

**Understanding the Importance of Work-Family Supportive Coworkers in
Navigating the Work-Family Interface**

Alicia McMullan

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy in Psychology

School of Psychology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

Abstract

Coworkers can play an important role in helping each other overcome stressful circumstances (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; LaRocco & Jones, 1978; Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999), yet work-family researchers have paid significantly less attention to coworker-provided support than they have to supervisor-provided support (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). This thesis contributes to the occupational health literature by providing empirical evidence of the benefits of a novel construct termed work-family supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB) – defined as any supportive action that a coworker can take to contribute to the improved management of an individual’s work and family role demands. A phenomenological qualitative investigation revealed five categories of WFSCB that were tested using three quantitative samples to develop and validate a multidimensional measure. The findings indicated that four dimensions of behavior best reflect WFSCB including: 1) emotional support, 2) facilitating work adjustments, 3) sharing resources and knowledge, and 4) proactively developing solutions. In testing the criterion-related validity of the new measure, this research provides evidence of the positive relationship between these behaviors and various work-family outcomes, as higher levels of WFSCB were associated with lower levels of work-to-family conflict, and higher levels of work-family balance, work-family positive spillover, and overall life satisfaction. In addition, the utility of WFSCB as a source of informal workplace support was underscored based on evidence of its incremental validity in the prediction of these same outcome variables over and above a measure of general coworker support (i.e., emotional and instrumental support). Practically, these findings suggest that general measures of coworker support

may fall short in assessing a broad spectrum of supportive coworker behaviors that can significantly contribute to improved work-family outcomes. Overall, the results of this research program will place scholars in a better position to provide prescriptive advice to organizations and employees on the behaviors that they can engage in towards one another to promote improved work-family integration for individuals and more broadly, to contribute to a work-family supportive organizational climate.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Laurent Lapierre. Over the past seven years you have generously dedicated your time and energy to support my growth and development as a researcher, and as a person. I can always count on you for expert advice and a generous dose of humour. You have become more than a mentor to me and I am truly fortunate to have you in my corner. To my committee members, Dr. Patrick Gaudreau, Dr. Krystelle Shaughnessy, Dr. Jane O'Reilly, and Dr. Michael Ford, thank you for your thoughtful advice and invaluable feedback throughout this journey. A special thank you to Dr. Silvia Bonaccio, who has enriched my education and has acted as a mentor to me from the beginning of this endeavour.

I would like to thank my dear friends and fellow graduate students Renee Grenon, Dr. Hilary Maxwell, and Helen Monkman whose advice, patience, kind words, and friendship have been my rock through many challenges and successes. To Yanhong Li, a friend and talented researcher, thank you for your contribution to the quality of this research program and for donating countless hours of your time to see it through. Thank you to my friends and family for your constant love and encouragement – especially my closest girlfriends, my sister Alana McMullan, and my brother Sean McMullan. To my parents, Clem McMullan and Cathy Simpson, thank you providing me with a strong foundation and instilling in me the values that encouraged my education. Last but not least, thank you to my partner Mark Blaney – I am grateful for your unconditional love and unwavering support as I have worked to achieve this dream. You are my role model and I love you always.

Content of Thesis and Contribution of Authors

This thesis contains two manuscripts and three samples of data. All of the research was carried out in collaboration with my thesis supervisor, Dr. Laurent Lapierre. The first manuscript involved semi-structured interviews that I conducted independently. The interviews were coded and analyzed with the support of Yanhong Li, a Masters student. My thesis supervisor provided a review and validation of the results at various stages of the analysis (e.g., identification of initial qualitative labels, deduction of data, identification of higher-order categories, etc.). For the second manuscript, prior to the first data collection effort, I lead the development of an exhaustive list of measure items that were generated based on the qualitative results of the first manuscript. Yanhong Li and Laurent Lapierre also made significant contributions to item development. In manuscript two, for the second and third samples, I independently designed a survey and analyzed the data with the guidance of my thesis supervisor. For both manuscripts, I was responsible for conducting the literature reviews, formulating hypotheses, designing the methods, leading the data analyses, and writing the results and discussion sections. I am the primary author for both manuscripts. The first manuscript is co-authored by Laurent Lapierre and Yanhong Li, and the second manuscript is co-authored by Laurent Lapierre.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Content of Thesis and Contribution of Authors	v
Table of Contents	vi
General Introduction	1
Aspects of the Work-Family Interface	3
Work-family conflict.	4
Positive spillover	5
Work-family balance.	6
Formal Organizational Support	7
Social Support	11
Supervisor support.	13
Family supportive supervisors.	14
Coworker support	16
Research Objectives	19
References	22
Manuscript 1: A Qualitative Investigation of Work-Family Supportive Coworker Behavior (WFSCB)*	40
Abstract	41
Review of the Literature	44
Method	49

Participants.....	49
Materials.	51
Procedure.	53
Data Analysis.....	54
Results.....	56
Categories of WFSCB.....	56
Demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life.	57
Emotional support.....	58
Sharing resources and knowledge.....	60
Facilitating work adjustments.	61
Proactively developing solutions.	62
Antecedents of WFSCB.....	65
Understanding of the coworker situation.....	66
Similarity with coworker(s).	66
Relationship with coworker(s).	67
Ability to contribute to a change or improvement.	67
Perceived benefits of providing support.	68
Personal characteristics.....	68
Discussion.....	69
Categories of WFSCB.....	69
Antecedents of WFSCB.....	74
Limitations and Avenues for Future Research.....	79
Conclusion and Practical Implications.....	81

References	83
Table 1	99
Table 2	103
Manuscript 2: Work-Family Supportive Coworker Behavior (WFSCB): Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure	106
Abstract	107
Evidence from Research on Work-Family Supportive Supervisors	112
The Evolution of Coworker Support Research within the Work-Family Literature ..	113
Work-Family Supportive Coworkers.....	115
WFSCB: Defining a Multidimensional Construct.....	116
Demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life.	117
Emotional support.....	118
Sharing resources and knowledge.....	119
Facilitating work adjustments.	119
Proactively developing solutions.	120
WFSCB and Work-Family Outcomes	121
Study 1: Item Generation and Initial Construct Development.....	126
Method	126
Item development.....	126
Card sort.....	127
Procedure.	128
Participants.....	129
Measures.	129

Work-family supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB).	129
Analyses and results.....	130
Study 2: Measure Refinement and Validation	133
Sample 1: Measure Refinement	133
Method.	133
Participants.....	133
Measures.	134
Work-family supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB).	134
Analyses and results.....	134
Item Analysis.	136
Sample 2: Final Construct Validation.....	137
Participants.....	137
Measures.	138
Work-family supportive coworker behaviors (WFSCB).....	138
Work-life balance.....	138
Work-family conflict.	139
Positive spillover.....	139
Satisfaction with life.	139
General coworker support.....	139
General family-focused coworker support.....	140
Analyses and results.....	141
WFSCB validity.....	143
Convergent validity.....	143

Criterion-related validity.....	144
Incremental Validity.	144
Discussion.....	145
Practical implications.....	147
Limitations & future research.	148
Conclusion.	150
References.....	151
Table 1	169
Table 2	173
Table 3	176
Table 4	177
Table 5	178
Table 6	179
Appendix A.....	180
Appendix B.....	183
General Discussion	186
Research Findings and Future Directions	187
Limitations	190
Practical Implications.....	191
Conclusion	193
References.....	194

General Introduction

Over the last several decades, both work and family roles have evolved from their traditional roots. Organizations are seeing a greater representation of dual earner couples, a subsequent blurring of gender roles, an aging population, and an increased proportion of the population that delays having children in order to achieve a higher education (Greenhaus & Singh, 2004; Hoganson, 2011). These trends indicate that a growing percentage of the population is involved in multiple life roles (e.g. parent, spouse, employee, volunteer, student, caregiver to an elderly parent, etc.), which demand time and energy to fulfill. A recent report by the Conference Board of Canada (Hoganson, 2011) indicates that people today are struggling more than ever to balance their work role with other life roles, particularly those involving their family. The struggle to meet both work and family needs is connected to a host of problems for individuals (e.g., reduced mental health), their employers (e.g., increased absenteeism and turnover, and lost productivity), and their families (e.g., strained family relationships, home absenteeism) (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005).

Several employers have implemented family-friendly policies (e.g., flextime, telework) in the hopes of maintaining a resilient workforce. Unfortunately, these formal policies have been shown to have very mixed success (e.g., Allen & Shockley, 2009; Byron, 2005; Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood, & Colton, 2005; Masuda, Poelmans, Allen, Spector, Lapierre, Cooper, et al., 2011; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). Informal resources in the work environment, such as informal social support, can be more beneficial than such formal policies in helping employees to better manage competing

roles (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Behson, 2002). One such form of support is coworker support. Coworkers can play an important role in helping each other overcome stressful circumstances (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; LaRocco & Jones, 1978; Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999), yet work-family (WF) researchers have paid significantly less attention to coworker-provided support than they have to supervisor-provided support (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). In a knowledge driven economy the support of coworkers has become increasingly important given the prevalence of teamwork and the trends towards more team-based organizational structures (Ensign, 1998; Illgen & Hollenbeck, 1991).

The aim of the proposed research program is to contribute to the existing WF literature by empirically investigating specific behaviors that coworkers engage in to demonstrate their support aimed at benefiting employees' management of work and family life demands, and how this can impact employees' experiences of harmony between the work and home domain, in addition to life satisfaction overall. A multidimensional measure of WF supportive coworker behaviors was developed and validated using data from both qualitative and quantitative studies. The results of this research program will place WF scholars in a better position to provide prescriptive advice to employees on the behaviors that they can engage in towards their coworkers to promote their WF balance, positive affective spillover, life satisfaction, and to decrease their experience of WF conflict. Organizations should be particularly interested in this evidence, as the improved management of competing work and family demands should lead to positive health, job, and family outcomes including decreased stress, psychological strain, turnover intentions, and absenteeism, as well as increased

organizational citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction, family wellbeing, and marital and family satisfaction (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011; Allen et al., 2000; Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005).

This introduction will provide a comprehensive review of the literature pertaining to organizational support and important WF outcomes. The review will touch on both formal and informal sources of support with an emphasis on coworker support. The motivation behind research in this topical area, the evolution of its empirical literature base, and evidence to suggest future research avenues will be highlighted. The section will conclude by outlining the research objectives of the current thesis.

Aspects of the Work-Family Interface

Role theory has, for the most part, served as the impetus for a large portion of organizational research into various WF constructs. Organizational role theory originated from seminal pieces by Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958) and, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal (1965) and focuses on social systems that are task-oriented and that are associated with normative expectations. These norms vary widely and can reflect the official structures and demands of the organization, or the pressures associated with membership in informal groups within the organization. Conflict theory later evolved from this foundation to describe the effects of conflicting role obligations and expectations. Role conflict has been defined as “the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other” (Kahn et al., 1965, p.19). Research framed within this theory typically follows the scarcity hypothesis wherein the expectation is that individuals will eventually experience role conflict and stress that will negatively impact quality of life

(Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). On the contrary, the expansionist theory postulates that the advantages of participation in multiple roles can outweigh the disadvantages (Barnett & Baruch, 1985). Although conflict theory has dominated the WF literature (Casper, Eby, Bordeau, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007), in recent years there have been many scholarly contributions made to our understanding of the positive side of the WF interface through the lens of expansionist theory (e.g., Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Gareis, Barnett, Ertel, & Berkman, 2009; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; van Steenbergen, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2007). The following sections highlight three topics of popular interest that have emerged out of role theory and motivate a significant proportion of research within the WF field.

Work-family conflict.

Work-family conflict results when role pressures from the work and family domains are incompatible with each other; when the resources needed to fulfill the demands of one particular role are drained and as a result, the needs of other roles are not sufficiently met (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Jansen, Kant, Kristensen, & Nijhuis, 2003). As conceptualized first by Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) and later validated by Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996), as well as Carlson et al. (2000), conflict is a bidirectional construct and can occur due to work interfering with family and/or family interfering with work. It is also a multidimensional construct including time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based forms of conflict (Carlson et al., 2000). Over the past 30 plus years, WF conflict has remained the most popular topic of research within the WF field (Casper et al., 2007; Lapierre & McMullan, 2016) and has been connected to a plethora of nonwork, work, and health outcomes. This

list includes but is not limited to: wellbeing, general stress, work-related stress, family-related stress, burnout, health problems, marital satisfaction, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors, and performance (Allen et al., 2000; Amstad et al., 2011; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

Positive spillover.

The positive side of the WF interface has been less popular in research, as many scholars have approached the intersection between work and family from a conflict perspective (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Casper et al., 2007; Lapierre & McMullan, 2016). However, since the rise of positive psychology (Seligman, 2002), the beneficial effects of combining work and family roles has been investigated and reported as various constructs including: positive spillover, enrichment, and facilitation. From this point forward, the term “WF positive spillover” will be used. This is appropriate given that there is significant conceptual overlap among the aforementioned constructs, as all offer insight into a common mechanism whereby participation in one life role (e.g., family) provides an employee with resources (e.g., skills, knowledge, positive mood, etc.) that will benefit him/her in another life role (e.g., work; Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; van Steenbergen et al., 2007). For example, a positive mood at work may carry over and result in a positive mood at home, or behaviors that are beneficial at home are also found to be useful on the job. Similar to WF conflict, WF positive spillover can be investigated bi-directionally as either a work-to-family or family-to-work influence, and has also been measured as a multidimensional construct (Carlson et al., 2006; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a; 2000b; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). WF positive spillover has demonstrated significant positive relationships with job satisfaction,

affective job commitment, family satisfaction, physical and mental health, and psychological well being, as well as a significant negative relationship with turnover intention (Carlson et al., 2006; Gareis et al., 2009; Hanson & Hammer, 2006; McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010; Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006). It has also been confirmed as a distinct construct, as research has demonstrated a significant relationship with work and family-related outcomes (e.g., performance at work and at home, satisfaction at work and at home) over and above that explained by WF conflict (van Steenbergen et al., 2007).

Work-family balance.

Work-family balance is defined as the feeling of being satisfied and effective in all life roles that are deemed important (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). When employees experience lower levels of WF conflict and higher levels of WF positive spillover, they are more likely to achieve WF balance (Carlson, Grzywacz, & Zivnuska, 2009; Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Greenhaus, Ziegert, & Allen, 2012). Thus, resources that aid in alleviating WF conflict and which improve levels of WF positive spillover should synchronously contribute to WF balance. Recent empirical investigations have supported the conclusion that WF balance is a distinct phenomenon. For example, a recent study provides evidence that WF balance explains a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, family satisfaction, family performance, and family functioning over and above that explained by WF conflict and positive spillover (Carlson, Grzywacz, & Zivnuska, 2009).

Formal Organizational Support

Changes to the demographic nature of the North American workforce (e.g., dual-earner couples, an aging population), along with a growing awareness of the adverse consequences of WF conflict (Allen et al., 2000; Amstad et al., 2011; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), have led many organizations to place a greater emphasis on the provision of family-friendly benefits. Workplace family-friendly formal supports are defined as “employer provided benefits that permit employees some level of control over when and where they work outside of the standard workday” (Lambert, Marler, & Gueutal, 2008, p. 107). These provisions can include policies (e.g., alternative work arrangements, telecommuting, and schedule flexibility), services (e.g, resources offered such as child care referrals), and benefits (e.g., maternity leave, subsidized child care; Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Neal, Chapman, Ingersoll-Dayton, & Emlen, 1993). Resource provision is not only important for maintaining a healthy workforce, but it is also instrumental in attracting and maintaining top talent in a competitive business environment (Galinsky & Stein, 1990). Given an overall increase in the number of life roles individuals are now taking on (Hoganson, 2011), organizations are commonly evaluated according to their provision of these resources, which have been proven effective through a substantial bank of research (e.g., Allen, 2001; Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Newman, 1999; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Masuda et al., 2011). Some of the resources that have been shown to hold considerable weight in this assessment are the provision of flexible scheduling/alternative work arrangements, child-care resources, and efforts towards the advancement of women (Canada’s Top Family-Friendly Employers, 2015; Bond, Galinsky, & Hill, 2004; Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2002). In addition to

alleviating WF conflict (e.g., Gajendran & Harrison, 2007), research has also highlighted the benefits of formal organizational support to WF balance, WF positive spillover, and psychological and physical wellbeing (Christensen & Staines, 1990; Grzywacz, Carlson, & Shulkin, 2008; Siu, Lu, Brough, Lu, Bakker, Kalliath, et al., 2010; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006; Thomas & Ganster, 1995).

Although formal organizational supports have frequently demonstrated positive relationships with the aforementioned array of outcomes, the results have also been mixed or weak, with several studies reporting non-significant relationships where they would have otherwise been expected (e.g., Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006; Shinn, Wong, Simko, & Ortiz-Torres 1989; Thompson & Prottas, 2005; Wayne et al., 2006). For example, flextime or flexible scheduling, typically operationalized as having control over start and stop times and the power to change work schedules, is quite frequently investigated in the literature. This is likely due to the fact that it is one of the most commonly offered resources within organizations, and also because employees have consistently listed this resource as important for managing their work and home life (Bond, Galinsky, & Hill, 2004; Bond, Galinsky, Kim, & Brownfield, 2005; Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Shinn et al., 1989). However, this specific resource has been inconsistent in terms of its demonstrated benefits. Thomas and Ganster (1995) found support for indirect effects on attitudes and mental and physical health outcomes through increases in perceived control, which decreased WF conflict. Shinn, Wong, Simko, and Ortiz-Torres (1989) found support for the positive relationship between *perceived* flexible schedules and perceived stress between work and family roles, but not for formal flextime offerings. Grzywacz, Carlson, and Shulkin (2008) found a significant relationship

between flextime and WF conflict, but with the caveat that the generally beneficial effect of schedule flexibility varied depending on participant age and whether or not their spouse had a similar work arrangement. In opposition to the above findings, research by Thompson and Prottas (2005) revealed no relationship between flexible schedules and any of the outcomes they investigated which included stress, life satisfaction, positive spillover, and WF conflict. Additionally, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2006) found no support for the relationship between flexibility and work-to-family conflict, and Campbell Clark (2001) failed to find a relationship between flexible schedules and any of the work or personal outcomes that were under investigation, including family wellbeing. Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, and Shockley (2013) conducted a recent meta-analysis to address these inconsistencies and found that overall, flexible work arrangements (when lumped together) demonstrated a weak relationship with work-to-family conflict and no relationship with family-to-work conflict. When the authors broke down both the construct of flexibility by type and WF conflict according to direction (work-to-family and family-to-work), results highlighted the importance of domain-specificity when hypothesizing and investigating these relationships. The type of flexible work arrangement (i.e., flextime/flexible scheduling, flexplace/flexibility in work location) paired with a specific direction of conflict, can demonstrate very different results. Although significance was demonstrated for many of the specific relationships tested, a majority of the effects observed were small to very small in magnitude. This may indicate that flexible work arrangements are not always the most useful resource in better managing the demands of work and family, perhaps because they contribute to further blurring the lines between both roles (Allen et al., 2013; Schieman & Young, 2010). The

explanation of blurred role boundaries is especially plausible with respect to flexible work arrangements in the form of telework. The borders between life roles provide individuals with cues as to when to attend to family responsibilities and when to attend to work responsibilities. Telework removes the physical boundary and can result in difficulties juggling these two life roles (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Golden, Veiga, & Simsek, 2006; Lapierre, van Steenbergen, Peeters, & Kluwer, 2016). In some cases, use of telework has been associated with reported increases in WF conflict (Lapierre & Allen, 2006), and research has also found that women with more flexible work arrangements tend to take on more domestic responsibilities resulting in higher levels of family interference with work (Silver & Goldscheider, 1994).

In the investigations of formal organizational support detailed above, many of the studies also simultaneously assessed the benefits of various sources of social support, such as supervisor and coworker support. The potential utility of these informal resources was demonstrated through evidence of significant relationships with various family, work, and non-work outcomes in the absence of significance for similar hypotheses involving formal benefits (e.g., Shinn et al., 1989; Thompson & Prottas, 2005; Wayne et al., 2006). In fact, empirical evidence has provided compelling evidence to support the increased relative contribution of informal organizational supports over formal benefits in aiding employees to better balance the competing demands of multiple life roles (e.g., Anderson et al., 2002; Behson, 2002; O'Driscoll, Poelmans, Spector, Kalliath, Allen, Cooper, et al., 2003; Wayne et al., 2006). Seminal theorization on organizational effectiveness (Schneider, 1987) and research on gender discrimination in the workplace (Metz, 2011; Roth, 2007), offers insights into *why* formal family-friendly supports (i.e.,

programs/policies/benefits) may not contribute to significant improvements to WF integration –and it has to do largely with the informal (i.e., cultural) organizational aspects including coworkers and supervisors, and the underlying expectations of the organization as a whole (e.g., long work hours). Formal family-friendly supports are commonly available within organizations (e.g., telework, flextime; Comfort, Wallace, & Johnson, 2003) but their use can be dependent on the practices, behaviors, and perceptions of the people within the organization (Allen, 2001; Metz, 2011; Roth, 2007). For example, research conducted within the context of the corporate world revealed that women may be discouraged from using the very programs that were designed to help them, based on the negative perceptions of others that using these supports is reflective of low commitment to work or poor performance (Roth, 2007; Metz, 2011). Furthermore, as mentioned previously, those who do make use of formal benefits appear to benefit very little (Allen et al., 2013), or do not appear to benefit at all (e.g., Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006; Shinn, Wong, Simko, & Ortiz-Torres 1989; Thompson & Prottas, 2005; Wayne et al., 2006). These two concerns related to the benefits of formal supports underscore the importance of further investigating informal supports, specifically social support within the workplace that is aimed at improving WF management.

Social Support

The importance of social support for improved coping and social adaptation has been consistently demonstrated over several decades of significant psychological and medical research. Early epidemiologists, mental health practitioners, and physicians uncovered the link between life events and wellbeing by noting a correlation between clusters of life events such as job loss, marital dissolution, role transitions, geographic

moves, and illness (Bloom, 1990; Cobb, 1976; Gottlieb, 1985). In both retrospective and prospective investigations there has been statistical confirmation of this relationship – its strength varying in degree depending on the number of life events and their severity. Although this link was apparent, very little was known about the intervening variables involved (Kessler, Price, & Wortman, 1985). Analysts who took an environment-centered approach (Cassel, 1976; Kessler, 1979; Kessler & Cleary, 1980) to the study of stress and health noted that different social groups (e.g., males and females, various social classes) experienced different stress-related morbidity rates based on varying levels of experienced stress. They also noted that this phenomenon was related to differential access to support systems between the social groups (Haines, Hurlburt, & Zimmer, 1991) and thus, the study of the benefits of social support for mental and physical health was born. The term “social support” typically denotes the means by which an interpersonal relationship cushions an individual from the effects of a stressful event or environment (Cohen & McKay, 1984). The construct has been defined in several different ways over the years, but the common factor linking all definitions together is the fact that it is a form of knowledge, or a source of information, that lets us know we are loved, cared for, and valued; and that we ultimately belong to a network of communication or mutual obligation (Cobb, 1976; Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983). This knowledge also serves a functional purpose whereby through interactions with others, we are provided with tangible resources (also referred to as instrumental support) and/or emotional understanding and encouragement (also referred to as affective/emotional support; Caplan, 1974; Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau, 1975).

Despite the popularity of social support in explaining various life outcomes (e.g., physical health, marriage, psychosocial disorders, etc.), it was not until the early 1970s (see House & Wells, 1978; Pinneau, 1976) that the construct appeared within the emerging field of occupational stress, after a general concern for the detrimental effects of both organizational and job characteristics on the employee surfaced (Cummins, 1989). Job stressors such as role conflict and ambiguity, a lack of autonomy, work overload, and a lack of control over work-related tasks and decisions, have all been linked to negative job-related attitudinal and behavioral outcomes such as job dissatisfaction, lower job performance, and psychological strain (Beehr et al., 2000; Cummins, 1989; Spector, Dwyer, & Jex, 1988; Wall, Jackson, Mullarkey, & Parker, 1996). There have also been negative links drawn between job stressors and organizational-related outcomes such as turnover intention, overall productivity and morale, and absenteeism (Cummins, 1989; Spector et al., 1988). It became imperative to investigate known sources of social support within the workplace as potential mitigating factors, and thus to take advantage of an opportunity to ameliorate the negative effects of job-related stress.

Supervisor support.

Thomas and Ganster's (1995) study was one of the first to offer support for the utility of informal support over the provision of formal family-friendly benefits. In their research, the authors found a significant negative relationship between WF conflict and supervisor support; this finding was not replicated with formal benefits. Since the publication of this seminal piece, there has been sufficient interest in the topic of supervisor support in relation to many outcomes within the organizational research field

(Kossek et al., 2011; LaRocco & Jones, 1978; Viswesvaran et al., 1999). This interest is in part due to the clear power that a supervisor holds over their direct report(s)'s overall work experience, including their ability to encourage or discourage employees' policy use (Hopkins, 2005) and their direct influence over workload and work-related stressors (Beehr, Farmer, Glazer, Gudanowski, & Nair, 2003). Supervisor support, in a general sense, refers to the degree to which employees feel that their supervisor cares about their global wellbeing on the job through the provision of positive social interaction or resources (i.e., general emotional and/or instrumental support; Kossek et al., 2011). Supervisory support is also a well-studied topic of research within the WF field, and has been reported as a promising means by which employees can experience less WF conflict (e.g., Allen, 2001; Clark, 2001; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Shinn, Wong, Simko, & Ortiz-Torres, 1989; Thomas & Ganster, 1995) and increases in WF positive spillover (Thompson & Prottas, 2005). More recent empirical investigations have highlighted the importance of studying family-focused forms of family-supportive supervision, because they have been shown to correlate more than general forms of supportive supervision with reductions in employees' WF conflict (Kossek et al., 2011).

Family supportive supervisors.

Compared to general supervisory support, family-supportive supervisors demonstrate their empathy towards employees' efforts to better balance work and family demands (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Specific family-supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSBs) reflect whether supervisors care for their employees' WF wellbeing by facilitating their ability to jointly manage work and family demands/responsibilities (Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2009; Kossek et al., 2011). FSSB, as a

multidimensional construct, has been shown to provide incremental predictive ability with respect to reduced work-to-family conflict, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction, over and above general supervisory support (Hammer et al., 2009). Research by Kossek et al. (2011) has revealed that it may be a more powerful construct overall, when predicting WF outcomes. Job-Demands-Resources theory (JD-R; Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) offers insight into why support that is family-focused should be more useful in predicting various WF outcomes. Individuals are constantly striving to gain and maintain resources that are valuable to them, and actual or perceived resource loss, as well as the threat of resource loss, induces stress reactions (Hobfoll, 1989). Job-Demands-Resources theory posits that job demands and resources share an important interplay – although demands are not always negative, they can drain resources and become stressors if the individual is not given the appropriate amount of time and energy to recover (Meijman & Mulder, 1998). Within the framework of JD-R theory, resources (e.g., social support) are valuable because they aid in either mitigating the potentially negative effects of various stressors (e.g., strain experienced as burnout), can directly impact appraisals of stressors, and/or can directly impact the experience of strain (Bakker et al., 2004; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). For example, WF conflict represents a stressor whereby one role drains resources (e.g., time, energy) that are needed in the other role, thus inducing various types of negative stress reactions (Allen et al., 2000; Eby et al., 2005; Frone, Yardley, & Markell, 1997; Lapierre & Allen, 2006). Family-specific support would help to remedy this depletion effect by adding to an individual's resource pool a form of support that would be used very specifically for dealing with work and

family role conflicts. The empirical findings discussed above (e.g., Hammer et al., 2009; 2013; Kossek et al., 2011) point to this and the fact that compared to general supervisory support, FSSBs are more psychologically and functionally useful in helping employees manage or avoid workplace role requirements that would otherwise drain the resources needed to fulfill family role obligations (Hammer et al., 2009; Kossek et al., 2011) and vice-versa. Measurement research has also demonstrated that ensuring operational congruence between a predictor and an outcome construct is instrumental in observing stronger statistical relationships (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Viswesvaran et al., 1999; Hogan & Holland, 2003). In a similar vein, this thesis expects that family-focused (referred to henceforth as WF focused/supportive) coworker support would explain incremental variance in predicting WF outcomes such as WF balance, conflict, and positive spillover, above and beyond that which is explained by general coworker support.

Coworker support.

Along with the current organizational trends towards flatter and less hierarchical structures and climates (Ensign, 1998), there has been an accompanying increase in the amount of interactions one has with their coworker(s) on a day-to-day basis. As a result, teamwork and shared decision-making among those of a similar lateral status has now begun to define the typical work environment (Cascio, 1998; Gordon, 1992; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008; Salas, Burke, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000). The fact that similar others can be one of the most effective sources of social support in stressful situations makes coworker support a highly relevant topic of scholarly interest (LaRocco, House, & French, 1980). Within the social support literature, coworker support is defined

as the provision of desirable resources including more tangible task-related assistance, emotional support, friendliness and warmth, and in some cases, coworker mentoring (Caplan, Cobb, & French, 1975; Caplan et al., 1975; Ensher, Thomas, & Murphy, 2001; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). As a workplace resource, coworker support has been related to a host of outcomes including, but not limited to: reductions in stress, frequency of illness, role ambiguity, conflict, and overload, and turnover intentions. It has also been associated with increases in self-esteem, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the organization (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; LaRocco & Jones, 1989; McManus, Korabik, Rosin, & Kelloway, 2002; Mesmer-Magnus, Murase, DeChurch, & Jimenez, 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). Pertaining to the WF field specifically, coworker support has been negatively related to both directions of WF conflict, and positively related to family satisfaction and positive spillover (Frone et al., 1997; McManus et al., 2002; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005).

