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Abstract

This study examined predictors of employee perceptions of organizational work-life support. Using organizational support theory and conservation of resources theory, we reasoned that workplace demands and resources shape employees’ perceptions of work-life support through two mechanisms: signaling that the organization cares about their work-life balance and helping them develop and conserve resources needed to meet work and nonwork responsibilities. Consistent with our hypotheses, we found that higher demands (work hours and work overload) were associated with reduced perceptions that the organization was supportive of work-life integration. Resources (job security, fit between employees’ needs and the flexible work options available to them, supervisor support and work group support) were positively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support. The results of this study urge further scholarly attention to work-based demands and resources as predictors of perceived organizational work-life support and yield implications for managerial practice.
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Imagine that you are an average working American. According to current statistical profiles from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (Current Population Survey, American Time Use Survey) and survey data from the Gallup Organization, you are most likely either married to or partnered with someone who is also working, or you are the single head of your household. In either case, there is no one in your household who stays home full time to take care of family, household and other nonwork demands. The daily struggle to manage all of the demands on your time and energy is familiar to you. You also worry about the security of your job, the stability of your career and/or your financial future, even as demands from work seem unrelenting. What would help? Feeling that your employer understands the challenges you face and wants to help you integrate work with the rest of your life (Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002; Stone, 2007; Valcour & Batt, 2003).

It is clear that successfully integrating work, family and personal life is a difficult challenge and that employees need support from their employers to do so. Fully 90 percent of working mothers and 95 percent of working fathers report experiencing work-life conflict (Williams & Boushey, 2010). Executives and human resource managers report that work-life balance is one of the top HR challenges their organizations face (Galinsky, Bond, Sakai, Kim, & Giuntoli, 2008). Many organizations invest time, effort and financial resources in helping employees combine work and nonwork responsibilities, for example, by offering family-friendly human resource policies.

However, in order for employers to reap the benefits of their initiatives, it is crucial that employees actually feel supported and free to use the work-life supports that the organization offers (Eaton, 2003). Employees in many organizations are reluctant to ask for support, out of fear that doing so will make them appear less committed and therefore more expendable (Stone, 2007). If employees doubt that the organization truly intends to help them achieve work-life
balance, work-life initiatives are of little value. To a greater extent than individual policies and benefits, employee perceptions that the organization supports work-life integration may be its most powerful tool for fostering and sustaining productivity, engagement and retention (Boston College Center for Work & Family, 2004; Lowe, 2010). It is thus crucial for work-life scholars and practitioners to understand what factors contribute to employees’ perceptions of organizational work-life support, which is the purpose of this study.

Perceptions of Organizational Work-life Support

Perceptions of organizational work-life support reflect employees’ global assessment of the extent to which their employer respects and supports their desire to successfully combine work and nonwork roles and intends to help them do so. Perceptions of organizational work-life support add value above and beyond other components of work-life support, for example, by facilitating the effective implementation of flexible work options. Research has found that employee perceptions of organizational work-life support and related constructs (family-supportive organization perceptions, organizational work-family culture) are associated with increased organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction and psychological well-being, and with decreased work-family conflict and turnover intentions (Allen, 2001; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006; O'Neill, et al., 2009; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999; Thompson & Prottas, 2006).

While several studies have examined the relationship of work-life support perceptions to individual and organizational outcomes, we found only two studies that have investigated the predictors of employee perceptions of organizational work-life support. Forret and de Janasz (2005) found that employees with mentors perceived their organization’s culture to be more supportive of work and family than did employees without mentors, while Mauno, Kinnunen and Piistulainen (2005) found that employee perceptions of organizational work-family culture in
Finland were more positive among public sector than private sector employees.

