubin; 1978).

Indeed, empirical support exists for the negativity women, particularly mothers, face in the workplace. The "motherhood penalty" (Benard & Correll, 2010) describes a cross cultural

phenomenon (Sigle-Rushton & Waldfogel, 2007) in which mothers fare worse in the labor market in terms of wages, perception of competence, and perceptions of commitment than other employees (Anderson, Binder, & Krause, 2002; Budig & England, 2001; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Güngör & Biernat, 2009; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). The “fatherhood bonus”, on the other hand, refers to the benefits accorded to men that are fathers, including better wages, perceptions of dependability, loyalty, competence, and warmth (Cuddy et al., 2004; Glauber, 2008; Hodges & Budig, 2010).

These results, when considering social dominance theory, should not be surprising, given that men enjoy a disproportionate share of resources, positive social value, and power over women (Pratto et al., 2006). In addition to receiving less support and holding less power in the workplace, women are also held to paradoxical expectations (Heilman, 2012). Although the motherhood penalties studied encompass only wages and perceptions (Anderson et al., 2002; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004), it is possible that this penalty extends to family related support as well. These theories and evidences of the disadvantaged status of women in the workplace suggest that women would receive less family support.

### **Alternative Theories**

Finally, it is also possible that there are no gender differences in family related support. Although a common sentiment in the work-family domain is that balancing work and family is a gendered issue and that gender is “essential to consider to fully understand work-family interference” (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005, p. 181), Shockley et al.’s 2017 meta-analysis found that men and women generally do not differ in WFC. Furthermore, theories in the work-family literature have moved beyond theories of conflicting social roles; for example, role accumulation theory explains that holding multiple social roles can actually result

in positive outcomes like pooled resources, a sense of fulfillment, and increased status. These positive outcomes can outweigh the associated negativity of having both work and family responsibilities (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002; Sieber, 1974). Similarly, work-family enrichment theory (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), and role enrichment theory (Rothbard, 2001) have proposed that family roles and work roles can be beneficial and improve the quality of life in the other role (Barnett & Garies, 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Marks, 1997; Sieber, 1974). There is also dispute as to whether theories about gender roles and norms are sufficient in keeping pace with the changing nature of work and family. With the changes in society, like dual earner households becoming the norm (Neilson & Stafors, 2014), some scholars argue that society has shifted in such a large extent that the assumptions of gender role theories are becoming obsolete (Barnett & Hyde, 2001).

### **Current Study**

The purpose of the current study is to determine if gender differences exist in family related support and to discover specific contexts that strengthen or attenuate these differences. This will be accomplished by examining articles that measure FSSB and/or FSOP and include gender information. Though gender differences in family related support were not the explicit focus of research in the studies collected, information regarding the presence of gender differences can still be extracted if the necessary information is included in the article. Because theoretical support exists for either direction or for a lack of gender differences in family related support, the following research question is asked:

*Research Question 1: Do gender differences exist in relation to FSSB and FSOP?*

## **Moderators**

### **Male and female dominated field.**

One context in which gender differences in family related support may be exacerbated or attenuated is in fields that are dominated by a specific gender. Gender can be an especially salient descriptor in fields where gender demographics are unbalanced, putting the minority group in a highly visible position (Kanter, 1977; Riordan & Shore, 1997). According to expectation state theory (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972), the devalued social identities of minority group members become salient descriptors that can downwardly bias the evaluation of an employee's job competency (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004).

Ingroup bias is mostly motivated by the preferential treatment of ingroup members (Brewer, 1999); it can result in ingroup members receiving more favorable perceptions and allocation of larger amounts of resources (Amiot & Bourhis, 2003; Hodson, Dovidio, & Esses, 2003; Koval, Laham, Haslam, Bastian, & Whelan, 2011). While ingroup bias is a phenomenon experienced across social identity groups (Brewer, 1999), it can be experienced at a higher level among certain groups, specifically men (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002; Sidanius, Levin, Federico, & Pratto, 2001). Asymmetrical ingroup bias refers to the tendency for dominant or high-status identities in society to display higher levels of ingroup bias to fellow ingroup members than subordinate identity members do to their ingroup members (Pratto et al., 2006; Pratto, Sidanius, & Rabinowitz, 1994; Sidanius et al., 2001). The effects of ingroup bias can be strengthened when group membership is salient (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992), which is likely the case in male dominated fields where males are the dominant ingroup both terms of numbers and their social identity.

Given that gender can serve as an indicator of lack of fit within a field, that males experience stronger ingroup bias to ingroup members than females, and that ingroup bias results in a disproportionate allocation of resources to ingroup members, gender differences in the provision of family related support are expected to be moderated by fields that are dominated by a specific gender.

*Hypothesis 1:* There is no hypothesis regarding the direction of the gender difference (if any). However, it is hypothesized that gender dominance will moderate the gender difference effect such that gender differences in family related support will be larger between men and women in male dominated fields if men receive more family related support and smaller if women receive more family related support. If no gender differences are found in family related support, a difference that favors men will be found only in male dominated fields.

**Organizational tenure.**

Organizational tenure represents the duration of the relationship between the employee and their organization (Ng & Feldman, 2010; Wayne, Shore, Boomer, & Tetrick, 2002). Both social support and family related support have been linked to lower levels of turnover intentions and increased affective commitment (Ahmad & Omar, 2010; Eisenberger, Singlhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; O'Neill et al., 2009; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Wayne et al., 2013; Wayne, Shore, & Linden, 1997). While there is evidence of the positive link between affective commitment and workplace support, increased affective commitment doesn't directly translate to increased organizational tenure. Social support doesn't have as clear of an empirical (Harris, Winskowski, & Engdahl, 2007; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Wayne, Shore, Boomer, & Tetrick, 2002) or theoretical relationship with organizational

tenure as it does with organizational commitment. However, organizational tenure is often a control variable in other studies involving family related support (Las Heras et al., 2015; Lv, 2018; Russo, Buonocore, Carmeli, & Guo, 2018), indicating that tenure is an important variable when studying support. As such, I examined the role of organizational tenure in an exploratory manner and ask the following question:

*Research question 2:* Does organizational tenure moderate the gender differences in family related support?

### **Gender inequality.**

The Gender Inequality Index (GII), developed by the United Nations, encompasses a wide set of national policies and norms around women; specifically, it measures women's educational attainment, economic participation, political participation, and reproductive health (Gaye, Klugman, Kovacevic, Twigg, & Zambrano, 2010). In essence, GII reflects how accessible resources are to women; nations with lower gender equality would indicate fewer educational, political, and economic resources being allocated to women. Workplace support itself is a resource; it serves as a buffer against stress in the workplace (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Llorens et al., 2006). Nation's that provide less resources to women would be expected to provide less workplace family support to women as well.

*Hypothesis 2:* There is no hypothesis regarding the direction of the gender difference (if any). However, it is hypothesized that a nation's gender inequality will moderate the gender difference effect such that gender differences in family related support will be larger between men and women in nations with high gender inequality. Smaller differences between men and women will be seen in family related support if women receive more family related support. If no gender differences are found in family related

support, a difference that favors men will be found only in nations with higher level gender inequality that favors men.

**Economic context.**

***Gross Domestic Production (GDP) Per Capita.***

GDP is an indicator of a nation's development and can serve a resource to both employees and organizations (Allen, French, Dumani, & Shockley, 2015). For an employee, these resources can be in the form of higher wages for individuals, which gives them more flexibility to meet family demands (e.g. paying for a caretaker, taking more time off from work). GDP may also represent overall economic prosperity for an organization, making it easier for the organization to provide family supportive provisions (Allen et al., 2015).

When looking at the relationship between GDP and gender, women in developing countries hold a relatively lower status than women in more developed countries; they get less education, there is less investment in their health, and their legal rights in the economy are weaker than men's rights (Dollar & Gatti, 1999). Higher GDP may signal that a nation is better able to tap into women's economic potential by investing in them, seeing as how "countries that under-invest [in women] grow more slowly" (Dollar & Gatti, 1999, p. 22). While the causal direction between women's equality and GDP is unclear, the positive relationship between the two is more established.

*Hypothesis 3:* There is no hypothesis regarding the direction of the gender difference (if any). However, it is hypothesized that GDP will moderate the gender difference effect such that gender differences in family related support will be larger between men and women in nations with lower GDPs if men receive more family related support and smaller if women receive more family related support. If no gender differences are found

in family related support, a difference that favors men will be found only in nations with low GDPs.

***Unemployment Rate.***

Unemployment rates represent economic conditions and job scarcity in a nation, with high unemployment rates reflecting economic strain (French et al., 2018). During times of economic uncertainty, when individuals feel threatened, they are more likely to decrease support for diversity initiatives and evaluate minority job candidates more poorly (King, Knight, & Hebl, 2010), increase prejudice towards certain ethnic outgroups (Butz & Yogeeswaran, 2011), and perceive immigrants as realistic threats (Bouman, van Zomeren, & Otten, 2014). Taken together, these findings indicate that times of economic uncertainty are categorized by increased discrimination and in-group bias. Since traditional prescriptive gender norms are for men to work (Carli, 2001; Janssens, 1997), men become the default in-group in the workplace. As such, during times of economic uncertainty, in-group bias would lead to the preferential treatment of male employees, including in the provision of family related support.

*Hypothesis 4:* There is no hypothesis regarding the direction of the gender difference (if any). However, it is hypothesized that unemployment rate will moderate the gender difference effect such that gender differences in family related support will be larger between men and women in nations with higher unemployment rates if men receive more family related support and smaller if women receive more family related support. If no gender differences are found in family related support, a difference that favors men will be found only in nations with high unemployment rates.



**Cultural moderators.**

Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 2001) is a cultural values framework comprised of six dimensions used to describe cross-cultural differences. Since its establishment in 1980, virtually all subsequent models of cultural values either incorporate or conform to his framework (Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2010). Despite the theoretical and methodological criticisms it's received (Baskerville, 2003; Chiang, 2005; Fang, 2003; Signorini, Wiesemes, & Murphy, 2009), Hofstede's framework is favored by cross-cultural scholars in management and psychology fields (Taras, Roney, & Steel, 2009).

***Power distance.***

Power distance refers to the "extent to which the members of a society accept that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally" (Hofstede, 1984 p. 83), with the crucial aspect of this dimension being how both the leaders and followers in society address human inequality (Hofstede, 2011). Societies with small power distances strive for equality and demand justifications for inequalities, whereas societies with a larger power distance question inequality less and are more accepting of hierarchies (Hofstede, 2011). Since societies high on power distance are more accepting of unequal distributions of power and resources, there would be less of a push from members in these societies to ensure that all employees are receiving an equal amount of family related support. Additionally, recall that men hold a dominant social identity in society, and in turn are awarded a disproportionate share of resources and power over women (Pratto et al., 2006). Given their dominant identities, and that gendered descriptive norms remain consistent across cultures (Heilman, 2012), nations that are more accepting of inequalities in power would be more accepting of an unequal distribution of family support across genders in the workplace.

