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ABSTRACT

Century-old work arrangements designed for full-time employees are ill-suited to today's workers, the majority of whom do not have a family or household structure that allows them to work unencumbered by external obligations. Some firms have adopted work-home policies that offer alternative work arrangements such as flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting to help workers with increased vulnerability to domestic interference juggle their dual responsibilities while maintaining their productivity. Managers, however, typically have the discretion to make the scheduling options available.

Using qualitative, quantitative, and archival data collected in a case study of three divisions in Midwest Securities (MW), a financial services organization, I investigated the determinants of three factors that affect the effectiveness of the options outlined in MW's work-home policy: (1) employees' access to flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting; (2) employees' use of the alternative arrangements; and (3) employees' home-to-work spillover. I assessed the relationship between spillover and workers' use of the scheduling options by estimating causal models that allowed a reciprocal relationship between the two. My study thus contributes to our understanding of the totality of circumstances that affect workers' access to and use of alternative work arrangements, as well as the nature of work-home conflict.
I assessed the influence of three sets of factors on workers' access to the scheduling options: MW's managerial guidelines for implementing the scheduling options (job suitability, employee suitability, and the cost-benefit ratio); indicators of the context in which employees worked; and employees' personal and household characteristics.

I found inconsistent evidence that MW's managerial guidelines explained the variation in employees' access to AWAs. Indicators of employee suitability affected workers' access to flextime. Indicators of job and employee suitability affected workers' access to compressed work weeks. Indicators of employee suitability and the cost-benefit ratio affected workers' access to telecommuting. Personal and household characteristics had little influence on workers' access to the options. However, the context in which workers performed their jobs—their division and their awareness of the policy—had a strong and consistent effect on managers' decisions to make the options available.

Similarly, I examined three sets of factors associated with employees use of AWAs: job factors influencing workers need and ability to use AWAs; job factors related to the perceived risk of using AWAs; and personal and household characteristics that should affect need. Workers' status and autonomy, the context in which they worked, and their sex influenced employees' use of flextime. In contrast, job measures related to the complexity and interdependence of workers' jobs, their work context, and their education, household income, and sex affected workers' use of compressed work weeks. A third group of factors affected workers' telecommuting: the context in which employees performed their jobs, employees' seniority, the importance of facetime in their evaluation process, and workers' domestic spillover.
Home-to-work spillover stemmed primarily from domestic obligations. Women experienced more spillover than similarly situated men, and having children and eldercare responsibilities also increased employees' domestic spillover. Telecommuting, the use of compressed work weeks, and the ability to make job-related decisions were effective means of reducing the intrusion of domestic concerns at work. Thus, my analyses suggest that the relationship between employees' domestic spillover and their use of an AWA depends on the scheduling option.

My research provided evidence for five summary conclusions. First, the study confirms research that the context in which employees perform their work is a key influence on both managers' decisions to make the options available and employees' decisions to use AWAs. Second, the degree alternative work arrangements deviate from traditional work arrangements has implications for managers' decisions to make the options available. Third, a variety of evidence establishes that managerial support for alternative work arrangements is, in part, idiosyncratic. Fourth, consistent with Midwest's intent, managers implemented the firm's work-home policy with little regard for workers' familial circumstances. Moreover, telecommuting and compressed work weeks were effective in reducing workers' domestic spillover. Finally, corporations such as MW that lack measures of individual productivity are unable to fully evaluate the effectiveness of work-home policies.

I consider the implications of my findings and conclusions, and I recommend strategies for corporations interested in promoting employees' access to and use of work-home policies.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Week in and week out, more than 124 million women and men in the United States go to work (U. S. Bureau of the Census 1996:table 616). The firms in which they work have historically been characterized as "greedy organizations" that sought their employees' undivided loyalty (Coser 1974). Consequently, employers distrusted workers' outside obligations, such as family responsibilities, that might reduce workers' job commitment and performance (Rodgers 1992:184; Googins 1991:8; Acker 1990:149).

Indeed, employees' jobs were typically organized on the assumption that workers were free of domestic responsibilities, and were thus able to devote full attention, time, and energy to their jobs (Shelton 1992:151; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991:20; Acker 1990:150; Kanter 1977b). Dramatic changes in the demographic composition of the U.S. labor force have meant that a growing majority of both female and male employees no longer have a family or household structure that allows them to work unencumbered by external obligations. By 1997, only about one worker out of ten (14 percent) left a nonemployed spouse or partner at home to deal with the demands of their families and households (Bond et al. 1998:28-9).1