A review of the literature revealed that, compared to supervisory support, coworker-provided support has received relatively little empirical attention as an additional means of helping employees avert WF conflict. This is despite the fact that coworkers can play an important role in helping each other to overcome stressful circumstances (Beehr et al., 2000; LaRocco & Jones, 1978; Viswesvaran et al., 1999). The little research done to date on coworker-provided support in relation to WF outcomes has mainly addressed general support from coworkers (Dolcos & Daley, 2009; Frone et al., 1997; Major, Fletcher, Davis, & Germano, 2008; Matthews, Bulger, & Barnes-Farrell, 2010; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2012; Wang, Liu, Zhan, & Shi, 2010). Researchers have typically used measures that employ the use of broadly worded items in order to

uncover whether individuals generally feel that they have support from their coworkers. General coworker support is most often conceptualized as one of two types –either emotional or instrumental (tangible) in nature, and measures are operationalized with items assessing one or both of these types of support. For example, emotional support is often studied with items such as “How easy is it to talk with your coworkers?” and instrumental support is often studied with items such as “How much do your coworkers go out of their way to do things to make your work life easier for you?” (e.g., Caplan et al., 1975; Ducharme, Knudsen, & Roman, 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Haynes, Wall, Bolden, Stride, & Rick, 1999; Sloan, 2012; Tang, 1998). While general support provided by coworkers holds some promise in helping employees better manage the WF interface (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011), the evidence presented above on supervisor support would suggest that investigating WF focused forms of coworker support (i.e., support aimed at helping one another successfully juggle family and work responsibilities) would be more salient to WF outcomes (Kossek et al., 2011).

Similar to the rationale provided previously for the utility of WF focused supervisor support in accordance with the components of COR and JD-R theory, the researcher posits that coworker support that is directed at helping an employee to more effectively meet the demands of their work and family roles will be more psychologically relevant and useful in the balance of work and family and in avoiding WF conflict. Due to their shared work environment and proximity to one another, coworkers often have firsthand knowledge of how workplace demands and family responsibilities may be incompatible, putting them in an optimal position to offer each other WF focused support (Ray & Miller, 1994). Despite its potential utility, there is little evidence available to

support the notion that WF supportive resources from coworkers would be more beneficial than general forms. The literature review revealed only three studies that investigated this topic (McManus et al., 2002; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). Of these studies, two investigated relationships based on general forms of support (McManus et al., 2002; Thompson & Prottas, 2005) and only one study provided prescriptive evidence of *how* coworkers specifically enact this type of support (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010). Information on specific behaviors would be instrumental for organizations in their efforts to ameliorate the negative effects potentially experienced by their employees who struggle to effectively manage work and family demands. There are two primary reasons why future research into specific behaviors is warranted. The most important being that empirical evidence has pointed to the enhanced utility of specific behavioral measures in predicting various WF outcomes (Kossek et al., 2011; Hammer et al., 2009; Hammer, Kossek, Bodner, & Crain, 2013). The second is the practical use of this type of evidence and the fact that knowledge of specific behaviors that are beneficial to employees' quality of life should provide more detailed guidance and be more easily applied by employees and encouraged by organizations. Thus, the focus of this thesis will be to develop a deeper understanding of the nature of WF supportive coworker behaviours, and to identify behaviors that can be beneficial in helping individuals to better navigate the WF interface.

Research Objectives

Based on the review of the literature presented above, a need to shift the focus from investigations of formal organizational support to that of informal support was highlighted. A focus on coworker support was deemed appropriate given the popularity

of team-based work environments and current gaps in our knowledge pertaining to the benefits of WF supportive coworkers, along with the lack of a measure that assesses the breadth of specific behaviors involved in the provision of this resource. In manuscript 1, the author conducted an in-depth qualitative investigation into the nature of WF supportive coworker behaviors (WFSCB) that were aimed at helping individuals to better balance the demands of their work and family roles. This included a detailed description of contextual information surrounding the lived experiences of coworker support (i.e., potential antecedents to WFSCB).

In manuscript two, the author built on the qualitative data to develop and validate an empirically supported measure of WFSCB. The items for this measure were initially developed inductively based on a content analysis of 22 semi-structured interviews. The measure was then refined and validated following a step-by-step approach. First, the psychometric properties of the measure were assessed based on results of two exploratory factor analyses and a confirmatory factor analysis that drew on data from multiple North American quantitative samples. The correlations between WFSCB and a measure of both general coworker support and general WF focused coworker support were used to investigate convergent validity. To test the criterion-related validity of the measure, multiple regression analyses were conducted using WFSCB scores to predict WF conflict, balance, positive spillover, and life satisfaction. Finally, the incremental validity of the WFSCB measure was investigated by running the same regression analyses while controlling for general coworker support. This manuscript focused on outcome variables to validate the measure and thus, potential antecedents to WFSCB were not quantitatively measured. This decision was made in an effort to limit survey length (i.e., average

completion time of 15 minutes) in order to further encourage quality responses from participants throughout the course of the survey; this was done in addition to the inclusion of various quality assurance tests (e.g., minimum time to complete, open-ended response to a survey-specific question, duplicate questions, coding for response streamlining, and attention testers within scales).

References

- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 414-435.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1774>
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–Family Conflict and Flexible Work Arrangements: Deconstructing Flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 345-376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012>
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278-308. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.5.2.278>
- Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. (2009). Flexible work arrangements: Help or hype? In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 265-284). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
<https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.47-4737>
- Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 16(2), 151. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022170>
- Anderson, S., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28, 787-810. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-2063\(02\)00190-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-2063(02)00190-3)

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/259305>

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83-104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>

Baltes, B.B., Briggs, T.E., Huff, J.W., Wright, J.A., & Neuman, G.A. (1999). Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 496–513.

<https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.84.4.496>

Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K. (1985). Women's involvement in multiple roles and psychological distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(1), 135.

<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.49.1.135>

Beehr, T. A., Farmer, S. J., Glazer, S., Gudanowski, D. M., & Nair, V. N. (2003). The enigma of social support and occupational stress: source congruence and gender role effects. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(3), 220.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.3.220>

Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A. (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 391-405.

- <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/%28SICI%291099-1379%28200006%2921:4%3C391::AID-JOB15%3E3.0.CO;2-9>
- Behson, S. J. (2002). Coping with family-to-work conflict: The role of informal work accommodations to family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7, 324-341. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.7.4.324>
- Bloom, J. R. (1990). The relationship of social support and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 30(5), 635-637. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(90\)90162-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(90)90162-1)
- Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., & Hill, E. J. (2004). When works, works: A status report on workplace flexibility. Who has it? Who wants it? What difference does it make? New York: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved February 2015 from <http://www.familiesandwork.org>
- Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., Kim, S. S., & Brownfield, E. (2005). National study of employers. New York: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved February 2015 from <http://www.familiesandwork.org>
- Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Protas, D. (2002). Highlights of the national study of the changing workforce: executive summary. Families and Work Institute. Retrieved February 2015 from <http://www.familiesandwork.org>
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(2), 169-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.009>
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., & French, J. R. (1975). Job demands and worker health; main effects and occupational differences. *Hew Publication (NIOSH)*, 75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e573842014-001>

- Caplan, G. (1974). *Support Systems and Community Mental Health*. New York: Behavioral Publications. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/ps.25.10.682-a>
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V., & Pinneau, S. R. (1975). *Job demands and worker health*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health*. <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/10057645>
- Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G., & Zivnuska, S. (2009). Is work – family balance more than conflict and enrichment? *Human Relations*, 62(10), 1459-1486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267093336500>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work–family interface: Development and validation of a work–family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(1), 131-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249-276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713>
- Cascio, W. (1998; 2005). *Applied Psychology in Human Resources Management*. Pearson. <https://www.pearsonhighered.com/program/Cascio-Applied-Psychology-in-Human-Resource-Management-7th-Edition/PGM248374.html>
- Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.28>
- Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual

synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1082>

Christensen, K. E., & Staines, G. L. (1990). Flextime: A viable solution to work/family conflict? *Journal of Family issues*, 11(4), 455-476.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/019251390011004007>

Clark, S. C. (2001). Work cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 348-365. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1759>

Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 38, 300-314. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-197609000-00003>

Cohen, S., & McKay, G. (1984). Social support, stress and the buffering hypothesis: A theoretical analysis. *Handbook of Psychology and Health*, 4, 253-267. Retrieved from <http://kungfu.psy.cmu.edu/~scohen/buffer84.pdf>

Comfort, D., Johnson, K., & Wallace, D. (2003). *Part-time work and family-friendly practices in Canadian workplaces*. Statistics Canada.

Cummins, R. (1989). Locus of control and social support: Clarifiers of the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19(9), 772-788. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb01258.x>

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 86(3), 499. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>

- Dolcos, S. M., & Daley, D. (2009). Work pressure, workplace social resources, and work-family conflict: The tale of two sectors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 16(4), 291-311. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017319>
- Ducharme, L. J., Knudsen, H. K., & Roman, P. M. (2007). Emotional exhaustion and turnover intention in human service occupations: The protective role of coworker support. *Sociological Spectrum*, 28(1), 81-104.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02732170701675268>
- Ducharme, L. J., & Martin, J. K. (2000). Unrewarding Work, Coworker Support, and Job Satisfaction A Test of the Buffering Hypothesis. *Work and Occupations*, 27(2), 223-243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888400027002005>
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(1), 124-197.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003>
- Ensher, E. A., Thomas, C., & Murphy, S. E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on protégés' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(3), 419-438. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25092732>
- Ensign, P. C. (1998). Interdependence, coordination, and structure in complex organizations: Implications for organizational design. *The Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*, 34(1), 5-22.
<http://search.proquest.com/openview/f1f6323691b552ffaae1939d55cb85e8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=24292>

- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 145-167. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577>
- Gajendran, R.S., & Harrison, D.A. (2007). The good, the bad and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Galinsky, E., & Stein, P. (1990). The impact of human resource policies on employees. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11(4), 368-383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251390011004002>
- Gareis, K. C., Barnett, R. C., Ertel, K. A., & Berkman, L. F. (2009). Work- Family Enrichment and Conflict: Additive Effects, Buffering, or Balance? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(3), 696-707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00627.x>
- Golden, T. D., Veiga, J. F., & Simsek, Z. (2006). Telecommuting's differential impact on work-family conflict: Is there no place like home? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1340-1350. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1340>
- Gordon, J. (1992). Work teams: How far have they come? *Training*, 29, 59-65.
- Gottlieb, B. H. (1985). Social networks and social support: An overview of research, practice, and policy implications. *Health Education & Behavior*, 12(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019818501200102>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277352>

Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G., Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender & work* (p.391-412). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publishing.

<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231365.n20>

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>

Greenhaus, J. H., & Singh, R. (2004). Work-family relationships. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied psychology* (pp. 687–698). San Diego: Elsevier.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/b0-12-657410-3/00682-6>

Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. D. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work–family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 266-275.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008>

Gross, N., Mason, W. S., & McEachern, A. W. (1958). Explorations in role analysis: Studies in the school superintendency role. *Political Science Quarterly*, 73(4),

635. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2146057>

Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Shulkin, S. (2008). Schedule flexibility and stress: Linking formal flexible arrangements and perceived flexibility to employee health. *Community, Work and Family*, 11(2), 199-214.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802024652>

- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000a). Family, work, work–family spillover, and problem drinking during midlife. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(2), 336-348. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00336.x>
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000b). Reconceptualizing the work–family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.5.1.111>
- Haines, V. A., Hurlbert, J. S., & Zimmer, C. (1991). Occupational stress, social support, and the buffer hypothesis. *Work and Occupations*, 18, 212-235. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888491018002005>
- Hammer, L. B., Ernst Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the Family Supportive Supervisor Behavior Short-Form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032612>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 35(4), 837-856. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308328510>
- Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., Newsom, J. T., Brockwood, K. J., & Colton, C. L. (2005). A longitudinal study of the effects of dual-earner couples' utilization of family-friendly workplace supports on work and family outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 799-810. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.799>

- Hammer, L. B., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Quality of work life. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (Vol. 3; pp. 391-431). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-000>
- Hanson, G. C., & Hammer, L. B. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(3), 249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t13087-000>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.44.3.513>
- Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: a socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 100-112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.100>
- Hoganson, C. (2011). Work and life: The balancing act: The Conference Board of Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=4506>
- Hopkins, K. (2005). Supervisor support and work-life integration: A social identity perspective. In E. E. Kossek (Ed.), *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp. 445-467). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2004-21246-020>
- House, J. S., & Wells, J. A. (1978). Occupational stress, social support and health. In *Reducing occupational stress: Proceedings of a conference* (pp. 78-140). US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Washington, DC.

- Ilgen, D. R., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1991). The structure of work: Job design and roles. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 165–207). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. Retrieved from <http://tamuweb.tamu.edu/faculty/bergman/ilgen1991.pdf>
- Jansen, N. W., Kant, I., Kristensen, T. S., & Nijhuis, F. J. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict: A prospective cohort study. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 45(5), 479-491. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.jom.0000063626.37065.e8>
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J., Rosenthal, R. A. (1965). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. *American Sociological Review*, 30(4), 620. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091375>
- Kessler, R. C. (1979). Stress, social status, and psychological distress. *Journal of Health and Social behavior*, 259-272. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2136450>
- Kessler, R.C. & Cleary, P.D. (1980). Social class and psychological distress. *American Sociological Review*, 45, 463-478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095178>
- Kossek, E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work–family conflict, policies, and the job–life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior–human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139-149. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.83.2.139>
- Kossek, E., Pichler, S., Hammer, L., & Bodner, T. (2007). Contextualizing workplace supports for family: An integrative meta-analysis of direct and moderating linkages to work-family conflict. In *National Meetings of the Society of Industrial*

& Organizational Psychology.

Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family specific supervisor and organizational support.

Personnel Psychology, 64(2), 289-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>

Lambert, A.D., Marler, J.H., & Gueutal, H.G. (2008). Individual differences: Factors affecting employee utilization of flexible work arrangements. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.02.004>

Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T. D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: implications for work-family conflict and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(2), 169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.2.169>

Lapierre, L. M., & McMullan, A. D. (2016). A review of methodological and measurement approaches to the study of work and family. In Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*, pp. 36-52. Oxford University Press: New York. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199337538.013.4>

Lapierre, L. M., van Steenbergen, E. F., Peeters, M. C. W., & Kluwer, E. S. (2016). Juggling work and family responsibilities when involuntarily working more from home: A multi-wave study of financial sales professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, 804-822. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2075>

- LaRocco, J. M., House, J. S., & French Jr., J. R. (1980). Social support, occupational stress, and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 202-218.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2136616>
- LaRocco, J. M., & Jones, A. P. (1978). Coworker and leader support as moderators of stress-strain relationships in work situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 629-634. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.63.5.629>
- Major, D. A., Fletcher, T. D., Davis, D. D., & Germano, L. M. (2008). The influence of work-family culture and workplace relationships on work interference with family: A multilevel model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(7), 881-897.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.502>
- Masuda, A. D., Poelmans, S. A., Allen, T. D., Spector, P. E., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., ... & Lu, L. (2012). Flexible work arrangements availability and their relationship with work- to- family conflict, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison of three country clusters. *Applied Psychology*, 61(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00453.x>
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T. L., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34, 410-476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316061>
- Matthews, R. A., Bulger, C. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Work social supports, role stressors, and work-family conflict: The moderating effect of age. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(1), 78-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.011>

- McManus, K., Korabik, K., Rosin, H. M., & Kelloway, E. (2002). Employed mothers and the work-family interface: Does family structure matter? *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1295-1324. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055011919>
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 381-396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1>
- Meijman, T.F. and Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In P.J. Drenth, H. Thierry, & C.J. de Wolff (Eds.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology*, 2nd ed. (pp. 5-33). Hove: Psychology Press.
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., Murase, T., DeChurch, L. A., & Jimenez, M. (2010). Coworker informal work accommodations to family: Scale development and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(3), 511-531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e518442013-624>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2006). How family-friendly work environments affect work/family conflict: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Labor Research*, 4, 555-574. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-006-1020-1>
- Metz, I. (2011). Women leave work because of family responsibilities: Fact or fiction? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 49(3), 285-307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1038411111413216>
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689-725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>

- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(6), 1321.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>
- Neal, M. B., Chapman, N. J., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Emlen, A. C. (1993). *Balancing work and caregiving for children, adults, and elders* (Vol. 3). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/40.5.714>
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 400-410. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.81.4.400>
- O’Driscoll, M. P., Poelmans, S., Spector, P. E., Kalliath, T., Allen, T. D., Cooper, C. L., et al. (2003). Family-responsive interventions, perceived organizational and supervisor support, work-family conflict, and psychological strain. *International Journal of Stress Management, 210*(4), 326-344.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137309341.0022>
- Pedersen, D. E., & Minnotte, K. L. (2012). Self- and spouse-reported work-family conflict and dual-earners' job satisfaction. *Marriage & Family Review, 48*(3), 272-292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2012.665015>
- Pinneau, S.R. (1976). Effects of social support on occupational stresses and strains. In Meeting of the American Psychological Association.
- Ray, E. B., & Miller, K. I. (1994). Social support, home/work stress, and burnout: Who can help? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 30*, 357-373.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886394303007>

- Roth, L. M. (2007). Women on Wall Street: Despite diversity measures, Wall Street remains vulnerable to sex discrimination charges. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 24-35. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2007.24286162>
- Salas, E., Burke, C. S., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2000). Teamwork: emerging principles. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(4), 339-356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00046>
- Sarason, I.G., Levine, H.M., Basham, R.B., & Sarason, B.R. (1983). Assessing social support: The social support questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 127-139. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.44.1.127>
- Schieman, S., & Young, M. (2010). Is there a downside to schedule control for the work-family interface? *Journal of Family Issues*, 31(10), 1391-1414. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x10361866>
- Seligman, M. E. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.
- Shinn, M., Wong, N. W., Simko, P. A., & Ortiz-Torres, B. (1989). Promoting the wellbeing of working parents: Coping, social support, and flexible job schedules. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17(1), 31-55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00931201>
- Silver, H., & Goldscheider, F. (1994). Flexible work and housework: Work and family constraints on women's domestic labor. *Social Forces*, 72(4), 1103-1119. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/72.4.1103>
- Siu, O. L., Lu, J. F., Brough, P., Lu, C. Q., Bakker, A. B., Kalliath, T., ... & Sit, C. (2010). Role resources and work-family enrichment: The role of work

- engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 470-480.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.06.007>
- Sloan, M. M. (2012). Unfair treatment in the workplace and worker well-being: The role of coworker support in a service work environment. *Work and Occupations*, 31(1), 3-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406555>
- Spector, P. E., Dwyer, D. J., & Jex, S. M. (1988). Relation of job stressors to affective, health, and performance outcomes: A comparison of multiple data sources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.73.1.11>
- Tang, H. K. (1998). An inventory of organizational innovativeness. *Technovation*, 19(1), 41-51. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4972\(98\)00077-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4972(98)00077-7)
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.80.1.6>
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2005). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 100-118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.100>
- van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2007). How work and family can facilitate each other: distinct types of work-family facilitation and outcomes for women and men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(3), 279.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.279>

- Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The Role of Social Support in the Process of Work Stress: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 314-334. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1661>
- Wall, T. D., Jackson, P. J., Mullarkey, S., & Parker, S. K. (1996). The demands-control model of job strain: A more specific test. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69, 153-166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1996.tb00607.x>
- Wang, M., Liu, S., Zhan, Y., & Shi, J. (2010). Daily work-family conflict and alcohol use: Testing the cross-level moderation effects of peer drinking norms and social support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 377-386. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018138>
- Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 108-130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8791\(03\)00035-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8791(03)00035-6)
- Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work-family support in work-family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(3), 445-461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.002>

**Manuscript 1: A Qualitative Investigation of Work-Family Supportive
Coworker Behavior (WFSCB)***

Alicia McMullan

University of Ottawa

School of Psychology

Laurent Lapierre

University of Ottawa

Telfer School of Management

Yanhong Li

University of Ottawa

Telfer School of Management

*Manuscript under a revise and resubmit to the Journal of Vocational Behavior

Abstract

Employee experiences of work-family supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB) were investigated in a phenomenological qualitative study. WFSCBs involve any action that coworkers can take to facilitate each other's balance of work and family. The results of a content analysis based on 22 semi-structured interviews revealed five categories of WFSCBs including: emotional support, facilitating work adjustments, demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life, sharing resources and knowledge, and proactively developing solutions. A detailed description of each category and specific behaviors identified within these categories, along with quotations, are provided. Six categories of WFSCB antecedents were also identified including: understanding of the coworker situation, similarity with coworker(s), relationship with coworker(s), ability to contribute to a change or improvement, perceived benefits of providing support, and personal characteristics. The results of this inductive research provide unique, evidence-based insights not only into various possible behaviors that coworkers can engage in to help each other better manage the demands of work and family, but also why they would display them.

Coworkers play an integral role in both the social and task environments of most organizations. In the United States, roughly 90% of employees have at least one coworker (Fairlie, 2004) – an individual with whom they work and interact on a regular basis, and who is typically in a similar role or working at a similar hierarchical level within the organization. In response to evolving global economic landscapes that demand collaboration to fuel innovation and competitive advantage, the prevalence of teamwork has increased (Cascio, 1998; Gordon, 1992; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008; Salas, Burke, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000) and this has further reinforced the importance of the coworker in influencing workplace dynamics.

Current labour trends including a greater representation of women in the workforce, an increase in the prevalence of dual-earner couples, and an aging population indicate that individuals are taking on additional life roles (e.g., mother, elderly caregiver, worker, volunteer) that demand an exertion of time and energy to fulfill. As the lines between work and family continue to blur, people are struggling now more than ever to find a balance (Aumann & Galinsky, 2009; Hoganson, 2011). This has ramifications for the individuals seeking balance (e.g., reduced mental & physical health), their employers (e.g., increased absenteeism, turnover intention, and health-related costs), and their families (e.g., decreased family functioning and family and marital satisfaction; Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Higgins, Duxbury, & Lyons, 2008). Given their close proximity to one another and access to firsthand knowledge of workplace demands that may interfere with family responsibilities (Ray & Miller, 1994), coworkers are in an optimal position to provide one another with work-family (WF) focused support; a

specific form of support that is directed at helping one another to better balance the demands of both work and family.

On a day-to-day basis we often interact most frequently with our peers (Cascio, 1998; Fairlie, 2004; Gordon, 1992; Salas et al., 2000). This provides a direct window into each other's lives and offers our coworkers an opportunity to better understand us and to empathize with our situations due to shared experiences. As a direct result, our coworkers can support us more effectively. Coworker support has been well documented in the occupational stress literature as a highly promising resource in stressful situations (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; LaRocco, House, & French, 1980; Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fischer, 1999), and has been related to reduced burnout (Halbesleben, 2006), improved attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008), as well as lower physical strain (Schwarzer & Leppin, 1989). More recent empirical research suggests that coworker support would benefit WF outcomes, such as more WF positive spillover (when one domain provides resources that enhance the quality of life in the other domain), reduced WF conflict, as well as enhanced life and family satisfaction (Dolcos & Daley, 2009; Frone et al., 1997; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Major, Fletcher, Davis, & Germano, 2008; McManus, Korabik, Rosin, & Kelloway, 2002; Mesmer-Magnus, Murase, DeChurch, & Jimenez, 2010; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2012; Thompson & Prottas, 2005; Wang, Liu, Zhan, & Shi, 2010). While providing some evidence suggesting that WF-focused coworker support could be of value to employees, this small body of work has fallen short of providing a clear understanding of the potentially broad array of specific WF-focused support behaviors that coworkers could display to help one another more easily balance their work and family roles. Moreover, no empirical attention has

been given to the reasons why coworkers would provide each other with WF-focused support. To address these gaps in knowledge, we used an inductive, qualitative approach to better understand *how* and *why* coworkers help each other better balance their work and family roles. For the purpose of this study, we define WF-supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB) as any action that one or more coworkers can take to facilitate an employee's WF balance. WF balance is defined as the feeling of being satisfied and effective in the work role as well as the family role (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). We chose to focus on behaviors enabling WF balance rather than those specifically aimed at preventing WF conflict or at promoting WF positive spillover, because the notion of balance has been described as a broader construct that strongly implies lower levels of conflict and higher levels of positive spillover (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Greenhaus & Allen, 2011).

Review of the Literature

In the late 1980's, after the topic of social support within the occupational stress field of research had gained popularity, Johnson and Hall (1988) described the protective effects of workplace support with respect to the prevalence of cardiovascular disease. The authors reported that low levels of coworker support accentuated the experience of job strain, whereby employees with the lowest levels of support experienced a higher prevalence of cardiovascular disease at each level of job strain. This was one of the first studies to support the buffering hypothesis for coworker support in relation to physiological strain in the work environment, and it is a hypothesis that has since been replicated (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Johnson, Stewart, Hall, Fredlund, & Theorell, 1996; Viswesvaran et al., 1999). Research has also highlighted the direct effects of

coworker support on various occupational outcomes including benefits to job involvement, job satisfaction, employee effectiveness, organizational commitment, and lowered role ambiguity, role conflict, effort reduction and withdrawal (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Viswesvaran et al., 1999). Since then, cumulative research findings in the WF literature strongly imply that coworker support can serve to alleviate work and family-related stress (Dolcos & Daley, 2009; Frone et al., 1997; Major et al., 2008; Matthews, Bulger, & Barnes-Farrell, 2010; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2012; Wang et al., 2010). To date, the WF literature has largely operationalized coworker support in its general form (i.e., general coworker support) by using broadly worded items intended to capture whether individuals generally feel instrumentally assisted (e.g., “how much do your coworkers go out of their way to do things to make your work life easier for you;” Caplan, Cobb, & French, 1975a) and/or emotionally supported (e.g., “how easy is it to talk with your coworkers;” Caplan et al., 1975a) by their coworkers (Caplan et al., 1975a; Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau, 1975b; Ensher, Thomas, & Murphy, 2001; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006).

General coworker support does hold some promise in helping employees better manage the WF interface (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011), as is evidenced above. However, the supervisor support literature suggests that coworker support explicitly considering the intersection of work and family roles could be more useful and psychologically relevant in avoiding or overcoming challenges in balancing those two roles (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011; Hammer, Kossek, Zimmerman, & Daniels, 2007; Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2009; Hammer, Ernst Kossek, Bodner, & Crain, 2013). Compared to those offering general

support to their employees, some supervisors specifically strive to facilitate their employees' ability to jointly manage work and family demands (Hammer et al., 2009; Kossek et al., 2011). This more specific type of support has been labeled "family-supportive supervisor behavior" (FSSB). It is a multidimensional construct, which includes emotional (e.g., "my supervisor takes the time to learn about my personal needs"), instrumental (e.g., "I can rely on my supervisor to make sure my work responsibilities are handled when I have unanticipated nonwork demands"), role modeling (e.g., "My supervisor demonstrates how a person can jointly be successful on and off the job"), and creative WF management supportive behaviors (e.g., "My supervisor thinks about how the work in my department can be organized to jointly benefit employees and the company"). FSSB has been shown to explain incremental variance in reduced work-to-family conflict, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction, over and above general supervisor support (Hammer et al., 2009). Meta-analytic work by Kossek et al. (2011) further implies that such WF-focused support is relatively more salient to WF outcomes.

Only a handful of studies have considered WF-focused coworker support. Two studies used measures of support that were operationalized with broad statements of support such as, "I feel I have the coworker support I need to manage my work and family life" (McManus et al., 2002; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). Such measures provide little practical insight into the specific nature of the support provided. Moreover, only one of these investigations found significant relationships with WF outcomes (e.g., reduced WF conflict) and job-related outcomes (e.g., reduced turnover intentions), which casts doubt over the usefulness of such general measures in explaining variation in WF

outcomes. A third study (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010) did in fact develop a measure of WF-specific coworker support behaviors. However, it focused almost exclusively on instrumental (tangible) support, and this seems to ignore the possibility that WF supportive behaviors could involve manifestations of a different nature, as observed among supervisors (e.g., creative WF management, role modeling; Hammer et al., 2009). The primary goal of our research was to provide greater insight into the possible array of specific WFSCB manifestations.

Our second goal was to uncover possible antecedents of WFSCB. Previous work has addressed antecedents to several constructs falling under the broader umbrella of workplace social support, including mentoring (e.g., Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Eby et al., 2013), FSSB (Straub, 2012), and family-facilitative coworker support (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2009), with suggestions regarding the latter two constructs having no direct empirical grounding. Although mentoring behavior and FSSBs are both forms of social support and thus, share some similarities with WFSCBs, it could be naive to assume that their antecedents would be identical. Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner (2007) reviewed the literature on social exchange relationships in the workplace, which often involve the exchange of supportive gestures, and concluded that individuals perceive themselves as having different types of social exchanges with different parties at work. Thus, the authors encouraged researchers to specify the unique antecedents of behaviors that could benefit a particular type of exchange partner. Moreover, previous research suggests that individuals tend to pursue different interpersonal goals within different types of relationships (Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2003). What motivates supervisors to provide WF-focused support to subordinates may be

different than what motivates coworkers to provide such support to each other. Therefore, Straub's (2012) proposed antecedents of FSSB may not all be relevant to WFSCB. Furthermore, coworkers' relative proximity to one another could generate various motivations for providing WF-focused support, which could differ from those of a supervisor who sits from a more removed vantage point.

Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2009) provided a framework of potential antecedents to family-facilitative coworker support. There are similarities and differences with the antecedents to FSSB proposed by Straub (2012). Common antecedents include a family-supportive organizational culture, the quality of the relationship between the provider and the receiver of support, and whether the provider has experienced WF struggles. Antecedents unique to family-facilitative coworker support include the job interdependence between provider and receiver, the frequency of the support requested, and high organizational justice perceptions regarding family-friendly organizational initiatives. While potentially informative, these theoretical propositions were derived from related theory (e.g., social support, coworker support, organizational citizenship behavior), not grounded in empirical observation, thus raising possible doubt over their actual salience to WFSCB.