*Hypothesis 5:* There is no hypothesis regarding the direction of the gender difference (if any). However, it is hypothesized that power distance will moderate the gender difference effect such that gender differences in family related support will be larger between men and women in nations with large power distances if men receive more family related support and smaller if women receive more family related support. If no gender differences are found in family related support, a difference that favors men will be found only in nations with large power distances.

***Masculine and feminine.***

This cultural dimension refers to “the distribution of values between the genders” (Hofstede, 2011, p. 12). Masculine societies are characterized by a strong division of emotional roles between men and women; men deal with facts while women deal with emotions, men make the family decisions, and few women are in positions of power (Hofstede, 2011). Gender roles are more distinct in masculine societies and contain overlap in feminine societies (Arrindell, Well, Kolk, Barelds, Oei, & Lau, 2013). Masculine societies are also more assertive, more competitive, and less caring than feminine societies. In terms of work and family, feminine societies display a balanced relationship between the two, and both parents equally share the family responsibilities at home (Hofstede, 2011). Conversely, work prevails over the family in masculine societies. Finally, in masculine cultures “men *should be* and women *may be* assertive and ambitious” (Hofstede, 2011 p.12). Since women have more flexibility relative to men in masculine societies, women may receive more family related support in masculine cultures.

*Hypothesis 6:* There is no hypothesis regarding the direction of the gender difference (if any). However, it is hypothesized that masculinity will moderate the gender differences in family related support such that gender differences will be smaller between men and

women in masculine societies if men receive more family related support and larger if women receive more support. If no gender differences are found in family related support, a difference that favors women will be found only in masculine nations.

***Individualism and collectivism.***

Individualistic societies are marked by a “preference for a loosely knit social framework in society wherein individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families only” (Hofstede, 1984 p. 83). Collectivist societies, on the other hand, are marked by an interdependent, tightly knit social framework, are relationally focused, and integrate individuals into strong and cohesive in-groups. In these collectivist cultures, individuals can expect the members of their clan to protect and watch after them in exchange for unquestioned loyalty (Hofstede, 1984).

There is evidence that cultures that vary on this dimension also vary in the types of social support that is preferred; for example, collectivist cultures can view explicitly asking for support as having potential harmful effects on group harmony (Kim, Sherman, Ko, & Taylor, 2006; Kim, Sherman, & Taylor, 2008; Taylor et al., 2004). Meta-analyses support the importance of this dimension in the experiences of family to work conflict (Allen et al., 2015), with collectivist cultures experiencing more family to work conflict. The relevance of this cultural dimension in relation to social support and WFC has been established, but the role of gender in this mix has very little theoretical or empirical evidence. For that reason, we ask the following exploratory question:

*Research Question 3: Does a nation’s level of individualism moderate gender differences in family related support?*

***Uncertainty avoidance.***

The uncertainty avoidance dimension captures the extent to which nations are comfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity of an unknown future (Hofstede, 2011). Nations high on uncertainty display rigid codes of beliefs and are less tolerant towards unorthodox ideas as a means to lessen the stress of uncertainty (Hofstede, 1984; Hofstede, 2011). This dimension was included as a possible relevant moderator because intolerance towards unorthodox ideas may encompass intolerance towards unorthodox family structures as well. What may be considered an unorthodox family structure is likely to vary between nations. However, there was not enough theoretical or empirical evidence to definitively make a directional hypothesis of how uncertainty avoidance could moderate gender difference in family related support. Its potential as a moderator lead to the following exploratory question:

*Research Question 4:* Does a nation's level of uncertainty avoidance moderate gender differences in family related support?

***Time orientation.***

Time orientation refers to whether a society focuses on the future or the current and past (Hofstede, 2011). Low scores on time orientation are categorized as having a short-term orientation. Because short-term societies focus on the current and past, they are marked by a preference to honor traditions and norms. These societies views change with hesitancy, have little or no economic growth, and have universal guidelines about what is good and evil. Conversely, long-term orientation societies are future focused. They focus their efforts on preparing for the future and view traditions as adaptable to change (Hofstede, 2011). Since long-term orientation are more flexible and open to change, it's possible that these cultures are more open to more non-traditional family structures and may provide more family related support.

However, I didn't find any studies that looked at time orientation and family related support or the treatment of genders. Additionally, time orientation was a dimension added after the initial four cultural values were established (Fang, 2003) and has consequently received little theoretical and empirical attention (Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2010). For that reason, the following research question is asked:

*Research Question 5: Does a nation's time orientation moderate gender differences in family related support?*

***Indulgence and restraint.***

The indulgence dimension measures a society's allowance for gratification of natural of basic and natural drives while restrained societies typically control these drives to gratify needs through strict social norms (Hofstede, 2011). Societies that are indulgent have a higher percentage of people declaring themselves as happy, put a high importance on leisure, have higher obesity rates, and more lenient sexual norms (Hofstede, 2011). While there are no hypothesized links between this dimension and family related support, this dimension was included for the sake of completion of Hofstede's six major cultural dimensions.

*Research Question 6: Does a nation's level of indulgence moderate gender differences in family related support?*

## CHAPTER 2

### METHODS

#### Keyword Search

The initial keyword search included the following keywords: *FSSB*, *FSOP*, *family supportive supervisory behaviors*, *supervisor support*, *family supportive behaviors*, *family supportive organizational perceptions*, *work family culture*, *family friendly organizational culture*, and *family supportive perceptions*. All keywords were searched in the ABI Inform, APA PsycNet, and Google Scholar databases. The ABI Inform database also includes unpublished dissertations and theses. To prevent publication bias in the data, calls for unpublished data were made through several relevant listservs, discussion boards, and websites. Prominent researchers in the field were contacted for their unpublished manuscripts and working papers, and SIOP and AOM conference proceedings starting from 2010 were searched for additional unpublished manuscripts. The references of relevant meta-analyses (e.g. French et al., 2018; Kossek et al., 2011) and review papers (Crain & Stevens, 2018) were used to find additional articles.

Additionally, several functionalities within Google Scholar's database were utilized. The "cited by" option provides a list of all published articles that cite a specific article in their paper. This tool was utilized for the paper that established the common FSSB (Hammer et al., 2009) and FSOP (Allen, 2001) measure. Finally, I also used the "related articles" tool. This tool presents around 100 articles related to specific article of interest. This tool was utilized with several articles that explicitly focused on the establishment, validation, or review of a family support construct (e.g. Allen 2001; Behson, 2002; Crain & Stevens, 2018; Hammer et al., 2007; Hammer et al., 2009).

In these initial database searches, abstracts were skimmed to determine if the articles measured either FSSB or FSOP. After the abstracts were skimmed, the initial search resulted in 220 studies. These studies were then analyzed thoroughly using the selection criteria described below. There was a final total of 50 studies that were used in the study. Of those studies, 14 measured both FSSB and FSOP, 12 measured only FSOP, and 24 measured only FSSB.

### **Selection Criteria**

Studies had to include working individuals and could not be student based. Experimental studies that manipulated the amount of support received were also excluded, as these studies did not measure the actual support received in the workplace. However, studies that had samples of employed students, particularly full-time working students in part-time MBA programs, were included. Only studies that included support measures specific to family and work life (e.g. family balance, work life balance) were included. Additionally, only studies that included zero order correlations (or the information to compute the correlation) between gender and support measures were included. For articles that did not report the correlation between gender and support ( $n = 31$ ), the authors were contacted to see if they would provide the correlation. Of those that were contacted, 45% responded with the requested information.

### **Coding**

All articles were coded by two independent coders. The information obtained from both coders was compared for any discrepancies, which were then resolved by the author through referencing the paper and determining the correct answer. The interrater agreement level was .917. Articles were also coded as either published or unpublished to assess if the data was a vulnerable to publication bias (Rosenthal, 1979). Of the 50 studies included in the meta-analysis,

45 were published studies and the other five were unpublished. All these data were study-level, so organizational tenure, for example, refers to the average organizational tenure for the sample.

*Organizational tenure* was defined as the length of time, in months, that employees had spent with an organization (Ng & Feldman, 2010). If information was provided in years, the mean and standard deviations were multiplied by 12. While some studies reported other forms of tenure, like job tenure, group tenure, and tenure with the current supervisor, the focus of this study was organizational tenure. Likewise, some articles provided work experience, which has been used as a proxy for work tenure, but this information was also excluded because the two are often not synonymous (Ng & Feldman, 2010). A total of 20 studies were included in this moderator analysis.

*Country* was coded based on the information provided in the study. If the information was not provided in the paper, but all authors worked at universities in the same country, the country of their universities was used, a technique used in previous meta-analyses (French et al., 2018). Studies that involved samples from different countries were not used in the moderator analyses if they did not provide the correlation coefficients for each country. There were a total of 42 studies that were based in a single country that could be used for subsequent country level moderators analyses.

*Male and female dominated field* was based on the information provided in the study regarding the sample, organization, or field that data was collected in. The Bureau of Labor Statistics website was utilized to determine percentage of females in the field. This moderator was only for studies where data collection occurred in the United States, seeing as how the information provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is specific to the United States.



Additionally, studies that had employees of various occupations across different domains were not included. The final number of studies for this moderator was 7.

*Hofstede's Cultural Values* were obtained from Hofstede's website, *Hofstede Insights*. This website assigns six different numerical values to each country, all ranging from 1-100. These different values represent where each country lies on each dimension. For power distance, masculine-feminine, individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, time orientation, and indulgence, higher values on each dimension indicated higher power distance, more masculine cultures, more individualistic cultures, higher uncertainty avoidance, long term orientation, and more indulgence, respectively. A total of 41 studies were included in the national cultural values moderator.

*Gender Inequality* was based on The Gender Inequality Index (GII) report developed by the United Nations. These values take the educational attainment, economic participation, political participation, and reproductive health of women in the nation into account (Gaye et al., 2010). Values ranged from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating higher gender inequality. From 2010 onward, a yearly evaluative number was reported for most countries around the world. However, before that, information was only provided in increments of five starting from 1995-2010. For studies that did not fall on an exact five-year increment during the 1995-2010 time frame, (e.g. 2003), the year that it was closest to (e.g. 2005) was used. Thirteen of the 42 studies used in this moderator analysis used proximal GII values.

*GDP and country level unemployment rate* were collected based on data from The World Bank's website. The GDP indicator used in the study was obtained by The World Bank, which defined GDP as "the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products" ("World

Development Indicators”, 2018). It was calculated by dividing the gross domestic product by the midyear population and didn’t make any deduction for the depletion of natural resources. All GDP data was in current U.S. dollars. Unemployment rate was defined as by the International Labor Organization as “the share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment” (“World Development Indicators”, 2018). GDP and unemployment rate information were available for a total of 42 of the studies.