**Theoretical Framework**

We draw on two theories, organizational support theory and conservation of resources (COR) theory, to develop arguments that workplace factors affect employees’ perceptions of organizational work-life support through two primary mechanisms: (a) by leading employees to interpret aspects of the organizational environment as signals of organizational supportiveness and (b) by helping employees to develop and conserve resources that are useful in meeting work and nonwork demands. Organizational support theory postulates that individuals’ perceptions of the organization’s supportiveness are affected by the human tendency to anthropomorphize organizations (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Ascribing characteristics and intentions to an organization leads employees to construe behaviors exhibited by its agents as indications of the organization’s intent (Eisenberger, et al., 1986). On the basis of what they experience and observe at work, employees make judgments of whether and to what extent the organization values and is likely to support their desires and efforts to balance work and the rest of life. Research has shown, for example, that the availability, use and perceived value of work-life benefits are associated with perceptions of organizational support (Casper & Harris, 2008; Lambert, 2000; Muse, Harris, Giles, & Feild, 2008). We argue in this article that workplace demands and resources serve as signals that inform employees’ perceptions of the degree to which their employer intends to support the integration of their work and personal lives.

Employees are also likely to develop perceptions of the organization’s work-life support based upon the extent to which the demands they face at work and the resources that they derive from the organization enable them to carry out their work and personal/family responsibilities. This mechanism is best articulated in conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), which proposes that individuals are motivated to acquire and maintain resources (objects, conditions,
personal characteristics and energies) that are valued on their own or that help to develop or protect other valued resources (Hobfoll, 2001). According to the COR model, an environment rich in resources helps individuals to conserve and build resources that enable them to handle their work and nonwork demands. Research indicates that demands that pose a threat to resources (e.g., work overload, role ambiguity) are associated with employee perceptions that the organization is less supportive, whereas resources (e.g., work autonomy, supervisor support, family friendly-benefits, training) promote employees’ perceptions of organizational supportiveness (Lambert, 2000; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Similarly, we argue that work demands are likely to undermine employees’ perceptions of organizational work-life supportiveness by draining or threatening the resources they need to successfully integrate work and nonwork roles, while resources present in the work environment are likely to promote perceptions of organizational work-life supportiveness.

**Hypotheses**

**Demands**

**Work hours.** The number of hours an employee works constitutes a primary demand of any job, and long work hours are a reality in many contemporary workplaces. In the terms of COR theory, time is among the most highly valued personal resources. The greater the number of hours a person works, the less of this precious resource he or she has to devote to family and personal life. In addition, long work hours can drain other vital resources, such as energy, that are needed in nonwork roles. Consistent with this argument, several studies have found that longer work hours are associated with greater work-family conflict and/or diminished work-family balance (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1997; Grandey, Cordeiro, & Michael, 2007; Major, Klein, & Ehrhart, 2002; Valcour, 2007; Voydanoff, 2005; Wallace, 1997, 1999), which are in turn negatively related to perceptions of organizational work-life support (Forret & de Janasz,
2005). Additionally, organizational support theory would suggest that, all else being equal, the greater the time required for work, the less likely employees are to perceive the organization as supportive.

**Hypothesis 1.** Work hours are negatively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Work overload.** Work overload is characterized by a chronic sense of pressure that one has too many things to do and not enough time to do them in (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). Research findings that work overload is associated with increased work-family conflict (Bolino & Turnley, 2005; Frone, Yardley, et al., 1997; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996; Wallace, 1997, 1999) and ultimately with lowered organizational commitment and increased turnover intention (Ahuja, McKnight, Chudoba, George, & Kacmar, 2007; Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, & Parasuraman, 1997) are consistent with explanations derived from both COR and organizational support theory. Employees are likely to resent an employer that overworks them and to perceive the organization as unsupportive of work-life balance (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003). Furthermore, given that work overload represents a fundamental state of imbalance between demands and resources such that one’s work demands exceed the resources available to meet them, COR theory would also suggest that work overload lowers employee perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Hypothesis 2.** Work overload is negatively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Resources**

**Job security.** Job security is an important resource that promotes perceptions of organizational work-life support both because it helps employees to develop and conserve multiple valued resources (e.g., income, health insurance and other benefits, career identity and
social connectedness) and because it fosters the belief among employees that the organization cares for them and their families. Berg, Kalleberg and Applebaum (2003) found that job security and related high-commitment work practices are positively related to employee perceptions that the company is helping them achieve work-life balance. Meta-analytic evidence provides support for a positive relationship between job security and perceived organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