Considering the relatively scarce empirical and theoretical attention given to WF-focused coworker support, which has either relied on measures too broadly worded to provide practical guidance or focused exclusively on support of a specific nature, and given the absence of empirically grounded theoretical suggestions for antecedents to such support, an inductive rather than a deductive research approach was warranted (Spector, Rogelberg, Ryan, Schmitt, & Zedeck, 2014). Inductive research begins with data

collection and then looks for patterns among the data as a basis for generating theoretical possibilities, while deductive research begins by deducing hypotheses from existing theory and then puts them to the test using data (Runkel & McGrath, 1972). Using qualitative methodology, we aimed to provide a stronger, evidence-based conceptual basis for future hypothetico-deductive research on this topic (McGrath, 1982; Runkel & McGrath, 1972).

Method

This study was designed according to phenomenological principles of qualitative data collection and interpretation (Creswell, 2013a; Creswell, 2013b). We focused on collecting as much information and detail as possible surrounding WFSCBs. Meaning was extracted on a case-by-case basis (i.e., by analyzing each interview in-depth) and patterns were highlighted in order to describe the common experience (Creswell, 2013a; Smith & Shinebourne, 2012).

Participants.

In order to confidently achieve data saturation we continued to collect data until no new themes emerged (Creswell, 2013a; Creswell, 2013b; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Sandelewski, 1995), resulting in a sample size of twenty-two individuals from Canada and the United States. Following best practice recommendations to increase the likelihood that participants had experienced WFSCB and could therefore provide a detailed description of the construct of interest (Creswell, 2013a), we specified inclusion criteria. Participants were recruited if they were employed full-time, had at least one coworker, were married or cohabitating, and had at least one child (newborn to school-aged) living at home. The decision to require a child living at home was made in order to

maximize the likelihood that participants had significant family demands, which would presumably increase their need for WFSCB. Previous research has shown that individuals with young (i.e., school-aged) children experience heightened difficulty juggling responsibilities in both work and family roles (Erickson, Martinengo, & Hill, 2010). In order to qualify as a full-time employee, participants were required to work a minimum of 30 hours per week (Statistics Canada, 2010). A coworker was defined as “someone that you work with on a regular basis, and who is typically in a similar role or working at a similar level as you within the organization” (e.g., you work on the same projects or on related projects, are on the same team, etc.; excerpt from the Interview Protocol). As a result of these requirements, participants should be in a better position to provide a high level of detail around supportive behaviors and the context surrounding those behaviors by using specific examples from their lives.

Participants represented a variety of industries including private, public, and not-for-profit sectors, and varying organizational levels (e.g., non-supervisory, supervisory, middle management, senior management, executive). Participants held a range of roles across the technology, finance, government, policing, professional services, and communications industries. Examples of positions held by participants include: project manager, HR advisor, usability analyst, account manager, sales executive, accountant, computer engineer, policy analyst, and insurance broker. Twelve participants (55%) were female, all participants were married or cohabitating, and the sample had an average age of 38.1 years with an average of 1.8 children living at home.

Materials.

A semi-structured interview format was used to collect data (see Appendix A). Participants were asked two standardized open-ended questions about their experiences receiving and providing support from/to their coworker(s) aimed at improving WF balance. Participants were also asked a similar question regarding how their coworker(s) have made it more difficult (i.e., hindered their ability) to balance work and family. The semi-structured nature of the interviews allowed the researcher to ask pre-determined follow-up questions and probe the participant further using unscripted questions when new ideas or themes emerged. The standardized questions were developed following the STAR method – Situation, Task, Action, Result and thus, were purposefully worded to capture all of the details of participants' lived experiences of coworker support (or lack thereof). Posing broad and general questions in this manner is a common strategy employed in qualitative studies of this nature, as it facilitates the collection of data that will allow for a textual and structural description of the experiences, and ultimately leads to an understanding of the common experiences of individuals (Creswell, 2013a; Mousakas, 1994; Smith & Shinebourne, 2012). The standardized questions were as follows:

1. Can you describe a situation when your coworker(s) made it easier for you to balance your work and family life? (In other words, what has a coworker (or coworkers) done to help you be satisfied and effective both at work and at home?)
 - a) Who was the coworker?
 - b) What exactly did they do?
 - c) What was the context surrounding their supportive behaviors?

- d) Did you ask for help?
- e) In what way did this help you experience WF balance?
- f) Why do you think your coworker helped you?
- g) Are there any other similar situations you can describe?

2. In the past, how have you engaged in behaviors directed at making it easier for your coworker(s) to balance their work and family demands?

- a) What context, situation, or personal factors prompted you to behave in this way towards your coworker(s)?
- b) What did you perceive to be the personal benefits of supporting your coworker?
- c) Why did you decide to help your coworker(s)?
- d) What did you perceive to be the benefits to your coworker (of your support)?

3. Can you describe a situation when your coworker(s) made it more difficult for you to balance your work and family life? (In other words, what has a coworker (or coworkers) done to hinder your ability to be satisfied and effective both at work and at home?)

- e) Who was the coworker?
- f) What exactly did they do?
- g) What was the context surrounding their unhelpful behaviors?
- h) Had you asked him/her/them for help?
- i) In what way did this hinder your experience of work-family balance?
- j) How was this problematic for you?
- k) Are there any other similar situations you can describe?

Procedure.

The study employed a combination of purposive and snowball sampling approaches. To begin the process, the authors contacted participants from their personal networks who met the study inclusion criteria (listed above) and invited them to participate. In addition to this recruitment strategy, a number of individuals within the primary and secondary authors' personal networks were asked to send out an email invitation to participate to their own networks, on behalf of the researchers. All potential participants were provided with the study information sheet when they were invited to participate. The information sheet included a description of the research objectives, what participation would involve, and researcher contact information. Those who received an email invitation to participate (via a contact of the researchers) and who were interested in participating were asked to reach out to the primary researcher directly, and an interview date and time were scheduled. Interviews generally lasted 45 minutes to one hour and were held in-person or via Skype. All interviews were audiotaped and then later transcribed in full. All interview notes and transcriptions were given a code in order to ensure participant anonymity and confidentiality.

Before beginning, the researcher explained the purpose of the study and obtained consent from the participants to audiotape their interview. The researcher began each interview by providing a definition of 'coworker' and 'WF balance' and asked that the participant reference these definitions throughout the interview when answering questions. The definitions provided were: "WF balance is defined as the feeling of being satisfied and effective both at work and at home," and "a coworker is someone that you work with on a regular basis, and who is typically in a similar role or working at a similar

level as you within the organization.” For each of the three main questions (listed above), the interviewer followed a critical incident technique (Flanagan, 1954). This format involved requesting that participants provide specific examples from experiences/events that have occurred in their lives, including all of the details, as well as the context surrounding the events. For each of the standardized questions, the researcher asked participants if they could think of any additional examples to detail experiences with their coworker(s) related to WF balance until the participant could not provide anything further.

Data Analysis.

Full transcripts of the interviews underwent a multi-step content analysis procedure aided by NVivo software for qualitative analysis. NVivo is a tool that aids researchers in the coding process by adding efficiency to the identification and organization of significant statements (i.e., phrases), and in turn, improves accuracy in grouping similar statements. The authors used an open-coding technique where they created labels for several statements that seemed to differ in their meaning, and then applied these same labels to other similar statements. As the researchers pursued their analysis of the qualitative data, additional labels were created and existing ones were edited to better reflect what the data implied. Data reduction was achieved by grouping similar statements (i.e., labels) into higher order categories (i.e., patterns, themes; Creswell, 2013a). These higher order categories could in turn be edited upon further reflection of their respective labels and associated statements. For example, the statement “So I emailed my colleagues that we all work closely together, we are on the same level., and I explained the situation [child was sick and h/she had to stay home to care for the

child] and rather than saying ‘well tough luck’ they offered to help me and they took some of that work load off of me,” would be labelled as *taking over work tasks*, and then categorized under the higher order category *facilitating work adjustments*.

In the first step of our analysis, the first and third authors sat together and coded the first interview in order to get a feel for the nature of the data and to start a list of labels for significant statements that captured family supportive coworker behavior. After this step, both individuals coded interviews separately and met after a single interview was coded in order to review and ensure a high level of agreement. Agreement was calculated based on the number of agreements divided by the total number of highlighted statements (i.e., the total number of labels applied) for that particular source document. Agreement between the two coders reached 89% on the 6th interview; at this point, each researcher coded multiple interviews in succession. The two coders continued to check each interview for agreement; agreement did not fall below 80% at any point thereafter. There were no significant recurring themes or patterns in the disagreements among coders, although there were more disagreements among antecedent codes versus WFSCB codes. Data saturation was reached on the 14th interview, as no new WF supportive coworker behavior labels were generated after this point. Despite reaching data saturation at this point, we continued to collect data in order to be meticulous in meeting an additional saturation recommendation by Polkinghorne (i.e., 5-25 interviews; 1989), and ultimately, to ensure that we had ample detail to describe the nature of the construct and its antecedents.

The statements of supportive behavior were instrumental in providing an understanding of the phenomenon with respect to *how* support was manifested (e.g., type

of behavior), and helped to understand descriptions of the context within which it was experienced (i.e., the antecedent/factor that initiated supportive action). If there were any discrepancies, the coders discussed the statement(s) until both parties came to a mutual agreement and a consensus code was applied. Next, highlighted statements that had similar meaning (i.e., labels) were grouped into higher order categories (i.e., themes), also referred to as “clusters of meaning” (Creswell, 2013a), and each was given a unique identifying title. This process was repeated until the data could not be reduced any further. At this point, all three authors met to compare higher order categories and their respective labels. If there were any discrepancies, all researchers discussed until a mutual agreement was reached. This process resulted in several higher order categories of specific types of behavior (labels) that coworkers engage in to provide one another with WF-focused support, as well as a detailed description of the context (i.e., antecedents) surrounding the experience of family supportive coworker behaviors. Antecedents were coded using the same process as detailed for the coding of WFSCB information. At this stage in the analysis, all three authors did a final review of the higher order categories, labels, and associated quotes for accuracy. The coding procedures outlined above are typical of phenomenological qualitative research (Creswell, 2013a; Moustakas, 1994; Polkinghorne, 1989).

Results

Categories of WFSCB.

Five categories of WFSCB emerged as a result of grouping specific behaviors (i.e., labels) with similar meaning. The categories are presented below. Considering the qualitative and inductive nature of this research, we do not provide frequencies because

the data collected do not lend themselves to statistical generalization (Pratt, 2009). Instead, we provide detailed quotes to illustrate the nature of the supportive behaviors (see Table 1).

Demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life.

This category involves behaviors that convey the general importance that a coworker ascribes to personal and family time (i.e., the home domain). This includes advocating for a coworker's WF balance (e.g., when their work is impacting their home life) and being understanding and encouraging of a coworker's desire to more effectively meet personal and family commitments. According to participants, a form of this support was to *advocate for additional resources to support coworkers' WF balance* evidenced by the following quote:

“Then things that were in my control was resource balancing, so try and get in with the client and really say listen ... [i]f you want more than that kind of stuff, we're going to have to increase scope, we're going to have to increase the fees, we're going to have to do something because this is just not sustainable long term.”

An important feature of the behaviors in this category is conveying an acceptance and support of a coworker when they make the decision to place personal and family needs above their work demands. This theme was evident through the behavioral label *coworker accepts that sometimes family and personal needs take priority*, “I think it's because we... you know, for the most part we had a team that recognized that we had other things in life.” and *encouraging one to attend to family and personal needs*, “[I would say to my coworker] Like what is more important here than spending your last days with your mom or fighting to get that document done on time?”

Finally, it was viewed as supportive when coworkers themselves clearly demonstrated their own values with regards to the priority of balancing work and family, as demonstrated by the label *coworker models work-family behaviors*, “You could see that she had balance in her life because she was very... just very happy and managed well her work and her family life, I think. She wasn’t really stressed. She was actually an example for me of a person who is very well balanced and not stressed.” (See Table 1 for additional labels and quotes.)

Emotional support.

Emotional support provided by a coworker with the aim of improved WF balance involves listening to personal issues and struggles meeting work and family demands, being aware of family and personal life commitments, encouraging the stress relief activities of others, sharing stories of similar experiences, and demonstrating that the coworker is cared for (see additional labels and detailed quotes in Table 1).

Participants also detailed examples of support that simply involved acknowledging a coworker’s situation and being there for them if they needed it. In regards to *acknowledging your coworker’s heavy workload*, one respondent put it this way, “Well, people have come up to me for sure and said I can see that you're going crazy with all the stuff this year.” On a related note, it was deemed supportive when a *coworker expresses their availability to help if needed*, “I did end up following up with an email saying, hey, if there's anything that I can do or my team can do to help, let us know.”

As a form of emotional support, participants provided examples of support that was specific to alleviating stress, such as *supporting and encouraging team stress relief*

activities, “[B]asically, my coworkers and I all train together [referring to exercising together]; people get together every day. And I find that’s a good stress relief.” In addition, they mentioned that *providing guidance on stress management* was a form of support.

[Participant paraphrases the guidance he gave a coworker.] “And you know, you just... you need to disconnect, you need to unplug and you need to not worry about it....In fact, it sounds harsh, but at the end of the day all those relationships that you built at the places where you work, it’s just a job, right? Just get a book, sit outside, eat your cereal, watch the birds, ... that kind of deal. Just don’t use your brain and disconnect.”

Taken together, the data that emerged paint a picture of emotional support as a behavioral expression of positive affect towards the coworker and providing a sense of comfort. The following quotes highlight this notion:

“So we started going for walks together and this would give us an opportunity for one, or if not both of us, to vent, share something stressful that came out that day, the other person to hear it.” (*Listening to personal issues and details of personal lives*)

“Yeah, I mean, I've had especially in the last year because of all the work... we've been doing a lot in the last year, so the last year was heavy. This is even heavier [participant is referring to the birth of a child and death of a parent]. So then I've had lots of people kind of say to me I don't quite get how you're doing it type thing; like they don't understand how you're still standing, that sort of thing. So it's supportive that way, but not necessarily they'd be in a position to take some of that work on themselves, if you know what I mean.” (*Caring demonstrated amongst coworkers*; see Table 1 for additional labels and quotes)

Sharing resources and knowledge.

This category involves sharing material (i.e., documentation) and knowledge resources and providing advice – whether specific to the work and or family realm, or to both. The specific behaviors within this category typically occur when the coworker providing support has gone through a similar experience (whether with family or with work), or has knowledge of the coworker’s situation, and as a result, is in a position to offer appropriate advice, share relevant resources and/or knowledge, or provide perspective (see Table 1). The following quotes highlight the themes that emerged in this category.

[Participant details a situation when s/he arranges for their mother, who specializes in teaching children with learning disabilities, to facilitate an assessment for a coworker’s children.] “One of my other co-workers whose got triplets and two of them have learning disabilities, so I grab my mum to meet with her just to teach her [the coworker] because she [the coworker] was struggling with getting testing done for them, psychological testing and everything, and getting plans in place at the school.”

(Arranging for the provision of resources to help meet a family need)

“It’s not part of her job description but she did. It had to do with [participant’s husband] and his work path and how, the issue has been dealt with at this company and I was just really looking at her professional advice as a Human Resources person. She took the time to sit down with me and gave me her professional perspective and how it may help my husband’s situation.” *(Providing advice for a family member)*

[Participant describes getting a client call after hours regarding a computer software issue] “And at the time, like the way that [the company] culture was, like the

managers really just manage people. They didn't really get into the software to really know it. So when the call came in, I was like all right, I've got to find somebody specifically who can help this customer with their problem. And so it worked out well enough because we had some sort of instant messaging tool and he was online at the time. So he was already working. But he was able to get on the phone with them right away and take it from there, sort of thing." (*Sharing subject matter expertise*)

[Participant details an example of providing advice to a coworker who has newborns at home.] "And we talked a lot about what it was like, you know, having children and you know the kind of support and resources that you could use. I gave him some practical advice on how to deal with the situation." (*Providing advice*)

"Yeah, it's more kind of – I don't know the specific incident, but more the general fact that like [my wife] and I both work, we are going to school, we are really busy, but [my coworkers] - they are all police officers and they've all managed their family throughout working shift work and working opposite shifts with their spouse so they can trade off. So it's putting things in perspective that truly anything is possible." [Participant clarifies that it's not about seeing what her/his coworkers do.] "[You know] it's more so just knowing that things are crazy [in life], and kids are crazy and, I don't know, like this, the way of life, and then they [coworkers] will always get through it and when they become teenagers it's even worse. I think perspective is the key thing." (*Providing perspective*; for additional behavioral labels and associated quotes, see Table 1)

Facilitating work adjustments.

This type of behavior is reactive in nature and occurs when an employee responds to a specific WF issue faced by a coworker. As an example, the following quote from the

behavioral label *taking over work tasks* does a good job of illustrating the reactive nature of these behaviors:

“So I was in the east end with my daughter at a skating rink, and then my plan was to come downtown [to work], make the changes and print off the documents, deliver them, then go back out to the east end to pick up my daughter. But instead, [my coworker] made the changes and printed them and ran them over to [our boss] so that I didn't have to do all that running around.”

This category also highlights the flexibility that coworkers are willing to provide to one another. For example, the employee adjusts his or her work-related activities or workload in order to help a coworker better balance work and family, demonstrates flexibility with schedules including rearranging one's work schedule and switching schedules with a coworker to accommodate a family need, as well as being flexible with the work location of a coworker and any accompanying task adjustments (see Table 1 for associated labels and quotes).

Proactively developing solutions.

Unlike *facilitating work adjustments* that is more reactive in nature, *proactively developing solutions* involves more forward-thinking initiatives on the part of the employee. The specific behaviors within this category involve generating ideas to avoid WF challenges, strategizing work tasks, and planning how schedules and workloads could be rearranged to allow coworkers to more effectively manage work and family (see Table 1). These behaviors are also more likely to benefit several team members and therefore, are less focused on a particular individual than are those in the *facilitating work adjustments* category.

Several of the labels applied to quotes highlight proactive support directed at reducing workload. For example:

“I know that in some cases like you know I’ve had co-workers, if we’re working on a project together, like if they know that I have like a lot of stuff going on at home they might take on a bit more of the load in that project or something like that. So like balancing at work.” (*Suggestions for managing the workload by reallocation of work tasks*)

“We’ve had to like... we had a shared project and we were kind of dividing up who’s going to do what. And I knew that she had a lot of other stuff on her plate [personally and professionally], so I took on the larger task of the two that we were going to kind of divide [equally]. (*Suggestions to reduce a coworker’s workload*; for additional quotes related to workload management see Table 1)

Participants also discussed strategizing work tasks and task-related problem solving in order to introduce efficiencies and support one another’s balance of work and family. The following quotes highlight a few of the behavioral labels that touched on this theme.

“I would say definitely we look at who knows the thing the best. So there’s some stuff s/he knows better. So typically, you know, I would let her/him do that. And vice-versa. It’s faster that way.” (*Redistributing work based on subject matter expertise*)

“So I created a document, a spreadsheet, that we could use to track all of our resources’ hours per week and we started changing our production meeting to focus on just the things that were due that week. Like specific deliverables that were upcoming, and how many hours they had assigned to each of those things for the week, so that everyone knew at a glance on Monday mornings – these are the things that I have to do

before the end of the week. This is how many hours it all adds up to.” (*Suggesting strategies for maximizing time at work*)

“So people who do the same kind of work as me and we’re working on a particular project together will kind of come to a consensus as to when we all need to get together for something that might be outside of the bounds of the normal office day. Or, yeah, look, so and so is on vacation next week, so maybe the three of us can get together and work it out ahead of time and then be able to provide them with an update when they’re back. That kind of thing.” (*Strategizing upcoming work tasks as a team*)

“So feeling comfortable in sort of going to [my coworker] who’s running let’s say the upcoming meeting, or whom I’m supposed to get something done for by that time and say: Look, this has come up. Can we strategize quickly before I have to go how we can meet your needs? Can I push it until tomorrow? Or can I take part of it away and get it to you later? Or can you say: No, you know what? I can handle that. I don’t need you as much as I thought, or because this has come up, I’ll take care of it.” (*Talk through work tasks or work problems to develop a solution*)

Data stemming from the question on how coworkers may have hindered participants’ ability to balance work and family were consistent with the higher order WFSCB categories detailed above, as all of the labels given to unsupportive examples had a counterpart in a WFSCB category. For example, *not respecting others’ preferences for WF balance* (an unsupportive WF coworker behavior label) is opposite in meaning to the WFSCB label *avoid disturbing a coworker’s personal time*. The following is an example quote that references a situation wherein a coworker intrudes on the participant’s WF balance by expecting them to continue to work after regular work hours. “Expecting

to meet after work to talk about something for work, it's like, 'Let's go for coffee after work just to talk about that topic, or this topic, or whatever it is'... And it's just being asked as if it is not a big deal. And again, it's a two-way street, your coworker has to understand that potentially they're crossing a line." Additional evidence of the conceptual redundancy among WFSCBs and the examples of unsupportive behaviors is their common reference to workload. Many of the examples of specific WFSCBs resulted in reduced workload. This theme was common across labels in several higher order WFSCB categories (e.g., sharing resources and knowledge based on experience, taking over work tasks, group problem solving to address high workload; see table 1) and its counterpart was found in many of the specific unsupportive behaviors mentioned by participants. The counterpart behavior involved adding to the workload and included labels such as: lack of assumed responsibility for their workload, ignoring work tasks, failing to meet deadlines, and not participating in work problem solving. In sum, we deemed it unnecessary to create additional higher order categories that would reflect unsupportive coworker behavior given our observation that such behaviors essentially mirror the supportive behaviors we identified.

Antecedents of WFSCB.

Six categories of antecedents emerged from the responses participants provided when describing the context surrounding specific WFSCBs. Antecedents were captured through several of the follow-up questions/probes for each of the standardized interview questions. Because the questions in the interview protocol asked participants to provide examples of support received and of support provided, the data were analyzed and categorized according to whether the participant was providing antecedent-related

information for support received (e.g., why do you think your coworker helped you, what was the context surrounding their supportive behaviors, and who was the coworker), or for support provided (e.g., why did you decide to help your coworker(s), what context, situation, or personal factors prompted you to behave in this way towards your coworker(s)). A detailed description of each antecedent category is presented below and detailed sample quotations can be found in Table 2.

Understanding of the coworker situation.

When reflecting on the reasons why the participant decided to help their coworker(s) achieve better WF balance, participants mentioned that knowing their coworker's situation regarding both work and/or family led them to provide support. Knowledge of the situation came from either communication between the two parties or through direct observation of their coworker struggling (e.g., when providing reasons why they helped a coworker, one participant stated "sometimes I would go by her cubicle and see that she's sad or even in tears"). Communications between the participant and their coworker(s) included details of their workload, details of home life, and values of WF balance. According to the responses, the coworkers sometimes directly asked for help. Interestingly, responses to the question "why do you think your coworker(s) helped you?" only provided the detail that it could have been because their coworker knew of the situation through communication.

Similarity with coworker(s).

According to participant responses, sharing similarities amongst one another also contributed to WF-supportive behaviors. Specifically, common to descriptions of why support was received and of why support was provided, participants mentioned

similarities in terms of WF demands (e.g., “they have kids as well”), working style (e.g., “we ... are both the kind of people who enjoy work as a hobby”), age group (e.g., “our age is pretty close”), level within organization (e.g., “we share the same level of position), and life experiences (e.g., “I have been there ...”).

Relationship with coworker(s).

This category includes antecedents that reflect the relationship between coworkers, and were all common to descriptions of why support was received and why it was provided. Participants mentioned that knowing their coworker for a longer period of time affected their decision to provide support and likely influenced the coworker(s) decision to provide them with support. For example, one participant stated: “The people I’ve known longer... I certainly sort of in the back of my mind am thinking about them.” This is likely associated with other relationship antecedents that were identified including the quality and trusting nature of their relationship; in some cases, as the length of a relationship increases, so too does the quality of a relationship and the level of trust between both individuals.

Ability to contribute to a change or improvement.

Having certain skills and interdependency and knowledge of work tasks were mentioned as contributors to receiving support from coworker(s), as well as participants’ own decisions to help their coworkers (e.g., “I think if I hadn’t, there wasn’t anybody else who could do it because it was a scarce skill.”). A label that was unique to providing support was having flexibility with one’s schedule; participants detailed that this flexibility made it easier for them to provide support by accommodating the coworker’(s)’ need(s).

Perceived benefits of providing support.

Common to descriptions of why support was received and why it was provided, participants mentioned several perceived potential benefits as antecedents to the occurrence of WF supportive behaviors. Three types of benefits were acknowledged. The first label, “benefits to mutually supportive relationships,” refers to the utility of building personal relationships and a team bond between their coworkers with the hope that supportive action will be continuously exchanged. “Benefits to work quality” refers to potential benefits of increased work quality and productivity as a result of support aimed at improved WF balance. The final label, “personal benefits for providing support,” was common to why support was provided and received. It denotes potential benefits such as improving one’s personal image and earning opportunities to learn and gain work experience through the provision of support.

Personal characteristics.

Participants also mentioned that their own personal characteristics and the personal characteristics of their coworker(s) influenced the occurrence of WFSCBs. The likeability of the receiver, and the provider’s empathy and altruistic tendency were mentioned as antecedents in descriptions of support provided as well as support received. There were two antecedents that were unique to descriptions of support provided: the receiver’s dedication to work (e.g., “she works really hard”) and his or her work competency (e.g., “I care much more about [coworkers who perform at a high level] than I do somebody who has consistently not delivered.”). An antecedent that was unique to the description of support received was the perception that a coworker supported them because the coworker wanted to pass on knowledge.

Discussion

The primary goal of this qualitative, inductive investigation was to add to our understanding of the range of specific WF-focused supportive behaviors that coworkers could engage in to enhance one another's experience of WF balance. Our research, based on data from 22 semi-structured interviews, identified five main categories of WFSCBs including: emotional support, facilitating work adjustments, demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life, proactively developing solutions, and sharing resources and knowledge. Our second goal was to explore possible antecedents of such supportive behavior. Our analyses yielded six categories of antecedents that include: understanding of the coworker situation, similarity of coworkers, relationship between coworkers, ability to contribute to a change or improvement, perceived benefits of providing support, and personal characteristics. In the following paragraphs, we discuss the five WFSCB categories and the six antecedents by comparing and contrasting them with previously studied constructs. We also propose possible relationships among the antecedents in explaining the manifestation of WFSCB. We conclude with a few suggestions on how our findings could be applied in organizations and inform future quantitative, deductive research.

Categories of WFSCB.

The results of this phenomenological study contribute to our conceptual understanding of WFSCBs in several ways. First, the findings on emotionally supportive behaviors invoke the broader notion of emotional support, which denotes sympathetic or caring behaviors aimed at helping a person to better cope with the negative emotions brought on by stressful experiences (Beehr, 1985). It therefore seems plausible that

coworkers can help each other better cope with the emotional strains stemming from WF balance struggles. Moreover, the range of behaviors we identified go well beyond those captured by common measures of coworker-provided emotional support. For example, the popular measure by Caplan et al. (1975a) taps emotional support with the items “how easy is it to talk with your coworkers?” and “how much are your coworkers willing to listen to your personal problems?” (e.g., Caplan et al., 1975a; Ducharme, Knudsen, & Roman, 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Haynes, Wall, Bolden, Stride, & Rick, 1999; Sloan, 2012; Tang, 1998). Our findings suggest that coworkers can engage in other behaviors aimed at curbing the negative emotions associated with poor WF balance, such as acknowledging a colleague’s heavy workload, expressing availability to help if needed, supporting and encouraging team stress relief activities, and providing guidance on stress management. Our work could therefore be used as a basis for considering the broader content domain of coworker-provided emotional support, particularly when studying how such support relates to employees’ WF balance. Importantly, the behaviors we identified were specifically displayed in the context of an employee exerting effort to achieve WF balance. Such specific behaviors could be quite different, in their manifestation and in their intent, from the emotionally supportive behaviors captured in more general studies of coworker support (i.e., those not specifically addressing WF-focused support). Thus, it may be a mistake to conclude that the emotionally supportive actions identified in this study reflect the same construct as those captured in research on coworker support that is not specific to the WF interface. Doing so could prevent the consideration of emotionally supportive behaviors of particular benefit to WF balance.

The labels in the category of *facilitating work adjustments* appear to imply instrumental support, a broader construct commonly measured in social support research. Generally speaking, instrumental support is “tangible” support characterized by rendering of actual assistance, such as actively contributing to task accomplishment (Beehr, 1985). While the notion of instrumental support is implied by our observations, our findings provide added detail regarding the specific behaviors that coworkers can engage in to provide such support in a manner that is focused on helping coworkers attain greater levels of WF balance. For example, being flexible with the location that a coworker works from due to their need to attend to family demands, or being flexible with respect to sharing work tasks, or even taking over work tasks. In comparison to the general manner in which coworker-provided instrumental support has been conceptualized and operationalized in past research, these specific forms of support could be more useful in helping an employee find a greater balance between their work and home demands.

The category of *sharing resources and knowledge* also evokes the broader notion of instrumental support in that the behaviors included in this category would help an employee more easily overcome demands in an effort to better balance work and family roles. However, these particular behaviors appear distinguishable from those included in the *facilitating work adjustments* category discussed above, which focuses on being flexible with the structure of work (i.e., timing, location) and demonstrating the flexibility to directly support the execution of work tasks (e.g., sharing the workload). *Sharing resources and knowledge* involves providing a colleague with material resources or knowledge to support them in independently dealing with a current task (e.g., dropping of work documents at a coworker’s home, providing subject matter expertise) or future need

(e.g., providing advice for managing a home demand), and are ultimately aimed at improving efficiency in order to allow for better WF balance. Furthermore, the behaviors involved in *facilitating work adjustments* are more clearly “in the moment” reactive responses, whereas *sharing resources and knowledge* can provide information or insights that could be applied at a later time, such as providing advice for future work or home demands. Our findings therefore suggest that tangible, coworker-provided support salient to WF balance can take at least two seemingly different forms.

