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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.
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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; Breaugh 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 (Mcbey & 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 \textit{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, \textit{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; Breaugh & 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, Rowney, & 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 societieis, 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 thorough 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,
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 be 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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Failsafe k</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>SDₜ</th>
<th>δ</th>
<th>SDδ</th>
<th>% var.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>90% CrI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34,948</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.0997</td>
<td>43.96</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

Positive d and δ 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

SDₜ = standard deviation of the uncorrected difference value

δ = corrected difference value

SDδ = 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

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

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 clarity 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 & Yogeeswaran, 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 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
expiring 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pub</th>
<th>Industry/Field</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>GII</th>
<th>GDP</th>
<th>UR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen (2001)</td>
<td>FSOP</td>
<td>Created Own</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>32,949</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Shockley, &amp; Poteat (2008)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Created Own</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>44,308</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayree, Chu, Kim, &amp; Ryu (2013)</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>22,087</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagger, Li (2014) - Study 1</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Clark (2001)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>48,401</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baral &amp; Bhargava (2010)</td>
<td>FSOP</td>
<td>Lyness et al. (1999)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beham, Drobnic, &amp; Prag (2014)</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>Dikkers et al. (2004)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch, Las Heras, Russo, Rofcanin, &amp; Grau (2018)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Hammer et al. (2009)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi, Kim, Han, Ryu, Park, &amp; Kwon (2017)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Thomas &amp; Ganster (1995)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>27,811</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark (2001)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Created Own</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>32,949</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crain, Hammer, Bodner, Kossek, Moen, Lilienthal, &amp; Buxton (2014)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Hammer et al. (2013)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>49,794</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demirtas, Arslan, &amp; Karaca (2017)</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>12,127</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Method (Year)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Industry/Field</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Total Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houle, Chiocchio, Favreau, &amp; Villeneuve (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>40,773.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu &amp; Ho (2016)</td>
<td>FSOP</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Airlines</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>51,451.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwang &amp; Ramadoss (2017)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Adapted</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>52,782.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (2014)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>52,782.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatype &amp; Kilic (2007)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>23,932.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Las Heras, &amp; Escribano (2016)</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>12,977.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Heras, Bosch, &amp; Raes (2015)</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>6314</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study &amp; Authors</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>FSSB: Hammer et al. (2009)</td>
<td>FSOP</td>
<td>FSOP: Thompson et al. (1999)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Heras, Bosch, &amp; Raes (2015) Study 2</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Heras, Trefalt, &amp; Escribano (2015)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Hammer et al. (2009)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyness &amp; Kropf (2005) Study 2</td>
<td>FSOP</td>
<td>Thompson et al. (1999)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyness &amp; Kropf (2005) Study 1</td>
<td>FSOP</td>
<td>Thompson et al. (1999) - adapted</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russo &amp; Waters (2006)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Shinn et al. (1989)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>23,437</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russo, Buonocore, Carmeli, &amp; Guo (2015) Study 1</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Hammer et al. (2009)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>35,370</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson &amp; Prottas (2006)</td>
<td>FSOP</td>
<td>Created Own</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2810</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>38,166</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>I-C</td>
<td>M-F</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>I-R</td>
<td>GII</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>UR</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Beauvais, &amp; Lyness (1999)</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>Created Own</td>
<td>P Various</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>30,068</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voydanhoff (2004)</td>
<td>*FRS</td>
<td>Created Own</td>
<td>P Various</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>31,573</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang &amp; Tu (2016)</td>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>Hammer et al. (2013)</td>
<td>P Technology</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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