**Hypothesis 3.** Job security is positively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Flexibility fit.** Flexibility in the time and location of work has been shown to facilitate work-life integration (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman, 2001; Thomas & Ganster, 1995), particularly when employees have access to the options that are most well suited to their own needs and life circumstances. Thus, we adopt the construct of flexibility fit, employees’ assessment of the degree to which the flexibility afforded to them at their workplace meets their needs (Pitt-Catsouphes & Matz-Costa, 2008). Consistent with research which has found that flexible work options are related to perceptions of general organizational supportiveness (Casper & Harris, 2008; Muse, et al., 2008) and to perceptions of organizational family-supportiveness (Allen, 2001), we expect that flexibility fit will contribute to perceptions of organizational work-life support both because employees are likely to interpret it as a signal of the organization’s care for them and because access to needed flexibility helps to build resources needed to meet work and family demands.

**Hypothesis 4.** Flexibility fit is positively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Supervisor support.** Supervisor support has been recognized as a critical element of family-supportive work environments (Allen, 2001; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, et al.,
Supportive supervisors provide instrumental and socioemotional support to employees, resources which help employees integrate work and nonwork demands, prevent and alleviate stress (Halbesleben, 2006), and demonstrate care for and commitment to employees. As organizational agents who are hierarchically close to employees and have responsibility for directing and evaluating their subordinates’ performance, supervisors have a strong influence on their subordinates’ impressions of the organization (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). Supervisor support is thus both a source of resources and an important factor in promoting perceptions of organizational support (Eisenberger, et al., 2002; Ng & Sorensen, 2008).

**Hypothesis 5.** Supervisor support is positively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Work group support.** Intra-group relationships are an understudied but potentially important source of support for work-life integration. Research has found that the support and flexibility of work group members can help to reduce absenteeism and work-life conflict among members (Bailyn, 1993). The support of work-group members in both instrumental (e.g., offering to fill in for a colleague who needs to stay home to care for a sick child) and socioemotional (e.g., assuring a fellow work group member that his nonwork commitments are not resented) forms comprises resources that help employees manage work and nonwork responsibilities. Furthermore, since work group members are also agents of the organization, the support that they show constitutes a part of the set of signals that employees interpret in formulating perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Hypothesis 6.** Work group support is positively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support.

**Methods**
Data and Sample

We used data from the Age & Generations Study, a study conducted by the Sloan Center on Aging & Work at Boston College in 2007-2008, to test our hypotheses. The 2,025 respondents worked in 13 departments (with an average response rate of 55.3%) within the nine participating organizations, representing multiple industries (education, health care, retail, finance, insurance, and pharmaceuticals). Employees in this sample were 60% female, 40% male, and 41 years old on average. Seventy-three percent were married or cohabiting; 43% had children under age 18. Eighty-six percent worked full time and 14% worked part time. Average organizational tenure was 8.5 years. Fifty-one percent of the employees were hourly; these workers earned $22 per hour on average. Forty-nine percent were salaried employees earning an average of $80,000 per year.

Measures

Dependent variable. We measured perceptions of organizational work-life support (POWLS) with a scale adapted from Thompson, Beauvais and Lyness (1999), which we shortened due to survey length constraints. Respondents rated the following three statements on a scale of (1) “strongly disagree” to (6) “strongly agree”: “To get ahead in this organization, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at the workplace or at home”; “Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs ahead of their personal or family lives”; and “In this organization, employees who make use of flexible work options (e.g., flextime, job sharing, part-time work) are viewed as less serious about their careers than those who do not make use of such options.” The items were reverse-coded and averaged so that higher scores indicate a more supportive organization; α = .79.

Independent variables: demands. Work hours was measured as the number of hours respondents reported working for their job in a typical work week. Work overload was measured
using four items from Wallace (1997), including “I do not have enough time to get everything done in my job” plus a fifth item, “I can work at a comfortable pace” (reverse scored). The response scale ranged from (1) “strongly disagree” to (6) “strongly agree”; α = .87.