If the data collection year was not discussed in the paper, the year associated with each study was the publication year of the study subtracted by three years (or subtracted by one year if it was a dissertation or thesis). This practice is done to account for the average time it takes to publish a study after conducting the study (Berry, Lelchook, & Clark, 2012). So, if a study was published in 2007, the year 2004 was used. This adjusted yearly information was used when collecting information for the GDP, unemployment rate, gender dominance, and gender inequality moderator.

Two additional steps were taken while collecting and coding data to ensure that the data dependency assumption of meta-analyses were not violated. First, only the first wave of data was used in longitudinal studies that measured support over time in the same sample. There were also 11 studies that collected both FSSB and FSOP information from the same sample. In these cases, the composites of these measures were calculated to form an overall family related support measure that encompassed both the FSSB and FSOP information contained in the sample (Ghiselli, Campbell, & Zedeck, 1981).

### **Meta-Analytic Procedures**

Hunter and Schmidt’s (2004) meta-analytical procedures for random effects model were used on the standardized mean differences between female and male employees on family

related support. Random effects models assume that population parameters vary across studies, and they are used when researchers want to generalize their findings to a larger population (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). Corrections for statistical artifacts were also made. First, Hunter and Schmidt's formula (2004, p. 280) was used to correct for the unequal distribution of males and females (i.e. if sample sizes are not evenly split). Unequal distributions can artificially attenuate the point biserial correlation. This correction was made to each correlation coefficient obtained from the studies before conducting the meta-analytical procedures, similar to other meta-analyses (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Shockley et al., 2017).

Second, the corrected correlation for each study was adjusted with the reliability of the support measure used in the study, which corrects for any measurement error in the support measures (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). Reliability for the independent variable (gender) was assumed to be perfect. Finally, corrections for sampling error were made by weighing each study according to its sample size. Studies that have larger samples are given more weight than studies with smaller sample sizes, as smaller samples are subject to more sampling error, and weighing by sample size produces more accurate population estimates (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). All main effects analyses were conducted in excel.

The presence of moderator variables was determined based on whether the 90% credibility interval calculated for the main effect of gender contained the value of zero (Whitener, 1990). To test specific moderation hypotheses, weighted least squares regression was used to regress the moderator value on each of the correlation coefficients obtained between family related support and gender. Using weighted least squares that weigh the correlation coefficients by sample size provide the most accurate results in comparison to other meta-analysis moderator analyses, as this method is largely unaffected by multicollinearity or

violations of homoscedasticity (Steele & Kammeyer-Muller, 2002). All continuous moderator analyses were conducted in SPSS Version 25.

To test if results are robust to publication bias (Rosenthal, 1979; Rosenberg, 2005), a failsafe  $k$  was calculated for the main effect of gender using Orwin's 1983 calculation (Orwin, 1983). A failsafe  $k$  reflects the number of studies with null findings that need to exist to bring the estimated value to a non-significant level (Fragkos, Tsagris, & Frangos, 2014; Hunter & Schmidt, 2004).

## RESULTS

Main effects results of the meta-analysis are presented in Table 1. The results indicate that female employees report receiving significantly more family related support ( $\delta = .064$ , 95% CI [.040, .089]) than male employees. A 90% credibility interval [-.094, .225] contained the value of 0, indicating the existence of moderators (Whitener, 1990).

### Moderator Analyses

A weighted least squares regression was used to test the hypothesized moderations. The significant moderators of the gender difference in family related support were GDP ( $b = .452$ ,  $p = .002$ ), unemployment rate ( $b = .486$ ,  $p = .001$ ), masculinity ( $b = -.406$ ,  $p = .009$ ), and time orientation ( $b = .394$ ,  $p = .011$ ). All other moderators, GII ( $b = -.283$ ,  $p = .437$ ), power distance ( $b = .004$ ,  $p = .305$ ), individualism ( $b = -.003$ ,  $p = .151$ ), uncertainty avoidance ( $b = -.133$ ,  $p = .250$ ), indulgence ( $b = -.080$ ,  $p = .626$ ), tenure ( $b = .089$ ,  $p = .963$ ), and gender dominance ( $b = .431$ ,  $p = .334$ ), were non-significant. Results can be found in Table 2.

#### **GDP.**

GDP significantly moderated ( $b = .452$ ,  $p = .002$ ) the gender differences in family related support. The significant moderation indicates that the gender difference favoring female employees become stronger for countries with higher GDPs compared to countries with lower GDPs. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was supported.

#### **Unemployment.**

Unemployment rate significantly moderated ( $b = .486$ ,  $p = .001$ ) the gender difference in family support. However, the direction was opposite to what was hypothesized. The gender difference in family related support that favor women becomes larger in nations with higher unemployment rate compared to lower unemployment rate. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was partially

supported in that I predicted unemployment rate would be a significant moderator, but the hypothesized direction was not supported.

### **Time orientation.**

The 5th research question asked if time orientation moderated the difference between genders in family related support. Time orientation significantly moderated ( $b = .394, p = .011$ ) gender differences in family related support such that societies with longer time orientations have significantly larger gender differences favoring women compared to societies with shorter time orientations.

### **Masculinity.**

As predicted in hypothesis 6, masculinity did significantly moderate ( $b = -.406, p = .010$ ) the gender difference in family related support. However, the direction was opposite to what was hypothesized. Results indicate that as societies move from feminine to masculine societies, the gender difference in family related support that favors women become smaller.

### **Publication bias.**

A fail-safe  $k$  of 14 was calculated based on the data, meaning 14 unpublished studies are needed to bring the findings to a non-significant value (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). Compared to the total number of studies that were obtained after extensive efforts to collect unpublished data, 14 is a sizeable number. However, due to the vagueness of the calculated failsafe  $k$ , an additional publication bias methodology was also pursued. A funnel plot of standardized mean differences plotted against sample size were created using the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Software. A funnel plot's symmetry can be used to help determine the presence of publication bias, with an asymmetrical plot indicating the possibility of publication bias (Boresntein et al., 2009; Sterne &

Egger, 2001). The funnel plot produced was symmetrical, suggesting the results were robust to publication bias.

Table 1.  
*Meta-Analytic Results for the Mean Gender Difference in Family Related Support*

<i>N</i>	Failsafe <i>k</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>SD<sub>d</sub></i>	$\delta$	<i>SD<math>\delta</math></i>	% var.	95% CI		90% CrI	
								LL	UL	LL	UL
34,948	14	50	.052	.117	.064	.0997	43.96	.040	.089	-.094	.225

*Note.*

Positive *d* and  $\delta$  values indicate that female employees have higher levels of family related support

Failsafe *k* reflects the number of studies needed with null results to achieve non-significant results

*d* = uncorrected difference value

*SD<sub>d</sub>* = standard deviation of the uncorrected difference value

$\delta$  = corrected difference value

*SD $\delta$*  = standard deviation of the corrected difference value

% var. = percentage of variance attributable to sampling error

95% CI = 95% confidence interval around the mean *d* value

LL = lower limit of the interval

UL = upper limit of the interval

90% CrI = 90% credibility interval.



Table 2.

*Results from Moderator Analyses*

Moderator	<i>N</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Unstandardized beta					
					<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	95% CI	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>GDP</b>	<b>22,255</b>	<b>42</b>	\$35,651	\$16,104	<b>0.000007</b>	<b>0.000002</b>	[.000003, .00001]	<b>.452</b>	<b>3.208</b>	<b>.003</b>
GII	22,255	42	.233	.099	-.302	.355	[-1.02, .417]	-.133	-.85	.401
<b>Unemployment rate</b>	<b>22,255</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>6.23</b>	2.05	<b>.049</b>	<b>.014</b>	[.021, .077]	<b>.486</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>.001</b>
Power distance	21,797	<b>41</b>	46	13	.004	.004	[-.004, .013]	.164	1.04	.305
Individualism	21,797	41	75	27	-.003	.002	[-.007, .001]	-.236	-1.52	.137
<b>Masculinity</b>	<b>21,797</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>-.009</b>	<b>.003</b>	[ <b>-.015</b> , <b>-.002</b> ]	<b>-.406</b>	<b>-2.70</b>	<b>.009</b>
Uncertainty avoidance	21,797	41	51	14	-.005	.004	[-.014, .004]	-.189	-1.15	.259
<b>Time orientation</b>	<b>21,797</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>.005</b>	<b>.002</b>	[ <b>.001</b> , <b>.009</b> ]	<b>.394</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>.011</b>
Indulgence	21,797	41	59	16	-.002	.003	[-.009, .005]	-.080	-.49	.626
Tenure	16,067	20	92	42	.00003	.001	[-.002, .002]	.089	.380	.709
Gender dominance	4,056	7	47	26	.001	.001	[-.001, .003]	.431	1.07	.334

*Note.*

Bolded coefficients indicate statistical significance at  $p < .05$

*N* = total sample size

*k* = number of studies included

*M* = mean level of the moderator

*SD* = standard deviation of the moderator

*B* = unstandardized beta

*SE* = standard error of the unstandardized beta

95% CI = 95% confidence interval for the unstandardized beta

*b* = standardized beta coefficient

GII = Gender Inequality Index

Gender dominance = percentage of women in the field

Hofstede's cultural values range from 0-100; high values on the individualism scale indicates more individualistic societies; higher values on masculinity indicate more masculine societies; high values on power distance indicate a larger power distance; higher values on indulgence indicates more indulgent societies; higher values on time orientation indicate longer term orientation; higher values for uncertainty avoidance indicate a larger uncertainty avoidance.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to meta-analytically examine the presence of gender differences in family related support and explore contexts in which these differences may be exacerbated or attenuated. The results of this study provide greater clarity into role that gender can play in receiving family related support in the workplace. The findings support the predictions that social role theory make about gender differences in family related support. Although a small effect, results indicate that female employees receive significantly greater family related support than male employees. Additionally, specific contexts which strengthen the gender differences that favor women include nations with higher GDP, nations with higher unemployment rate, and nations with longer time orientation. However, gender differences that favor women are attenuated in nations that are more masculine.

### **Theoretical Implications**

A major goal of the study was to clarify the conflicting theoretical predictions of both the existence and direction of gender differences in family related support. Social role theory (Eagly, 1987), the shifting standards model (Biernat, 2003), social dominance theory (Pratto et al., 2006), and role enhancement theory (Barnett & Gareis, 2006; Barnett & Hyde, 2001) all provide theoretical rationale for gender differences in either direction, or none at all. This meta-analysis found that, compared to men, women report feeling more supported by their organizations and supervisors to meet family needs, suggesting social role theory as the relevant theory in predicting and explaining gender differences in family related support.

Social role theory discusses the pervasive prescriptive and descriptive gender norms in society as well as the associated consequences of behaving against these norms. The theory predicts that women would receive more family related support because attending to family

responsibilities aligns with the prescriptive and descriptive gender norm of women being the family caretaker. These findings repudiate the argument that social role theory's underlying assumptions are obsolete (Barnett, Rosalind, & Hyde, 2001). They also indicate the persistence of gender norms despite changes in the workforce demographics and family structures (Crain & Stevens, 2018; Montez et al., 2014; SHRM, 2017) that may pave the way for more equitable divisions of caretaker responsibilities. Social role theory would explain that these gender differences may still exist in family related support despite the changes in society because the norms that prescribe behaviors, attributes, and roles for each gender have endured across time and society (Fortin, 2005; Heilman, 2012). Furthermore, the process of changing these deeply rooted gender norms can be nuanced, difficult, and is often contested, with change requiring broad and deliberate efforts through various channels ("How do gender norms change?" 2015).