The notion of sharing knowledge has been studied as a component of general social support (Caplan et al., 1975a; Caplan et al., 1975b), and bares some similarity to the conceptualization of coworker-provided mentoring (Ensher et al., 2001). However, the behaviors we observed are more specifically aimed at benefitting WF balance. Also, the behaviors captured by our *facilitating work adjustments* and *sharing resources and knowledge* categories bare some resemblance to some behaviors included in the instrumentally focused measure of WF coworker support developed by Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2010). The common behaviors include sharing work tasks, swapping work shifts, taking over work tasks/responsibilities, and providing information and resources to help a coworker work outside of the office. Such convergence could speak to the particular salience of these actions to the promotion of WF balance among coworkers.

The category *proactively developing solutions* bears some resemblance to the construct of creative WF management that was first conceptualized and validated in the development of a FSSB measure (Hammer et al., 2009; Hammer et al., 2007). The construct of creative WF management is based on the emerging literature that focuses on dual agendas and organizational strategies to design work that accommodates and

supports effectiveness in both work and non-work roles (Bailyn, 2003; Bailyn, Fletcher, & Kolb, 1997; Bailyn & Harrington, 2004; Kolb & Merrill-Sands, 1999; Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002; Rayman, Bailyn, Dickert, Carré, Harvey, & Krim, 1999). At its core, this construct delineates proactive action and involves the insight to uncover and implement new ways of facilitating both employee and company needs. It differs from instrumental support in that it is not so much a reactive behavior as it is a strategic effort to address issues that impact the greater organization (versus the individual) (Hammer et al., 2009).

Our findings suggest that proactive behavior that is forward-looking and aimed at ameliorating stressful conditions in the work group that may be thwarting WF balance is not necessarily the sole purview of supervisors. Furthermore, the behaviors identified in the category of *proactively developing solutions* are consistent with the voice literature, which implies that employees can be excellent generators of ideas/solutions of potential benefit to group/unit functioning (Detert & Burris, 2007; Janssen & Gao, 2013; Lepine & Van Dyne, 1998; Liu, Zhu, & Yang, 2010; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Saunders, Sheppard, Knight, & Roth, 1992; Stamper & Dyne, 2001; Van Dyne & Lepine, 1998).

Other behaviors that emerged from our data are similar in nature to those that supervisors can display (e.g., listening to struggles meeting work and family demands, flexibility with schedules, and developing solutions to better accommodate work and family; Hammer et al., 2009; 2013). These commonalities not only imply that coworkers and supervisors can provide similar forms of WF-focused support, but also that they can each conceivably contribute to more family-supportive work environments, either independently or by influencing one another. For example, supervisors and employees

can voice suggestions on how to help unit members achieve WF balance. Alternatively, supervisors can model supportive behavior for coworkers to enact and/or employees can convince supervisors to be more WF-supportive by exemplifying such support with each other.

Finally, the category *demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life* provides unique insights into WFSCB, as this category does not appear to have an obvious counterpart in the supervisor support (Hammer et al., 2009; 2011), coworker support (McManus et al., 2002; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005), or social support literatures (Caplan, 1974, Caplan et al., 1975a; Caplan et al., 1975b; Ducharme et al., 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Haynes et al., 1999; Sloan, 2012; Tang, 1998). Previous research has demonstrated that peers' attitudes play an important role in individuals' decisions on issues in the workplace (Donmez, Matson, Savan, Farahani, Photiadis, & Dafoe, 2014). By being understanding and encouraging of a coworker's desire to more effectively meet personal and family commitments, as well as by speaking up for a fellow coworker's WF balance, individuals demonstrate that they value non-work life. As a result, exhibiting these behaviors can directly support a specific coworker, while simultaneously contributing to a more WF-supportive work culture.

Antecedents of WFSCB.

Our results suggest that there are similarities and differences between potential antecedents of WFSCB and proposed antecedents to FSSB and to family-facilitative coworker support (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2009; Straub, 2012). In our study, the *relationship with coworker(s)* emerged as a potential antecedent for WFSCB, with specific components of the relationship identified, including its length, quality, and trust

level. This is in keeping with Straub's (2012) suggestion that the degree of leader-member exchange quality should influence a manager's FSSB, as well as Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran's (2009) idea that high work-group cohesion predicts family-facilitative coworker support.

Straub (2012) proposed that managers' life course stage and family life stage should have an effect on their level of FSSB. Specifically, managers are more cognizant of WF issues when they are in WF-intense life course stages (e.g., during child-rearing years). Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2009) similarly proposed that coworkers experiencing similar WF demands to the individual in need of support should be more likely to provide family-facilitative support. Our results are consistent with both frameworks, as represented by the labels "coworker has similar WF demands" and "similar age group" under the higher order category of *similarity with coworker(s)*. However, in Straub's (2012) model, the emphasis is on managers being in specific life stages, regardless of the life stages of the recipients, while in our results and the framework provided by Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2009), the emphasis was on the "similarities" between providers and recipients of WFSCB. Participants in our study also provided greater nuance regarding types of similarity among coworkers that might contribute to the provision of WFSCB. They described similarity in terms of working style, age group, level/position within the organization, and life experiences (generally). Similarities in terms of work styles and WF pressures may make it easier for coworkers to identify with each other's needs and thus, provide valuable support.

Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2009) proposed interdependency of work tasks as a potential antecedent, given that a coworker could be in a better position to

provide support. This aligns with the label “interdependency and knowledge of work tasks,” which is included in the *ability to contribute to a change or improvement* category. The remaining FSSB antecedents proposed by Straub (2012) and those of family-facilitative coworker support proposed by Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran (2009), such as gender roles, social identification, frequency of requesting support, and organizational justice were not mentioned by participants in the current study, although this does not necessarily mean that they are of lesser relevance.

Several higher order categories of antecedents identified in this study, including *understanding of the coworker situation*, *perceived benefits of providing support*, *personal characteristics*, and the *ability to contribute to a change or improvement* were not implied by Straub’s (2012) or Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran’s (2009) work. We discuss them below in relation to existing theory and research.

Understanding of the coworker situation could conceivably be a necessary condition for many forms of WFSCB, in that a lack of understanding would make it difficult to know that support is needed, let alone what specific type of support would be of most benefit. It is conceivable that the quality of the relationship between coworkers, a possible antecedent discussed earlier, would facilitate conversations of a personal nature that could bring to light the specifics of each other’s WF situations. If this is true, then efforts among coworkers to build mutual trust, particularly of an affective nature (McAllister, 1995), could provide them with the comfort to reveal difficult personal circumstances, thus cuing their need for support. Such trust is likely to be fostered through a process of social exchange (Blau, 1964), where coworkers reciprocate discretionary favors for each other over time.

The *perceived benefits of providing support* evoke one of the basic tenets of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), where individuals are more likely to develop a relationship (such as providing help or assistance to another person) when they believe that the relationship will provide greater benefits than costs. Considering the results of our research, such benefits could include “looking good” (not only in the eyes of the person being supported) and/or some kind of future in-kind reciprocation by the supported party. Research on cultural differences in social support suggests that this category of antecedents might be more salient in an individualistic rather than a collectivistic culture, as the former tends to view support in terms of economic exchange, whereas the latter tends to view support as an integral part of social roles and relationships (Yoon & Lim, 1999).

Personal characteristics of the support recipient appear to capture the importance of their contributions at work (e.g., dedication to work, competency). This could suggest that thoughts of distributive fairness (Adams, 1965) are at play, in that coworkers could consider some peers as more deserving of WFSCB than others given their superior performance contributions to the unit. Social exchange cognitions could also be implied if coworkers consider how they could personally gain from supporting a particularly valuable colleague. This finding is in keeping with mentoring research suggesting that people have a greater desire to support those who have greater ability/potential (Allen, Poteet, & Russell, 2000; Lapierre, Bonaccio, & Allen, 2009). Irrespective of the underlying reasoning, coworkers could be more prone to supporting the WF balance of those who bring greater value to their work unit. Turning now to personal characteristics of the support provider, these seem to reflect an inherent and/or experience-driven desire

to help others. For example, being an empathetic and/or altruistic person involves having an inherent, prosocial orientation toward others. The desire to support others may also stem from one's desire to pass on considerable experience and knowledge gained, which has also been discussed as a possible reason that some people enjoy mentoring others (Allen et al., 1997).

Finally, the *ability to contribute to a change or improvement* would conceivably be a necessary condition for any WFSCB that requires the use or alteration of organizational resources or practices, such as changing workloads, redistributing work in the team, or altering how tasks are accomplished within the unit, which are implied by our *proactively developing solutions* category. Extrapolating beyond the data, this antecedent implies that at least some examples of WFSCB could more easily be manifested when employees feel more empowered, particularly in terms of having influence over job responsibilities and workplace decisions (Matthews, Diaz, & Cole, 2003).

The preceding discussion implies possible causal relationships among some of the antecedents identified. For instance, the quality of relationships with coworkers would likely play an important role in explaining the provision of WFSCB by making coworkers see the benefits of providing support (e.g., maintained or further enhanced relationships), although this does not preclude the possibility that support could be given purely for self-aggrandizing reasons (e.g., "looking good"). In turn, closer relationships among coworkers could make it easier for them to understand their situations, thus making them more aware of support needed. The personal characteristics identified in our research could also indirectly influence WFSCB by first facilitating closer coworker

relationships. Pro-social characteristics (e.g., being empathetic, altruistic) could make it easier for a person to forge closer relationships with others, and being viewed as highly valuable to the unit (e.g., highly competent, dedicated to work) could be (professionally) attractive to others. Also, similarities between coworkers (e.g., similar WF demands, similar level in the organization, similar age) could indirectly influence WFSCB by enhancing understanding of each other's situations. For example, research has found that having similar demands at home or at work as one of your coworkers may increase the likelihood of communication regarding those demands (Burt, 1982; Friedkin, 1993). In sum, there are reasons to believe that the antecedents we identified could explain the occurrence of WFSCB in a sequential fashion.

Limitations and Avenues for Future Research.

Given the inductive qualitative method employed in this study, our findings should be seen for what they are: possibilities regarding the range of behaviors exemplifying the theoretical construct of WFSCB, and those regarding the factors that could account for their manifestation. The results of this study should not be seen as an empirical test of whether the WFSCB categories that emerged or the relationships between the antecedent factors and manifestations of WFSCB exist in a given population. Such verification would be the aim of future quantitative, deductively-focused research. The results of this qualitative inquiry highlight the importance of measuring coworker support beyond its general conceptualization (i.e., emotional and instrumental support). The social support literature is currently limited with regards to its empirically based knowledge and understanding of the broader spectrum of behaviors that coworkers can engage in to support the balance of work and family responsibilities. Our research

provides evidence for the existence of very specific behavioral manifestations of such support. As a first step toward carrying out this type of research, our qualitative results could be used to develop a more specific, WF-focused measure of coworker support. We suggest that our labels be used as a basis for generating specific items for each higher order category. Samples of employees representatively drawn from a target population of interest could then be used to examine the measure's factor structure, thus revealing whether the higher order categories we identified have generalizable validity. A psychometrically sound measure of WFSCB would be essential for testing specific hypotheses depicting relationships between WFSCB, possible antecedents, and anticipated outcomes, such as WF balance and conflict.

Participants in the current study were from Canada and the United States and as a result, it is possible that WFSCBs would differ across countries with varying cultural norms. In collectivist countries for example, many of the types of WFSCBs identified in our study may not generally be considered acceptable in the workplace. Research from various Asian samples has demonstrated that individuals are not encouraged, or even permitted, to express their feelings in the workplace (Taylor, Welch, Kim, & Sherman, 2007; Yoon & Lim, 1999). Perhaps in these countries emotional support behaviors, such as talking about shared experiences and expressing availability to help, would not be observed. Furthermore, talking about problems is less common as a style of giving or receiving support in Asian cultures (Wellisch, Kagawa-Singer, Reid, Lin, Nishikawa-Lee, & Wellisch, 1999) and this could result in less knowledge and resource sharing. The centrality of work and family roles could also impact findings for WFSCBs. For example, research on social support in collectivist (e.g., Asia) versus individualist (e.g., North

America) societies has shown that family and work centralities are negatively related (Sinha, 1986); in India (a collectivist country), work is secondary to family for many people (Misra, Ghosh, & Kanungo, 1990). Consequently, it is plausible that individuals who value family over work seek out many forms of social support primarily in their home life. This tendency could result in a narrowed spectrum of support behaviors being enacted at work by coworkers due to a reduced need and/or desire to seek support from coworkers. Therefore, it is recommended that an empirical investigation be conducted to verify the existence of these WFSCBs across different cultures.

Conclusion and Practical Implications.

The present study extends previous WF research on coworker support by contributing rich, empirically-grounded information regarding the possible manifestations of WF-focused support provided by coworkers, as well as factors that could influence the display of such behavior. The common themes that emerged from the interview data should not only help future quantitative deductive research efforts on the topic, but also provide insights for beneficial organizational practices. For example, regular team/staff meetings where coworkers each voice their work- and/or family-related challenges can increase the team's understanding of each other's situation (an antecedent identified in this study), which could foster more WFSCB. Encouraging activities and conversation that allow coworkers to gain more knowledge of each other's work tasks and family demands, along with allowing flexibility and autonomy in work tasks, should contribute to an increase in coworkers' motivation and ability to contribute to changes that could help enhance WF balance for most, if not all unit members. The results of this study could also provide individuals in the workforce with specific knowledge on how they can

contribute to a family-supportive organizational culture by referring to the specific WFSCB examples provided in this article.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York, NY: Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 414-435. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1774>
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: a review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.5.2.278>
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 70-89. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1997.1596>
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Russell, J. E. (2000). Protege selection by mentors: What makes the difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(3), 271-282. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1379\(200005\)21:3%3C271::aid-job44%3E3.3.co;2-b](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(200005)21:3%3C271::aid-job44%3E3.3.co;2-b)
- Aumann, K., & Galinsky, E. (2009). *The state of health in the American workforce: Does having an effective workplace matter?* New York, NY: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved from http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/HealthReport_9_11.pdf
- Bailyn, L. 2003. Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT.

- Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(2), 137-153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00008> [L]
[SEP]
- Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Kolb, D. 1997. Unexpected connections: Considering employees' personal lives can revitalize your business. *Sloan Management Review*, 38(4), 11-19. Retrieved from <http://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/unexpected-connections-considering-employees-personal-lives-can-revitalize-your-business/> [L]
[SEP]
- Bailyn, L., & Harrington, M. 2004. Redesigning work for work-family integration. *Community, Work & Family*, 7(2), 197-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1366880042000245470>
- Beehr, T. A. (1985). The role of social support in coping with organizational stress. In T. A. Beehr & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Human stress and cognition in organizations: An integral perspective* (pp. 375-398). New York, NY: Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068700800208>
- Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A. (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 391-405. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1379\(200006\)21:4%3C391::aid-job15%3E3.3.co;2-0](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(200006)21:4%3C391::aid-job15%3E3.3.co;2-0)
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2574842>
- Burt, R. S. (1982). *Toward a structural theory of action: network models of social Structure, Perception, and Action*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/63.3.858>

- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., & French, J. R. (1975a). Job demands and worker health; main effects and occupational differences. *Hew Publication (NIOSH)*, 75.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/e573842014-001>
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V., & Pinneau, S. R. (1975b). Job demands and worker health. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health*.
<http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/10057645>
- Caplan, G. (1974). Support Systems and Community Mental Health. New York: Behavioral Publications. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/ps.25.10.682-a>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249-276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713>
- Cascio, W. (1998). *Applied Psychology in Human Resources Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. <https://www.pearsonhighered.com/program/Cascio-Applied-Psychology-in-Human-Resource-Management-7th-Edition/PGM248374.html>
- Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.28>
- Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1082>

- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 38, 300-314. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-197609000-00003>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013a). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publishing. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/qualitative-inquiry-and-research-design/book235677>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013b). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publishing. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book237357>
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 869-884. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.26279183>
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.611>
- Dolcos, S. M., & Daley, D. (2009). Work pressure, workplace social resources, and work-family conflict: The tale of two sectors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 16(4), 291-311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017319>
- Donmez, B., Matson, Z., Savan, B., Farahani, E., Photiadis, D., & Dafoe, J. (2014). Interruption management and office norms: Technology adoption lessons from a product commercialization study. *International Journal of Information Management*, 34(6), 741-750. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.08.003>
- Ducharme, L. J., Knudsen, H. K., & Roman, P. M. (2007). Emotional exhaustion and turnover intention in human service occupations: The protective role of coworker

- support. *Sociological Spectrum*, 28(1), 81-104.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02732170701675268>
- Ducharme, L. J., & Martin, J. K. (2000). Unrewarding work, coworker support, and job satisfaction: A test of the buffering hypothesis. *Work and Occupations*, 27(2), 223-243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888400027002005>
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(1), 124-197.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003>
- Eby, L. T. de T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., Baldwin, S., ... Evans, S. C. (2013). An interdisciplinary meta-analysis of the potential antecedents, correlates, and consequences of protégé perceptions of mentoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(2), 441-476. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0029279>
- Ensher, E. A., Thomas, C., & Murphy, S. E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on protégés' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(3), 419-438. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25092732>
- Erickson, J. J., Martinengo, G., & Hill, E. J. (2010). Putting work and family experiences in context: Differences by family life stage. *Human Relations*, 63, 955-979.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709353138>
- Fairlie, R. W. (2004). Self-employed business ownership rates in the United States: 1979-2003. SBA Office of Advocacy. Retrieved from

<https://www.sba.gov/category/advocacy-navigation-structure/research-and-statistics>

- Fitzsimons, G. M., & Bargh, J. A. (2003). Thinking of you: Nonconscious pursuit of interpersonal goals associated with relationship partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.84.1.148>
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4), 327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061470>
- Friedkin, N. E. (1993). Structural bases of interpersonal influence in groups. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 861–72. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095955>
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 145-167. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577>
- Gordon, J. (1992). Work teams: How far have they come? *Training*, 29, 59-65.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. Campbell Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 165-183). Chicago: American Psychological Association. <https://monash.rl.talis.com/items/2D23ACC4-3A6C-3E56-4805-C9C9763D15FA.html>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>

- Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. D. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work–family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 266-275.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008>
- Halbesleben, J. R. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: a meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1134.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1134>
- Hammer, L. B., Ernst Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the Family Supportive Supervisor Behavior Short-Form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 285.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032612>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 35(4), 837-856.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308328510>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Zimmerman, K., & Daniels, R. (2007). Clarifying the construct of family-supportive supervisory behaviors (FSSB): A multilevel perspective. *Research in Occupational Stress and Wellbeing*, 6, 165-204.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s1479-3555\(06\)06005-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1479-3555(06)06005-7)
- Haynes, C. E., Wall, T. D., Bolden, R. I., Stride, C., & Rick, J. E. (1999). Measures of perceived work characteristics for health services research: Test of a measurement model and normative data. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 4(3), 257-275.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/135910799168614>

- Higgins, C. A., Duxbury, L. E., & Lyons, S. (2008). Reducing Work-Life Conflict: What Works? What Doesn't? : Health Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/pubs/occup-travail/balancing-equilibre/index-eng.php>
- Hoganson, C. (2011). Work and life: The balancing act: The Conference Board of Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=4506>
- Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 673–703.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/256742>
- Janssen, O., & Gao, L. (2015). Supervisory responsiveness and employee self-perceived status and voice behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41(7), 1854-1872.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312471386>
- Johnson, J. V., & Hall, E. M. (1988). Job strain, workplace social support, and cardiovascular disease: A cross-sectional study of a random sample of the Swedish working population. *American Journal of Public Health*, 78(10), 1336-1342. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.78.10.1336>
- Johnson, J. V., Stewart, W., Hall, E. M., Fredlund, P., & Theorell, T. (1996). Long-term psychosocial work environment and cardiovascular mortality among Swedish men. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86(3), 324-331.
<https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.86.3.324>
- Kolb, D. M., & Merrill-Sands, D. (1999). Waiting for outcomes: Anchoring a dual agenda for change to cultural assumptions. *Women in Management Review*, 14(5), 194-203. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649429910281989>

- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 289-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
- Lapierre, L. M., Bonaccio, S., & Allen, T. D. (2009). The separate, relative, and joint effects of employee job performance domains on supervisors' willingness to mentor. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 135-144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.005>
- LaRocco, J. M., House, J. S., & French Jr, J. R. (1980). Social support, occupational stress, and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 202-218. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2136616>
- LaRocco, J. M., & Jones, A. P. (1978). Coworker and leader support as moderators of stress-strain relationships in work situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 629-634. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.63.5.629>
- Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 841-866. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307307635>
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 853. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.83.6.853>

- Liu, W., Zhu, R., & Yang, Y. (2010). I warn you because I like you: Voice behavior, employee identifications, and transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(1), 189-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.10.014>
- Major, D. A., Fletcher, T. D., Davis, D. D., & Germano, L. M. (2008). The influence of work-family culture and workplace relationships on work interference with family: A multilevel model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(7), 881-897. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.502>
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410-476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316061>
- Matthews, R. A., Bulger, C. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Work social supports, role stressors, and work-family conflict: The moderating effect of age. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(1), 78-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.011>
- Matthews, R. A., Diaz, W. M., & Cole, S. G. (2003). The organizational empowerment scale. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 297-318. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480310467624>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 21-59. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256727>

- McGrath, J. E. (1982). Dilemmatics: A study of research choices and dilemmas. In J. E. McGrath, J. Martin, & R. A. Kulka (Eds.), *Judgment calls in research* (pp. 69-102). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000276428102500205>
- McManus, K., Korabik, K., Rosin, H. M., & Kelloway, E. (2002). Employed mothers and the work-family interface: Does family structure matter? *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1295-1324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055011919>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., Murase, T., DeChurch, L. A., & Jimenez, M. (2010). Coworker informal work accommodations to family: Scale development and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(3), 511-531.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164409355687>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2006). How family-friendly work environments affect work/family conflict: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Labor Research*, 4, 555-574. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-006-1020-1>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2009). The role of the coworker in reducing work-family conflict: A review and directions for future research. *Pratiques Psychologiques*, 15(2), 213-224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prps.2008.09.009>
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689-725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>
- Misra, S., Ghosh, R., & Kanungo, R. N. (1990). Measurement of family involvement: A cross-national study of managers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21(2), 232-248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022190212006>

- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(6), 1321.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>
- Morrison, E.W., & Milliken, F.J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(4), 706-725. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707697>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Monograph Publications.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412995658>
- Pedersen, D. E., & Minnotte, K. L. (2012). Self- and spouse-reported work-family conflict and dual-earners' job satisfaction. *Marriage & Family Review, 48*(3), 272-292. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2012.665015>
- Pinneau, S.R. (1976). Effects of social support on occupational stresses and strains. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle, & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41-60). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-6989-3_3
- Pratt, M. G. (2009). For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*, 856–862.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.44632557>
- Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Pruitt, B. H. (2002). *Beyond work-family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ^[1]_{SEP} <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.39-5897>

- Ray, E. B., & Miller, K. I. (1994). Social support, home/work stress, and burnout: Who can help? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 30, 357-373.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886394303007>
- Rayman, P. M., Bailyn, L., Dickert, J., Carré, F., Harvey, M. A., Krim, R., et al. (1999). Designing organizational solutions to integrate work and life. *Women in Management Review*, 14, 164-176. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649429910281934>
- Runkel, P. J., & McGrath, J. E. (1972). *Research on human behavior: a systematic guide to method*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1161667>
- Salas, E., Burke, C. S., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2000). Teamwork: emerging principles. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(4), 339-356.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00046>
- Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 18(2), 179-183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.4770180211>
- Saunders, D. M., Sheppard, B. H., Knight, V., & Roth, J. (1992). Employee voice to supervisors. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 5, 241-259.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01385051>
- Schwarzer, R., & Leppin, A. (1989). Social support and health: A meta-analysis. *Psychology and Health*, 3(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870448908400361>
- Sinha, J. B. (1986). Work- related values and climate factors. *Applied Psychology*, 35(1), 63-78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1986.tb01277.x>

- Sloan, M. M. (2012). Unfair treatment in the workplace and worker well-being: The role of coworker support in a service work environment. *Work and Occupations*, 31(1), 3-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406555>
- Smith, J.A. & Shinebourne, P. (2012). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In H. Cooper, P.M. Camic, D.L. Long, A.T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K.J. Sher (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology* (Vol. 2; pp 73-82). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-005>
- Spector, P. E., Rogelberg, S., Ryan, A., Schmitt, N., & Zedeck, S. (2014). Moving the pendulum back to the middle: Reflections on and introduction to the inductive research special issue of Journal of Business and Psychology. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(4), 499-502. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9372-7>
- Stamper, C. L., & Dyne, L. V. (2001). Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(5), 517-536. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.100>
- Statistics Canada. (2010, June 21). Classification of Full-time and Part-Time Work Hours. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/concepts/definitions/labour-travail-class03b-eng.htm>
- Straub, C. (2012). Antecedents and organizational consequences of family supportive supervisor behavior: A multilevel conceptual framework for research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(1), 15-26. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2011.08.001>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research* (Vol. 15). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.

- Tang, H. K. (1998). An inventory of organizational innovativeness. *Technovation*, 19(1), 41-51. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4972\(98\)00077-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4972(98)00077-7)
- Taylor, S. E., Welch, W. T., Kim, H. S., & Sherman, D. K. (2007). Cultural differences in the impact of social support on psychological and biological stress responses. *Psychological Science*, 18(9), 831-837. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01987.x>
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.80.1.6>
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2005). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 100-118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.100>
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108-119. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256902>
- Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The Role of Social Support in the Process of Work Stress: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 314-334. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1661>
- Wang, M., Liu, S., Zhan, Y., & Shi, J. (2010). Daily work-familyWF conflict and alcohol use: Testing the cross-level moderation effects of peer drinking norms and social support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 377-386. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018138>

- Wellisch, D., Kagawa-Singer, M., Reid, S. L., Lin, Y. J., Nishikawa-Lee, S., & Wellisch, M. (1999). An exploratory study of social support: a cross-cultural comparison of Chinese-, Japanese-, and Anglo-American breast cancer patients. *Psycho-oncology*, 8(3), 207-219. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1611\(199905/06\)8:3%3C207::aid-pon357%3E3.3.co;2-2](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1611(199905/06)8:3%3C207::aid-pon357%3E3.3.co;2-2)
- Yoon, J., & Lim, J. C. (1999). Organizational support in the workplace: The case of Korean hospital employees. *Human Relations*, 52(7), 923-945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679905200704>

Table 1

Higher-Order Categories of WFSCB, Labels Representing Specific Behaviors Within Each Category, and Representative Quotes

HOC	Labels	Example Quotes
Demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life	• Advocate for additional resources to support coworkers' work-family balance • Advocating for the importance of your coworkers' work-family balance • Being understanding and supporting flexibility with a coworker's personal schedule • Coworker accepts that sometimes family & personal needs take priority • Encouraging one to attend to family & personal needs • Coworker displays work-family balance behaviors (in own life) • Avoiding disturbing a coworker's family time	▪ Participant details support received from a coworker wherein she was away on maternity leave and she was assigned a project (for her return) that would require her to travel a lot and be away from her family. "I would have had to live in a different country for six months since I got back [from my maternity leave]. And one of my coworkers, unbeknownst to me, because he just knew me so well, went and talked to the Senior VP and just said that this isn't ideal." <i>Advocating for the importance of your coworkers' work-family balance</i> ▪ Participant describes how their coworkers demonstrate understanding of family commitments/responsibilities. "People at the coworker level, so not just our supervisor, seem to respect [your family commitments] if you state – look, I've got a hard stop at three o'clock. I have to go because of a family commitment or appointment or whatever it might be, there's not a lot of pushback against that. It's sort of a very understanding circle." <i>Being understanding and supporting flexibility with a coworker's personal schedule</i> ▪ Participant discusses receiving support from a coworker who shared a work task with her. The participant was away from the office for an extended period of time. "She was very good about not reaching out to me unless she absolutely needed guidance. She took the direction I provided [before I left] and really made a conscious effort to do as much as she could without bothering me while I was away." <i>Avoiding disturbing a coworker's family time</i>
Emotional support	• Acknowledging your coworker's heavy workload • Coworker expresses their availability to help if needed • Supporting and encouraging coworker stress relief activities • Supporting a coworker's need to step away briefly from a stressful work situation • Talking about shared experiences	▪ Participant discusses a scenario supporting a coworker who had a sick elderly parent and their stress was spilling over to work and was visible when they were completing work tasks. "Maybe this is part of that informal thing that seeing somebody is maxed out and frazzled and being able to pull them aside and say – lets go have a coffee and just sit down and unwind for 20 minutes." <i>Supporting a coworker's need to step away briefly from a stressful work situation</i> ▪ Participant discusses being able to speak with a coworker about his sick mother because that coworker had gone through a very similar experience with his own mother. "He was able to say, okay, it has happened. Take a deep breath. It's not going to go away but you will come to be able to deal with it a bit more once you start breathing. And I could go and talk to him about it and feel I had someone I could open