---

1 Nationally, one third (35 percent) of wage and salaried employees are single—and 78 percent of those who live with spouses or partners (i.e., a total of 51 percent of the workforce) live in dual income households (Bond et al. 1998: 5, 28).
Thus, century-old work arrangements designed for full-time employees who were free of domestic obligations are ill-suited to today's workers who experience home-to-work conflict—conflict that can affect their job performance. Work-home balance has become the "hot career issue of the new decade" (Hall 1990:5), and work-home policies that offer alternative work arrangements (AWAs) designed to enhance employees' ability to meet the dual demands of home and work have proliferated. We know little about the implementation of AWAs within firms, however. Moreover, assessment of work-home policies' effectiveness is limited. To enhance our understanding of the implementation, use, and effectiveness of alternative work arrangements, I investigated three questions: (1) what are the determinants of workers' access to three alternative work arrangements, (2) what are the determinants of workers' use of AWAs, and (3) what are the determinants of employees' home-to-work spillover.

Although women and men have always worked to support themselves and their dependents, that work has typically differed by sex. Sex became the paramount criterion for the assignment of tasks at home and in the workplace after the Industrial Revolution when the creation of a labor force distinguished paid from unpaid work. Married men assumed primary responsibility for the economic well-being of their households through their paid work, while married women assumed primary responsibility for unpaid domestic tasks. Those women who were in the paid labor force tended to live in households in which another woman undertook primary responsibility for domestic work.²

² Whether married or single, immigrant and nonwhite women have traditionally had a higher labor force participation rate than other women, although the gap between black
By mid-20th century, a sexual division of labor was firmly entrenched within both the workplace and in the home. Being a "family man" meant being the family's primary, if not sole, wage earner (Coltrane 1996:41; Hochschild 1990). The price of employment and financial stability for many male workers was long hours that precluded doing domestic work or spending much time with family members. Indeed, it was unmanly to participate in certain domestic tasks, particularly those that were stereotypically female (West and Zimmerman 1987:144; Coser 1974:93-4). These included food preparation and caregiving to dependents, as well as tasks directed at maintaining family status, such as participating in school or community volunteer activities (Papanek 1979:777-8). In the workplace, the sexual division of labor segregated women and men into different jobs, and positions with high status or responsibility were reserved for men (Reskin and Padavic 1994:49). Thus, employed women, whether single or married, rarely held the kind of demanding managerial or professional jobs that presumed unlimited hours or no external demands. The few women who did often sacrificed marriage and children (Linden 1994:96; Friedman 1991:21; Ferree 1987:326).

Three fundamental changes have taken place in the sexual division of labor over the past 35 years. First, married women and mothers (regardless of their marital status) have flooded into the labor force, doubling their participation since 1960 (U. S. Bureau of and white women has almost disappeared (U. S. Bureau of the Census 1996: tables 615; Bose 1987: 274, 280). World War II brought an influx of married women into the labor market and marked the turning point for women's labor force participation. By 1948, the proportion of married women in the labor force exceeded the 1944 level, although women were typically restricted to poorly paid, secondary jobs that did not challenge their primary orientation to their families (Milkman 1987:100, 124).
the Census 1996: tables 624, 626).³ Beginning in the 1970s, changes in the U.S. economy raised women’s employment, as declining real income and productivity meant that families needed two incomes to maintain their standard of living (Menaghan and Parcel 1990:1081-2; Googins 1991:4). Second, although employed women and men continue to be concentrated in different kinds of jobs, occupational sex segregation has declined (Jacobs 1992:282). Increasingly, women work in “virtually all occupations” (Crosby 1991:25)—including traditionally male managerial, professional, and sales positions—where the demands for overtime, travel, and working long hours potentially compete with the needs of their families (Schwartz 1994:37-8; Ferree 1991:110; Presser 1989:523).

Third, the amount of time that women and men in dual-earner couples devote to domestic tasks is converging (Robinson and Godbey 1997:104; Shelton 1992:145). Males in the 1980s performed about half as much housework as their partners—double the amount they performed in the 1960s—although the time men devote to childcare has remained constant over that time period (Robinson and Godbey 1997:104).

These changes have increased the potential for both women and men to experience the intrusion of domestic obligations into the workplace. This interference of home-related demands at work is known as home-to-work spillover. “Spillover theory” proposes that permeable boundaries between work and home facilitate the interference of home-based responsibilities at work and work-based responsibilities at home (Zedeck 1992). Such interference adversely affects work performance (Galinsky et al. 1991:115-7). It is,

³ The majority of wives (61 percent) are now employed outside the home, as are the majority of women with children, regardless of their marital status—53 percent of single
therefore, a topic of interest to employers and employees, makers of public policy, and researchers concerned with the optimal functioning of the labor force.