Results did not support the predictions put forth by the shifting standards model, lack of fit model, and social dominance theory. These theories discuss women's disadvantage in the workplace and suggest that this disadvantage may generalize to disadvantages in family related support as well. These theories were insufficient in predicting gender differences, likely due to too large of a generalization being made. For example, the disadvantage discussed by shifting standards model and lack of fit model pertain to the lowered performance expectations and unfavorable perceptions of job competency that employed women face (Benard et al., 2007; Biernat & Manis, 1994; Phelan et al., 2008; Tyler & McCullough, 2009). Receiving less workplace support, like fewer networking and promotion opportunities, may be a feasible outcome of lowered performance and competency expectations, as these employees are not seen as not having as much potential (Kierein & Gold, 2000; Rosenthal & Rubin; 1978). However, receiving less family related support, which mostly encompasses whether an organization or

supervisor helps employees meet family demands, is not as feasible of an outcome of lowered performance expectations. Family related support has the additional layers of family and gender roles, which adds a level of complexity that makes generalizing from overall workplace support to workplace family support less appropriate and applicable.

One area of literature that results from this meta-analysis can apply to is the WFC literature, specifically anticipated WFC. Anticipated WFC refers to an individual's expectation of incompatible work and family roles in the future. While most of the literature regarding anticipated WFC is conducted in college aged students, anticipated WFC and its implications may generalize to the working population. Anticipated WFC has been related to lower the self-efficacy in managing work-family conflict (Cinamon, 2006), future career plans (Cinamon, 2010), and limiting and delaying family planning (Weer, Greenhaus, Colakoglu, & Foley, 2006). There are conflicting results regarding which gender experiences more anticipated work family conflict (Westring & Ryan, 2011), with some support that men report higher anticipated WFC (Livingston et al., 1996). This pattern aligns with the findings in this study; its possible men may report higher anticipated WFC because they receive less family related support. The conflicting findings that are present in the anticipated WFC literature may be a result of moderators, which were present in this meta-analysis. Future studies should explore the relationship between family related support received and anticipated work family conflict across genders, in both college aged and employed samples.

### **Moderators**

#### **GDP.**

As hypothesized, moderator results suggest that the gender difference favoring women become stronger in nations with higher GDPs in comparison to nations with lower GDPs.

Gender equity has been related to several indicators of economic prosperity, including human

development, higher income per capita, faster economic growth, and more economic stability (International Monetary Fund [IMF], 2018; UNPWEE, 2016). One possible explanation for the stronger gender difference favoring women in higher GDP nations is because of the relative gender equity and female empowerment associated with economically prosperous nations. Money can serve as a form of empowerment and agency, (UNPWEE, 2016) which in turn can give women more authority to voice any concerns or requests to their employer to meet family needs. Furthermore, if women are making more money in these nations, they can utilize the different formal policies or take time to support their family without it posing severe economic hardships.

Similarly, it's possible that GDP moderates gender differences in family related support because, as some scholars discuss, WFC is a privileged concern experienced primarily by individuals in middle- and upper-class jobs (Agars & French, 2016; French et al. 2018; Lambert & Haley-Lock, 2004). Low income workers typically work low-wage, shift work jobs that give little consideration to work family conflict. Furthermore, formal benefits and programs created to help with work-family support are typically not extended to low income workers (Agars & French, 2016; Lambert & Haley-Lock, 2004). Indeed, meta-analytical studies have found stronger relationships between support and WFC in high GDP nations (French et al., 2018). This is not to say that low income workers are not immune to WFC or indifferent to family related support. Rather, as French et al. 2018 suggest, they must focus on survival and meeting basic needs. Consequently, family related support may not be as relevant of a resource in societies with lower GDP where more fundamental needs remain unaddressed.

### **Unemployment rate.**

Due to the heightened discrimination towards outgroup members during times of high unemployment (Butz & Yogeewaran, 2011; King et al., 2010), it was hypothesized that gender differences between employed men and women would be smaller in high unemployment contexts if women receive more family related support. However, contrary to this hypothesis, moderator analyses indicate that the difference favoring women becomes stronger among nations with comparatively higher unemployment rates.

There are a few possible explanations that may account for this moderation. First, as French and colleagues (2018) suggest, there's a higher need for social support during times of high unemployment, due to the associated stress and financial insecurity. In the context of family related support, it's possible that organizations recognize how periods of high unemployment can impact an employee's family, so family related support is provided in response. Employees may also seek this type of support more during times of high unemployment.

Alternatively, times of high unemployment are marked by fewer demands for business output (Jackson & Schuler, 1995), to which businesses may respond in two ways. They can reduce the hours that employees work or reduce their company size and increase the workload of the remaining employees (Marimon & Zilibotti, 2000). If employers reduce employee work hours, it makes it easier for both employers to provide and employees to utilize family friendly policies. Conversely, since wages during times of high unemployment are likely to remain stagnant (Marimon & Zilibotti, 2000), organizations that choose to reduce company size may provide workplace family related support as a benefit to the remaining employees with the increased workload.

### **Masculinity.**

The masculinity cultural dimension refers to the distribution of roles and values between genders (Hofstede, 2011). Because one of the defining features of a masculine society is that men and women hold distinct emotional roles and values with little overlap (Arrindell et al., 2013), I hypothesized that masculinity would strengthen gender differences favoring women in masculine societies if women received more family related support. However, this meta-analysis found that gender differences favoring women become less prominent in masculine societies, indicating that employed men and women report receiving more similar levels of support in masculine societies compared to feminine societies.

One potential reason for this unexpected moderation is related to the conceptualization and measurement of the masculinity dimension. Hofstede's cultural values are explained in a multifaceted manner, but the values assigned to each country reflect unidimensionality (Taras et al., 2010). For example, masculinity has two relatively distinct facets, but only one overall masculinity score is assigned to a country. One facet, which guided hypothesis development, is related to the emotional and value separation of genders in society. The other facet is related to the assertiveness and competitiveness of the society (Hofstede, 2006). Masculine societies are considered more aggressive, assertive, and are driven by competition (Hofstede, 2011), while feminine societies are dominated by values that include modesty, caring for others, quality of life, and well-being (Hofstede, 2001; Huettinger, 2008).

Since countries are only assigned one value, instead of multiple values reflecting the multiple facets, it becomes difficult to differentiate which facet of the masculinity dimension is driving these results. As some scholars have discussed (Ailon, 2008; Jackson, Colquitt, Weeson, & Zapata-Phelan, 2006; Taras et al., 2010), the facets within overall cultural values could predict



different types of outcomes, meriting further attention (similar to Jackson et al., 2006 psychological collectivism scale).

My hypothesis was developed based on the facet related to gender values, but it may be the assertiveness facet that's driving the differences. Aince masculine societies are more assertive (Hofstede, 1998; 2011; Ng, Sorensen, & Yin, 2009), both men and women may be more forthcoming and firmer about what they want from their employer to meet their family needs, which may explain the attenuation of the gender difference in masculine societies. Conversely, the larger differences between genders in feminine societies could be *because* they emphasize modesty, family, and caring. Feminine societies, like the rest of the world, still operate within the relevant and pervasive gender norms that can influence decision making. As such, feminine societies would *want* those that are most equipped to care for others do so, which according to social role theory (Eagly, 1987), would (and should) be women.

### **Time orientation.**

The potential for time orientation to serve as a moderator was asked in an exploratory manner with no strong rationale for moderation in any specific direction. However, this meta-analysis found that time orientation moderated gender differences in family related support such that longer time orientation societies had a significantly stronger gender difference favoring women compared to shorter time orientation societies. Because societies with shorter time orientations focus on the present and how things have been, they prefer to maintain time honored traditions and view societal change with suspicion, while long term orientation societies encourage efforts in modernity and preparing for the future (Hofstede's Insights, n.d.).

As previously discussed, the gender difference found between employed men and women can be explained by the gender norms that are still operating in society. Women may be

perceived as more vulnerable to WFC because they are expected to tend to their families, and subsequently receive a disproportionate amount of family related support. Time orientation serves to strengthen the existing gender difference that favors women. The most parsimonious explanation for this exacerbation is because these societies are future focused. They may recognize the long-term commitment and long-term impact that having a family can have on an employee, well beyond the 9-month pregnancy. As such, in comparison to short term societies, long term orientation societies may provide more organizational policies and foster a stronger family supportive culture. They may also see the benefits and long-term implications of a balance between work and family, which include lower levels of burnout (Li & Sun, 2015; Lambert & Hogan, 2010) and lower turnover intentions (Blanch & Aluja, 2012; Boyar, Maertz, Pearson, & Keough, 2003; Karatepe & Kilic, 2007). Indeed, societies with long term orientations practice more long-term human resource management strategies like providing contracts that retain employees for longer periods and focusing on research and development (Buck, Liu, & Ott, 2010). However, theory and cross-cultural studies examining the impact that time orientation has in general, and even more in relation to WFC and family support, been sparse and underdeveloped (Taras et al., 2010). As such, this dimension should be explored more thoroughly to test the validity of these explanations.

### **Limitation and Future Research**

One limitation of this study is its potential exposure to publication bias, with the failsafe k producing providing unclear evidence to whether results were robust to publication bias. However, the symmetrical funnel plot of the standardized mean differences plotted against sample sizes were symmetrical, suggesting results were robust to publication bias. Furthermore, one important thing to note is that the vast majority of the studies included in this meta-analysis

were not conducted for the purpose of exploring gender differences in family related support. Rather, the data obtained for this meta-analysis were from studies that measured family related support in relation to other variables (e.g. commitment, engagement, turnover intentions). Studies were included in this meta-analysis if they just so happen to also include the gender information of their sample. Because the studies included in the current meta-analysis did not explicitly ask about gender differences, they may be less vulnerable to publication bias because the significance of the relationship between gender and family related support was not of importance in the publication process.

Another limitation of this study is the heterogeneity of the samples analyzed, with most individual samples containing data across various fields and positions. While heterogeneity of samples improves the generalizability of results, it did prove to be a limitation when exploring potential moderators, like organizational position and gender dominance, which either could not be explored or were limited by the small number of samples. For example, the gender dominance moderator was underpowered, with a total of 7 samples analyzed. This leaves the question of whether the gender dominance of a field serves as a mostly unanswered. Similarly, the question of whether organizational position moderates these differences could not be asked. Most studies either neglected to report information regarding the positions of participants, or if they did, there wasn't enough information. Positions within an organization can vary in terms of their benefits, workload, expectations, and autonomy. It also can impact how much influence and social capital an employee has in an organization (Leana & Van Bruen III, 1999), all of which may influence how much family related support an employee receives. Future studies should explore the role of an employee's position in the company as a potential moderator. They should also look at family related support in specific industries or fields that are known to be dominated by one gender.