HOC	Labels	Example Quotes
	• Caring demonstrated amongst coworkers • Providing comfort and reassurance • Listening to personal issues and details of personal lives • Providing guidance on stress management	up to and share exactly how...someone who knew what I was going through.” <i>Talking about shared experiences</i> ▪ Participant discusses providing support to a coworker who was feeling guilty about spending too much time at work, and was debating making a change so that more time could be spent at home. “He said to me ‘I need to be home more’ and I just remember mentioning, you know, ‘just don’t lose sight of priorities,’ something like that. I thought that was helpful, if someone had done that same thing for me, and just comforting me and saying ‘these are your priorities, don’t worry - you have to set your priorities, keep your eye on the priorities.’ It’s almost like, again, comforting and the reassurance that this is the right way. ‘You don’t have to think about it too much, this is the right way.’” <i>Providing comfort and reassurance</i>
Sharing resources & knowledge	• Arranging for the provision of resources to help meet a family need • Facilitate the provision of work resources while away from the workplace • Sharing subject matter expertise • Providing advice for managing work and family demands • Sharing resources and knowledge based on similar experiences • Providing advice for a family member • Providing advice specific to work or family • Providing perspective (i.e., different way of thinking or viewing a situation)	▪ Participant discusses a scenario where she had been able to work from home when her children were sick because her coworker provided her with work resources. “Sometimes I work from home because the kids get sick and so I have no choice but to work from home. I’ll text her and ask her to send me documents that I don’t have access to from home. She’s the person I go to for everything.” <i>Facilitate the provision of work resources while away from the workplace</i> ▪ Participant discusses a scenario where she provided support to her coworker who was studying to be a certified accountant and had been experiencing difficulty juggling home and work life. “She [participant’s coworker] is doing her CGA now, so she will talk with me, mainly me, sometimes it was [our other coworker], about how to balance studies, kids, and work. So we will share our experience with her and how we organize the family duties and the work and the studying.” <i>Providing advice for managing work and family demands</i> ▪ Participant discusses being in a new leadership role when the workload was high and affecting time with family, and a peer (i.e., another supervisor) shared resources and knowledge regarding how to manage people. “There was a time when I first started as a supervisor, the amount of work that I was doing was above and beyond the hours that I was getting paid for. You know, as a new leader you definitely need support from coworkers and peers to kind of feel it out. I think he definitely was there to help me and kind of guide me along the way on learning.” <i>Sharing resources and knowledge based on experience</i>
Facilitating work adjustments	• Flexibility with sharing work tasks • Flexibility with work location	▪ Participant describes a situation when he took on more of the workload because he knew his coworker had too much on her plate. “We had a shared project and we were

HOC	Labels	Example Quotes
	• Taking over work tasks • Flexibility regarding work schedules	kind of dividing up who is going to do what. I knew that she had a lot of other stuff on her plate, so I took on the larger task of the two that we would have had to divide.” <i>Flexibility with sharing work tasks</i> ▪ Participant discusses examples of when she or her coworkers have had to work from home due to a family or personal demand and the flexibility of her coworkers with regards to working remotely. “Our coworkers, my colleagues, have no problem calling into meetings. We’re flexible in terms of if you’re calling into meetings if you have to stay at home... we always encourage when we’re setting up meetings, we always have call-in numbers, so that if someone for whatever reason is not in the office and needs to call in remotely, that’s doable.” <i>Flexibility with work location</i> ▪ Participant discusses alternating work start and stop times with her coworkers to accommodate each other’s family/personal needs. “In another organization that I worked at, we worked as stockbrokers together and we managed a book of business together. I guess I would typify it as the regular course of supporting each other’s work-life balance because we shared our clients and our book of business. We were structured in order to do that. There were three of us, and we each had younger families and we would spell each other off if one person needed to come in late, then the other person would come in early.” <i>Flexibility regarding work schedules</i>
Proactively developing solutions	• Group problem solving to address high workload • Redistributing work based on subject matter expertise • Suggesting strategies for maximizing time at work • Strategizing upcoming work tasks as a team • Suggestions to management to address workload on team • Talk through work tasks or problems to develop a solution • Suggestions for improving collaboration • Suggestions to reduce a coworker’s workload	▪ Participant discusses a period of time with an unusually high workload that had them working overtime; she and her coworker met outside of work to strategize and make a plan to address their high workload. “The other thing that we’re starting to do is book dedicated time where the two of us are together outside of the office. So that helps with work balance, which always leads to home balance because if you can get things done and feel accomplished at the end of the day then you won’t have that feeling that you are 10 feet under and you better sign on [to email] real quick [as soon as you get home] because tomorrow’s just going to get worse. So that’s really helpful.” <i>Group problem solving to address high workload</i> ▪ Participant discusses a large-scale project that had him and his coworkers working overtime. “We were really under-staffed for the project. People were working 100-hour weeks. So the first thing that we did [collectively] was really escalate things up to management and say hey, we need more people. These are the types of people we need and we put together some creative solutions to relax some of the burden on us.” <i>Suggestions to management to address workload on team</i> ▪ Participant works in a project-based environment and describes that on several occasions she has gone to a fellow coworker’s manager to discuss the schedule for

HOC	Labels	Example Quotes
	• Scheduling suggestions to better manage the workload • Suggestions for managing the workload through reallocation of work tasks	completing a number of work tasks. “One of the biggest things that I was able to do from a work-life balance [perspective] was adjust the schedule. I know it seems like a little thing, but actually go to their managers and sell them on the fact that it was going to be back to back to back weekends. I went to them [the managers] and even though I knew that not all of [the work] was my projects they were working on. It’s like – can we shift this out? Can we shift out the dates to give more breathing room in between?” <i>Scheduling suggestions to better manage the workload</i>

Note. HOC = higher order category. *Italicized text* indicates the label represented by the quote.

Table 2

Higher-Order Categories of Antecedents of WFSCB, Labels Representing Lower-Order Antecedents Within Each Category, and Representative Quotes

HOC	Label	Quote
Understanding of the coworker situation	*Knowledge of the situation through open communication	That you want to be cognizant of people's... the other demands on people's time outside of the work environment. So if somebody is saying, you know, like somebody has commented that their dad is sick and it's taking up a lot of their time, you're aware of that when you're thinking about planning the next project meeting going, okay, you know, Jen's got doctors' appointments with her dad somewhere around there. I'd better ask her about it before I go ahead and book this.
	[support provided] Knowledge of the situation through observation	When you see somebody who's struggling ... because they're feeling maxed out or because something has just happened in their life that is overwhelming either at work or in their personal lives... You know, I don't know, a silly example, someone's fighting with their computer to get it to save a Word document as a PDF... and they're losing their minds because they've got 15,000 things pulling them in different directions and their computer isn't working properly.
Similarity with coworker(s)	*Coworker has similar work-family demands	They are kind of in the same boat. I mean, they have kids as well so they completely understand.
	*Coworker is like-minded and has similar working style	Because we are very similar in [that] what drives and motivates us is very much the same... We both believe, you know, it's not what you say, it's what you do that defines a person. So through our actions and how we work together and how we support each other, we were very much able to see, oh, this is who this guy is and we were able to see that we're both stand-up and that we'd be there for each other.
	*Similar age group	I guess we are 30 and most of the people working (there) are above their 40s. So there is a big age gap, but yeah we hang out with them outside of work... Yeah, basically, everybody is like ten years older than me.
	*Similar level/position within the organization	So we are both HR advisors, and we share the same level of position, which I think is also key that we have this working relationship... You're always making sure that you're working at the same pace, so it's just been really helpful that we've connected really well and back each other up.

HOC	Label	Quote
	*Went through a similar experience	I have been there, so I was able to provide perspective on saying, you know, listen, I know where you are. And I was able again, here's an area where we developed the vocabulary, the words just locked, like they clicked right away because I'd say this is how you feel. He's like yes. And this is what you're thinking and this is what you think you should do next. But here's why it's wrong.
Relationship with coworker(s)	*Length of relationship	The people I've known longer ... , I certainly sort of in the back of my mind am thinking about them when we're talking about work that has to get done and the volume of work or that kind of thing.
	*Quality of relationship	I've had a pretty good personal relationship with my coworkers as well, so that helps as well.
	*Trusting relationship	She was a good friend and I knew that she had my back when something went wrong. There was a lot of mutual trust.
Ability to contribute to a change or improvement	*Specific skills	I think if I hadn't [taken over the task], there wasn't anybody else who could do it because it was a scarce skill.
	[support provided] Flexibility with schedule	Probably because at the time I was pretty flexible. Like I didn't have lots of personal restrictions that made it hard for me to accommodate that.
	*Interdependency and knowledge of work tasks	I would say the only other example I can think of right now is work sharing. So we are very connected in our deliverables, and we have a very large team structure. So we know what is on the plate, and we back each other up well.
Perceived benefits of providing support	*Benefits to mutually supportive relationships	Where we see an opportunity to help the other, we take it because we know that when I help you, you will help me someday.
	*Personal benefits for providing support	It's partially because I wanted to look good. I knew that I had a promotion coming up.
	*Benefits to work quality	I also cared about the project that we were working on together and wanting to not have that fall between the cracks or become more difficult.
Personal characteristics	*Receiver's likeability	I think [it is because] she likes me and I try to help her out whenever I can.

HOC	Label	Quote
	[support provided] Receiver's dedication to work	S[he] was a very good worker, she worked really hard. But she just wasn't a morning person. Sometimes it was a struggle to come in at 9:00. Sometimes not [un]til 10:00, sometimes 10:30. So sometimes she was very late and she'd miss meetings, but I'd cover.
	[support provided] Receiver's competency	I care much more about [coworkers who perform at a high level] than I do somebody who has consistently not delivered. While I will try to provide support to both [higher and lower performers], my time is valuable in terms of who I spend it with. And so I'll probably spend more time with that top performer making sure that they're okay, that they're well supported.
	*Provider's empathy	I think generally there's empathy there. She's gone through it, right? I think we're a pretty good team, we're supportive, and I think that factors into it as well, right?
	*Provider's altruism	I didn't really think of it that way. [I mean] the benefits to me. I mean, ultimately I guess just a sense of, well, that's just the right thing to do. We're not giving her the support she needs in this kind of situation. So if there's something that I can do that will help with that, well then that just feels pretty good. So I guess it's intrinsic that way.
	[support received] Provider wants to pass on knowledge	She's been with the company for five years. She's been there forever and ever and ever. She is the one that showed me kind of the internal workings of our office when I first started.

Note. "Support received" refers to participants' account of why they think their coworker provided them with support; "support provided" refers to participants' account of why they provided support to a coworker; * = label is common to responses given by participants in reference to support received and support provided; HOC = higher order category; Total number of sources/participants in the data = 22; When [support received] or [support provided] precedes a label, this indicates that the label is unique to participants' account of either support received or support provided.

**Manuscript 2: Work-Family Supportive Coworker Behavior (WFSCB):
Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure**

Alicia McMullan (first author)

University of Ottawa

School of Psychology

Laurent Lapierre (second author)

University of Ottawa

Telfer School of Management

*I would like to thank work-family scholars Tammy Allen, PhD. (University of South Florida), Kristen Shockley, PhD. (University of Georgia), and Leslie Hammer, PhD. (Portland State University) for their comments and insights.

Abstract

This study builds and extends previous work-family (WF) research on coworker support by contributing rich, empirically grounded information regarding specific manifestations of WF supportive coworker behaviors (WFSCB). The factor structure and potential benefits of WFSCB was investigated in two studies. Findings from two exploratory factor analyses and a confirmatory factor analysis revealed that WFSCB is best represented by four dimensions including: emotional support, facilitating work adjustments, sharing resources and knowledge, and proactively developing solutions, all of which demonstrated adequate internal consistency. The findings of a hierarchical regression analysis ($N = 502$ employees) provided preliminary evidence suggesting that WFSCB can significantly reduce work-to-family conflict, and improve WF balance, WF positive spillover, and life satisfaction. The utility of WFSCB as a source of informal workplace support was underscored based on evidence of its incremental validity in the prediction of these outcome variables over and above general coworker support. The findings demonstrate that these WF focused behaviors provide benefits beyond what emotional and/or instrumental support (i.e., general coworker support) can offer. Practical guidance on how employees can actively engage with their coworkers to foster improved functioning, and to do so while also contributing to a family-supportive work environment is also provided.

Evolving trends in the global labour force including a greater representation of women and dual-earner couples, an aging population, growing numbers of single parents, and expanded gender role responsibilities, have contributed to a blurring of the lines between work and family life (Hammer & Zimmerman, 2011; Hoganson, 2011; Marshall, 2009). Difficulty in effectively managing the competing demands of important life roles has become a struggle for a large proportion of the Canadian and American populations (Aumann & Galinsky, 2009; Hoganson, 2011). As a result, now more than ever, there is a greater awareness and emphasis being placed on obtaining a healthy work-life balance. Growing knowledge of the interdependence between work and family, coupled with the substantive body of research illuminating issues that individuals encounter in attempting to manage competing life demands (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005), has led many organizations to implement family-friendly policies and programs in the hopes of maintaining the health of their workforce. Although these formal organizational supports can be an important resource in the alleviation of stress, research has been mixed in terms of the benefits to various work-family (WF) outcomes (e.g., Allen & Shockley, 2009; Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, & Shockley, 2013; Byron, 2005; Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood, & Colton, 2005; Masuda, Poelmans, Allen, Spector, Lapierre, Cooper, et al., 2011; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006). Furthermore, evidence has suggested that formal family-friendly supports may not be sufficient as the only source of workplace support (Allen, 2001; Kossek, Lewis, & Hammer, 2009). One explanation for this, specifically with regards to telework, is the difficulty that employees may experience managing the boundary between their work and home lives. These borders provide individuals with cues as to

when to attend to family responsibilities and when to attend to work responsibilities; when these lines blur, responsibility management may suffer resulting in consequences to WF integration (Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Silver & Goldscheider, 1994). A more global explanation is the influence that the informal organizational aspects (e.g., peers, supervisors, informal expectations such as long work hours) have over an employee's decision to use family-friendly benefits (Allen, 2001; Metz, 2011; Roth, 2007). For example, if an employee is led to believe that their use of a family-friendly benefit would be perceived as low commitment to work or poor performance, they would likely be discouraged from using it. Alternatively, if there were positive beliefs surrounding the use of family-friendly benefits (i.e., clear value placed on WF integration), their use would be more likely. Thus, it is important that both the formal (e.g., policy, benefits) and informal (coworker support, supervisor support) organizational components demonstrate alignment and consistency.

Over the last several decades, WF research has pointed to the utility of informal organizational supports, specifically social support from coworkers and supervisors, as a resource that directly contributes to improved navigation of the WF interface (e.g., Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2009; Hammer, Kossek, Zimmerman, & Daniels, 2007; Kossek Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011; Matthews Bulger, & Barnes-Farrell, 2010; O'Driscoll, Poelmans, Spector, Kalliath, Allen, Cooper, et al., 2003; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). In some cases, research has demonstrated that informal support may offer greater relative importance over formal support with respect to various WF and health outcomes, as well as job-related attitudes, including WF conflict, stress,

turnover intention, and job satisfaction (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Behson, 2002; Behson, 2005).

In a knowledge-driven economy, the support of coworkers has become increasingly important as employers move towards flatter organizational structures (Ensign, 1998) with more team-based environments where employees work interdependently (Cascio, 1998; Devine, Clayton, Philips, Dunford, & Melner, 1999; Gordon, 1992; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008; Salas, Burke, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000). As a result, not only do coworkers have increased decision-making power and discretion over task responsibilities and workload, they also often have firsthand knowledge of how workplace demands and family responsibilities may be incompatible. This puts them in an optimal position to offer each other family-focused support (Ray & Miller, 1994). As compared to supervisor support however, the coworker support topical area has not experienced a comparable amount of research attention and theory progression. This is true despite demonstrated utility of coworker support in the alleviation of the negative effects associated with work and family-related stress (Byron, 2005; Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; LaRocco & Jones, 1978; Mesmer-Magnus, Murase, DeChurch, & Jimenez, 2010; Michel et al., 2010; Viswesvaran et al., 1999). Of the little research that has been completed-to-date, most has focused on *general* support from coworkers (Dolcos & Daley, 2009; Frone et al., 1997; Major, Fletcher, Davis, & Germano, 2008; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2012; Matthews et al., 2010; Wang, Liu, Zhan, & Shi, 2010). Empirical investigations of WF focused support from coworkers are scarce (McManus, Korabik, Rosin, Kelloway, 2002; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). While general support provided by coworkers holds some promise in

helping employees better manage the WF interface (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011), research comparing general to family-focused forms of supportive supervision (Kossek et al., 2011) would indicate that coworker support that is family-facilitative may be even more useful in this regard. Currently however, there exists very little empirical evidence of the utility of WF focused coworker support (see McManus et al., 2002; Thompson & Prottas, 2005), and even less is available concerning the specific positive behaviors that WF supportive coworkers engage in (for an exception see Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010). Recent qualitative research by McMullan, Lapierre, and Li (2016) points toward the existence of different forms of WF focused support, yet empirical verification of their existence using quantitative scale methodology does not yet exist.

The goal of this research was to address this gap in the literature by developing a valid and empirically supported measure of WF supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB). In study 1, the item-level psychometric properties and factor structure of a multidimensional WFSCB measure were assessed. In study 2, sample 1, after refining items in the measure, the factor structure and psychometric properties were further assessed. In study 2, sample 2, confirmatory evidence of the factor structure is provided. Finally, evidence of construct, convergent, and criterion-related validity is provided based on an investigation of the relationships between the measure and various constructs within its nomological network including: general coworker support, general family-focused coworker support, WF balance, WF conflict, WF positive spillover, and life satisfaction. Evidence of the incremental validity (i.e., predictive utility) of the WFSCB

measure over and above an existing measure of general coworker support is also provided.

Evidence from Research on Work-Family Supportive Supervisors

As mentioned previously, to date the vast majority of WF research on social support provided in the workplace has addressed support provided by employees' immediate supervisors (managers) (e.g., Allen, 2001; Clark, 2001; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Shinn, Wong, Simko, & Ortiz-Torres, 1989; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). In a recent meta-analysis of workplace supports for family, it was reported that a majority of these investigations have made use of general measures of emotional support to operationalize the construct (Kossek, Pichler, Hammer, & Bodner, 2007; Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). This particular study also found that supervisor support directed at the family role demonstrated enhanced utility over and above general support measures in predicting WF outcomes, (i.e., WF conflict; Kossek et al., 2007; 2011). These results taken together pointed to a clear need for researchers to dig deeper in order to be in a position to deny or refute evidence of the incremental validity of WF supportive action. In an effort to answer this call, Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, and Hanson (2009) developed and validated a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). Compared to general supervisory support, which refers to the degree to which employees feel that their supervisor cares about their general wellbeing on the job through the provision of positive social interaction or resources (Kossek et al., 2011), FSSBs reflect whether supervisors care for their employees' WF wellbeing by facilitating their ability to jointly manage work and family demands/responsibilities (Hammer et al., 2009; Kossek et al., 2011). The original measure developed by Hammer et al. (2009), as

well as a short version (2013), have both demonstrated significant relationships with WF conflict, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, control over work hours, obligation to work when sick, perceived stress, and reports of family time adequacy. The full measure has also demonstrated incremental validity over general supervisory support in terms of WF conflict, WF positive spillover, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions (Hammer et al., 2009), and the short version over work-to-family conflict and family-to-work positive spillover (Hammer et al., 2013). This evidence has lead the researcher to hypothesize that WF focused behaviors enacted by coworkers could potentially demonstrate similar utility in predicting WF outcomes.

The Evolution of Coworker Support Research within the Work-Family Literature

Generally speaking, coworker support is defined as the provision of desirable resources including more tangible task-related assistance and positive affect (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau, 1975; Ensher, Thomas, & Murphy, 2001; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). It has been extensively supported in its link to various health, work, and non-work outcomes (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; LaRocco & Jones, 1989; McManus et al., 2002; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005; Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999). Unfortunately, the evolution of research on coworker support has progressed fairly slowly, as a greater emphasis has been placed on understanding the benefits of formal organizational supports (i.e., family-friendly benefits) along with supervisor support. Based on the frequency of scholarly publications, it appears that supervisors have been deemed as a more significant workplace resource. This is in part due to their ability to encourage or discourage employees' policy use (Hopkins, 2005) and their direct influence over workload and work-related stressors (Beehr, Farmer,

Glazer, Gudanowski, & Nair, 2003). Over decades of research on the benefits of supportive workplaces, coworker support has often been entirely left out of the equation, despite evidence pointing to the utility of this form of support and changes to the structural work environment (e.g., self-managed teams, less hierarchy) that raise the influence of the coworker on one's lived experience of the work environment (Appelbaum, Bethune, & Tannenbaum, 1999). This is evident in research detailing relationships between factors that contribute to supportive work cultures/supportive WF cultures and various indicators of positive WF integration (e.g., Amad & Omar, 2010; Clark, 2001; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999).

Over its history of research, coworker support has been operationalized in many different ways and this has muddled its clarity as a psychological construct within the occupational health literature. To begin with, there have been instances when results attributable to coworker support specifically have been difficult to parse out, as employed measures did not clearly distinguish between constructs. For example, in a study by Grzywacz & Marks (2000) who found a positive relationship between coworker support and WF positive spillover, two general coworker support frequency items ("How often do you get help and support from your coworkers?" and "How often are your coworkers willing to listen to your work-related problems?") were combined with items assessing supervisor support, as a part of an overall work support measure. In other examples, Anderson et al. (2002) combined coworker support items with job satisfaction, and Shinn et al. (1989) measured coworker support by interchanging the words "supervisor" and "coworker" into the same items in a measure of social support. Another shortcoming of the coworker literature within the WF field is its overreliance on general support

measures. A large proportion of studies have operationalized coworker support as general emotional and/or instrumental support (e.g., “How much are your coworkers willing to listen to your personal problems?” and “How much can your coworkers be relied on when things get tough at work?”), and have either used one or the other type of support or a combination of both (Dolcos & Daley, 2009; Frone et al., 1997; Major, Fletcher, Davis, & Germano, 2008; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2012; Wang et al., 2010). Although the results of these studies have been promising, there is reason to expect that support that is more specific to the family role will be more useful in navigating the demands of work and family (Kossek et al., 2011; Hammer et al., 2007; 2009; 2013).

Work-Family Supportive Coworkers

Work-family supportive coworkers are defined as those who influence or directly contribute to the success of an employee’s WF integration (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). According to Ajzen’s (1991) principle of compatibility, measures that are specific to the conceptual landscape of focal outcomes may demonstrate improved predictive validity. Within the literature, there are very few instances of research that offer evidence of significant relationships between WF focused support and WF outcomes. Of the little research available, there is an even greater limit on our knowledge pertaining to the specific types of behaviors that employees engage in to provide WF assistance to one another. This limits the practical implications of research in industry, as hardly any prescriptive advice can be given directly to employees on how they can act as a resource in this manner. A literature review revealed the existence of three studies using 3 different measures of WF focused support – two were general in nature (McManus et al., 2002; Thompson & Prottas, 2005) and one was behavioral

(Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010). The general measure of support used by Thompson & Prottas (2005) demonstrated positive relationships with job, family, and life satisfaction, and positive spillover, as well as negative relationships with turnover intentions and both directions of WF conflict. Unfortunately, the measure used by McManus et al. (2002) did not show any significant relationships with their outcome of focus, WF conflict. While it is promising that there is now some evidence of specific actionable means by which coworkers can influence improved WF management, Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2010) focused exclusively on instrumental forms of family support. They also found a small positive relationship between this new construct and WF conflict, which leads to concerns about the measure's predictive validity. It would also be expected that the spectrum of behaviors coworkers engage in is much more expansive than simply task-related, tangible supportive actions. Future research using an expanded behavioural measure is required in order to elucidate the relationship between WF focused coworker support and improved WF management.

WFSCB: Defining a Multidimensional Construct

Recent qualitative inquiry and analysis to conceptualize the construct of WFSCB identified five categories (i.e., dimensions) of specific behavior including: demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life, emotional support, sharing resources and knowledge, proactively developing solutions, and facilitating work adjustments (McMullan, Lapierre, & Li, 2016). We define WFSCB as any action that one or more coworkers can take to facilitate an employee's WF balance. In other words, WFSCB is reflective of an individual's empathy towards a fellow coworker's desire to balance their work and family responsibilities (see also Thomas & Ganster, 1995). These five

dimensions of behavior would be effects that stem from the broader construct of WFSCB. Therefore, these dimensions are hypothesized to be indicators of WFSCB as a superordinate construct (i.e., second order latent factor). In the case of a superordinate construct, all dimensions are expected to share significant conceptual overlap in such a way that the second order factor represents their commonality (Cheung, 2008; Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Johnson, Rosen, & Chang, 2011). Modelled as a higher-order construct, WFSCB could benefit research and practical application by providing an opportunity to examine and understand the construct on two different levels of abstraction (e.g., total score, dimension score). The five dimensions of WFSCB are described in detail below.

Hypothesis 1. WFSCB will be best modeled as a superordinate construct (i.e., second order factor) represented by five dimensions of specific behavior including: demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life, emotional support, sharing resources and knowledge, facilitating work adjustments, and proactively developing solutions. There will be strong correlations between each of the dimensions ($r \geq .50$), with factor loadings of each dimension onto the second-order factor greater than .70, and high internal consistencies within the dimensions ($\alpha \geq .80$; Johnson et al., 2011).

Demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life.

This category of behavior is somewhat unique because it does not appear to have a direct counterpart in the social support literature (e.g., FSSB: Hammer et al., 2009; WF supportive coworkers: McManus et al., 2002; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005; social support: Caplan, 1974, Caplan et al., 1975; Ducharme, Knudsen, & Roman, 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Haynes, Wall, Bolden, Stride, & Rick, 1999; Sloan, 2012; Tang, 1998). Demonstrating that one values non-work life involves

behaviors that convey understanding and encouragement of a coworker's desire to more effectively meet the needs of their home and work life. Many of the behaviors explicitly emphasize the importance of the home domain (e.g., encouraging one to attend to family and personal needs, avoiding disturbing a coworker's family time, and coworker accepts that sometimes family and personal needs take priority), and this includes advocating for a coworker's WF balance when their work is impacting their home life.

Emotional support.

The behaviors identified in this category share similarities with the broader, more general notion of emotionally supportive coworkers who are caring and make themselves available to talk to their coworkers when they are dealing with negative emotions or stressful life events (Beehr & Bhagat, 1985; Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; Caplan et al., 1975). Emotional support that is focused on improved WF balance does involve demonstrating that a coworker is cared for, however, the behaviors identified extend beyond those captured by general emotional support measures (e.g., Caplan et al., 1975; Ducharme et al., 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Haynes et al., 1999; Sloan, 2012; Tang, 1998). The behaviors in this category provide an added level of specificity and focus on both life domains such as, listening to personal issues and struggles meeting work and family demands, being aware of family and personal life commitments, encouraging the stress relief activities of others, sharing stories of similar experiences, and acknowledging a coworker's heavy workload. Taken together, the data that emerged paint a picture of emotional support as a behavioral expression of positive affect towards the coworker, and concern for both their work and family emotional needs.

Sharing resources and knowledge.

This category involves sharing material (e.g., facilitating the provision of work resources while away from the workplace) and knowledge resources (e.g., providing subject matter expertise, providing advice) – whether specific to the work or family realm, or to both. In this manner, the behaviors evoke instrumental support, as receiving this kind of support from a coworker would help one more easily address role demands in an effort to achieve greater balance. The specific behaviors within this category typically occur when the coworker providing support has gone through a similar experience (whether with family or with work), or has knowledge of the coworker's situation, and as a result, is in a position to offer appropriate advice, share relevant resources and/or knowledge, or provide perspective. The key difference between *sharing resources and knowledge* and *facilitating work adjustments* (described below) is that these behaviors involve the coworker receiving support and independently addressing their own work task (e.g., using a coworker's document template) or future need (e.g., applying advice for managing a home demand). Sharing knowledge has been investigated in the general social support (e.g., Caplan et al., 1975) and coworker-provided mentoring (Ensher et al., 2001) literature, but without a focus on managing work and family demands.

Facilitating work adjustments.

This category appears to imply instrumental support and bares some comparison to instrumental support as measured by more broad measures of general coworker support (e.g., Beehr et al., 2000; Caplan et al., 1975; Sloan, 2012). Instrumental support is more reactive and tangible in nature and typically involves a coworker actively contributing to task accomplishment (Beehr & Bhagat, 1985; Beehr et al., 2000; Caplan

et al., 1975). However, the behaviors identified in this category occur when an employee responds to a specific WF issue faced by a coworker. The employee adjusts his or her work-related activities or workload in order to help a coworker better balance work and family. The behaviors involve demonstrating “in the moment” flexibility with work schedules, work location, sharing the workload, and in taking over a coworker’s work tasks.

Proactively developing solutions.

These behaviors are proactive, unlike the behaviors identified in the *facilitating work adjustments* category that are more reactive in nature. Proactively developing solutions involves employees providing forward-thinking suggestions, solutions, or initiatives that will help coworkers to avoid WF challenges. In many cases, the focus of these ideas will be on a broader level and address the needs of many (e.g., the work team, the department, the organization) versus a particular coworker (the focus of *facilitating work adjustments* behaviors). Specific examples include: planning how schedules and workloads could be rearranged to allow coworkers to more effectively manage work and family, suggestions to management to address workload on the team, strategizing upcoming work tasks as a team, and redistributing work based on subject matter expertise. This category resembles the FSSB category of *creative work-family management* identified in measure development research by Hammer et al. (2007; 2009). Hammer’s sub-scale is based on the emerging literature that focuses on dual agendas and organizational strategies to design work that accommodates and supports effectiveness in both work and non-work roles (Bailyn, 2003; Bailyn, Fletcher, & Kolb, 1997; Bailyn &

Harrington, 2004; Kolb & Merrill-Sands, 1999; Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002; Rayman, Bailyn, Dickert, Carré, Harvey, & Krim, 1999).