In addition to the demographic changes in the workforce, other factors have compounded the potential for home-to-work spillover. First, employers assume that the amount of time workers devote to their jobs is positively related to their productivity, and that full-time, uninterrupted careers are the hallmark of committed employees (Lewis 1997:16-18; Schwartz 1994:37; Rodgers 1992:184; Starrels 1992:262). The typical American employee annually spends more hours on the job than a decade ago (Schor 1992:29), and these long hours on the job contribute to their vulnerability to domestic needs intruding at work. Indeed, two-thirds of the non-agricultural U.S. labor force worked at least 40 hours a week in 1995; almost half of those workers—31 percent of the total labor force—worked more than 40 hours a week (U. S. Bureau of the Census 1996: table 630). Simultaneously, employees perceive that their use of work-home policies—from flexible time arrangements to leaves of absence—will negatively affect their careers (Hochschild 1997:97; Haas and Hwang 1995:34; Schwartz 1994:26-9). Second, more employees are traveling on business, leaving their partners and children to shift for mothers and 64 percent of married mothers with children under age six (U. S. Bureau of the Census 1996: tables 626, 627).

\[4\] Schor attributes the increase in part to employees working more weeks per year than in the past, not just more hours of work per week (1992:29). Indeed, Robinson and Godbey (1997:288) argue that workers' estimates of hours worked per week—such as those used by Schor and the U.S. Census—are likely to be high, and that time diaries provide a more accurate measure. According to Robinson and Godbey's calculations, the trend in the U.S. from 1965-1985 is for workers to work fewer hours per week (p. 94). They have no time diary data for the past 15 years, however, a period during which many firms downsized and during which the unemployed labor pool almost disappeared.
themselves in their absence (Miller 1996: B1). Finally, employees' elderly caregiving is on the rise. One quarter of workers had elder care responsibilities during 1997, but closer to half (42 percent) expect to provide eldercare by the year 2002 (Bond et al 1998:151).5

Social institutions have responded to the changing workforce demographics in a variety of ways. Some manufacturers and service providers have altered their products, schedules, or structures in response to middle-class women's growing labor force participation. Thus, we have microwave foods, home-cleaning services, businesses that offer catalogue shopping and 24-hour service, and stores that fill and deliver customers' faxed or e-mailed orders.

Other institutions have responded little, if at all, to the changing profile of the paid labor force. For example, most health-care professionals' schedules still assume a parent or caregiver is available during the workday. Similarly, child-care providers' schedules typically mirror the traditional workday and work week, despite the growing number of jobs that involve evening, night, and weekend work (Presser 1989:524-5). School systems have retained their nine-month, morning-to-mid-day schedules, leading to late-afternoon and "vacation acrobatics" as parents struggle to juggle work and family demands (Crosby 1991:27). Other factors have aggravated scheduling conflicts. There is little institutional support for employees' non-routine demands at home, such as last minute changes in a child's school schedule—and little institutional support for employees' non-routine demands at work, such as overtime. Finally, the proliferation of school-related and after-school activities—from more parent-teacher conferences to more

5 Indeed, in the 21st century, workers are likely to be shouldering more elder- than child-care responsibilities (Friedman 1991:31; Galinsky et al. 1991:121).
organized sports and lessons for youngsters, combined with the transportation needs dictated by suburban sprawl—make juggling parents’ and children’s schedules more difficult (Crosby 1991; Googins 1991:42; Hayden 1984). Thus, Googins argues (1991:40) that there is a “provision of care” crisis among families as workers struggle to fulfill their care-giving responsibilities in non-supportive—even hostile—environments.

Employed women and men face a conundrum. Men are less likely than their fathers and grandfathers to have stay-at-home spouses to perform household and childcare tasks, and thus are under more personal and societal pressure to help with domestic responsibilities. Simultaneously, women—who continue to perform most domestic and caregiving tasks—are increasingly likely to work for pay and to face job demands that leave limited time for familial responsibilities. As paid work spills over into the home and domestic work spills over into the workplace, both women and men feel the squeeze of combining work and family (Reskin and Flack 1996:16; Barnett 1994:655; Friedman 1991:21).

Work-home conflict may have adverse consequences for both employees and employers. The demands on employees to meet work and home obligations lead to stress

---

6 Bankert and Googins (1996:47) suggest that employed parents’ need for children’s structured activities spawned the growth of before- and after-school programs.