Additionally, although there was a total of 14 different countries represented, many of those countries were only represented once, with most of the studies still conducted in the US. Furthermore, the studies that weren't conducted in the US were mostly in countries that held similar cultural values as the US (i.e. Canada, Germany, Australia). Thus, moderator results, particularly ones looking at cultural values, are based on samples that predominately hold relatively similar values. Therefore, results that are interpreted as between country differences should be taken with some precaution. In the future, researchers should continue to study workplace family support in other countries, particularly countries outside of the US and Europe.

Future research should also give more consideration to dimensions outside of the individualism-collectivism dimension, which has been the predominant cultural value that's received attention in the organizational literature (Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2010). Even in meta-analyses looking at work-family conflict across cultures (Allen, French, Dumani, & Shockley, 2015), only the individualism dimension is explored. This meta-analysis found that masculinity and time orientation served as significant moderators, while individualism did not. Since masculinity and time orientation have received relatively little attention, theory and empirical evidence that can help explain *why* they serve as significant moderators is sparse. As organizations are becoming increasingly global, it becomes imperative to study phenomena related to work in different settings, and from different perspectives.

Finally, since there was a significant difference in family related support received between genders, future research should continue to explore this difference by delving into and differentiating between family related support received from the organization and supervisors. Due to the smaller sample size, this meta-analysis was conducted across studies measuring FSOP and/or FSSBs, but as more studies are being published, differences between FSOPs and FSSBs

may be insightful in identifying exactly what level in the organization the deficit in family related support for men is originating from.

### **Practical Implications**

Despite the small effect size of .064, the difference in family related support among female and male employees is both statistically and practically significant. Translated into a percent overlap statistic (Cohen, 1988), a difference of .064 in family related support equates to a 5% nonoverlap between the employed male and female populations. In context, this 5% of nonoverlap, among a population of a million male employees and a million female employees, translates to about 50,00 women reporting higher levels of family related support than men (Purvanova & Muros, 2010). In 2017, the United States had about 153 million employees, and if we assume equal populations, this effect size of .064 translates to 3,825,000 female employees reporting higher levels of family related support than male employees in the 2017 working population in the United States.

With the contextualization of these gender differences in the working population, the practical implications of a small, statistically significant, effect size is illuminated. It becomes imperative to mitigating these differences, especially considering the impact that family related support can have on important outcomes like organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction (Jennings et al., 2016; Las Heras et al., 2015; Ratnasingham et al., 2012; Wayne et al., 2013). To reduce these differences, organizations can make efforts to better support and encourage male employees to take advantage of organizational policies geared towards work family balance, like paternal leave and flexible scheduling. Organizations would also benefit from ensuring that family friendly policies are not aimed towards or advertised heavily to female employees. Doing so can alleviate pressure on women to adjust their work life

to meet family demands while simultaneously providing a supportive environment for male employees to utilize family friendly policies.

Finally, the moderator results also have practical implications for multinational enterprises. Moderators do not operate in vacuums; societies may be relatively high on some national moderator and low on others. These variations may result in similar gender differences across societies, but different contextual factors within societies that influence the gender difference. The moderators are just one place organizations can look to as a diagnostic tool to help guide future organizational efforts in reducing the gender differences in family related support across locations (i.e. does the society have a long- or short-term orientation? How masculine is this nation in comparison to the other nation that the organization is based in?). They also can play a role in the effectiveness of certain interventions. For example, if a society has a high unemployment rate that's contributing to the large gender differences, it may be hard to address unemployment rate at an organizational level.

## **Conclusion**

Support is a complex construct that plays an integral role in an employee's job attitudes and motivations, with family related support serving as a particularly important type of support in experiences of employee's WFC. Despite the seemingly conflicting empirical evidence and fragmented theories, the results indicate that female employees experience more family related support than male employees, which is consistent with gender role theory. However, these differences are not uniform across contexts. Large-scale influences, like economic or cultural factors, play an important role in making the difference either larger or smaller. While the difference between genders is small, it's both statistically and practically significant. Organizations should try to include male employees in family friendly initiatives to provide a

more supportive environment to male employees and potentially less stress on female employees to consistently be the partner that has adjust work to meet family needs.

Table 3

*Articles included in the meta-analysis*

Citation	Support	Measure	Pub	Industry	%	N	Country	PD	IC	MF	UA	TO	IR	GII	GDP	UR
				/Field	female											
Allen (2001)	FSOP	Created Own	P	Various	-	520	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.305	32,949	4.51
Allen, Shockley, & Poteat (2008)	FSSB	Created Own	P	Various	-	220	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.264	44,308	5.08
Ayree, Chu, Kim, & Ryu (2013)	*FRS	<i>FSSB</i> : Thomas & Ganster (1995) <i>FSOP</i> : Jahn et al. (2003)	P	Various	-	230	South Korea	60	18	39	85	100	29	0.095	22,087	3.72
Bagger, Li (2014) - <i>Study 1</i>	FSSB	Clark (2001)	P	Academia	53.5	82	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.242	48,401	5.78
Bagger & Li (2014) - <i>Study 2</i>	FSSB	Thomas & Ganster (1995)	P	Various	-	225	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.242	48,401	5.78
Baral & Bhargava (2010)	FSOP	Lyness et al. (1999)	P	IT	-	216	India	77	48	56	40	51	26	0.619	1,018	4.06
Beham, Drobnic, & Prag (2014)	*FRS	Dijkers et al. (2004)	P	Various	-	1850	Mixed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Behson (2002)	FSOP	Allen (2001)	P	Various	-	147	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.305	34,621	4.22
Bosch, Las Heras, Russo, Rofcanin, & Grau (2018)	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2009)	P	Various	-	2046	Mixed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caughlin (2016)	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2013)	D	Healthcare	78%	1524	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.242	47,002	9.25
Choi, Kim, Han, Ryu, Park, & Kwon (2017)	FSSB	Thomas & Ganster (1995)	P	Various	-	118	South Korea	60	18	39	85	100	29	0.071	27,811	3.53
Clark (2001)	FSSB	Created Own	P	Various	-	179	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.305	32,949	4.51
Crain, Hammer, Bodner, Kossek, Moen, Lilienthal, & Buxton (2014)	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2013)	P	IT	26%	623	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.237	49,794	8.95
Demirtas, Arslan, & Karaca (2017)	*FRS	<i>FSSB</i> : Fernandez (1986)	P	Technology	-	271	Turkey	66	37	45	85	46	49	0.34	12,127	9.88





Las Heras, Bosch, & Raes (2015) <i>Study 2</i>	*FRS	<i>FSSB</i> : Hammer et al. (2009) <i>FSOP</i> : Thompson et al. (1999)	P	Finance	-	754	Mixed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Las Heras, Trefalt, & Escribano (2015)	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2009)	P	Various	-	988	Mixed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lv (2018)	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2009)	P	Various	-	211	China	80	20	66	30	87	24	0.157	8,069	4.61
Lyness & Kropf (2005) <i>Study 2</i>	FSOP	Thompson et al. (1999)	P	Various	-	144	Mixed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lyness & Kropf (2005) <i>Study 1</i>	FSOP	Thompson et al. (1999) - adapted	P	Various	-	391	Mixed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mansour & Tremblay (2017)	FSSB	Clark (2001)	P	Healthcare	-	562	Canada	39	80	52	48	36	68	0.102	50,633	6.91
Mauno & Rantanen (2013)	FSSB	Thompson et al. (1999)	P	Healthcare	-	1956	Finland	33	63	26	59	38	57	0.071	46,202	8.39
Premeaux, Adkins, & Mossholder (2007)	*FRS	Thompson et al. (1999)	P	Various	-	564	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.264	41,922	5.53
Ratnasingam et al. (2012)	FSOP	Allen (2001)	P	Various	-	143	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.242	47,002	9.25
Russo & Waters (2006)	FSSB	Shinn et al. (1989)	P	Legal	-	169	Australia	36	90	61	51	21	71	0.139	23,437	5.93
Russo, Buonocore, Carmeli, & Guo (2015) <i>Study 1</i>	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2009)	P	Various	-	156	Italy	50	76	70	75	61	30	0.091	35,370	12.15
Russo, Buonocore, Carmeli, & Guo (2018) <i>Study 2</i>	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2009)	P	Various	-	356	China	80	20	66	30	87	24	0.165	6,338	4.47
Selvarajan, Singh, & Cloniger (2016)	FSOP	Kossek et al. (2001)	P	Various	-	435	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.222	52,782	7.38
Skinner (2006)	FSOP	Allen (2001)	D	Various	-	404	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.264	44,308	5.08
Straub, Beham, & Islam (2017)	*FRS	<i>FSSB</i> : Hammer et al. (2009) <i>FSOP</i> : Allen (2001)	P	IT	-	424	Germany	35	67	66	65	83	40	0.075	48,043	4.98
Thompson & Prottas (2006)	FSOP	Created Own	P	Various	-	2810	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.264	38,166	5.78

Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness (1999)	*FRS	Created Own	P	Various	-	276	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.305	30,068	5.40
Thompson, Jahn, & Prottas (2004)	FSSB	Fernandez (1986)	P	Various	-	310	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.264	37,274	4.73
Voydanhoff (2004)	*FRS	Created Own	P	Various	-	1938	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.305	31,573	4.94
Walsh, Matthews, Toumbeva, Kabat-Farr, Philbrick, & Pavisic (2018)	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2013)	P	Various	-	214	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.206	56,444	5.28
Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen (2013)	FSOP	Allen (2001)	P	Engineering	14%	408	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.242	48,375	9.63
Wayne, Randel, & Stevens (2006)	*FSOP	Thompson et al. (1999)	P	Various	-	167	US	40	91	62	46	26	68	0.264	39,677	5.99
Zhang & Tu (2016)	FSSB	Hammer et al. (2013)	P	Technology	-	371	China	80	20	66	30	87	24	0.165	7,078	4.54

*Note:* \*indicates that a composite was computed, either among the dimensions of a measure or between family support measures.

FRS: Family Related Support; FRS represents studies that used both FSSB and FSOP measures and the composite between the two is computed

Pub: Publication Status; P: Published; D: Dissertation; T: Thesis; C = conference presentation.

% female: Percentage of female in the field or industry the sample was collected in

PD: power distance

I-C: individualism – collectivism

M-F: masculine – feminine

UA: uncertainty avoidance

TO: time orientation

I-R: indulgence – restraint

GII: Gender Inequality Index

GDP: gross domestic product

UR: unemployment rate

- indicates that there either was no data available or that it couldn't be computed

## REFERENCES

*References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.*

AbuAlRub, R. F. (2004). Job stress, job performance, and social support among hospital nurses.

*Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 36(1), 73-78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2004.04016.x>

Agars, M. D., & French, K. A. (2016). Underrepresented populations in work–family research.