**Independent variables: resources.** To assess job security, we asked respondents to rate two items from Oldham, Kulik, Stepina, & Ambrose (1986) on a scale of (1) “very inaccurate” to (6) “very accurate” including “Regardless of economic conditions, I expect I will have a job at my current organization at least for the next 5 years”; α = .83. To assess flexibility fit, we asked respondents to rate the extent to which they have access to the flexible work options they need to fulfill their work and personal needs on a scale from (1) “not at all” to (4) “to a great extent.” We used 5 items from Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley (1990) to measure supervisor support (α = .92). Respondents indicated their agreement on a scale of (1) “strongly disagree” to (6) “strongly agree” with statements including “My team leader/supervisor gives me helpful feedback about my performance” and “My team leader/supervisor often asks for my opinion before making important decisions.” Work group support was measured using four items adapted from the National Study of the Changing Workforce (Families and Work Institute, 2002). Respondents rated items including “Your work team clearly recognizes the importance that working and managing flexibly has for business success” and “Members of your work team are comfortable discussing their needs for flexibility” on a scale from (1) “strongly disagree” to (6) “strongly agree”; α = .86.

**Control variables.** We included the following control variables: gender (female = 1; male = 0); age (continuous); marital status (married or cohabiting = 1; single = 0); parental responsibilities (1 = has child or children age 18 or under; 0 = does not); elder care responsibilities (1 = provides care to an elderly family member on a weekly basis or provides significant financial support; 0 = does not), and education (2 = high school diploma/GED or less;
1= 2-year college degree/bachelor’s degree; 0 = graduate degree).

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables included in analyses are presented in Table 1.

- Table 1 about here -

**Analyses**

To assess whether adjustments were needed to accommodate the nested nature of our data (employees nested within departments within organizations), we measured the degree of dependence by calculating the proportion of variance in perceived organizational work-life support to be explained at the employee level (ICC=.804, *p*<.000), department level (ICC=.033, *p*=.001), and organization level (ICC=.163, *p*<.000). These ICCs indicated that employees’ perceptions of organizational work-life support scores were significantly dependent on department and that department scores were significantly dependent on organization.

Random effects models are the preferred method for dealing with nested data structures, as they take into account unit-specific effects in the estimation of coefficients and standard errors (Kreft & deLeeuw, 1998). We controlled for department- and organization-level effects using a 3-level random effects model in which the employee-level intercept is allowed to vary freely across departments and the department-level intercept is allowed to vary freely across organizations. Our model was built in a series of steps, beginning with a null or empty model (unreported), followed next by the addition of the control variables (Model 1), job demands (Model 2), and finally, job resources (Model 3). All models were estimated using full maximum likelihood methods. Independent variables, with the exception of 0/1-coded dummy variables, were grand mean centered for analysis, a practice that produces more stable estimates, helps to reduce multicollinearity, and provides consistency across models (Field, 2009).

**Results**
The results of the hierarchical linear models appear in Table 2. With regard to the control variables, those with elder care responsibilities perceived their organizations to be significantly less supportive than those with without elder care responsibilities, while those with a high school degree or less perceived their organizations to be significantly more supportive than those with a graduate degree. Gender, age, marital status, and parental status were nonsignificant.

Hypothesis 1, that work hours are negatively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support, was partially supported. A curvilinear relationship between work hours and POWLS was detected while checking that the data met HLM assumptions. To properly model the shape of this relationship, both linear and squared work hour terms were included in the model. This relationship took the shape of an inverted U, such that as work hours increased, POWLS increased initially, then this relationship became flat, and subsequently negative. The threshold at which this relationship started to become negative fell at the 35-40 hour mark, which is the typical range for a standard full-time work week. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, we found that as work overload increased, POWLS decreased.

Consistent with Hypothesis 3, we found that employees who felt secure in their jobs perceived their organizations to be more supportive than employees who felt less secure. In support of Hypothesis 4, we found that flexibility fit was positively associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support; employees who reported that they had access to the flexible work options they need to fulfill their work and personal needs reported greater POWLS. Supervisor support was also positively associated with POWLS, supporting Hypothesis 5 (supervisor support scores were squared in analyses to correct for negative skew). Finally, consistent with Hypothesis 6, we found that work group support of work-life integration was
positively associated with POWLS.