7 The intrusion of home responsibilities at work or work responsibilities at home occurs only when the boundaries between the two are permeable (Lobel 1992:255). Nippert-Eng (1996) argued that “home” and “work” are not mutually exclusive. Rather, the two are part of a continuum for which the possibilities for conceptualizing and juxtaposing the two range from integration to segregation. “Home” and “work” are socially constructed such that the boundary between them varies for each worker depending on the broader historical and cultural norms of the society, as well as the specific occupational, workplace, familial, and individual norms.
Ferber and O'Tarrell 1991:54; Galinsky and Stein 1990:368) and possibly impaired performance for women and men in both spheres (Galinsky et al. 1993:68-75; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991:54). In their reviews of organizational research, Friedman (1991:12-4, 25) and Galinsky et al. (1991:115-7) found evidence that the intrusion of home obligations at work decreases employees' effectiveness and productivity, indicated by workers' decreased ability to concentrate and their increased absenteeism, tardiness, and stress. Workers with little flexibility to deal with the competing demands of work and home have lower job satisfaction and organizational commitment than those with more malleable schedules (Galinsky et al. 1993:83; Friedman 1991:51; Friedman and Galinsky 1990:58). Moreover, jobs that restrict workers' ability to balance their dual responsibilities limit employers' ability to recruit and retain the most qualified workers (Schwartz 1994:21; Perlman 1993:17; Friedman 1991:11-3; Galinsky et al. 1991:130).

Both workers and employers have an incentive to find ways to decrease the intrusion of domestic obligations at work. Women who have the financial leeway and employment options to shape their careers and work schedules around familial responsibilities have often done so (Presser 1989:531). Men are increasingly following suit (Shellenbarger 1998:B1). For example, workers resist promotions, relocation, or jobs that require overtime or extensive travel in order to balance their work and family obligations (Lewin 1995:25). Indeed, men are as likely as women to refuse promotions or decrease their hours at work in response to family obligations (Kmec and Barry 1997; Chapman 1987:30). 8 Second, workers may purchase services they previously performed
(Sheth and Sisodia 1999:A26; Robinson and Godbey 1997:36; Hochschild 1997:230-1; Bergmann 1986) and reduce the time they spend on domestic tasks (Robinson and Godbey 1997:94; Schor 1992:36). A third strategy is to reduce the number of dependents by delaying or foregoing childbearing or marriage (Morris 1997:86; Spain and Bianchi 1996:174; Presser 1995:303; University of California at Los Angeles/Korn-Ferry 1993:149). Workers may also simply forfeit their leisure time in order to meet competing responsibilities (Robinson and Godbey 1997:130; Schor 1992:5; Shelton 1992:145; Galinsky et al. 1993:73). Another strategy for many women and men is to seek employers with work-home policies that allow a better balance between their paid and unpaid responsibilities (Shellenbarger 1997:B1; Galinsky et al. 1991:113).

**Alternative work arrangements as work-home policies.** One of the benefits employees most frequently seek is flexibility in their work schedules to address both their work and home obligations (National Report on Work and Family 1999:45; Galinsky 1992; Rodgers 1992:186; Galinsky and Stein 1990:375). The implicit assumption in work-family literature is that the more flexibility employees have in the timing and location of their work, the better equipped they are to balance competing work-home obligations (Hill 1996:299; Friedman 1991:38). By the late 1980s, it was not unusual for firms to
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8 Two high-profile male workaholics exemplified the changing mores in 1995. Bill Galston, domestic-policy adviser to President Clinton, and Harvey Golub, American Express Co.'s chairman, resigned at the peaks of their careers to find jobs that permitted a better balance between work and family (Shellenbarger, June 21, 1995:A1; Knecht, Nov. 22, 1995:A1).

9 Hill et al.'s research (1996) about the relationship between work-home balance and telecommuting raised questions about the assumption that flexibility is helpful. However, the telecommuting respondents in their study had not chosen to use the option. Rather, the firm assigned employees to telecommute in order to reduce office space. Thus, it is
implement work-home policies, including those offering alternative work arrangements such as flextime, compressed work week (CWW), and telecommuting. The scheduling options were intended to help workers with increased vulnerability to domestic interference juggle their dual responsibilities, and to increase organizations' ability to recruit and retain good workers (Witkowsky 1999:204; Kelly 1999:169; Galinsky et al. 1991:82). According to a 1988-90 survey of 188 Fortune 500 firms, about 88 percent offered part-time schedules, 77 percent offered flextime, 48 percent offered job-sharing arrangements, and 35 percent offered flexplace (Galinsky et al. 1991:87). The majority of alternative work arrangements were not available to all employees within the firms, however, because different norms applied to different workers and divisions (Hochschild 1997:96; Galinsky et al. 1991:84-6). Moreover, individual managers often have the discretion to make corporate-sanctioned arrangements available to their subordinates (Hochschild 1997:25; Rodgers 1992:191; Starrels 1992:261; Galinsky et al. 1991:84-6).

In sum, the boundary between the public and private spheres is increasingly permeable, and both employers and employees are searching for effective strategies to reduce home-to-work spillover. Most workers have home obligations that make them vulnerable to the intrusion of domestic responsibilities at work (Bond et al. 1998:28-9; Galinsky et al. 1993:41; U. S. Bureau of the Census 1996: tables 624, 626).

impossible to discern whether those using the option would have chosen to do so to reduce work-home conflict.