In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of work and family* (pp. 362–375). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ahmad, A., & Omar, Z. (2010). Perceived family-supportive work culture, affective commitment and turnover intention of employees. *Journal of American Science*, 6(12), 839-846.

Ailon, G. (2008). Mirror, mirror on the wall: Culture's consequences in a value test of its own design. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 885-904.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.34421995>

Allen, T. D., & Russell, J. E. (1999). Parental leave of absence: Some not so family-friendly implications. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(1), 166-191.

Allen, T. D., French, K. A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). Meta-analysis of work–family conflict mean differences: Does national context matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 90, 90-100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.07.006>

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.278>

- \*Allen, T. D., Shockley, K. M., & Poteat, L. F. (2008). Workplace factors associated with family dinner behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(2), 336-342.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.07.004>
- \*Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(3), 414-435.  
doi:10.1006/jvbe.2000.1774
- Amiot, C. E., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2003). Discrimination and the positive-negative asymmetry effect: Ideological and normative processes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(5), 597-608. doi: 10.1177/0146167203251524
- Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(2), 151. doi:10.1037/a0022170
- Anderson, D. J., Binder, M., & Krause, K. (2002). The motherhood wage penalty: Which mothers pay it and why? *American Economic Review, 92*(2), 354-358. doi: 10.1257/000282802320191606
- Arrindell, W. A., van Well, S., Kolk, A. M., Barelds, D. P. H., Oei, T. P. S., Lau, P. Y., & Cultural Clinical Psychology Study Group. (2013). Higher levels of masculine gender role stress in masculine than in feminine nations: A thirteen-nations study. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science, 47*(1), 51-67.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1069397112470366>

- \*Aryee, S., Chu, C. W., Kim, T. Y., & Ryu, S. (2013). Family-supportive work environment and employee work behaviors: An investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Management, 39*(3), 792-813. doi: 10.1177/0149206311435103
- \*Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2014). How does supervisory family support influence employees' attitudes and behaviors? A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Management, 40*(4), 1123-1150. doi: 10.1177/0149206311413922
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309-328. doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115
- Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2006). Role theory perspectives on work and family. *The work and Family Handbook: Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives and Approaches*, 209-221.
- Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist, 56*(10), 781. doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.56.10.781
- \*Barraha, J. L., Shultz, K. S., Baltes, B., & Stolz, H. E. (2004). Men's and women's eldercare-based work-family conflict: Antecedents and work-related outcomes. *Fathering, 2*(3), 305-331.
- Bartley, S. J., Blanton, P. W., & Gilliard, J. L. (2005). Husbands and wives in dual-earner marriages: Decision-making, gender role attitudes, division of household labor, and equity. *Marriage & Family Review, 37*(4), 69-94. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J002v37n04\\_05](http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J002v37n04_05)
- Baskerville, R. F. (2003). Hofstede never studied culture. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28*(1), 1-14. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682\(01\)00048-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(01)00048-4)
- Becker, P. E., & Moen, P. (1999). Scaling back: Dual-earner couples' work-family strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 995-1007*.

- Beehr, T. A., Farmer, S. J., Glazer, S., Gudanowski, D. M., & Nair, V. N. (2003). The enigma of social support and occupational stress: Source congruence and gender role effects. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*(3), 220. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.8.3.220
- \*Beham, B., Drobnič, S., & Präg, P. (2014). The work–family interface of service sector workers: A comparison of work resources and professional status across five European countries. *Applied Psychology, 63*(1), 29-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12012>
- \*Behson, S. J. (2002). Which dominates? The relative importance of work–family organizational support and general organizational context on employee outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 53-72. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1845>
- Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work–family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(3), 487-500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.02.004>
- Benard, S., & Correll, S. J. (2010). Normative discrimination and the motherhood penalty. *Gender & Society, 24*(5), 616-646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243210383142>
- Benard, S., Paik, I., & Correll, S. J. (2007). Cognitive bias and the motherhood penalty. *Hastings Law Journal, 59*, 1359. [https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings\\_law\\_journal/vol59/iss6/3](https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings_law_journal/vol59/iss6/3)
- Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch Jr, M. (1972). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review, 37*(3), 241-255. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2093465>
- Berry, C. M., Lelchook, A. M., & Clark, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the interrelationships between employee lateness, absenteeism, and turnover: Implications for models of withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(5), 678-699. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.778>

- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 410–424. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410>
- Biernat, M., & Fuegen, K. (2001). Shifting standards and the evaluation of competence: Complexity in gender-based judgment and decision making. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 707-724. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00237>
- Biernat, M., & Manis, M. (1994). Shifting standards and stereotype-based judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(1), 5. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.5
- Biernat, M. (2003). Toward a broader view of social stereotyping. *American Psychologist, 58*(12), 1019. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.58.12.1019>
- Blanch, A., & Aluja, A. (2012). Social support (family and supervisor), work–family conflict, and burnout: Sex differences. *Human Relations, 65*(7), 811-833. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726712440471>
- Borenstein, M. (2005). Software for publication bias. *Publication bias in meta-analysis: Prevention, assessment and adjustments*, 193-220.
- \*Bosch, M. J., Las Heras, M., Russo, M., Rofcanin, Y., & i Grau, M. G. (2018). How context matters: The relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviours and motivation to work moderated by gender inequality. *Journal of Business Research, 82*, 46-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.08.026>
- Bouman, T., van Zomeren, M., & Otten, S. (2014). Threat by association: Do distant intergroup threats carry-over into local intolerance? *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*(3), 405-421. . doi:10.1111/bjso.12046



- Boyar, S. L., Maertz, C. P., Jr., Pearson, A. W., & Keough, S. (2003). Work-family conflict: A model of linkages between work and family domain variables and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 15*(2), 175-190.
- Breaugh, J. A., & Frye, N. K. (2007). An examination of the antecedents and consequences of the use of family-friendly benefits. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 35*-52.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40601192>
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 429-444. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126>
- Buck, T., Liu, X., & Ott, U. (2010). Long-term orientation and international joint venture strategies in modern China. *International Business Review, 19*(3), 223-234.
- Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review, 204*-225. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657415>
- Budig, M. J., & Hodges, M. J. (2010). Differences in disadvantage: Variation in the motherhood penalty across white women's earnings distribution. *American Sociological Review, 75*(5), 705-728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122410381593>
- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 5*(3), 665. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.5.3.665>
- Butz, D. A., & Yogeewaran, K. (2011). A new threat in the air: Macroeconomic threat increases prejudice against Asian Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(1), 22-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.07.014>

- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person–organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67(3), 294-311. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0081>
- Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 725-741. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00238>
- Carvalho, V. S., & Chambel, M. J. (2014). Work-to-family enrichment and employees' well-being: High performance work system and job characteristics. *Social Indicators Research*, 119(1), 373-387. doi: 10.1007/s11205-013-0475-8
- \*Caughlin, D. E. (2015). Dynamic job satisfaction shifts: Implications for manager behavior and crossover to employees (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations and Theses. doi: 10.15760/etd.2342
- Chiang, F. (2005). A critical examination of Hofstede's thesis and its application to international reward management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(9), 1545-1563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190500239044>
- \*Choi, J., Kim, A., Han, K., Ryu, S., Park, J. G., & Kwon, B. (2018). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction with work–family balance: A moderating role of perceived insider status. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2205>
- Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 151-192). New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.

- Cinamon, R. G. (2006). Anticipated work-family conflict: Effects of gender, self-efficacy, and family background. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 54, 202-215.  
doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2006.tb00152.x
- Cinamon, R. G. (2010). Anticipated work-family conflict: Effects of role salience and self-efficacy. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 38(1), 83-99.
- \*Clark, S. C. (2001). Work cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 348-365. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1759>
- Claus, V. A., Callahan, J., & Sandlin, J. R. (2013). Culture and leadership: Women in nonprofit and for-profit leadership positions within the European Union. *Human Resource Development International*, 16(3), 330-345.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2013.792489>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310>
- Coombs, A. A. T., & King, R. K. (2005). Workplace discrimination: Experiences of practicing physicians. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 97(4), 467.
- “Country Comparison.” (2019). *Hofstede Insights*. Retrieved from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com>
- Cotter, D. A., Hermsen, J. M., Ovadia, S., & Vanneman, R. (2001). The glass ceiling effect. *Social Forces*, 80(2), 655-681. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2001.0091>

- Crain, T. L., & Stevens, S. C. (2018). Family-supportive supervisor behaviors: A review and recommendations for research and practice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(7), 869-888. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2320>
- \*Crain, T. L., Hammer, L. B., Bodner, T., Kossek, E. E., Moen, P., Lilienthal, R., & Buxton, O. M. (2014). Work–family conflict, family-supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB), and sleep outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(2), 155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036010>
- Crosby, F. J., Williams, J. C., & Biernat, M. (2004). The maternal wall. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(4), 675-682. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00379.x>
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2004). When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(4), 701-718. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00381.x>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499-512. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499
- \*Demirtaş, Ö., Arslan, A., & Karaca, M. (2017). Why perceived organizational and supervisory family support is important for organizations? Evidence from the field. *Review of Managerial Science, 1*-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-017-0264-x>
- Devonish, D. (2013). Workplace bullying, employee performance and behaviors: The mediating role of psychological well-being. *Employee Relations, 35*(6), 630-647. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2013-0004>
- Dollar, D., & Gatti, R. (1999). Gender inequality, income, and growth: are good times good for women? (1). Washington, DC: Development Research Group, The World Bank.

- Eagly, A. H., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to both women and men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(3), 451. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.3.451
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2011). Feminism and the evolution of sex differences and similarities. *Sex Roles*, 64(9-10), 758-767. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-9949-9
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(1), 124-197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003>
- Economic Policy Institute (2017, Feb). *State of Working America Data Library*. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org>
- Eisenberger, R., Singlhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 565–573. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.565
- Eskildsen, J., Kristensen, K., & Gjesing Antvor, H. (2010). The relationship between job satisfaction and national culture. *The TQM Journal*, 22(4), 369-378.
- Fagot, B., Rodgers, C., & Leinbach, M. D. (2012). Theories of gender socialization. In *The Developmental Social Psychology of Gender* (pp. 79-104). Psychology Press.
- Fang, T. (2003). A critique of Hofstede's fifth national culture dimension. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3(3), 347-368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1470595803003003006>
- Farzad, F., Stacey, Q., (2003). An empirical analysis of the relationship between gdp and unemployment. *Humanomics*, 19 (3), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb018884>

Fortin, N. M. (2005). Gender role attitudes and the labour-market outcomes of women across OECD countries. *Oxford review of Economic Policy*, 21(3), 416-438.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/gri024>

Fragkos, K. C., Tsagris, M., & Frangos, C. C. (2014). Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis: Confidence Intervals for Rosenthal's Fail-Safe Number. *International Scholarly Research Notices*, 2014, 825383. doi:10.1155/2014/825383

French, K. A., Dumani, S., Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and social support. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(3), 284.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/bul0000120>

French, K. A., Agars, M. D., & Arvan, M. L. (2016). The shift flexibility scale. *Poster presentation for the 2016 Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Anaheim, CA

Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work–family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 145-167.