WFSCB and Work-Family Outcomes

In a meta-analytic investigation, Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) found evidence for coworker support moderating the relationship between work stressors and psychological strains, while also providing support for the direct effects of this resource with regards to the benefits for job involvement, job satisfaction, withdrawal, effort reduction, employee effectiveness, and organizational commitment. Within the occupational stress literature, research findings have been at odds in terms of their support for either the moderating or the direct effects models. The unique quality of this investigation was that the authors followed the matching hypothesis. Simply stated, this means that an individual's specific needs should be matched to the specific type of support available (e.g., workload and instrumental support, reduced WF conflict and family facilitative coworker support). The effectiveness of this hypothesis in detecting significant effects has been validated and recommended by multiple scholars (Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Viswesvaran et al., 1999; Kossek et al., 2011). This hypothesis also appears to be directly in line with Ajzen's principle compatibility theory (1991) – specific measures will be better at predicting specific outcomes, thus providing support for the potential benefits of developing a WF specific measure of coworker support. Furthermore, as a specific contextual resource, WFSCB would arguably be perceived as more directly relevant to a WF integration situation (e.g., threat of long work hours impeding on family time), and as a result, would be more likely to be used to thwart resource loss (e.g., time with family; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). This would ultimately lend to the

increased likelihood that various WF outcomes (e.g., WF balance, WF conflict) would be impacted. Therefore, support that is geared directly towards the improvement of managing work and family responsibilities would likely demonstrate added value in the prediction of WF outcomes over and above general support.

Job-Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory, an extension of the Demands-Control Model (DCM; Karasek, 1979; 1998), is relevant in the explanation of how WF supportive coworker behaviors may influence WF conflict. This theory builds upon DCM by emphasizing the interaction between job demands and job resources with regards to their relationships with job stressors and experienced strain. This particular model acknowledges that there is a wide array of both job demands and resources that differ depending on the particular work role and its accompanying organizational context. Resources are instrumental because they can significantly contribute to individuals' recovery, which is necessary after job demands have drained a person of both energy and time (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). One of the key tenets of JD-R theory is that resources are valuable in and of themselves, as well as in serving a protective function against resource loss. This proponent of the theory sits well under the umbrella of Conservation of Resources theory (COR), which stipulates that individuals strive to gain and maintain resources and when they experience actual or perceived resource loss, as well as the threat of resource loss, a stress reaction is induced (Hobfoll, 1989). Greater access to social supports, such as WF focused coworker support, would help to buffer an individual from the negative impacts of stressors on experienced strain (e.g., burnout). Through resource accumulation, individuals are better equipped to deal with stressors

such as WF conflict. As a result of having access to coworker support, individuals may assess perceived or actual stressors at lower levels. For example, if an individual has a coworker who helps them to cope emotionally with their family demands, they may be less likely to perceive high levels of WF conflict. This is due to the fact that they are well positioned with this psychological resource to better cope with the stressor and thus taper their emotional reaction. In turn, lower levels of experienced WF conflict would lead to lowered levels of experienced strain. Work-family focused coworker support can also directly impact WF conflict. For example, having a coworker provide you with instrumental support at work that is focused on improving one's ability to balance work and family responsibilities (e.g., taking over work tasks so that you can attend to family needs) would allow for more time and energy in the family role, thus reducing or removing the experience of WF conflict.

Hypothesis 2a and 2b: WFSCB will have a significant negative relationship with WF conflict, both work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW).

Positive spillover represents the positive side of the WF interface. WFSCB seems most salient to one form in particular, namely affect-based spillover, where positive emotions experienced at work can spill over to family and vice-versa. Resource gain spirals, a proponent of COR theory, is useful in explaining how social support may contribute to increased WF positive affective spillover. Specifically, coworker support that is WF focused would likely provide personal affective resources (e.g., resilience, positive mood) that could feasibly be beneficial both at work and at home. According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), resources are more likely to be applied across roles when

they have higher relevance to the individual and when there is the perception that the resource will directly contribute to improved functioning in the other role. In this regard, WFSCBs that are aimed at helping to better balance competing role demands could contribute to positive affect experienced in the originating role that would then contribute to increased self-efficacy, motivation, and positive interpersonal interactions in the originating role (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), and these affective gains could spillover to the family (i.e., receiving role). For example, a coworker's suggestion that facilitates efficiencies in the way work gets done could contribute to an individual's experience of positive affect as a result of a sense of accomplishment. The resulting positive mood could then transfer over to the individual's family role. Similarly, many of the WFSCBs are likely to facilitate family needs to be met more readily. The positive mood stemming from successfully fulfilling family demands (e.g., spending needed time with a spouse or children) could then spillover into the work role. Furthermore, as a result of an increase in these psychological resources, an individual may perform better in the receiving role, thus reinforcing the positive spillover cycle. Finally, experiencing positive affect in one role can contribute to the experience of positive general affect that could in turn contribute to positive affect experienced in a second role (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

Hypothesis 3a and 3b: WFSCB will demonstrate a significant positive relationship with work-to-family (WTF affective spillover) and family-to-work (FTW affective spillover) affective positive spillover.

Work-family balance is defined as the feeling of being satisfied and effective in all life roles that are deemed important (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). As conceptualized above, the purpose of WFSCB is to provide support so that fellow coworkers can more

easily fulfil work and family demands. Thus, the more their coworkers engage in WFSCB, the more we would expect employees to experience higher levels of WF balance. Furthermore, given that an individual would likely experience lowered WF conflict and increased WF positive spillover via this resource, and that this should promote feelings of satisfaction and effectiveness in both life roles, enhanced WF balance would be expected.

Hypothesis 4: WFSCB will demonstrate a significant positive relationship with WF balance.

When family and work roles conflict with each other or are out of balance, it can create stress for individuals. Such stress can ultimately lead to less satisfaction with life in a global sense (Wan, Jaccard, & Ramey, 1996). Social support networks are important for avoiding stress and WFSCB should aid individuals in averting some of the stress associated with juggling work and family roles, thus allowing the feeling of being more satisfied with life overall.

Hypothesis 5: WFSCB will demonstrate a significant positive relationship with life satisfaction.

Finally, it is plausible that WFSCB would be more psychologically and functionally useful in helping individuals to avoid stress that results from a lowered ability to effectively manage work and family roles. Support that is content specific and directed at the management of both roles would theoretically serve a greater utility in predicting related WF constructs. In fact, when compared to general forms of supervisor support, extant empirical findings for family-focused supervisor support suggest exactly this (Hammer et al., 2009; 2013; Kossek et al., 2011). Furthermore, when it comes to

detecting stronger correlations between variables, recommendations from measurement research highlights the importance of ensuring there is congruence in the breadth of theoretical space covered by both the predictor and the criterion variable (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Viswesvaran et al., 1999; Hogan & Holland, 2003).

Hypothesis 6: WFSCB will demonstrate an incremental explanation of variance (i.e., incremental validity) in WF outcomes (hypotheses 2-4) and life satisfaction (hypothesis 5) over and above a general measure of coworker support (Caplan et al., 1975).

This research included two studies. In study 1, a sample was collected to explore the factor structure of the WFSCB measure. In study two, the first and second samples were collected in order to further refine and validate the measure.

Study 1: Item Generation and Initial Construct Development

Method

Item development.

In order to identify specific WFSCBs, full transcripts from 22 interviews with employees residing in both Canada and the United States underwent a multi-step content analysis procedure (see Manuscript 1 for more details). The analysis of interview data resulted in the identification of five main categories (i.e., dimensions) of WFSCB, along with several sub-categories of more specific behaviors. The five main categories included: demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life, emotional support, sharing resources and knowledge, facilitating work adjustments, and proactively developing solutions (detailed above). Several WF academics in the field reviewed these

categories of behavior (i.e., the qualitative data) in order to assess preliminary face validity; based on their review, no changes to the categorizations were necessary. Once this review was completed, three subject matter experts (including the author) created an exhaustive list of 52 items to capture specific WFSCBs. The final list included items from all of the subcategories of the five main categories of WFSCB identified from the interview data (see Manuscript 1, Table 1) to ensure that the content of each higher order category was captured effectively.

Card sort.

Twenty-two participants who were 25 years or older and who were married or cohabitating completed a card sort activity. Although selection criteria is not required for card sort activities given it is a cognitive task for participants (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, & Lankau, 1993), the author decided that including these criteria would ensure that participants understood the content of the items. Participants were given a detailed description of each WFSCB category and were then asked to sort each item into the category that they felt best represented the content of the item. They were also given the option of sorting items into the category “not sure.” Item presentation was randomized. Items that did not demonstrate agreement of .70 or above were discarded. Agreement was calculated based on the number of times each item was grouped into its correct category (i.e., the category of behavior it was intended to measure) divided by the total number of responses (22). This resulted in a final list of 39 items across the five categories of WFSCB (see Table 1).

Procedure.

An online questionnaire was distributed and completed by 203 participants in order to conduct item validation and to run an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Participants were recruited via Qualtrics, an online participant pool and survey tool. This service provides a small monetary reward to participants for completing online questionnaires. Several quality checks and attention tests were included in the survey to ensure data came from conscientious participants. The selection criteria required participants to be 25 years or older, speak English as a primary language, be employed full-time (minimum of 30 hours/week; Statistics Canada, 2010), have at least one live-in dependent (school-aged child or elderly person), and have at least one coworker who they work with on a regular basis and who reports to the same manager that they report to most frequently. The Qualtrics participant pool includes a broad sample of individuals across North America and this led to the English language requirement; we needed to ensure that each question would be understood fully. The remaining inclusion criteria were important because this study investigates WF issues and therefore, the researchers needed to maximize the likelihood that participants have faced such issues in their lives. Eligible participants received an email from Qualtrics notifying them that a new questionnaire was available to complete. If the participant self-selected to complete the questionnaire, they were guided to the online study information page where a description of the study and its objectives was detailed, along with all of the pertinent contact and ethics information. If a participant did not meet one of the selection criteria, they were screened out at the beginning of the survey before the survey measure responses were

collected. Participants were informed that by completing the questionnaire they had provided their consent to participate.

Participants.

The average age of the sample was 41.2 years old, 56.7% of the sample was male, 84.7% were married or cohabitating, the average job tenure was 8.6 years, and participants had an average of 2.1 dependents living at home. Participants were employed in a wide range of job families including healthcare practitioners and technical staff, healthcare support staff, office and administrative support, management, education, training and library, business and finance, maintenance and cleaning, arts and entertainment, farming, fishing and forestry, physical and social sciences, sales, construction, computer and mathematical occupations, and transportation. The most popular occupations were as follows: education, training and library (10.3%), business and finance operations (9.9%), healthcare practitioners and technical staff (8.9%), production (7.9%), office and administrative support (7.9%), and architecture and engineering occupations (6.4%).

Measures.

Work-family supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB).

Study developed measure (see Table 1). Participants were instructed to think about how their coworkers (with whom they work with on a regular basis and who report to the same manager that they report to most frequently) may have helped them to better balance their work and family lives. Items were rated on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Analyses and results.

An EFA using a principle axis factor extraction with Oblimin rotation was conducted to determine the factor structure of the WFSCB measure. The best practice recommendation for EFA is to collect data from 5-10 participants for each item in the measure (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007); our sample size is sufficient given the 39 items included. An Oblimin rotation was selected because it allows the extracted factors to correlate with one another, and there was reason to believe that receiving one form of WFSCB would be related to receiving other such forms of support. Multiple criteria were considered when determining how many factors to retain including Kaiser's criteria (Eigenvalues ≥ 1.0), percentage of variance explained, and scree plots (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Widaman, 2012). Five factors were identified. The five factors had eigenvalues of 18.9, 2.1, 1.8, 1.2, and 1.0, and accounted for 64% of the variance. The scree plots were also examined and appear to support a five-factor solution.

The five factors did not all clearly complement the hypothesized five dimensions of WFSCB, with many items developed for a specific category (i.e., factor) cross-loading onto another category. The two clear factors were associated with the WFSCB dimensions *facilitating work adjustments* (factor 2) and *emotional support* (factor 3). It appeared that the majority of *sharing resources and knowledge* and *proactively developing solutions* items loaded consistently onto the same factor – factor 1. Many of the items from the category *demonstrate an understanding of the value of non-work life* loaded onto factor 3 (emotional support) and an unknown fourth factor. It was unclear which WFSCB dimensions were best reflective of factor 4 or factor 5, as both contained

items generated for the dimensions *proactively developing solutions* and *demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life*.

An item-level analysis helped to identify items that did not perform well and items that needed to be reworded to improve clarity. Items were reworded if they demonstrated cross-loadings of .30 or higher, as this would indicate that an item may be simultaneously measuring multiple factors. Items were also reworded if they did not appropriately measure any of the extracted factors (i.e., factor loadings < .40). Based on these guidelines, we reworded three items (i.e., 10, 30, 31) from the *emotional support* category, and four items (i.e., 29, 32, 33, 34) from the category *demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life*. None of the items in the facilitating work adjustments category (i.e., factor 2) were reworded. An exception to the aforementioned guidelines was applied to the items developed for the dimensions *proactively developing solutions* and *sharing knowledge and resources*. The results of the EFA lend to the possibility that the wording of the items in both of these dimensions might have lead participants to believe that items were descriptive of one single category of behavior. As a result, items that were generated to assess both of these dimensions were reworded slightly, with the exception of item 15, to reflect the intended differences between both. Items were reworded in such a way as to highlight the forward-thinking nature of the problem solving involved in *proactively developing solutions*, versus the reactive behaviors involved in *sharing resources and knowledge*. The primary meaning/content of the items was maintained. For example, the item (*sharing resources and knowledge*), “My coworkers give me advice on how to handle challenging situations at work so I can be more effective at home” was reworded to “When I encounter challenging work

responsibilities, my coworkers give me advice I can use so that my work doesn't cause problems for my home life.” The item (*proactively developing solutions*) “My coworkers make suggestions for how our work can be rearranged to better meet team members' work and nonwork demands” was reworded to “My coworkers strategize how our work can be rearranged in the future to better meet individuals' work and family demands.” A *sharing resources and knowledge* item “My coworkers give me advice on how to handle challenging situations at work so I can be more effective at home,” was added (based on the wording of item 3), in order to ensure that both work-to-family and family-to-work focused support of this nature were represented. Finally, two items were deleted. Item 24 was deleted because although it was developed to tap emotional support, it demonstrated a poor factor loading (see Table 1). This item instead demonstrated a relationship with the factor representative of the category *facilitating work adjustments*, however the relationship was not strong enough to warrant keeping the item in the measure (see Table 1)). Item 37 was deleted because it was a poorly performing item and did not load onto any factor ($< .22$). The revised measure was composed of 38 items.

In sum, an exploratory factor analysis provided preliminary evidence for five dimensions of WFSCB, although the grouping of items onto various factors made it difficult to discern the constructs represented by each factor with the exception of facilitating work adjustments and emotional support. The WFSCB dimension *understanding the value of non-work life* had weak support (i.e., poor factor loadings, many cross-loadings) and as a result, several revisions were made to its items. There were also minor changes made to the wording of items developed to assess *facilitating work*

adjustments and proactively developing solutions. Further exploratory analyses were warranted given these changes.

Study 2: Measure Refinement and Validation

An online questionnaire was distributed and completed by 502 participants. The procedure followed and inclusion criteria specified were the same as followed for the EFA in study 1 (see above). Once data collection was finalized, the dataset was randomly divided into two separate samples for measure development purposes; one sample (200 participants) was used for a second EFA and the other (302 participants) was used for a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The research hypotheses (i.e., 1-5) were tested using the original dataset that included data from all 502 participants.

Sample 1: Measure Refinement

The purpose of sample 1 was to further investigate the construct validity of the revised WFSCB measure and refine based on findings from a second EFA. A second EFA was warranted given that many of the original items in the WFSCB measure were reworded based on the EFA results from study 1.

Method.

Participants.

This sample included data from 200 participants. The participants in the sample had an average age of 41.4 years, 50.5% of the sample was male, 84.5% were married or cohabitating, had an average job tenure of 9.3 years, and an average of 2.1 live-in dependents. Participants held occupations in a wide range of job families including healthcare practitioners and technical staff, healthcare support staff, office and administrative support, management, education, training and library, business and

finance, maintenance and cleaning, arts and entertainment, farming, fishing and forestry, physical and social sciences, sales, construction, computer and mathematical occupations, and transportation. The most popular occupations were as follows: education, training and library (12.0%), office and administrative support (12.0%), computer and mathematical (10.5%), business and financial operations (9.5%), management (7.5%), healthcare practitioners and technical (6.5%), construction and extraction occupations (6.0%), and architecture and engineering (5.5%).

Measures.

Work-family supportive coworker behavior (WFSCB).

This 38 item multidimensional scale (see Table 2) included items generated based on five main dimensions of behavior (demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life, emotional support, proactively developing solutions, sharing resources and knowledge, and facilitating work adjustments) that emerged from a previous qualitative study and was revised based the results of a preliminary EFA conducted in study 1. Items were rated on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability for this scale was .97. The reliability of each dimension of the scale was as follows: demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life = .88; emotional support = .92; sharing resources and knowledge = .93; facilitating work adjustments = .94, and proactively developing solutions = .92.

Analyses and results.

A second EFA using a principle axis factor extraction with Oblimin rotation was conducted to determine the factor structure of the WFSCB measure following item revisions. The best practice recommendation for EFA is to collect data from 5-10

participants for each item in the measure (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007); our sample size is sufficient given the 38 items included. An Oblimin rotation was selected because it allows the extracted factors to correlate with one another, and there was reason to believe that receiving one form of WFSCB would be related to receiving other such forms of support. Multiple criteria were considered when determining how many factors to retain including Kaiser's criteria (Eigenvalues ≥ 1.0), percentage of variance explained, and scree plots (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Widaman, 2012). Five factors were identified. The five factors had eigenvalues of 18.6, 2.8, 2.0, 1.5, and 1.0, and accounted for 68% of the variance. The scree plots were also examined and appear to support a four or five-factor solution. The results of this EFA, in combination with the findings from the initial EFA (study 1), provided sufficient evidence to warrant retaining only four factors representative of the superordinate construct of WFSCB. The four dimensions include emotional support, sharing resources and knowledge, facilitating work adjustments, and proactively developing solutions. The decision was made to discard the category demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life because the items did not clearly load onto one common factor in either of the EFAs. Furthermore, in the second EFA the pattern became much clearer, as all of these items loaded onto the factor representative of emotional support (i.e., factor 1; see Table 2) and the correlation between these two factors was strong, $r(198) = .77, p = .000$. Although items in the category demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life were intended to capture behaviors that are directed at helping a coworker fulfill a need in their home life, with an emphasis on the importance of WF balance, it is plausible that participants honed in on an underlying theme reflective of the encouragement of emotional wellbeing. In

other words, respondents did not appear to perceive a distinct difference between the two WFSCB dimensions. For example, “My coworkers encourage me to attend to my family demands/personal needs” (demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life) bares considerable similarity to “My coworkers care about my wellbeing outside of work (emotional support).”

Item Analysis.

In order to evaluate the psychometric properties of the measure and ultimately, to reduce the number of items in the scale, item analysis was conducted. Multiple criteria were used to assess the performance of each item. The psychometric soundness of items within the measure was assessed by evaluating factor loadings ($\geq .40$), communalities ($\geq .30$), and interitem correlations ($\geq .60$) within the same factor/category. Interitem correlations ($\leq .50$) between an item and any items outside of its intended factor/WFSCB category served as an assessment of divergent validity. Items were also considered good if their item total correlation with their intended category was above .60, if Chronbach's alpha if item deleted did not drop more than .03 points, and remained at .70 or higher (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Item difficulties, the percentage of respondents endorsing an item (i.e., agree to strongly agree), were also calculated. To maximize the information the measure provides regarding differences among respondents, it is generally recommended that items be retained if their item difficulty falls within the range of .30 to .70 (Allen & Yen, 2001). The aforementioned analyses resulted in the retention of 16 items from the original 38-item measure that were representative of the WFSCB dimensions of emotional support (5 items, $\alpha = .85$), sharing resources and knowledge (4

items, $\alpha = .87$), facilitating work adjustments (4 items, $\alpha = .89$), and proactively developing solutions (4 items, $\alpha = .88$).

Sample 2: Final Construct Validation

The purpose of sample 2 was twofold. First, the structural validity and psychometric properties of the final revised WFSCB measure was confirmed using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Second, the validity of the final measure was further investigated by testing construct, convergent, and criterion-related validity by comparing the measure to similar constructs (convergent validity), and by investigating its relationship to hypothesized outcome variables (criterion-related validity).

Participants.

An online questionnaire was distributed and completed by 302 participants. The procedure followed and inclusion criteria specified was the same as in study 1 and study 2, sample 1 (see above). The average age of participants was 40.2 years old, 40.4% of the sample was male, 80.8% of the sample was married or cohabitating, with an average job tenure of 14.6 years, and an average of 2.1 live-in dependents. Participants held a wide range of occupations including healthcare practitioners and technical staff, healthcare support staff, office and administrative support, management, education, training and library, business and finance, maintenance and cleaning, arts and entertainment, farming, fishing and forestry, physical and social sciences, sales, construction and extraction, computer and mathematical occupations, and transportation. The most popular occupations were as follows: office and administrative support (12.6%), business and finance operations (11.6%), education, training, and library (11.0%), computer and

mathematics (8.6%), healthcare practitioners and technical staff (6.6%), management (6.3%), architecture and engineering (5.6%), and sales and related (5.6%).

Measures.

Work-family supportive coworker behaviors (WFSCB).

This 16 item multidimensional scale (see Table 3) included items generated based on four main dimensions of behavior (emotional support, sharing resources and knowledge, facilitating work adjustments, and proactively developing solutions) that emerged from a previous qualitative study. This measure was revised based on the results of a preliminary EFA conducted in study 1 and a secondary EFA conducted from study 2, sample 1 data. Items were rated on a Likert scale from 1(strongly disagree) to 5(strongly agree). The reliability for this scale was .94. The reliability of each dimension of the scale was as follows: emotional support = .86; sharing resources and knowledge = .85; facilitating work adjustments = .89; and proactively developing solutions = .90. Overall, when the data was sorted by gender (i.e., male versus female), descriptives (i.e., *M* and *SD*) for each of the WFSCB dimensions were comparable (see Table 6), and the respective internal consistencies were sound ($r \geq .85$; see Table 6), thus lending support to the likelihood that both males and females interpreted (and responded) to the measure items similarly.

Work-life balance.

Greenhaus, Ziegert, & Allen's (2012) five-item measure was used. Participants answered items such as, "I am able to balance the demands of my work and the demands of my family," on a five-point Likert response scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7(strongly agree). The reliability of the scale was .90.

Work-family conflict.

Matthews and colleagues' (2010) six-item measure of WF conflict was used. This scale is a short version based on Carlson et al.'s (2000) measure. The bidirectional subscales include 3 items that tap work interference with family, WIF ($\alpha = .69$) and 3 items that tap family interference with work, FIW ($\alpha = .71$). A sample item is, "I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities." Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1(strongly disagree) to 5(strongly agree).

Positive spillover.

Affective work-to-family (WTF) and family-to-work (FTW) positive spillover was assessed using Hanson, Hammer, and Colton's (2006) measure. Sample items include, "When things are going well at work, my outlook regarding my family life is improved" and "Being happy at home improves my spirits at work." Items were rated on a Likert scale from 1(strongly disagree) to 5(strongly agree). Participants were instructed to think of their own experiences when answering the measure items. The reliability of the work-to-family scale (4 items) was .81 and .90 for the family-to-work scale (4 items).

Satisfaction with life.

We used Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin's (1985) five-item scale. Participants answered on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7(strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha was .90. A sample item is, "In most ways, my life is close to my ideal."

General coworker support.

We measured general coworker support using Caplan et al.'s (1975) scale in order to explore the WFSCB measure's convergent (i.e., moderate to strong correlations; $r \geq$

.40) and incremental validity. The measure includes four items in total: two that assess emotional and two that assess instrumental support. Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items include, “How much do your co-workers go out of their way to do things to make your work life easier for you?” and “How easy is it to talk with your co-workers?” The reliability of this scale was .80.

General family-focused coworker support.

An unpublished four-item scale that includes two items that measure instrumental and two items that measure emotional family supportive coworker behavior was pulled from the Work, Family, and Health Network (WFHN) research project (2016). This scale was used to assess the convergent validity of the WFSCB measure (i.e., moderate to strong correlations; $r \geq .40$), as it is a general family-focused measure of coworker support. Participants answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and were given the following instructions: “Thinking about your coworkers (individuals with whom you work with at least several times a week and who report to the same manager that you report to most frequently) please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements. The word *nonwork* refers to family and personal or free time.” Sample items include, “Your coworkers are willing to listen to your problems in juggling work and nonwork life” and “You can rely on your coworkers to make sure your work responsibilities are handled when you have unanticipated nonwork demands.” The Chronbach’s alpha for this scale was .88.

Analyses and results.

A hierarchical CFA was conducted on data from 302 participants to confirm the validity of WFSCB as a superordinate construct (i.e., second-order factor model) represented by the dimensions emotional support, sharing resources and knowledge, facilitating work adjustments, and proactively developing solutions. It is generally advised that a minimum of 300 participants is an appropriate sample size to conduct a CFA (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). A multi-step analysis was undertaken wherein five statistical models were specified in five separate analyses using AMOS. This stepped procedure was necessary in order to provide sound evidence that WFSCB, as a superordinate construct, is a superior conceptual organization as compared to a first-order model with inter-related dimensions.

To begin, a unidimensional first-order factor model was specified to test for the multidimensionality of WFSCB. The hypothesis, that one first-order factor accounts for the variance among all 16 indicators, was not supported ($\chi^2 = 904.45$, $df = 104$; $\chi^2/df = 8.7$; RMSEA = .16; CFI = .77; TLI = .74), thus suggesting that the indicators do not load onto a single factor. The second model specified multiple first-order factors representative of each of the four dimensions of WFSCB (i.e., a baseline model; interrelated dimensions) and directly tested the dimensionality and convergent validity of WFSCB as a superordinate construct (Wright, Campbell, Thatcher, & Roberts, 2012). This second model ($\chi^2 = 301.82$, $df = 98$; $\chi^2/df = 3.1$; RMSEA = .08; CFI = .94; TLI = .93) was a stronger fit than model 1, indicating that a multidimensional model consisting of four freely correlated first-order factors is superior to a unidimensional model with one first-order factor.

Given that the multidimensionality of the WFSCB measure had been confirmed, the final three models were run to detail the path diagram and to investigate the internal consistency and reliability of a second-order (i.e., superordinate) factor model. The third model, a parallel model, was the most restrictive of the five models, as the four dimensions are modelled with equal loadings and equal residual variances (Graham, 2006; Wright et al., 2012). This model demonstrated an adequate fit ($\chi^2 = 344.89$, $df = 106$; $\chi^2/df = 3.3$; RMSEA = .09; CFI = .93; TLI = .92). The fourth model, the tau equivalent measurement model, is less restrictive than the previous model, as the residual variances of the four dimensions are free to vary. This model is commonly used to test the internal consistency of a superordinate measure (Graham, 2006), and demonstrated a good fit ($\chi^2 = 320.35$, $df = 103$; $\chi^2/df = 3.1$; RMSEA = .08; CFI = .94; TLI = .93) that was superior to the parallel model (i.e., model three). The final model, the congeneric model, is the least restrictive of the superordinate measurement models, as it allows the factor loadings and residual variances of the four dimensions to freely vary. This fifth model demonstrated an adequate fit ($\chi^2 = 315.24$, $df = 100$; $\chi^2/df = 3.2$; RMSEA = .09; CFI = .94; TLI = .93) and was comparable to the statistics reported for model four. The tau equivalent model demonstrated the superior fit, as compared to the parallel and congeneric models. Therefore, the descriptive statistics and factor loadings from this model were further investigated and reported in Table 3, as best practice recommends (Graham, 2006). The factor loadings of each dimension are recommended to be equal to or greater than .70, with high internal consistencies equal to or greater than .80 (Johnson, Rosen, & Chang, 2011). These criteria were satisfied, as all factor loadings were .75 and

each dimension had an alpha > .80 (see Measures section above). Taken together, these findings support the use of a single WFSCB scale total score.

WFSCB validity.

In order to test the convergent, criterion-related, and incremental validity of the WFSCB measure, the data from samples 1 and 2 were combined, resulting in a total sample size of 502. The sample was 44.4% male, participants were an average of 40.6 years old, had an average job tenure of 12.5 years, 82.3% were married or cohabitating and had an average of 2.1 live-in dependents. Participants held a diverse range of occupations across various job families including office and administrative support (12.4%), education, training and library (11.2%), business and finance operations (10.6%), computer and mathematics (9.4%), management (6.8%), healthcare practitioners and technical staff (6.6%), architecture and engineering (5.6%), and sales and related (5.4%) occupations.

Convergent validity.

In order to test the convergent validity of the new measure, total scale scores and dimension scores for the WFSCB measure were correlated with the scores for Caplan et al.'s (1975) measure of general coworker support, and the WFHN (2016) measure of instrumental and emotional family-focused coworker support. The correlations between the WFSCB measure and both general coworker support ($r[500] = .74, p < .01$) and general family-focused coworker support ($r[500] = .83, p < .01$) were strong (see Table 4), suggesting significant conceptual overlap and thus, indicate that the measure demonstrates convergent validity. There were also strong correlations between the

WFSCB dimensions and both general coworker support and general family-focused coworker support (see Table 4).

Criterion-related validity.

In order to test the criterion-related validity of the measure, a regression analysis was run with WFSCB total scores used as predictors of important WF and general wellbeing outcomes including: WF balance, WF conflict, WF affective positive spillover, and life satisfaction (see Table 5). WFSCB was significantly positively related to WF balance ($\beta = .21, p = .000$), WTF affective spillover ($\beta = .20, p < .01$), FTW affective spillover ($\beta = .31, p = .000$), and life satisfaction ($\beta = .33, p = .000$), and significantly negatively related to WIF ($\beta = -.18, p < .01$). WFSCB was not significantly negatively related to FIW ($\beta = .04, p > .05$). Thus, hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 were fully supported and hypothesis 1 was partially supported given that the findings for the relationship between WFSCB and FIW were non-significant.