10 Larger firms are more likely than small to offer such benefits, although not all of the reported programs were official company policy or were available to all employees. Companies represented the largest employers in 30 industry groups drawn from the Fortune 500 Industrial and Service lists. One-third of the surveyed firms were in the
Characteristics of the work group and job may mitigate or aggravate that risk, thus affecting both the workers and their work (Jacobs and Gerson 1999:79). In addition, alternative work arrangements designed to help reduce the disruption of spillover may be inequitably implemented within firms. AWAs are also likely to vary in their ability to ameliorate employees' home-to-work spillover because they offer employees different degrees of flexibility.

We know relatively little about the conditions under which managers make alternative work arrangements available to their subordinates, the specific factors that prompt employees to use the options, and the options’ ability to mitigate the adverse consequences of home-to-work spillover. Organizational data on such policies do not always take into account restrictions on the scheduling options’ availability (Witkowsky 1999; Galinsky et al. 1991:84-6; ). However, the context of work, including supervisors’ support, typically affects employees’ access to and use of alternative arrangements (Hochschild 1997: 25; Schwartz 1994:41-2; Kingston 1990:443; Raabe 1990:483-4). Some managers may refuse to allow workers to use the options because they think work-home issues are inappropriate concerns of business, they fear diminished control, or they think such policies conflict with their responsibility to create a profitable department (Hochschild 1997:32; Gallo 1993:29; Rodgers 1992:189; Kingston 1991:446; Christiansen and Staines 1990:462; Friedman 1987:1). In addition, some workers may resist using

service sector and the remaining two-thirds were producers of consumer and industrial products (Galinsky et al. 1991:82, 84, 108).

In part this is because firms often adopt policies in order to emulate other organizations, improve their image, and gain legitimacy (Ingram and Simons 1995:1479; Galinsky et al. 1991:82, 84, 108).
alternative arrangements because they believe it will restrict their career advancement (Jacobs and Gerson 1999:93; Hochschild 1999:97; Hammonds et al. 1997:98; Schwartz 1994:92-9; Rodgers 1992:189; Galinsky et al. 1991:54). Therefore, the category of worker (e.g., part- or full-time), job characteristics (e.g., supervisory responsibilities), occupation (e.g., blue- or white-collar), and work environment (e.g., division and department) may influence workers' access to and use of work-home programs (Hochschild 1997:139; Schwartz 1994:15-6; Doerpinghaus and Feldman 1993:82; Galinsky et al. 1993:4; Galinsky et al. 1991:84; Raabe 1990:483).

Alternative arrangements such as flextime, CWW, and telecommuting also vary in the degree of flexibility they offer and in the equipment costs associated with them (Kelly 1999:187; Christensen and Staines 1990:471; Raabe 1990:482; Bohen and Viveros-Long 1981). These factors may influence managers' decisions to make the options available, employees' decisions to use them, and their effect on home-to-work spillover.

My research examines four related aspects of an organization's work-home policy: (1) factors that affect employees' access to three alternative work arrangement—flextime, CWW, and telecommuting; (2) factors that affect workers' use of the three scheduling options, (3) factors that affect home-to-work spillover, and (4) the relationship between employees' use of AWAs and their home-to-work spillover.
The locus of the study is a midwest financial services conglomeration that I will refer to as Inland Enterprise. My research focuses on three diverse business divisions within one of the Enterprise’s largest companies, Midwest Securities (MW).12

My analyses expand our understanding of worker’s access to and use of flexible work options, our knowledge of home-to-work spillover, and our understanding of the interrelationships between to two. By differentiating between and investigating both managers’ decisions to make the options available to their subordinates and workers’ decisions to use the options, I am able to assess the influence of job factors, the effects of contextual factors, and personal and household characteristics on managers’ decisions to make the options available and workers’ decisions to use AWAs. By examining the relationship between alternative work arrangements and the intrusion of domestic concerns into the workplace, I am able to gauge the interdependence of the two.

Increased understanding of the dynamics of the policy’s implementation—as well as increased understanding of AWAs’ effectiveness in helping employees balance their work-home conflict—will allow employers to devise strategies to successfully implement alternative work arrangements throughout their organizations.

Research Questions

Workers’ access to the alternative work arrangements outlined in MW’s work-home policy is conceptually distinct from workers’ use of the options. First, MW granted managers the discretion to make the options available to their subordinates. To assist in

12 I use pseudonyms for the organizations to preserve anonymity.
the implementation process, MW provided managers with *A Guide to Implementing Alternative Work Arrangements*. The guide outlines three criteria for managers’ consideration when determining their subordinates’ access to the options. I investigate three research questions about factors that affect employees’ access to flextime, CWW, and telecommuting: (1) To what extent do MW’s guidelines account for managers’ decisions to make the alternative work arrangements available? (2) What role do other factors, such as workplace, personal and household characteristics, play in that decision-making process? (3) Do managers use the same criteria to determine the availability of each option, or do the criteria vary by AWA?