<https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577>

Gaye, A., Klugman, J., Kovacevic, M., Twigg, S., & Zambrano, E. (2010). Measuring key disparities in human development: The gender inequality index. *Human Development Research Paper*, 46, 41.

“World Development Indicators: GDP per Capita.” (2018, Nov 14). *The World Bank Data*.

Retrieved from [data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD](http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD)

Geller, P. A., & Hobfoll, S. E. (1994). Gender differences in job stress, tedium and social support in the workplace. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 555-572.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407594114004>

- Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P., & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences*. A series of books in psychology. San Francisco: WH Freeman.
- Glauber, R. (2008). Race and gender in families and at work: The fatherhood wage premium. *Gender & Society*, 22(1), 8-30. doi: 10.1177/0891243207311593
- González-Morales, M. G., Peiró, J. M., Rodríguez, I., & Greenglass, E. R. (2006). Coping and distress in organizations: The role of gender in work stress. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(2), 228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.13.2.228>
- Grant, J. (1988). Women as managers: What they can offer to organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(3), 56-63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(88\)90036-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(88)90036-8)
- Gray, B.E. (2019). Psychosocial predictors of family friendly policy usability. (*Unpublished master's thesis*). Baruch College & The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, New York, NY.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277352>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>
- \*Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. D. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work-family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 266-275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008>

- Güngör, G., & Biernat, M. (2009). Gender bias or motherhood disadvantage? Judgments of blue collar mothers and fathers in the workplace. *Sex Roles, 60*(3-4), 232-246. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9540-1
- Hammer, L. B., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Quality of work life. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbooks in Psychology. APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 399-431). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12171-011>
- \*Hammer, L. B., Ernst Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the Family Supportive Supervisor Behavior Short-Form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*(3), 285.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032612>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management, 35*(4), 837-856.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308328510>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Zimmerman, K., & Daniels, R. (2007). Clarifying the construct of family-supportive supervisory behaviors (FSSB): A multilevel perspective. In *Exploring the Work and Non-Work Interface* (pp. 165-204). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Harris, J. I., Winskowski, A. M., & Engdahl, B. E. (2007). Types of workplace social support in the prediction of job satisfaction. *The Career Development Quarterly, 56*(2), 150-156.



- Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks? The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 81.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.81>
- Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(3), 416. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.416
- Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 657-674.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00234>
- Heilman, M. E. (2012). Gender stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 32*, 113-135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2012.11.003>
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 575-604. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135109>
- Hill, C., Corbett, C., & St Rose, A. (2010). *Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics*. American Association of University Women. 1111 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, DC 20036.
- Hodges, A. J., & Park, B. (2013). Oppositional identities: Dissimilarities in how women and men experience parent versus professional roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(2), 193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032681>

- Hodges, M. J., & Budig, M. J. (2010). Who gets the daddy bonus? Organizational hegemonic masculinity and the impact of fatherhood on earnings. *Gender & Society, 24*(6), 717-745. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243210386729>
- Hodson, G., Dovidio, J. F., & Esses, V. M. (2003). Ingroup identification as a moderator of positive–negative asymmetry in social discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(2), 215-233. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.141>
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 1*(2), 81-99.
- Hofstede, G. (1998). The cultural construction of gender. In G. Hofstede (Ed.), *Cross-cultural psychology series, Vol. 3. Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*(6), 882-896.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- How Do Gender Norms Change?* Rep. Overseas Development Institute, Sept. 2015. Web.
- \*Houle, L., Chiochio, F., Favreau, O. E., & Villeneuve, M. (2012). Role conflict and self-efficacy among employed parents: Examining complex statistical interactions. *Gender, Work & Organization, 19*(6), 592-614. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2011.00562.x>
- \*Hu, J. L., & Ho, C. W. (2016). Service quality and non-salary mechanism for airline companies in Taiwan. *Journal of Air Transport Management, 55*, 61-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2016.02.016>

- Hui, C. H., Yee, C., & Eastman, K. L. (1995). The relationship between individualism—collectivism and job satisfaction. *Applied Psychology, 44*(3), 276-282.
- “Human Development Reports.” (2017). *Human Development Data (1990-2015)*. *Human Development Reports*. Retrieved from [hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii](http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii)
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Sage.
- Huettinger, M. (2008). Cultural dimensions in business life: Hofstede's indices for Latvia and Lithuania. *Baltic Journal of Management, 3*(3), 359-376.
- \*Hwang, W., & Ramadoss, K. (2017). The job demands—control—support model and job satisfaction across gender: The mediating role of work—family conflict. *Journal of Family Issues, 38*(1), 52-72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X16647983>
- International Labor Organization (2018, September). *The World Bank data: Unemployment rate*. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS>
- Jackson, C. L., Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2006). Psychological collectivism: A measurement validation and linkage to group member performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 884. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.884
- Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1995). Understanding human resource management in the context of organizations and their environments. *Annual Review of Psychology, 46*(1), 237-264.
- Jansen, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2006). Toward a multidimensional theory of person-environment fit. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 19*(3)-212. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604534>

Janssens, A. (1997). The rise and decline of the male breadwinner family? An overview of the debate. *International Review of Social History*, 42(S5), 1-23.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020859000114774>

\*Jennings, K. S., Sinclair, R. R., & Mohr, C. D. (2016). Who benefits from family support?

Work schedule and family differences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*,

21(1), 51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039651>

\*Johnson, D. A. B. (2014). The effects of Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors (FSSB) on work and health related outcomes. *Online Theses and Dissertations*. 205.

<https://encompass.eku.edu/etd/205>

Judge, T. A., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2004). Personality, interactional psychology, and person-organization fit. *Personality and Organizations*, 87-109.

\*Kailasapathy, P., & Jayakody, J. A. S. K. (2017). Does leadership matter? Leadership styles, family supportive supervisor behaviour and work interference with family conflict. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-35.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1276091>

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965-990.

\*Karatepe, O. M., & Kilic, H. (2007). Relationships of supervisor support and conflicts in the work-family interface with the selected job outcomes of frontline employees. *Tourism Management*,

28(1), 238-252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.019>

Kierein, N. M., & Gold, M. A. (2000). Pygmalion in work organizations: a meta-analysis.

*Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(8), 913-928. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200012)21:8<913::AID-JOB62>3.0.CO;2-%23)

[1379\(200012\)21:8<913::AID-JOB62>3.0.CO;2-%23](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200012)21:8<913::AID-JOB62>3.0.CO;2-%23)

- Kim, H., & Stoner, M. (2008). Burnout and turnover intention among social workers: Effects of role stress, job autonomy and social support. *Administration in Social Work, 32*(3), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03643100801922357>
- Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., & Taylor, S. E. (2008). Culture and social support. *American Psychologist, 63*(6), 518. doi:10.1037/0003-066X
- Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., Ko, D., & Taylor, S. E. (2006). Pursuit of comfort and pursuit of harmony: Culture, relationships, and social support seeking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(12), 1595-1607. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206291991>
- \*Kim, S., Las Heras, M., & Escibano, P. (2016). When satisfaction with work-family balance pays. *International Business Research, 9*(11), 178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v9n11p178>
- King, E. B., Knight, J. L., & Hebl, M. R. (2010). The influence of economic conditions on aspects of stigmatization. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(3), 446-460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01655.x>
- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(2), 289-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
- Koval, P., Laham, S. M., Haslam, N., Bastian, B., & Whelan, J. A. (2012). Our flaws are more human than yours: Ingroup bias in humanizing negative characteristics. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(3), 283-295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211423777>

- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, *49*(1), 1-49.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x>
- Lambert, S. J., & Haley-Lock, A. (2004). The organizational stratification of opportunities for work–life balance: Addressing issues of equality and social justice in the workplace. *Community, Work & Family*, *7*(2), 179-195. DOI: 10.1080/1366880042000245461
- Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. (2010). Work-family conflict and job burnout among correctional staff. *Psychological Reports*, *106*(1), 19-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/PRO.106.1.19-26>
- \*Las Heras, M., Bosch, M. J., & Raes, A. M. (2015). Sequential mediation among family friendly culture and outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, *68*(11), 2366-2373.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.03.042>
- \*Las Heras, M., Trefalt, S., & Escribano, P. I. (2015). How national context moderates the impact of family-supportive supervisory behavior on job performance and turnover intentions. *Management Research: The Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, *13*(1), 55-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MRJIAM-06-2014-0556>
- Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 485-516.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142105>
- Leana III, C. R., & Van Buren, H. J. (1999). Organizational social capital and employment practices. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(3), 538-555.
- “Leave No One behind: A Call to Action for Gender Equality and Women's Economic Empowerment.” *Empower Women*, United Nations, 2016, [www.empowerwomen.org](http://www.empowerwomen.org).

- Li, Y., & Sun, J. (2015). Relationships between work-family conflict, gender-role attitude and job burnout. In L. Lu & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *New horizons in management. Handbook of research on work-life balance in Asia* (pp. 137-154). Northampton, MA, US: Edward Elgar Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781783475094.00013>
- Livingston, M. M., Burley, K., & Springer, T. P. (1996). The importance of being feminine: Gender, sex role, occupational and marital role commitment, and their relationship to anticipated work-family conflict. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 11*(5), 179.
- Llorens, S., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2006). Testing the robustness of the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13*(3), 378. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.13.3.378
- \*Lv, J. (2018). Family supportive supervisor behaviors and family-like employee-organization relationship: Effects on employees organizational citizen behavior. *Open Journal of Business and Management, 6*(02), 400. doi: 10.4236/ojbm.2018.62029
- \*Lyness, K. S., & Kropf, M. B. (2005). The relationships of national gender equality and organizational support with work-family balance: A study of European managers. *Human Relations, 58*(1), 33-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726705050934>
- Marimon, R., & Zilibotti, F. (2000). Employment and distributional effects of restricting working time. *European Economic Review, 44*(7), 1291-1326. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921\(00\)00032-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921(00)00032-5)
- \*Mansour, S., & Tremblay, D. G. (2018). Psychosocial safety climate as resource passageways to alleviate work-family conflict: A study in the health sector in Quebec. *Personnel Review, 47*(2), 474-493. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2016-0281>

- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 921-936. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2094577>
- \*Mauno, S., & Rantanen, M. (2013). Contextual and dispositional coping resources as predictors of work–family conflict and enrichment: Which of these resources or their combinations are the most beneficial? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 34(1), 87-104. doi: 10.1007/s10834-012-9306-3
- McBey, K., Karakowsky, L., & Ng, P. (2017). Can I make a difference here? The impact of perceived organizational support on volunteer commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(8), 991-1007. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-05-2015-0078>
- Montez, J. K., Sabbath, E., Glymour, M. M., & Berkman, L. F. (2014). Trends in work–family context among US women by education level, 1976 to 2011. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 33(5), 629-648. doi: 10.1007/s11113-013-9315-4
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22(2), 103-122. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420220202>
- “National Study of the Changing Workforce.” (2017, July 25). *Society for Human Resource Management*. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org>
- Neilson, J., & Stanfors, M. (2014). It’s about time! Gender, parenthood, and household divisions of labor under different welfare regimes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 35, 1066–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X14522240>
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Organizational tenure and job performance. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1220-1250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309359809>



- Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Yim, F. H. K. (2009). Does the job satisfaction—job performance relationship vary across cultures? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(5), 761-796. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022109339208>
- Orwin, R. (1983). A Fail-Safe N for Effect Size in Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 8(2), 157-159. doi:10.2307/1164923
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487-516. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256404>
- O'Neill, J. W., Harrison, M. M., Cleveland, J., Almeida, D., Stawski, R., & Crouter, A. C. (2009). Work–family climate, organizational commitment, and turnover: Multilevel contagion effects of leaders. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 18-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.10.004>
- Phelan, J. E., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Competent yet out in the cold: Shifting criteria for hiring reflect backlash toward agentic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(4), 406-413. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00454.x>
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17(1), 271-320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280601055772>
- “Pursuing Women's Economic Empowerment.” *International Monetary Fund*, May 2018, [www.imf.org/en/Publications/Policy-Papers/Issues/2018/05/31/pp053118pursuing-womens-economic-empowerment](http://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Policy-Papers/Issues/2018/05/31/pp053118pursuing-womens-economic-empowerment).
- Purvanova, R. K., & Muros, J. P. (2010). Gender differences in burnout: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 168-185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.006>

- \*Premeaux, S. F., Adkins, C. L., & Mossholder, K. W. (2007). Balancing work and family: A field study of multi-dimensional, multi-role work-family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 28(6), 705-727.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.439>
- Randall, D. M. (1993). Cross-cultural research on organizational commitment: A review and application of Hofstede's Value Survey Module. *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1), 91-110. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(93\)90045-Q](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(93)90045-Q)
- \*Ratnasingam, P., Spitzmueller, C., King, W. R., Rubino, C., Luksyte, A., Matthews, R. A., & Fisher, G. G. (2012). Can on-site childcare have detrimental work outcomes? Examining the moderating roles of family supportive organization perceptions and childcare satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(4), 435.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029538>
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S., (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 825–836. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.825
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Motherhood as a status characteristic. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(4), 683-700. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00380.x>
- Riordan, C. M., & Shore, L. M. (1997). Demographic diversity and employee attitudes: An empirical examination of relational demography within work units. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.342>

- Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). Family supportive supervisor behaviors and organizational culture: Effects on work engagement and performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(2), 207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000036>
- Rosenberg, M. S. (2005). The file-drawer problem revisited: a general weighted method for calculating fail-safe numbers in meta-analysis. *Evolution, 59*(2), 464-468.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2005.tb01004.x>
- Rosenthal, R. (1979). The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*(3), 638. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.638>
- Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1978). Interpersonal expectancy effects: The first 345 studies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1*(3), 377-386.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00075506>
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*(4), 655-684.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3094827>
- Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., Panzer, K., & King, S. N. (2002). Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(2), 369-386.  
<https://doi.org/10.5465/3069352>
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 743-762. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00239>
- Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2013). Penalizing men who request a family leave: Is flexibility stigma a femininity stigma? *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(2), 322-340.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12017>

- \*Russo, J. A., & Waters, L. E. (2006). Workaholic worker type differences in work-family conflict: The moderating role of supervisor support and flexible work scheduling. *Career Development International, 11*(5), 418-439.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13620430610683052>
- \*Russo, M., Buonocore, F., Carmeli, A., & Guo, L. (2018). When family supportive supervisors meet employees' need for caring: Implications for work–family enrichment and thriving. *Journal of Management, 44*(4), 1678-1702. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315618013>
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x>
- Shockley, K. M., Shen, W., DeNunzio, M. M., Arvan, M. L., & Knudsen, E. A. (2017). Disentangling the relationship between gender and work–family conflict: An integration of theoretical perspectives using meta-analytic methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(12), 1601. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000246>
- Shoss, M. K., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2013). Blaming the organization for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organizational support and supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(1), 158.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030687>
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Federico, C., & Pratto, F. (2001). Social dominance approach. *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations, 307*.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Rabinowitz, J. L. (1994). Gender, ethnic status, and ideological asymmetry: A social dominance interpretation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*(2), 194-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022194252003>

- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 845-880. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00401.x>
- Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 567-578. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2094422>
- Sigle-Rushton, W., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Motherhood and women's earnings in Anglo-American, Continental European, and Nordic countries. *Feminist Economics*, 13(2), 55-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545700601184849>
- Signorini, P., Wiesemes, R., & Murphy, R. (2009). Developing alternative frameworks for exploring intercultural learning: A critique of Hofstede's cultural difference model. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(3), 253-264.
- \*Skinner, J. L. (2006). Women's pursuit of advancement opportunities: The impact of gendered climates on women's perceptions of fit with leadership (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.
- Steel, P. D., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2002). Comparing meta-analytic moderator estimation techniques under realistic conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 96. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.96
- Sterne, J. A., & Egger, M. (2001). Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 54(10), 1046-1055. DOI:10.1016/S0895-4356(01)00377-8
- Stoeva, A. Z., Chiu, R. K., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2002). Negative affectivity, role stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(1), 1-16. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1812

- \*Straub, C., Beham, B., & Islam, G. (2017). Crossing boundaries: Integrative effects of supervision, gender and boundary control on work engagement and work-to-family positive spillover. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-24.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1340324>
- \*Sublett, L. W. (2014). When workplace family-support is misallocated: The importance of value congruence and fairness perceptions in predicting work-family conflict and job attitudes. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Houston, Texas.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/10657/677>
- Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of culture's consequences: A three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 405. doi: 10.1037/a0018938
- Taras, V., Roney, J. , Steel, P. (2009). Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations, and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture. *Journal of International Management*, 15(4), 357-373.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2008.08.005>
- Taylor, S. E., Sherman, D. K., Kim, H. S., Jarcho, J., Takagi, K., & Dunagan, M. S. (2004). Culture and social support: Who seeks it and why? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(3), 354. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.3.354
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.6>

- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2006). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(1), 100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.100>
- \*Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*(3), 392–415. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1681>
- \*Thompson, C. A., Jahn, E. W., Kopelman, R. E., & Prottas, D. J. (2004). Perceived organizational family support: A longitudinal and multilevel analysis. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 545*-565. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604468>
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 549*-579. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1991.4976867>
- Tyler, J. M., & McCullough, J. D. (2009). Violating prescriptive stereotypes on job resumes: A self-presentational perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*(2), 272-287. doi: 10.1177/089331890341412
- Vandello, J. A., Hettinger, V. E., Bosson, J. K., & Siddiqi, J. (2013). When equal isn't really equal: The masculine dilemma of seeking work flexibility. *Journal of Social Issues, 69*, 303–321. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josi.12016>
- \*Voydanoff, P. (2004). The effects of work demands and resources on work-to-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(2), 398-412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2004.00028.x>

- Wallace, J. E. (2014). Gender and supportive co-worker relations in the medical profession. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12007>
- \*Walsh, B. M., Matthews, R. A., Toumbeva, T. H., Kabat-Farr, D., Philbrick, J., & Pavisic, I. (2018). Failing to be family-supportive: Implications for supervisors. *Journal of Management*, 0149206318774621. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318774621>
- Wayne, J. H., & Cordeiro, B. L. (2003). Who is a good organizational citizen? Social perception of male and female employees who use family leave. *Sex Roles*, 49(5-6), 233-246.
- \*Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Family-supportive organization perceptions and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work–family conflict and enrichment and partner attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(4), 606. doi:10.1037/a0032491
- \*Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work–family support in work–family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(3), 445-461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.002>
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111. <https://doi.org/10.5465/257021>
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 590-598. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.59>



- Weer, C.H., & Greenhaus, J.H. (2006). The role of maternal employment, role altering strategies, and gender in college students' expectation of work family conflict. *Sex Roles*, 55, 534-544. DOI 10.1007/s11199-006-9107-y
- Westerman, J. W., & Cyr, L. A. (2004). An integrative analysis of person–organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(3), 252-261.  
[https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.279\\_1.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.279_1.x)
- Westring, A. F., & Ryan, A. M. (2011). Anticipated work–family conflict: A construct investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 596-610.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.02.004>
- Whitener, E. M. (1990). Confusion of confidence intervals and credibility intervals in meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(3), 315-321. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.75.3.315
- \*Zhang, S., & Tu, Y. (2018). Cross-domain effects of ethical leadership on employee family and life satisfaction: The moderating role of family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 152(4), 1085-1097. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.279\\_1.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.279_1.x)

## Daroon M. Jalil

250 Mills Godwin Building, Norfolk VA 23529, [djali001@odu.edu](mailto:djali001@odu.edu)

### Education

---

- 2017 – Present**    **Ph.D**, Industrial Organizational Psychology (Expected graduation date: 2022)  
*Old Dominion University; Norfolk, VA*
- 2013-2017**        **B.S.**, Psychology, Statistical Focus; Summa Cum Laude  
*James Madison University; Harrisonburg, VA*

### Work Experience

---

- **Intern, Research and Insights; Society for Human Resource Management**    5/19 – 8/19
  - Contributed to ongoing projects in the research department including survey development, data cleaning, data analysis, data visualization, and report writing
  - Aided in manuscript development on topics that are relevant to both practitioners and researchers
- **Statistical Consultant; Norfolk LGBT Life Center**    10/18- Present
  - Analyzed quantitative and qualitative data on various federal grant programs offered through the LGBT Life Center
  - Develop quarterly technical reports on the effectiveness of various programs
- **Intern, Education Programs; Society for Human Resource Management**
  - Developed a complete 2-day training seminar for HR professionals on diversity, inclusion, and equity    5/18 - 8/18
  - Analyzed customer demographics, student enrollment information, seminar data, and customer satisfaction reports to identify purchasing trends to drive future marketing strategy
- **Diversity Consultant & Educator; JMU Center for Multicultural Students**
  - Served as a consultant for the university's senior leadership, professors, and departments on diversity issues    2013 - 2017
  - Developed interventions, educational programs, and training materials related to privilege, identity, and cultural competency for audiences of 5 – 1,200 people

### Research & Teaching

---

- **Graduate Research Assistant, Old Dominion University**    2017- Present
  - Conducting a meta-analysis on gender and organizational support
  - Mentoring, supervising, and advising 3 undergraduate research assistants
  - Developing research ideas, running analyses, and writing manuscripts on various topics related to the workplace
- **Graduate Teaching Assistant, Old Dominion University**    2017- Present
  - **Courses:** Research Methods, Quantitative Methods, Psychology of Women, Biopsychology, Theories of Personality, Child Psychology