We assessed the proportion of variance in POWLS explained by demands and resources by using the formula outlined by Kret & deLeeuw (1998) to calculate the level-1 pseudo-$R^2$. The addition of the job demand variables increased the proportion of variance explained at the employee level by 14.9% over the control model. Furthermore, a likelihood ratio test based on the deviance values of a model with only the control variables compared to the job demands model suggested that there is a significant improvement in model fit that can be attributed to the addition of the job demands variables ($\chi^2 = 338.78$, $df = 3$, $p < .000$). The addition of the job resources variables increased the proportion of variance explained at the employee level by 9.7% over the job demands model. The model including resources also represents a significant improvement in model fit over the job demands-only model ($\chi^2 = 253.86$, $df = 4$, $p < .000$).

Discussion

Previous research has identified employee perceptions of organizational work-life support as an important predictor of multiple personal, family and job-related outcomes, but has not thoroughly investigated its antecedents; our study helps to fill this gap. Consistent with our hypotheses, we found that demands and resources in the work environment contributed to perceptions of organizational work-life support. Employees who worked longer hours were less likely to perceive their organization as supportive of work-life integration (this effect held for employees working 35-40 hours per week or more), as were employees who reported experiencing greater work overload. We identified job security, a variable that has received surprisingly little attention in work-family research, as a significant predictor. Our finding that the fit between flexible work options available and the employee’s personal needs and circumstances is related to POWLS extends literature which has primarily examined the availability and use of flexible work options as predictors of work-family outcomes. Supervisor
support was associated with greater POWLS, as was work group support. This last finding highlights the importance of the work group environment, a factor deserving of much greater attention in future research on work-life integration.

In keeping with organizational support theory and COR theory, we offer two complementary explanations for our results. First, employees’ experiences in the organization (including the demands they face and the resources they are able to draw on to meet their responsibilities) inform their impressions of the extent to which the organization values work-life balance and intends to support their efforts to integrate work and family. For example, supportive supervisors and work group members help to personify the organization in employees’ minds as a caring, helpful and supportive entity. Second, workplace factors affect the depletion, development and preservation of valued resources that are instrumental in meeting the demands of work and personal life. For instance, flexible work options give employees greater control over managing work and nonwork demands, a powerful resource that facilitates their ability to perform well in multiple roles and protects them from the resource drain of role conflict (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). We urge researchers to keep in mind the complementary mechanisms of signaling and resource development and conservation in developing future studies.

**Practical Implications**

The current study makes a contribution to managerial practice by identifying multiple leverage points for organizations that wish to be seen by their employees as truly supporting work-life integration. The finding that job demands exert an influence on employees’ perceptions of work-life support emphasizes the importance of managing workload, an often overlooked component of organizational work-life strategy. Employers have directed substantially more effort at putting programs in place to support employees taking on heavy
workloads than to ensuring that workloads remain at a level consistent with full
engagement in nonwork roles (Stone, 2007). However, our results suggest that work overload
and long work hours are likely to undermine perceptions of organizational work-life support
even in the presence of work-life programs.

Resources also explained a significant amount of variance in perceptions of
organizational work-life support, suggesting that employers can benefit by enhancing job
security, targeting flexible work options to the needs of their employees, and training supervisors
to be aware of the importance of work-life integration and creative in their approaches to helping
employees meet multiple role demands. The findings of this study also highlight the importance
of the work group, another factor that is not often emphasized in work-life programs. The
significance of work group support in our models urges managerial investment in the
development of work-life support within work groups.