Second, workers considering using an AWA must decide how an alternative arrangement will affect their job performance and the evaluation of that performance, as well as their need to use the arrangement. I investigate three related questions about factors that affect workers’ use of the scheduling options and the relationship between that use and home-to-work spillover: (1) What determines employees’ use of MW’s alternative work arrangements? (2) What factors influence employees’ home-to-work spillover? (3) What is the relationship between employees’ decisions to use the options and their domestic spillover?

**Overview of Dissertation**

This study contributes to our understanding of the implementation and use of alternative work arrangements, the nature of work-home conflict, and their interdependence. I identify contextual factors that promote or restrict employees’ access
to and use of alternative work arrangements, including organizational, job, and personal characteristics. My research also assesses the effects of work and personal factors on employees' home-to-work conflict. Reciprocal analyses of the relationship of the options’ use and domestic spillover identifies variations in the alternative work arrangements’ effectiveness in helping workers’ juggle their dual responsibilities.

I present my research methods, analyses, findings, and recommendations in Chapters Two through Five. In Chapter Two I discuss the locus of the study, as well as my research methods which include quantitative, qualitative, and archival data collected from surveys, interviews, focus groups, participant observation, and MW publications. The chapter provides an overview of MW and profiles of the three divisions in which respondents work. In Chapter Three I focus on the determinants of employees’ access to flextime, CWW, and telecommuting. I use OLS regressions to investigate factors that influence the likelihood that MW employees have access to flexible scheduling options. The chapter includes my hypotheses, variables’ measures, the results of my regression analyses, a discussion of the results, and the conclusions I reach. In Chapter Four I investigate the determinants of employees’ use of the three alternative work arrangements, job-related and personal factors influencing their domestic spillover, and the relationship between AWAs and spillover. I use simultaneous equation models to analyze the hypothesized reciprocal relationships between workers’ use of alternative work arrangements and their home-to-work spillover. The chapter includes my hypotheses, measures in my analyses not described in Chapter Three, regression results, a discussion of those results, and the conclusions I draw from the data. Chapter Five outlines the
contributions of my research, summarizes and discusses the research findings, notes the limitations of my investigation and suggests future research, and provides policy recommendations based on my results. I use qualitative data throughout the chapters to explain and enrich my hypotheses and findings.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH SETTING AND DATA COLLECTION

In this chapter I discuss the setting for my research, my entry into the firm, and my data collection procedures. I studied workers employed at a subsidiary of a financial services conglomeration, Inland Enterprise. The Inland Enterprise is a multi-faceted Fortune 500 organization of almost 100 companies. It is one of the largest multi-service financial services organizations in the United States with more than $80 billion in combined assets in 1997 and more than one billion dollars in combined net revenues (Inland Annual Report 1997).\(^1\) The Inland companies share a common management, overlapping boards of directors, and a common primary goal: "Our customers come first." The organization employs more than 30,000 workers throughout its subsidiaries in the United States, Europe, and Puerto Rico.

In 1994 the senior management of Inland endorsed a work-home policy proposed by Inland's Human Resources Department that offered three flexible work options—flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting.\(^2\) Inland's subsidiaries subsequently

---

\(^1\) These numbers are approximate to preserve Inland Enterprise's anonymity. Similarly, the numbers for Midwest are also approximate.

\(^2\) The policy also included job sharing as an alternative arrangement. Survey respondents who claimed to share jobs worked 40 hours a week, on average, indicating they do not clearly understand the definition of the option. Thus, I did not include job sharing in the analyses.
endorsed the policy, and it was announced to all Inland employees in the spring of 1995. Inland’s Human Resources Department was responsible for administering the policy through human resources personnel assigned to each subsidiary. In 1997 I approached the vice president of Inland’s Human Resources Department about assessing the implementation of the policy for my dissertation.

In consultation with the vice president, I agreed to focus on three divisions of Midwest Securities, the second largest company in Inland with 4200 employees. A senior MW officer explained that as a financial services company, MW is “...in the information business. There is no real tangible product except the written [policies] and the [information] service that supports it.” Midwest Securities produces hundreds of different types of policies, and oversees the daily movement of millions of dollars between customers’ mutual funds. The company has enjoyed spectacular growth in recent years and the firm’s assets have grown five-fold in the past decade. MW had total assets of over $50 billion and net revenue of $250 million in 1997, making it one of the country’s largest writers of individual variable annuities. More than 2660 employees worked in the three divisions at the time of this study. MW offices are located within the Inland home office complex, a multiple-building site in a major metropolitan area.