Incremental Validity.

Incremental validity was tested by assessing whether or not the WFSCB measure explained a unique proportion of variance in all of the outcome measures (listed above) over and above that which was explained by general coworker support (Caplan et al., 1975; see Table 5). A hierarchical regression analysis was run to test this hypothesis. In step 1 of the analysis, the general coworker support measure was entered into the model in order to control for its effects, and in step 2, the WFSCB measure was added. WFSCB was significantly positively related to WF balance ($\beta = .24, p = .000$), WTF affective spillover ($\beta = .21, p < .01$), FTW affective spillover ($\beta = .30, p = .000$), and life satisfaction ($\beta = .35, p = .000$), and significantly negatively related to WIF ($\beta = -.16, p <$

.05) over and above general coworker support. WFSCB was not significantly negatively related to FIW ($\beta = .11, p > .05$) over and above general coworker support.

Discussion

The central aim of this research was to provide greater insight into specific actions that coworkers can take to help each other more effectively manage the WF interface. In order to do so, we built upon previous qualitative findings (McMullan, Lapierre, & Li, 2016) to develop and validate a measure of WFSCB. The construct, content, criterion-related, and incremental validity of this measure was assessed, resulting in a 16-item measure representative of a superordinate construct with four dimensions of behavior including: emotional support, sharing resources and knowledge, facilitating work adjustments, and proactively developing solutions. This research provides evidence supporting the existence of WFSCB and suggests that having coworkers who display such behaviors not only makes it easier for employees to balance their work and home demands and to avoid work interference with family, but also aids with positive affective spillover from one role to the other, as well as enhanced overall life satisfaction. These benefits of WFSCB held true over and above general coworker support, thus highlighting the utility of a WF focused measure of support.

Our findings with regards to significant relationships between WFSCB and WF balance and both directions of WF positive spillover, as compared to the lack of a significant finding for FIW, are in keeping with recent theorizing on the WF interface. Ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) have argued that the benefits of social support are more relevant to resource gain spirals (underlying WF positive spillover) than they are to resource loss spirals (underlying WF conflict). This argumentation was empirically

supported in a recent meta-analysis conducted by Lapierre, Li, Shao, and DiRenzo (2016) that found that social support was more strongly associated with increases in spillover than with reductions in conflict. As operationalized in our measure, WFSCB could be more salient to resource gain by providing the means to fulfil both work and family needs, and although helpful, it is possible that such behavior does not thwart the potential for FIW. Furthermore, the absence of significant findings for the unique contribution of WFSCB in explaining FIW suggests that coworkers may not be well positioned to provide support that would directly help employees manage their family role in such a way as to avoid encroachment upon work obligations. This finding is plausible given the fact that coworkers are more privy to each other's work situation and issues, and thus, would be in a better position to offer supportive action most salient to managing the work role versus the family role. This is also consistent with meta-analytic evidence showing that general coworker support is more highly related to WIF than it is to FIW (Michel et al., 2011). Further research is warranted in order to provide a stronger understanding of the true relationship between WFSCB and WF conflict.

By placing an emphasis on behaviors that are focused on helping employees to better manage both their work and family demands, our WFSCB measure extends well beyond traditional measures of coworker support that tap general emotional and instrumental support (e.g., Beehr et al., 2000; Caplan et al., 1975; Ducharme, Knudsen, & Roman, 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Sloan, 2012; Tang, 1998). Furthermore, our measure demonstrates that coworkers can help one another not only by providing support that is instrumental and emotional in nature, but also by proactively engaging in solution

development aimed at solving one another's WF management issues, similar to what research on WF supportive supervisors has demonstrated (Hammer et al., 2009).

Practical implications.

Formal policies have shown mixed success with respect to their influence on work-family outcomes, and are also not always available or feasible (Kelly et al., 2008). Therefore, informal methods of providing WF support are necessary in order to maintain the resilience of the workforce. Given that WFSCB, as a superordinate construct, provides researchers and practitioners with the opportunity to extract meaning on two different levels, any findings based on the use of this measure could be quite beneficial within the organizational context. For example, generation of a total score for WFSCB could be indicative of the level of WF-focused support overall that employees experience and could ultimately hint towards the existence (or lack thereof) of a WF supportive culture. Another avenue would be to interpret levels of the specific dimensions of WFSCB as indicative of the specific forms of support present or lacking within a team, department, or organization. This type of insight could inform policy development or future operational practices that might encourage employees to engage more in certain behaviors. For example, flattening the formal hierarchy (i.e., levels of authority) within an organization so that employees would have increased autonomy over how and when they do their work could open up the potential for more behaviors observed in the dimension *proactively developing solutions*.

Our results may help to inform organizational practices aimed at informally helping employees better manage work and family demands by providing examples of behaviors that coworkers can engage in to help one another better manage the intersection

of their work and family roles. In today's competitive business environment, organizations must implement new strategies for meeting the needs of their changing workforce. As more team-based work strategies begin to be adopted by organizations, coworkers and their positive influence on each other's health and productivity has become increasingly important. Based on the findings of the present study, organizations should be taking steps to encourage WFSCBs in order to aid their employees in the management of competing work and family demands.

Limitations & future research.

There are several strengths to the scale development and validation process that was employed in this research program. To begin, the research involved four samples and as a result, provides a thorough investigation into the nature of WFSCB. At the outset, we followed best practice recommendations to ensure the content validity of the inductively generated measure items by conducting a card sort activity and making refinements prior to full-scale data collection. Furthermore, the underlying structure of WFSCB emerged through an iterative process based on two EFAs using two independent samples. A third sample was used to confirm the superordinate factor structure of the measure. Another strength of this research was that the data was collected from a North American sample across various industries and as a result, the measure and its predictive validity is more likely to be applicable across various organization and job types.

Despite the methodological rigour highlighted above, this research was not without its limitations. First, we employed the use of cross-sectional data, which precludes causal conclusions from being drawn. Future longitudinal research could be helpful in providing evidence of whether WFSCB truly leads to improved WF outcomes.

Scholars are also urged to re-examine our hypotheses with various samples, across a variety of countries, in order to more confidently conclude on their validity. For example, there may be differences in the specific types of WFSCBs that are displayed by employees in individualist versus collectivist cultures. Research suggests that in some Asian countries several of the specific WFSCBs identified in our research may be frowned upon or even prohibited in the workplace (Taylor, Welch, Kim, & Sherman, 2007; Yoon & Lim, 1999). Given that expressing emotions is in many cases considered unacceptable, emotionally supportive WFSCBs, such as talking about shared experiences at work and talking to coworkers about stresses balancing work and family demands, may not be enacted by employees. By extension, in order for coworkers to engage in many of the behaviors observed in the category *sharing resources and knowledge*, individuals would most likely have to discuss their struggles with work or family to some extent (McMullan, Lapierre, & Li, 2016). Thereby, upholding collectivistic cultural norms could feasibly contribute to a reduction in the provision of this type of support amongst coworkers. In regards to the nuanced relationship between WFSCB and the various dimensions of WF conflict, the short measure used in the current research did not allow for specific hypotheses to be generated and tested in relation to time, strain, and behavior-based conflict. It is expected that the WFSCB measure would demonstrate a significant negative relationship with all three dimensions of conflict. For example, *sharing resources and knowledge* behaviors geared towards the work domain could lead to the adoption of similar behaviors in the home domain, and vice versa. The behaviors identified in *facilitating work adjustments*, *sharing resources and knowledge*, and *proactively developing solutions* could quite feasibly alleviate time and strain-based

conflict work-to-family conflict, and finally, *emotional support* could likely alleviate both directions of strain-based WF conflict. Finally, we also encourage scholars to examine situational factors that may moderate the degree to which WFSCB relates to various outcomes. For example, the number of coworkers who engage in WFSCB may enhance the benefits to WF affective positive spillover, WF conflict, or WF balance. Such knowledge would be instrumental in understanding how the benefits of WFSCB can be maximized.

Conclusion.

Overall, this study resulted in the development of a sound measure of WFSCB and provides compelling initial evidence of the potential value of having coworkers engage in such behaviors. We have shown that these specific types of coworker behavior may provide benefits beyond what emotional and/or instrumental support may offer. Our findings suggest that employees can act in a variety of ways to improve one another's experience of WF conflict, WF positive affective spillover, WF balance, and life satisfaction. The findings presented also provide further practical guidance on how coworkers can specifically contribute to a family-supportive work environment.

References

- Ahmad, A., & Omar, Z. (2010). Perceived family-supportive work culture, affective commitment and turnover intention of employees. *Journal of American Science*, 6(12), 839-846.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265511124_Perceived_Family-Supportive_Work_Culture_Affective_Commitment_and_Turnover_Intention_of_Employees
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 414-435.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1774>
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278-308. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.5.2.278>
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–Family Conflict and Flexible Work Arrangements: Deconstructing Flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 345-376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012>
- Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. (2009). Flexible work arrangements: Help or hype? In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary*

Perspectives (pp. 265-284). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

<https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.47-4737>

Allen, M. J., & Yen, W. M. (2001). *Introduction to measurement theory*. Longrove, Illinois: Waveland Press.

https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=MNUpY_csc6cC&oi=fnd&pg=PR1&dq=Introduction+to+measurement+theory&ots=ynYrWmoUPf&sig=BhP8zA0KH6n3taM9SBCvwcx5GEY#v=onepage&q=Introduction%20to%20measurement%20theory&f=false

Anderson, S., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28, 787-810. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-2063\(02\)00190-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-2063(02)00190-3)

Appelbaum, S. H., Bethune, M., & Tannenbaum, R. (1999). Downsizing and the emergence of self-managed teams. *Participation and Empowerment: An International Journal*, 7(5), 109-130.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/14634449910287837>

Aumann, K., & Galinsky, E. (2009). *The state of health in the American workforce: Does having an effective workplace matter?* New York, NY: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved from

http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/HealthReport_9_11.pdf

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/259305>

- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(2), 137-153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00008>
- Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Kolb, D. (1997). Unexpected connections: Considering employees' personal lives can revitalize your business. *Sloan Management Review*, 38(4), 11-19. <http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1034&context=advance>
- Bailyn, L., & Harrington, M. (2004). Redesigning work for work-family integration. *Community, Work & Family*, 7(2), 197-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1366880042000245470>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83-104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>
- Beehr, T. A. and Bhagat, R. S. (1985). Introduction to human stress and cognition in organizations. In T. A. Beehr & R.S. Bhagat, (Eds.), *Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations* (pp. 3-19). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Beehr, T. A., Farmer, S. J., Glazer, S., Gudanowski, D. M., & Nair, V. N. (2003). The enigma of social support and occupational stress: source congruence and gender role effects. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(3), 220.

- <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.3.220>
- Beehr, T.A., Jex, S.M., Stacy, B.A., Murray, M.A., (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21, 391–405. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1379\(200006\)21:4%3C391::aid-job15%3E3.3.co;2-0](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(200006)21:4%3C391::aid-job15%3E3.3.co;2-0)
- Behson, S. J. (2002). Coping with family-to-work conflict: The role of informal work accommodations to family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7, 324-341. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.7.4.324>
- Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work–family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(3), 487-500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.02.004>
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(2), 169-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.009>
- Caplan, G. (1974). Support systems and community mental health. New York: Behavioral Publications. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/ps.25.10.682-a>
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V., & Pinneau, S. R. (1975). *Job demands and worker health*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work–family interface: Development and validation of a work–family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(1), 131-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002>

- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249-276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713>
- Cascio, W. (1998). *Applied psychology in human resources management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. <https://www.pearsonhighered.com/program/Cascio-Applied-Psychology-in-Human-Resource-Management-7th-Edition/PGM248374.html>
- Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.28>
- Cassel, J. (1976). The contribution of the social environment to host resistance. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 104, 107-123. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112281>
- Cheung, G. W. (2008). Testing equivalence in the structure, means, and variances of higher-order constructs with structural equation modeling. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(3), 593-613. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1094428106298973>
- Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1082>
- Clark, S. C. (2001). Work cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 348-365. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1759>

- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Devine, D. J., Clayton, L. D., Philips, J. L., Dunford, B. B., & Melner, S. B. (1999). Teams in organizations: Prevalence, characteristics, and effectiveness. *Small Group Research*, 30(6), 678-711. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104649649903000602>
- Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/t01069-000>
- Dolcos, S. M., & Daley, D. (2009). Work pressure, workplace social resources, and work-family conflict: The tale of two sectors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 16(4), 291-311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017319>
- Ducharme, L. J., Knudsen, H. K., & Roman, P. M. (2007). Emotional exhaustion and turnover intention in human service occupations: The protective role of coworker support. *Sociological Spectrum*, 28(1), 81-104.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02732170701675268>
- Ducharme, L. J., & Martin, J. K. (2000). Unrewarding work, coworker support, and job satisfaction: A test of the buffering hypothesis. *Work and Occupations*, 27(2), 223-243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02732170701675268>
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(1), 124-197.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003>

- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person–environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 85–129.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1998.2813>
- Ensign, P. C. (1998). Interdependence, coordination, and structure in complex organizations: Implications for organizational design. *Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*, 34, 5-22.
<http://search.proquest.com/openview/f1f6323691b552ffaae1939d55cb85e8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=24292>
- Ensher, E. A., Thomas, C., & Murphy, S. E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on protégés' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(3), 419-438. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25092732>
- Erickson, J. J., Martinengo, G., & Hill, E. J. (2010). Putting work and family experiences in context: Differences by family life stage. *Human Relations*, 63, 955-979.
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0018726709353138>
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 145-167. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577>
- Gordon, J. (1992). Work teams: How far have they come? *Training*, 29, 59-65.
- Golden, T. D., Veiga, J. F., & Simsek, Z. (2006). Telecommuting's differential impact on work-family conflict: Is there no place like home? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1340-1350. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1340>

- Graham, J. M. (2006). Congeneric and (essentially) tau-equivalent estimates of score reliability, what they are, and how to use them. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(6), 930-944. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164406288165>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. Campbell Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (p. 165-183). Chicago, USA: American Psychological Association. <https://monash.rl.talis.com/items/2D23ACC4-3A6C-3E56-4805-C9C9763D15FA.html>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. D. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work-family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 266-275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008>
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Family, work, work-family spillover, and problem drinking during midlife. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(2), 336-348. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00336.x>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the family supportive supervisor behavior short-form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032612>

- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 35(4), 837-856.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308328510>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Zimmerman, K., & Daniels, R. (2007). Clarifying the construct of family-supportive supervisory behaviors (FSSB): A multilevel perspective. *Research in Occupational Stress and Wellbeing*, 6, 165-204.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s1479-3555\(06\)06005-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1479-3555(06)06005-7)
- Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., Newsom, J. T., Brockwood, K. J., & Colton, C. L. (2005). A longitudinal study of the effects of dual-earner couples' utilization of family-friendly workplace supports on work and family outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 799-810. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.799>
- Hammer, L. B., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Quality of work life. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology Vol.3: Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 391-431). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-000>
- Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., & Colton, C.L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(3), 249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t13087-000>
- Haynes, C. E., Wall, T. D., Bolden, R. I., Stride, C., & Rick, J. E. (1999). Measures of perceived work characteristics for health services research: Test of a measurement model and normative data. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 4(3), 257-275.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/135910799168614>

- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.44.3.513>
- Hoganson, C. (2011). Work and life: The balancing act: The Conference Board of Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=4506>
- Hopkins, K. (2005). Supervisor support and work-life integration: A social identity perspective. In E. E. Kossek (Ed.), *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp. 445-467). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2004-21246-020>
- Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Chang, C. H. (2011). To aggregate or not to aggregate: Steps for developing and validating higher-order multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 241-248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9238-1>
- Karasek, R. (1998). Demand/control model: A social, emotional, and physiological approach to stress risk and active behaviour development. *Encyclopedia of Occupational Health and Safety*, 2, 34-6. <http://www.iloencyclopaedia.org/component/k2/item/12-psychosocial-factors-stress-and-health>
- Karasek Jr, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 285-308. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498>
- Kelly, E. L., Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Durham, M., Bray, J., Chermack, K., ... &

- Kaskubar, D. (2008). Getting There from Here: Research on the Effects of Work–Family Initiatives on Work–Family Conflict and Business Outcomes. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 305-349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211610>
- Kolb, D. M., & Merrill-Sands, D. (1999). Waiting for outcomes: Anchoring a dual agenda for change to cultural assumptions. *Women in Management Review (Women in Management: An International Journal)*, 14(5), 194-203. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649429910281989>
- Kossek, E. E., Lewis, S., & Hammer, L. B. (2009). Work–life initiatives and organizational change: Overcoming mixed messages to move from the margin to the mainstream. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709352385>
- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 289-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
- Kossek, E., Pichler, S., Hammer, L., & Bodner, T. (2007). Contextualizing workplace supports for family: An integrative meta-analysis of direct and moderating linkages to work-family conflict. In *National Meetings of the Society of Industrial & Organizational Psychology, Symposium Social Support, Leadership, & Work Outcomes*.
- Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T. D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping:

- implications for work-family conflict and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(2), 169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.2.169>
- Lapierre, L. M., Li, Y., Shao, P., & DiRenzo, M. (2016). A meta-analysis of the antecedents of work-family enrichment. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, California.
- Lapierre, L. M., van Steenbergen, E. F., Peeters, M. C. W., & Kluwer, E. S. (2016). Juggling work and family responsibilities when involuntarily working more from home: A multi-wave study of financial sales professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, 804-822. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2075>
- LaRocco, J. M., & Jones, A. P. (1978). Coworker and leader support as moderators of stress-strain relationships in work situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 629-634. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.63.5.629>
- Major, D. A., Fletcher, T. D., Davis, D. D., & Germano, L. M. (2008). The influence of work-family culture and workplace relationships on work interference with family: A multilevel model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(7), 881-897. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.502>
- Marshall, K. (2009). *The family work week*. (75-001-X). Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/sr.html?cdn=canada&st=s&num=10&langs=en&st1rt=1&s5bm3ts21rch=x&q=The+family+work+week.+&_charset_=UTF-8&wb-srch-sub=

- Masuda, A. D., Poelmans, S. A., Allen, T. D., Spector, P. E., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., ... & Lu, L. (2012). Flexible work arrangements availability and their relationship with work- to- family conflict, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison of three country clusters. *Applied psychology*, 61(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00453.x>
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410-476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316061>
- Matthews, R. A., Bulger, C. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Work social supports, role stressors, and work-family conflict: The moderating effect of age. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(1), 78-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.011>
- Matthews, R. A., Kath, L. M., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). A short, valid, predictive measure of work-family conflict: Item selection and scale validation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(1), 75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017443>
- Metz, I. (2011). Women leave work because of family responsibilities: Fact or fiction? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 49(3), 285-307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1038411111413216>
- McManus, K., Korabik, K., Rosin, H. M., & Kelloway, E. (2002). Employed mothers and the work-family interface: Does family structure matter? *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1295-1324. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055011919>
- McMullan, A.D., Lapierre, L.M., & Li, Y. (2016). A qualitative investigation of work-family supportive coworker behaviors. *Proceedings of the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology*.

- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., Murase, T., DeChurch, L. A., & Jimenez, M. (2010). Coworker informal work accommodations to family: Scale development and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 70*(3), 511-531. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164409355687>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2006). How family-friendly work environments affect work/family conflict: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Labor Research, 4*, 555-574. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-006-1020-1>
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(5), 689-725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(6), 1321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>
- O'Driscoll, M. P., Poelmans, S., Spector, P. E., Kalliath, T., Allen, T. D., Cooper, C. L., et al. (2003). Family-responsive interventions, perceived organizational and supervisor support, work-family conflict, and psychological strain. *International Journal of Stress Management, 21*(4), 326-344. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137309341.0022>
- Pedersen, D. E., & Minnotte, K. L. (2012). Self- and spouse-reported work-family conflict and dual-earners' job satisfaction. *Marriage & Family Review, 48*(3), 272-292. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2012.665015>
- Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Pruitt, B. H. (2002). *Beyond work-family*

- balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.39-5897>
- Ray, E. B., & Miller, K. I. (1994). Social support, home/work stress, and burnout: Who can help? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 30, 357-373.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886394303007>
- Rayman, P. M., Bailyn, L., Dickert, J., Carré, F., Harvey, M. A., Krim, R., et al. (1999). Designing organizational solutions to integrate work and life. *Women in Management Review (Women in Management: An International Journal)*, 14, 164-176. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649429910281934>
- Roth, L. M. (2007). Women on Wall Street: Despite diversity measures, Wall Street remains vulnerable to sex discrimination charges. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 24-35. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2007.24286162>
- Salas, E., Burke, C. S., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2000). Teamwork: emerging principles. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(4), 339-356.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00046>
- Schriesheim, C.A. & Hinkin, T.R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55, 246-257.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.3.246>
- Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of

- paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management*, 79, 385-417.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063\(93\)90058-u](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063(93)90058-u)
- Shinn, M., Wong, N. W., Simko, P. A., & Ortiz-Torres, B. (1989). Promoting the wellbeing of working parents: Coping, social support, and flexible job schedules. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17(1), 31-55.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00931201>
- Silver, H., & Goldscheider, F. (1994). Flexible work and housework: Work and family constraints on women's domestic labor. *Social Forces*, 72(4), 1103-1119.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/72.4.1103>
- Sloan, M. M. (2012). Unfair treatment in the workplace and worker well-being: The role of coworker support in a service work environment. *Work and Occupations*, 31(1), 3-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406555>
- Statistics Canada. (2010, June 21). Classification of Full-time and Part-Time Work Hours. Retrieved March 2, 2015 from
<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/concepts/definitions/labour-travail-class03b-eng.htm>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th edition). Needham Height, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tang, H. K. (1998). An inventory of organizational innovativeness. *Technovation*, 19(1), 41-51. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4972\(98\)00077-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4972(98)00077-7)
- Taylor, S. E., Welch, W. T., Kim, H. S., & Sherman, D. K. (2007). Cultural differences in the impact of social support on psychological and biological stress responses. *Psychological Science*, 18(9), 831-837. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01987.x>

- ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work–home interface: The work-home resources model. *American Psychologist*, 67, 545-556. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027974>
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.80.1.6>
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(3), 392-415. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1681>
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.80.1.6>
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2005). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 100-118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.100>
- Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The Role of Social Support in the Process of Work Stress: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 314-334. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1661>
- Wan, C. K., Jaccard, J., & Ramey, S. L. (1996). The relationship between social support and life satisfaction as a function of family structure. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 502-513. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353513>

- Wang, M., Liu, S., Zhan, Y., & Shi, J. (2010). Daily work-family conflict and alcohol use: Testing the cross-level moderation effects of peer drinking norms and social support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 377-386. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018138>
- Widaman, K. (2012). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In H. Cooper, P.M. Camic, D.L. Long, A.T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K.J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 3: Data analysis and research publication* (pp. 361-389). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13621-018>
- Work From Home Network: Families and Work Institute. (2016). *Employee Workplace Measures Book*. Retrieved from http://projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/wfhn/files/20160126_em_measures_book.pdf?m=1453851091
- Wright, R. T., Campbell, D. E., Thatcher, J. B., & Roberts, N. (2012). Operationalizing multidimensional constructs in structural equation modeling: Recommendations for IS research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 30(1), 367-412. <http://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3665&context=cais>
- Yoon, J., & Lim, J. C. (1999). Organizational support in the workplace: The case of Korean hospital employees. *Human Relations*, 52(7), 923-945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679905200704>

Table 1

Study 1 EFA Results

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1. My coworkers give me advice on how to handle challenging situations at work so I can be more effective at home.*	.73				
2. My coworkers are happy to share their knowledge or resources to help me better juggle my work and nonwork demands.*	.67				
3. My coworkers give me advice on how to handle challenging situations at home so I can be more effective at work.	.61				
4. My coworkers make suggestions for how our work can be rearranged to better meet team members' work and nonwork demands.*	.60				
5. My coworkers help me to meet work or family needs/obligations more effectively by sharing their experiences and knowledge.*	.59				
6. My coworkers make suggestions to management (for example, our supervisor) on how to improve the effectiveness of our team so that our work and nonwork needs can be met.*	.56				
7. I can go to my coworkers to seek information and resources when I need help in more effectively meeting work or nonwork needs.*	.55				
8. My coworkers are a sound source of advice on how to better meet work or nonwork needs/obligations.*	.54				
9. My coworkers are willing to share their knowledge or resources with me to help make my life easier.*	.50				
10. My coworkers reassure me that I am on the right path when I doubt whether I am effectively meeting my work or nonwork needs/obligations.*	.50				

11. My coworkers make suggestions to management (for example, our supervisor) to help solve our team's workload issues.*	.49	
12. My coworkers and I work as a team to solve workload issues that may impact our nonwork lives.*	.42	
13. My coworkers strategize upcoming work tasks as a team to better accommodate people's work and nonwork demands.*	.40	
14. My coworkers encourage me to avoid stress in my life.*	.37	
15. My coworkers and I plan ahead to ensure both work and nonwork needs can be met effectively.	.35	
16. If I need to be absent from work to attend to a nonwork demand, I can count on my coworkers to share my workload.*		-.84
17. My coworkers will take over my regular work responsibilities when a nonwork demand requires me to be absent.*		-.84
18. My coworkers will adjust their work schedule (for example, come in early or stay later) if I need to attend to a nonwork demand.*		-.73
19. If I need to be absent from work to attend to a nonwork demand, I can count on my coworkers to take over for me.*		-.72
20. My coworkers and I share the workload when I have a nonwork demand that conflicts with my ability to meet all of my work responsibilities.*		-.65
21. My coworkers are willing to adjust their work schedule when I have a nonwork demand come up.*		-.57
22. My coworkers are willing to make adjustments in how the work gets done when a nonwork demand requires me to work from an alternate location.*		-.48
23. My coworkers are willing to accommodate me when a nonwork demand requires me to work remotely (for example, at home).*		-.40

24. When I am feeling overwhelmed with work or nonwork, my coworkers let me know that they are available to help me if I need it.**	-.37	
25. My coworkers make an effort to learn about my personal life.		.60
26. My coworkers and I can talk about similar experiences in our home and/or work lives.		.54
27. My coworkers care about my wellbeing outside of work.		.52
28. I can talk to my coworkers about my struggles juggling work and nonwork life.		.51
29. My coworkers understand when a nonwork need takes priority over my work.*		.43
30. My coworkers are a comforting source when I am feeling overwhelmed about work and/or nonwork demands.*		.39
31. I can talk to my coworkers when I am feeling stressed about effectively meeting my work or nonwork needs/obligations.*		.37
32. My coworkers defend my efforts to balance my work and nonwork demands.*		.32
33. My coworkers make an effort to balance their own work and nonwork demands/needs.*		.69
34. My coworkers share the value I place on making an effort to balance my work and nonwork demands/needs.*		.45
35. My coworkers and I strategize ways to reorganize our work so that we can be more effective in the future.		.44

36. My coworkers offer useful suggestions to optimize our team's time at work.	.44	
37. My coworkers try to avoid contacting me about work issues during my personal time.**	.22	
38. My coworkers let others at work know that it is important to balance work and nonwork demands.		.56
39. My coworkers encourage me to attend to my nonwork demands/needs.		.40

N = 203. * = reworded item; ** = deleted item.

Table 2

Study 2, Sample 1, EFA Results

Item	Factor 1: Emotional Support	Factor 2: Facilitating Work Adjustments	Factor 3: Sharing Resources and Knowledge	Factor 4: Proactively Developing Solutions
1. Emotion 5. I can talk to my coworkers when I am feeling stressed about balancing my work and family demands.	.72			
2. Emotion 6. I can talk to my coworkers about my struggles juggling work and family life.	.70			
3. Emotion 3. My coworkers make an effort to learn about my personal life.	.69			
4. Emotion 7. My coworkers are a source of comfort when I am feeling overwhelmed about my work or family life.	.68			
5. Emotion 8. My coworkers and I can talk about similar experiences in our work and/or home lives.	.65			
6. Emotion 2. My coworkers care about my wellbeing outside of work.	.64			
7. Emotion 9. My coworkers reassure me when I am having doubts about my ability to meet the demands of my work and/or family life.	.62			
8. Value nonwork 7. My coworkers encourage me to attend to my family demands/personal needs.	.54			
9. Value nonwork 3. My coworkers think that it is important to balance work and family demands.	.52			
10. Value nonwork 1. My coworkers share the value I place on balancing my work and my family.	.51			
11. Value nonwork 6. My coworkers respect my personal time (for example, my time away from the office).	.47			

12. Emotion 4. My coworkers encourage me to avoid stress in my life.	.46	
13. Facilitate 5. If I need to be absent from work to attend to a family demand, I can count on my coworkers to share my workload.		.89
14. Facilitate 7. My coworkers will take over my regular work responsibilities when a family demand requires me to be		.87
15. Facilitate 3. If I need to be absent from work to attend to a family demand, I can count on my coworkers to take over for me.		.84
16. Facilitate 2. My coworkers are willing to adjust their work schedule when I have a family demand come up.		.82
17. Facilitate 1. My coworkers will adjust their work schedule (for example, come in early or stay later) if I need to attend to a family demand.		.78
18. Facilitate 4. My coworkers and I share the workload when I have a family demand that conflicts with my ability to meet all of my work responsibilities.		.78
19. Facilitate 8. My coworkers are willing to make adjustments in how the work gets done when a family demand requires me to work from an alternate location.		.59
20. Facilitate 6. My coworkers are willing to accommodate me when a family demand requires me to work remotely (for example, at home).		.51
21. Solutions 1. My coworkers strategize how our work can be rearranged in the future to better meet individuals' work and family demands.		.79
22. Solutions 7. My coworkers offer useful suggestions to improve how our team makes use of time at work.		.78

23. Solutions 3. My coworkers make suggestions to management (for example, our supervisor) on how to solve future workload issues so that we can each better balance our work and family demands.	.77	
24. Solutions 4. My coworkers make suggestions to management (for example, our supervisor) to improve our team's effectiveness in the future so that we can better balance work and family demands.	.74	
25. Solutions 2. My coworkers and I strategize ways to prevent future conflict between our work and family demands.	.69	
26. Solutions 8. My coworkers and I strategize ways to reorganize our work so that we can be more effective as a unit in the future.	.67	
27. Solutions 5. My coworkers and I work together to strategize ways to prevent our workload from impacting our personal lives.	.61	
28. Solutions 6. My coworkers and I plan ahead to ensure both our work and family needs can be met effectively.	.60	
29. Resources 9. My coworkers give me advice on how to handle challenging situations at work so that I can be more effective at home.		-.65
30. Resources 1. When I encounter challenging work responsibilities, my coworkers give me advice I can use so that my work doesn't cause problems for my home life.		-.65
31. Resources 6. When I need help to meet a work or family demand, my coworkers share their knowledge and resources with me.		-.60
32. Resources 3. When required, my coworkers share their knowledge or resources with me so that I can better manage my work or family demands.		-.52

$N = 200$. Note. Items that cross-loaded onto other factors $\geq .30$, or that had loadings $< .40$ are not included in this table. Item numbers are retained to allow for reference to Appendix B.