Limitations

We acknowledge that our measure of perceptions of organizational work-life support is
less than ideal. Due to employer-imposed limitations on the number of items permitted on the
employee survey, we included only three items from the original scale by Thompson, Beauvais
and Lyness (1999). We carefully selected items which we felt most thoroughly and accurately
captured the construct of perceptions of organizational work-life support, and selected only items
with high factor loadings in the analyses presented by Thompson, Beauvais and Lyness (1999).
Furthermore, to assess the construct validity of this measure as well as that of the other multi-
item scales included in our analyses, we conducted a series of supplementary confirmatory factor
analyses. Because a confirmatory factor analysis based on the total sample of nested data might
lead to underestimated standard errors (Muthén, 1994; Muthén & Satorra, 1995), we conducted
separate analyses using data from individual departments (mean $X^2=221.51$, $df=142$, $p<.05$).
Measures of goodness of fit indicated acceptable fit (e.g., the mean RMSEA across departments was .07 and the mean CFI across departments was .95).

Additionally, as is the case with most work-life research, our study relies on cross-sectional, self-report data and is thus subject to common method variance. In designing this study, we followed practices summarized by Conway and Lance (2010) to reduce the likelihood of common method variance biasing results.

Conclusion

Building upon past research that has identified employee perceptions of organizational work-life support as a vital component of effective organizational support for work-life integration, this study shows that workplace demands and resources are associated with perceptions of organizational work-life support. Results urge future attention to the ways in which workplace factors serve as signals of support and help build resources employees need to perform their work and nonwork roles.
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of org. W-L support</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/cohabitating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children &lt; age 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide elder care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors or 2 year degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility fit</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group support</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations < .|05| are significant at p < .05.

Reference:
a. Male.
b. No record of marriage or cohabitation.
c. Does not have children < age 19.
d. Does not provide elder care.
e. Graduate degree.
**Table 2**

*Hierarchical Linear Model Results for Perceptions of Organizational Work-life Support (Level-1 \( N = 2,025; \) Level-2 \( N = 13; \) Level-3 \( N = 9 \))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>Model 1 (Controls)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Job Demands)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Job Resources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.78 (.20) **</td>
<td>3.89 (.17) **</td>
<td>3.90 (.17) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female(^a)</td>
<td>.10 (.06)</td>
<td>.02 (.06)</td>
<td>.03 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/cohabitating(^b)</td>
<td>-.11 (.06)</td>
<td>-.07 (.06)</td>
<td>-.10 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children &lt; age 19(^c)</td>
<td>-.01 (.06)</td>
<td>-.00 (.06)</td>
<td>.02 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide elder care(^d)</td>
<td>-.29 (.07) **</td>
<td>-.21 (.07) **</td>
<td>-.17 (.06) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree or less(^e)</td>
<td>.44 (.11) **</td>
<td>.22 (.10) *</td>
<td>.24 (.09) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors or 2 year degree(^e)</td>
<td>.17 (.08) *</td>
<td>.08 (.07)</td>
<td>.10 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>-.01 (.00) **</td>
<td>-.02 (.00) **</td>
<td>-.02 (.00) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours(^2)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00) **</td>
<td>-.00 (.00) **</td>
<td>-.00 (.00) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>-.41 (.02) **</td>
<td>-.30 (.02) **</td>
<td>-.30 (.02) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08 (.02) **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13 (.03) **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02 (.00) **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19 (.03) **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Random Effects</th>
<th>Var. Comp. (SE)</th>
<th>Var. Comp. (SE)</th>
<th>Var. Comp. (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee-level variance (( \sigma^2 ))</td>
<td>1.25 (1.12)</td>
<td>1.06 (1.03)</td>
<td>.93 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-level variance (( \tau_\pi ))</td>
<td>.06 (.24) **</td>
<td>.04 (.20) **</td>
<td>.02 (.14) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization-level variance (( \tau_\beta ))</td>
<td>.24 (.49) **</td>
<td>.16 (.41) ***</td>
<td>.17 (.41) ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee-level *Pseudo-R*\(^2\)\(^f\) = .02 .17 .27

**Note.** All continuous variables in the model are centered on their grand means.
\(^a\) Reference = male; \(^b\) Reference = not married or cohabitating; \(^c\) Reference = does not have children < age 19; \(^d\) Reference = does not provide elder care; \(^e\) Reference = graduate degree
\(^f\) Compared to null model.

*\( p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001 \) (two-tailed tests).