The Operations, Systems, and Actuarial Divisions

MW workers’ jobs are “knowledge jobs” that involve creating, processing and managing information (Berns and Berns 1992:34). The three targeted divisions work

---

3 Primarily a life insurance company, Midwest’s standard industrial code is 6311.
together to produce the various policies MW offers. As line and support divisions, however, the divisions differ in their functions, cultures, and rules of operation.

**Operations division.** The first division is the Operations business unit, described by MW informants as "a high-tech sweatshop" and "a white-collar factory." Operations is a production-oriented core unit whose 1,789 employees work in an environment that is shaped by a goal for routinized, high-volume service delivery on a daily basis. The division's workforce is predominantly white (86 percent) and female (66 percent). A new vice president took charge of the division in 1997 shortly before I began this research.

The vast majority of Operations workers are customer-service representatives who work at call centers. The service "reps" provide information about and service for policies to external customers such as stock brokers, regional planners, and sales agents. The employees use well-defined phone and computer procedures, as well as communication skills, to answer customers' questions, adjust contracts (e.g., change benefits), and revise billing procedures. The majority of jobs are entry-level, salaried positions requiring only a high school education and one to three weeks training at MW.

As an Operations manager explained, the service reps "have a one-to-one relationship [with customers] and the customers call asking for a specific person. And we think that we need to match our hours to our customers' hours." Thus, the reps are required to be available whenever their customers call. Two nonmanagers described the work environment: "Callers—they are not deadlines or anything, [but] you don't know

---

4 The Operations' call centers are located in the main office complex. A call center typically has hundreds of employees assigned to it. Each worker has a cubicle, phone, and computer.
when they are going to come or what is going to happen. But they have to be dealt with.”
And “you...have a constant customer either on the phone or someone coming to you.”

Productivity in the Operations division is gauged on a ratio basis between the
number of customers’ policies processed and the unit’s expenses, augmented by customer-
service measures. As a nonmanagerial informant noted, “We have production deadlines
on a daily basis.” At the time of my study, the Operations division was understaffed
because of the area’s low unemployment rate (2.5 percent). Thus, workers’ had three to
eight hours of mandatory overtime per week and were under constant pressure to perform
their routinized jobs quickly. In sum, the Operations division offered me the opportunity
to investigate the effect that a highly routinized and competitively-oriented line unit has on
employees’ access to and use of alternative work arrangements, as well as their home-to-
work spillover.

Systems division. The second division is the Systems unit, whose 710 employees
provide day-to-day technical support to all facets of the corporation, including the
Operations and Actuarial divisions. The division is predominantly white (90 percent), and
men comprise just over half of its workforce (54 percent). A Human Resources manager
described this division as the “most stressed of the three” due to its reorganization six
months before this research began.

In the words of a Systems manager, the division “is where the rubber meets the
road, from the standpoint that we are responsible for putting [computer equipment and
programs] in, and they have to work for our customers.” Because their “hot skills” are in
demand—and scarce both within and outside MW, Systems “techies” consider themselves
to be "elite" and "cutting edge." Systems' customers (that is, workers in other divisions) describe Systems employees as mature and professional—but also warn that Systems workers are sometimes complacent about their technological expertise, lack customer relations skills, and are not always responsive to internal customers' needs.

The division has two major workgroups: business analysts who interpret clients' needs (that is, requests from Operations for new or revised products) to the computer programmers; and programmers who write the computer code to produce the product. As market forces create the demand for new products, insurance regulations change, and procedures evolve, Systems personnel are responsible for the installation of new hardware and software. Systems employees are also responsible for the redesign of software for such things as underwriting and servicing policies, paying agents' commissions, and billing customers. Thus, Systems employees' work is centered on technology and driven by change. In addition, the pressure to meet other divisions' needs is compounded by external timelines imposed by market forces, the SEC, and insurance regulatory commissions. Systems informants agreed that "project deadlines are not set by anyone in Systems, so they make absolutely no sense [in terms of matching the work required with the time allotted for it]. It stresses everyone so that our work quality goes down because you can't get things done in the time that they set."

Systems employees generally work in project teams that are on call 24-hours a day, 7 days a week for emergencies such as breakdowns in programs and urgent

---

5 Each state in which MW operates has a regulatory commission that defines the requirements for the financial service industry. Thus, requirements for contracts vary from state to state and are constantly being revised by the governments.
programming revisions. A Systems manager explained that "things break at midnight or at 6 a.m. They just don't break in the middle of the day." Consequently, in another manager's words, "We're in a production environment mode, so we—my team and I—need to be accessible around the clock." Team members rotate the on-call responsibilities and carry pagers and cell phones to remain accessible. As one informant noted, "It's nice we have some individuals who like to come in early and others who come in later and stay later. So we get the wide coverage.... [But] if you use the CWW and you take Fridays off, then you are [expected] to be at home on Fridays in case of an emergency."