Table 3

Study 2, Sample 2, Superordinate confirmatory factor analysis results for the WFSCB measure.

Factor	Item/Factor	Factor Loading (SE)	Error Variance (SE)
Emotional support	1. My coworkers make an effort to learn about my personal life.	1.00	.66 (.06)
	2. My coworkers and I can talk about similar experiences in our work and/or home lives.	.82 (.06)	.42 (.04)
	3. I can talk to my coworkers when I am feeling stressed about balancing my work and family demands.	1.06 (.06)	.30 (.03)
	4. My coworkers are a source of comfort when I am feeling overwhelmed about my work or family life.	1.28 (.06)	.29 (.04)
Sharing resources and knowledge	1. My coworkers give me advice on how to handle challenging situations at work so that I can be more effective at home.	1.00	.28 (.03)
	2. When I need help to meet a work or family demand, my coworkers share their knowledge and resources with me.	1.06 (.06)	.40 (.04)
	3. When I encounter challenging work responsibilities, my coworkers give me advice I can use so that my work doesn't cause problems for my home life.	1.03 (.06)	.45 (.04)
Proactively developing solutions	1. My coworkers strategize how our work can be rearranged in the future to better meet individuals' work and family demands.	1.00	.40 (.04)
	2. My coworkers and I strategize ways to reorganize our work so that we can be more effective as a unit in the future.	.90 (.05)	.28 (.03)
	3. My coworkers make suggestions to management (for example, our supervisor) to improve our team's effectiveness in the future so that we can better balance work and family demands.	.90 (.05)	.49 (.05)
	4. My coworkers make suggestions to management (for example, our supervisor) on how to solve future workload issues so that we can each better balance our work and family demands.	.97 (.05)	.37 (.04)
	5. My coworkers offer useful suggestions to improve how our team makes use of time at work.	.92 (.05)	.42 (.04)
Facilitating work adjustments	1. My coworkers will take over my regular work responsibilities when a family demand requires me to be absent.	1.00	.36 (.04)
	2. My coworkers are willing to adjust their work schedule when I have a family demand come up.	.99 (.05)	.41 (.04)
	3. My coworkers and I share the workload when I have a family demand that conflicts with my ability to meet all of my work responsibilities.	1.11 (.05)	.26 (.03)
	4. My coworkers are willing to make adjustments in how the work gets done when a family demand requires me to work from an alternate location.	.95 (.05)	.48 (.05)

N = 302. The tau equivalent model holds all factor loadings equal; the loadings for all four WFSCB factors were .75 with a standard error of .04.

Table 4

Study 2 Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-Order Correlations for Hypothesis Testing

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
WFSCB															
1. WFSCB overall	3.69	.78	1												
2. Emotional support	3.71	.89	.85**	1											
3. Sharing resources and knowledge	3.69	.93	.87**	.70**	1										
4. Facilitating work adjustments	3.65	.96	.83**	.59**	.58**	1									
5. Proactively developing solutions	3.69	.89	.84**	.59**	.65**	.62**	1								
General support															
6. General coworker support	3.03	.65	.74**	.67**	.64**	.61**	.58**	1							
7. General family-focused coworker support	3.61	.85	.83**	.75**	.68**	.75**	.64**	.67**	1						
Outcomes															
8. WF balance	3.71	.80	.29**	.22**	.20**	.33**	.22**	.24**	.41**	1					
9. WIF	2.69	.89	-.24**	-.18**	-.18**	-.28**	-.17**	-.23**	-.31**	-.55**	1				
10. FIW	2.40	.83	.02	.01	.05	-.03	.04	-.05	-.10*	-.34**	.53**	1			
11. Life satisfaction	4.72	1.39	.37**	.30**	.36**	.28**	.32**	.29**	.34**	.43**	-.22**	-.14**	1		
12. WTF positive spillover	4.05	.60	.20**	.22**	.18**	.15**	.15**	.14**	.27**	.20**	-.14**	-.21**	.24**	1	
13. FTW positive spillover	4.07	.72	.32**	.26**	.26**	.25**	.32**	.25**	.31**	.28**	-.26**	-.11*	.26**	.48**	1

N = 502; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

Table 5

Study 2, Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results

Variable	WIF		FIW		WF Balance		WTF affect		FWE Affect		Life Satisfaction	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
General coworker support	-.23**	-.11	-.05	-.13	.24**	.06	.14**	-.01	.25**	.03	.29**	.03
WFSCB	-	-.16*	-	.11	-	.24**	-	.21**	-	.30**	-	.35**
ΔR^2		.01*		.01		.03**		.02**		.04**		.05**

$N = 502$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 6

Study 2 WFSCB Dimension Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Estimates by Gender

Factor	Mean		Standard Deviation		Chronbach's Alpha	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Emotional Support	3.7	3.7	.87	.91	.85	.87
Sharing Resources & Knowledge	3.7	3.7	.93	.93	.86	.85
Facilitating Work Adjustments	3.8	3.5	.93	.97	.90	.89
Proactively Developing Solutions	3.8	3.6	.84	.90	.89	.90

N = 502.

Appendix A

Study 1 - Interview Protocol

(*Note.* This study only recruited participants who were employed full-time, who were married/cohabitating, and who had at least one school-aged child at home. These inclusion criteria were selected for the purpose of increasing the likelihood that participants would have encountered difficulties balancing work and family, which in turn warranted support from coworkers.)

The interviews began with the researcher explaining the research goals, providing a definition of both coworkers and work-family balance, and confirming that the participant understood these definitions.

“Work-family balance is defined as the feeling of being satisfied and effective both at work and at home (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011).”

“A coworker was defined as someone that you work with on a regular basis, and who is typically in a similar role or working at a similar level as you within the organization.”

STAR: Situation – Task – Action – Result

Interview Questions:

1. Can you describe a situation when your coworker(s) made it easier for you to balance your work and family life? (In other words, what has a coworker (or coworkers) done to help you be satisfied and effective both at work and at home?)
 - a. Who was the coworker?
 - b. What exactly did they do?
 - c. What was the context surrounding their supportive behaviors?
 - d. Did you ask for help?

- e. In what way did this help you experience work-family balance?
 - f. How did this help you?
 - g. Are there any other similar situations you can describe?
2. Can you describe a situation when your coworker(s) made it more difficult for you to balance your work and family life? (In other words, what has a coworker (or coworkers) done to hinder your ability to be satisfied and effective both at work and at home?)
- a. Who was the coworker?
 - b. What exactly did they do?
 - c. What was the context surrounding their unhelpful behaviors?
 - d. Had you asked him/her/them for help?
 - e. In what way did this hinder your experience of work-family balance?
 - f. How was this problematic for you?
 - g. Are there any other similar situations you can describe?
3. In the past, how have you engaged in behaviors directed at making it easier for your coworker(s) to balance their work and family demands?
- a. What context, situation, or personal factors prompted you to behave in this way towards your coworker(s)?
 - b. What did you perceive to be the benefits of your actions for your coworker(s)?
 - c. What did you perceive to be the personal benefits of supporting your coworker?
 - d. Why did you decide to help your coworker(s)?

Additional Questions (if the level of detail is lacking based on the responses above):

4. Have you ever observed any of your colleagues engaging in behaviors that would help or hinder their coworkers' work-family balance?

- a. If yes, what were those behaviors?
- 5. Can you think of a time when you were having difficulty balancing work and family?
 - a. Did any of your coworkers help you to achieve a better balance?
 - i. If yes, what types of support did they offer?
 - b. Did any of your coworkers hinder your ability to achieve a better balance?
 - i. If yes, how?

Appendix B

Study 2, Sample 1, Item Analysis: Structural Validity

Correlations outside of WFSCB category

	Emotion 5	Emotion 6	Emotion 3	Emotion 7	Emotion 8	Emotion 2	Emotion 9	Emotion 4
Solutions 1	.40**	.35**	.29**	.43**	.36**	.41**	.43**	.42**
Solutions 7	.35**	.28**	.25**	.44**	.33**	.41**	.43**	.41**
Solutions 3	.48**	.40**	.23**	.37**	.46**	.43**	.45**	.37**
Solutions 4	.50**	.42**	.31**	.46**	.51**	.47**	.43**	.45**
Solutions 2	.46**	.39**	.37**	.54**	.43**	.47**	.48**	.49**
Solutions 8	.47**	.35**	.30**	.44**	.36**	.42**	.41**	.50**
Solutions 5	.53**	.50**	.43**	.58**	.47**	.55**	.57**	.51**
Solutions 6	.45**	.42**	.31**	.45**	.38**	.43**	.42**	.42**

** $p < .01$; solutions = proactively developing solutions; emotion = emotional support. Emotional support item 6 and item 9 were removed from this analysis because their item difficulty was greater than .70. Emotional support item 4 was removed because it had the lowest factor loading (see Table 2). The decision was made to retain emotional support item 8 despite having an item difficulty of .82 because it demonstrated solid discriminant validity when compared to the other WFSCB dimensions, and strong correlations with its own category items (see convergent validity below). Bolding indicates a correlation value $> .49$.

	Resources 9	Resources 1	Resources 6	Resources 3
Solutions 1	.47**	.50**	.44**	.43**
Solutions 7	.39**	.41**	.48**	.45**
Solutions 3	.45**	.39**	.39**	.35**
Solutions 4	.49**	.38**	.45**	.45**
Solutions 2	.50**	.48**	.51**	.40**
Solutions 8	.31**	.33**	.39**	.38**
Solutions 5	.48**	.57**	.56**	.49**
Solutions 6	.39**	.47**	.44**	.36**

** $p < .01$; solutions = proactively developing solutions; resources = sharing resources and knowledge. All remaining sharing resources and knowledge items were not included in this analysis because they cross-loaded onto another category (i.e., factor loading $\geq .30$). Sharing resources and knowledge item 3 was removed from the measure because it had an item difficulty that was greater than .70. Bolding indicates a correlation value $> .49$.

	Facilitate 5	Facilitate 7	Facilitate 3	Facilitate 2	Facilitate 1	Facilitate 4	Facilitate 8	Facilitate 6
Solutions 1	.42**	.35**	.43**	.47**	.44**	.48**	.48**	.41**
Solutions 7	.36**	.31**	.39**	.35**	.41**	.43**	.43**	.33**
Solutions 3	.34**	.31**	.34**	.35**	.42**	.42**	.47**	.42**
Solutions 4	.39**	.42**	.42**	.39**	.44**	.42**	.48**	.42**
Solutions 2	.46**	.41**	.48**	.53**	.53**	.55**	.55**	.55**
Solutions 8	.38**	.32**	.38**	.39**	.34**	.35**	.48**	.33**
Solutions 5	.52**	.49**	.49**	.53**	.48**	.55**	.55**	.49**
Solutions 6	.46**	.41**	.44**	.42**	.48**	.46**	.49**	.50**

** $p < .01$; solutions = proactively developing solutions; facilitate = facilitating work adjustments. Facilitating work adjustments item 5 was removed from the measure because it had an item difficulty that was greater than .70. Items 3, 1, and 6 were removed because they had a sister item that demonstrated a stronger factor loading and therefore, were retained for the measure. Bolding indicates a correlation value $> .49$.

	ValueNonWork 7	ValueNonWork 3	ValueNonWork 1	ValueNonWork 6
Solutions 1	.36**	.36**	.39**	.44**
Solutions 7	.37**	.39**	.41**	.44**
Solutions 3	.39**	.423**	.456**	.421**
Solutions 4	.41**	.37**	.46**	.47**
Solutions 2	.48**	.44**	.55**	.46**
Solutions 8	.38**	.39**	.39**	.44**
Solutions 5	.50**	.42**	.52**	.55**
Solutions 6	.45**	.47**	.50**	.53**

** $p < .01$; solutions = proactively developing solutions; ValueNonWork = demonstrating the value of non-work life. All remaining demonstrating the value of non-work life items cross-loaded onto another category (i.e., factor loading $\geq .30$). Items 3, 1, and 6 were removed because they had an item difficulty that was greater than .70. Item 7 was removed because it did not demonstrate stronger convergent validity when compared to other emotional support items. Bolding indicates a correlation value $> .49$.

	Emotion 5	Emotion 3	Emotion 7	Emotion 9	ValueNonWork 7	Emotion 8
Resources 9	.54**	.44**	.60**	.59**	.45**	.40**
Resources 1	.55**	.40**	.60**	.62**	.54**	.45**
Resources 6	.64**	.53**	.68**	.69**	.54**	.59**

** $p < .01$.

	Emotion 5	Emotion 3	Emotion 7	Emotion 9	ValueNonWork 7	Emotion 8
Solutions 1	0.56**	0.40**	0.60**	0.59**	0.58**	0.42**
Solutions 7	0.50**	0.34**	0.56**	0.53**	0.53**	0.32**
Solutions 3	0.51**	0.34**	0.55**	0.56**	0.55**	0.39**
Solutions 4	0.47**	0.34**	0.51**	0.56**	0.51**	0.35**
Solutions 8	0.50**	0.32**	0.52**	0.53**	0.49**	0.34**

** $p < .01$

	Emotion 5	Emotion 3	Emotion 7	Emotion 9	ValueNonWork 7	Emotion 8
Facilitate 7	0.45**	0.36**	0.46**	0.50**	0.62**	0.40**
Facilitate 2	0.51**	0.45**	0.54**	0.59**	0.66**	0.44**
Facilitate 4	0.54**	0.41**	0.57**	0.61**	0.63**	0.45**
Facilitate 8	0.48**	0.43**	0.50**	0.58**	0.60**	0.43**

** $p < .01$

	Facilitate 7	Facilitate 2	Facilitate 4	Facilitate 8
Resources 9	0.40**	0.43**	0.44**	0.45**
Resources 1	0.44**	0.47**	0.52**	0.42**
Resources 6	0.47**	0.55**	0.54**	0.49**

** $p < .01$

Final measure items: Correlations within WFSCB category

Emotional Support

Item	Emotion 3	Emotion 5	Emotion 7	Emotion 8
Emotion 3	1			
Emotion 5	.49**	1		
Emotion 7	.59**	.70**	1	
Emotion 8	.55**	.60**	.59**	1

** $p < 0.01$.

Facilitating Work Adjustments

Item	Facilitate 2	Facilitate 4	Facilitate 7	Facilitate 8
Facilitate 2	1			
Facilitate 4	.73**	1		
Facilitate 7	.65**	.71**	1	
Facilitate 8	.68**	.62**	.56**	1

** $p < 0.01$.

Proactively Developing Solutions

Item	Solutions 1	Solutions 3	Solutions 4	Solutions 7	Solutions 8
Solutions 1	1				
Solutions 3	.58**	1			
Solutions 4	.61**	.78**	1		
Solutions 7	.66**	.62**	.56**	1	
Solutions 8	.57**	.52**	.59**	.61**	1

** $p < 0.01$.

Sharing Resources and Knowledge

Item	Resources 1	Resources 6	Resources 9
Resources 1	1		
Resources 6	.73**	1	
Resources 9	.68**	.69**	1

** $p < 0.01$.

General Discussion

The benefits of workplace social support to the improved well-being of employees has been consistently demonstrated in the literature (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; Frone et al., 1997; LaRocco, French, & Jones, 1980; LaRocco & Jones, 1978; Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999). To date however, there has been little empirical inquiry into the benefits of family-specific forms of coworker support on various WF outcomes such as WF balance, conflict, and positive spillover. Instead, the majority of research has focused on outcomes associated with the provision of general coworker support (Dolcos & Daley, 2009; Frone et al., 1997; Major, Fletcher, Davis, & Germano, 2008; Matthews, Bulger, & Barnes-Farrell, 2010; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2012; Wang, Liu, Zhan, & Shi, 2010). The widespread acknowledgement of issues facing individuals who struggle to successfully juggle their work and family responsibilities (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005), coupled with trends towards more team-based, interdependent work environments (Ensign, 1998; Illgen & Hollenbeck, 1991), highlighted the importance of research into WF focused supportive coworker behavior. This dissertation addressed the gap in the literature by developing an empirically validated multidimensional measure of WFSCB and demonstrated its predictive utility within the WF interface.

In the first step towards developing and validating a measure of WFSCB, an inductive phenomenological investigation into the nature of this type of coworker support was undertaken (manuscript one). The result, based on semi-structured interviews with 22 working parents, was a detailed description of the lived experience of WF supportive behaviors that participants had provided to, or received from, their coworker(s). In asking open-ended questions to capture supportive behaviors, contextual details were also captured, and this allowed for the

identification of potential antecedents to WFSCB. The detailed participant quotes were grouped into categories of behavior according to emergent themes and measure items were developed. In order to run a preliminary test of content validity, the inductively generated items were included in a card sort activity completed by 22 participants. This resulted in refinement of the measure prior to collecting an initial sample of data from 200 North American participants. The results of an exploratory factor analysis on the data from 200 participants lead to further refinement of the measure, and a final sample of data from 502 participants was collected. This final dataset was then randomly split into two separate samples: one to run a second EFA using data from 200 participants and another to run a CFA on the finalized measure using data from 302 participants. The final 16-item WFSCB measure demonstrated solid validity and reliability, and thus, was further tested in a hierarchical regression analysis ($N = 502$) to investigate its predictive and incremental validity over and above a general measure of coworker support (Caplan et al., 1975).

Research Findings and Future Directions

The findings of this research program indicate that WFSCB can be broken down into four dimensions including: 1) emotional support, 2) facilitating work adjustments, 3) sharing resources and knowledge, and 4) proactively developing solutions, all of which demonstrated adequate internal consistency. Although *demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life* was identified as a potential dimension of WFSCB in the first qualitative manuscript, the quantitative data in manuscript two did not support its validity as an indicator of the construct. As mentioned, participants did not appear to perceive a significant difference between *emotional support* and *demonstrating an understanding of the value of non-work life*, and thus, it is plausible that the behaviors identified within this dimension were perceived as an underlying theme reflective of the encouragement of emotional wellbeing.

The findings provide preliminary evidence that higher levels of WFSCB are associated with lower levels of work-to-family conflict, and higher levels of WF balance, WF positive spillover, and life satisfaction. Furthermore, the utility of WFSCB as a source of informal workplace support was underscored based on evidence of its incremental validity in the prediction of these outcome variables over and above general coworker support. This finding is in line with measurement theory that states operational congruence between a predictor and an outcome construct is instrumental in observing stronger statistical relationships (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2007; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Viswesvaran et al., 1999; Hogan & Holland, 2003). Practically, these findings suggest that more specific behaviors aimed at improving a coworker's ability to achieve harmony between their work and home lives could be more beneficial in terms of the benefits to WF outcomes such as WF conflict, balance, and positive spillover. Ultimately, general measures of coworker support may fall short in assessing a broad spectrum of behaviors that coworkers engage in to support one another's WF integration.

The qualitative analyses in manuscript two also identified several potential categories of antecedents to WFSCB including: 1) understanding of the coworker situation, 2) similarity with coworker(s), 3) relationship with coworker(s), 4) ability to contribute to a change or improvement, 5) perceived benefits of providing support, and 6) personal characteristics. These findings demonstrate similarities and differences with antecedents to family-facilitative coworker support proposed by Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran (2009). The WFSCB antecedents identified in this dissertation are consistent with the framework proposed by Mesmer-Magnus with respect to the relationship with coworker(s), the importance of similarities between providers and recipients of WFSCB with respect to life course stage and family life stage, and the interdependency of work. Additional antecedents proposed by Mesmer-Magnus &

Viswesvaran (2009) including gender roles, social identification, frequency of requesting support, and organizational justice were not corroborated by participants, although this does not necessarily mean that they are of lesser relevance and is an avenue for future deductive quantitative investigation. Future research would benefit our understanding of the relationships between various identified potential antecedents and the occurrence of WFSCB, including quantitative evidence to confirm or refute the proposed potential causal relationships between specific antecedents and specific WFSCB dimensions. For example, a multi-wave (longitudinal) design with potential antecedents measured at the outset, could be tested as time-lagged predictors of WFSCB. At a later time point, for example after a period of two months, WFSCB would be measured and potential antecedents re-measured, while controlling for WFSCB measured at the initial time point. Although such a design would not allow causal conclusions to be drawn, on account of possible unmeasured confounds, results of this nature could speak to the existence of time-lagged relationships (including those suggesting reverse causation), which in turn would speak to the possible causal sequencing of variables.

The WFSCB measure offers several advantages over existing measures of family-focused coworker support. Firstly, the WFSCB scale development was subjected to more rigorous methods than previous measures of WF focused coworker support (e.g., Thompson & Prottas, 2005; McManus et al., 2002; Families and Work Institute, WFHN research). The development of these existing scales did not benefit from a combination of inductive and deductive insights and thus, provide insufficient assurance that the important components of WF focused coworker support had been captured. Other measures have simply adapted items that were initially intended to assess other constructs, such as family-focused supervisor support (e.g., Thompson & Prottas, 2005). An exception is the mixed-method procedure employed to develop and validate

the C-IWAF, a measure focused almost exclusively on instrumental WF focused support (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010). However, the C-IWAF cannot be considered as robust as the WFSCB measure given that the authors collected qualitative information via application of a questionnaire and thus, were not able to capture arguably important contextual details associated with the identified supportive behaviors. Furthermore, the authors did not conduct an exploratory factor analysis of the items, which would have been warranted given the need to understand the true nature underlying a novel construct; instead, authors validated the measure by running a CFA on one sample of data. Second, the WFSCB measure provides evidence of predictive validity based on a breadth of specific behaviors beyond those commonly operationalized in more general and instrumental measures of WF focused support (McManus et al., 2002; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). For example, behaviors within the WFSCB dimensions of *sharing knowledge and resources* and *proactively developing solutions* have not been previously measured within the context of WF focused coworker support. Sharing resources and knowledge behaviors bare some similarity to coworker mentoring (Ensher, Thomas, & Murphy, 2001) and proactively developing solutions strongly resembles similar behaviors that supervisors have been shown to engage in with their subordinates (Hammer et al., 2009; 2013). Therefore, these findings add to our understanding of how coworkers can help one another to juggle multiple life roles.

Limitations

Despite the aforementioned methodological strengths, this research was not without its limitations. First, the use of cross-sectional data precludes causal conclusions from being drawn and thus, scholars are urged in future to conduct longitudinal research to provide evidence of whether or not WFSCB truly leads to improvements in WF outcomes such as balance and

positive spillover. Scholars are also urged to re-examine our hypotheses with various samples, across a variety of significantly different cultures, in order to more confidently conclude on their validity across various work environments. For example, there is reason to suspect that certain types of WFSCBs that are displayed by employees in individualist versus collectivist cultures will differ based on cultural norms (Taylor, Welch, Kim, & Sherman, 2007; Yoon & Lim, 1999). Second, the generalizability of the quantitative findings is limited given that project resources did not allow for the quantitative data to be pulled from a randomly generated nationally representative sample, the most rigorous test of generalizability. Data was however collected from multiple samples across North America in various industries to partially address this limitation. Finally, due to our research design the qualitative data were unable to demonstrate that a variable was a *likely* antecedent by investigating whether it was present when WFSCB was present, and absent when WFSCB was absent. This type of analysis is possible with qualitative research when the design focuses on specific case studies. Our research was designed to understand the experience and context of WFSCB (Creswell, 2013a; Creswell, 2013b) and thus, we could not test for causation (as can be done with case study methodology; Yin, 2014).

Practical Implications

The results of this dissertation contribute to practice in several ways. First, the findings reinforce the salience of both emotional and instrumental support amongst coworkers –two of the most commonly measured forms of social support. Given that WFSCB predicted various WF outcomes over and above general coworker support, this measure adds to our ability to provide prescriptive evidence to employees on how to express emotional and instrumental support when a fellow coworker is dealing with difficulty juggling multiple life role responsibilities. Furthermore, my data highlight the comparable importance of behaviors beyond these two broad

categories (i.e., emotional and instrumental support). Second, many of the specific behaviors that emerged are comparable to behaviors that describe family-supportive supervision (e.g., listening to struggles meeting work and family demands, flexibility with schedules, and developing solutions to better accommodate work and family; Hammer et al., 2009; 2013), and thus indicate that coworkers and supervisors can provide similar forms of WF focused support. There are certain behaviors that are unique to the coworker relationship however, such as taking over work tasks and being flexible with sharing the workload – ultimately “covering” for a coworker when a personal need arises. The WFSCBs identified also offer useful insights for organizational practices. For example, regular team/staff meetings where coworkers each voice their work- and/or family-related challenges can increase the team’s understanding of each other’s situation (a potential antecedent identified in this study), which could foster more WFSCB. Encouraging activities and conversation that allow coworkers to gain more knowledge of each other’s work tasks and family demands, along with allowing flexibility and autonomy in work tasks, should contribute to an increase in coworkers’ motivation and ability to contribute to changes that could help enhance WF balance for most, if not all unit members. Finally, as a superordinate construct, WFSCB provides practitioners with the opportunity to develop operational strategy based on insights drawn from two operationalizations. For example, a WFSCB total score could be indicative of the level of WF-focused support overall that employees experience and could ultimately point towards the existence (or lack thereof) of a WF supportive culture. Another practical use would be to interpret levels of the dimensions of WFSCB as indicative of the specific forms of support present or lacking within a team, department, or organization. This type of insight could inform policy development (e.g., flextime) or future operational practices (e.g., peer support recognition programs, knowledge sharing technology) that might encourage

employees to engage more in certain behaviors. Furthermore, as is known from research, the formal and informal organizational components should align with one another in order to tell a consistent and complete story of a WF supportive organizational culture (Metz, 2011; Roth, 2007). Scholars have demonstrated that the provision of WF supportive programs and policy alone may not be enough to effect job attitudes and experiences (Allen, 2001; Allen et al., 2013) and thus, it is feasible that having both WF supportive policies and coworkers could enhance potential benefits to the management of the WF interface.

Conclusion

This dissertation builds and extends previous WF research on coworker support by contributing rich, empirically grounded information regarding specific manifestations of WFSCB. In addition, the development and validation of a robust measure of WFSCB provides evidence of the potential value of having coworkers engage in such behaviors, especially with regards to WF balance, WF spillover, work-to-family conflict, and life satisfaction. The findings also demonstrate that these WF focused behaviors provide benefits beyond what emotional and/or instrumental support (i.e., general coworker support) can offer. Decades of research has underscored the importance of the coworker in effectively navigating the stresses and pressures associated with the intersection between work and family, and this dissertation has provided practical guidance on how employees can actively engage with their coworkers to foster improved functioning, and to do so while also contributing to a family-supportive work environment.

References

- Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A. (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 391-405. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/%28SICI%291099-1379%28200006%2921:4%3C391::AID-JOB15%3E3.0.CO;2-9>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013a). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publishing. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/qualitative-inquiry-and-research-design/book235677>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013b). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publishing. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book237357>
- Ensher, E. A., Thomas, C., & Murphy, S. E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on protégés' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(3), 419-438. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25092732>
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 145-167. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577>
- Hammer, L. B., Ernst Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the Family Supportive Supervisor Behavior Short-Form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 18(3), 285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032612>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive

- supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 35(4), 837-856.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206308328510>
- LaRocco, J. M., House, J. S., & French Jr, J. R. (1980). Social support, occupational stress, and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 202-218. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2136616>
- LaRocco, J. M., & Jones, A. P. (1978). Coworker and leader support as moderators of stress-strain relationships in work situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 629-634.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.63.5.629>
- McManus, K., Korabik, K., Rosin, H. M., & Kelloway, E. (2002). Employed mothers and the work-family interface: Does family structure matter? *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1295-1324. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055011919>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., Murase, T., DeChurch, L. A., & Jimenez, M. (2010). Coworker informal work accommodations to family: Scale development and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(3), 511-531. doi:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164409355687>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2006). How family-friendly work environments affect work/family conflict: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Labor Research*, 4, 555-574. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-006-1020-1>
- Taylor, S. E., Welch, W. T., Kim, H. S., & Sherman, D. K. (2007). Cultural differences in the impact of social support on psychological and biological stress responses. *Psychological Science*, 18(9), 831-837. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01987.x>
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2005). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 100-118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.100>

Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The Role of Social Support in the Process of Work Stress: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 314-334.

<https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1661>

Work From Home Network: Families and Work Institute. (2016). *Employee Workplace Measures Book*. Retrieved from

http://projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/wfhn/files/20160126_em_measures_book.pdf?m=1453851091

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*: Sage publishing.

<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/case-study-research/book237921>

Yoon, J., & Lim, J. C. (1999). Organizational support in the workplace: The case of Korean hospital employees. *Human Relations*, 52(7), 923-945.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679905200704>