In sum, both business and technological needs shape the division's functions, creating an internal environment of ongoing change. The division is known for using new technology and new processes—such as the flexible scheduling options—for the sake of innovation, not necessarily for the processes' business application. Productivity in Systems is explicitly calculated by financial and time-driven measures. Thus, the Systems division provided me with the opportunity to evaluate the effect of an innovative, technological, and change-driven business unit on workers' access to and use of AWAs, as well as their home-to-work spillover.

Actuarial division. The Actuarial division provides analytical and research expertise to the line departments that are charged with building sales and assets. Actuarial workers perform contract and compliance work—determining, for example, the prices of MW's products by taking into account probabilities of mortality and morbidity, anticipated expenses, and desired profit margins. With 167 workers, it is the smallest division that I studied, and one of the smallest in MW and within the Inland Enterprise. The workers are
predominantly white (94 percent) and male (63 percent). A male manager described the homogeneity within his department:

"...[T]he people that I work with [have] the same timeline in life, the same situations.... Married, have kids,...a lot of them are males [with] wives at home.... So you sorta know where the people you [work] with are at in their lives. It is a small, informal division so you get to know people more. There is [a lot of] interaction between the people. The people that I work with are very hard workers and are also very understanding [of my work and home situation]."

MW informants described Actuarial employees as "the folks with slide rules in their pockets," a reference to actuaries' stereotypical demeanor rather than the actual tools of their work. Indeed, one Actuarial officer described the impact of technology and the 20 percent annual growth rate of MW: "We have fewer actuaries that do more things. There are more investigations, more analyses to make, and more competitive things ...[that] you have to stay on top of." Like Systems and Operations, Actuarial's work is market driven and "we don't have that much control over deadlines." Nevertheless, an Actuarial manager summarized informants' consensus that external customers' project deadlines rarely impose production pressures: "There have been very few times in [my] 15 years...when there was a rush or critical things that needed to be done. I've never had a problem with that. It has been very infrequent." The compilation of MW's financial reports, however, do impose time pressures. One month each quarter actuaries produce detailed summaries of MW's earnings for investors, a time-consuming activity that is similar to accountants' quarterly "busy seasons."

Actuarial's work is highly analytical, and the professionalism of the division is widely respected. One manager summarized the distinctive nature of the division: "[It] is
secluded within the company. We tend to make our own rules and break our own rules.”

For example, employees’ promotions and status are determined by professional examinations (e.g., the Society of Actuaries’ series of examinations). An informant explained that “as you go through the exams..., you go up in rank as manager and you have more responsibility.... People who work hard seem to get further along.”

Moreover, the Actuarial division has a long history of informal use of nontraditional work arrangements. As a manager-of-managers noted, that is because policy dictates that managers grant “study time for people who are taking exams. The company has given them so many hours allotment to study.”

Measuring productivity is more ambiguous than in the other divisions, however, as a senior Actuary acknowledged: “There is no productivity measure that we use. It’s a matter of getting things done and keeping the operations profitable and understanding what is going on.” Also in contrast to the Operations and Systems divisions, the Actuarial division has experienced little change over the past year. Thus, the division offered me the opportunity to assess the effect that a professional research environment has on factors affecting employees’ access to and use of flexible work arrangements, and the employees’ vulnerability to the intrusion of domestic concerns in the workplace.

**Representative line and support divisions.** The three divisions represent a cross section of line and support divisions throughout the enterprise. The variation in the divisions’ size is a proxy for characteristics such as structural differentiation, degree of bureaucratization, and availability of replacement workers (Scott 1992:258-61; Baron 1984:41-2). The divisions’ functions determine their customers and their measures of
productivity, influence the type of employee who is drawn to—and who has the skills to perform—each division's specialized work, and shape the underlying work group processes, values, and perspectives. A MW officer maintained, for example, that "so many of the Operations workers deal with external clients, that [Operations workers] tend to be grounded in reality—unlike Systems and Actuarial workers, whose clients are internal customers." In sum, Operations' strength lies in its workers' skills and their customer relations. Daily production goals define the scheduling of work and productivity in the division. In contrast, Systems' strength lies in workers' technological proficiency. Project deadlines and ad hoc events determine Systems employees' schedules and measures of productivity. Actuarial's strength lies in its employees' analytical expertise. Actuarial workers' schedules—although also established by project deadlines—are relatively long term with ambiguous measures of productivity. Thus, characteristics such as each division's focus, goals, work processes, professionalism, workforce composition, and size shape the context in which employees work.

Despite the differences between the divisions, each is susceptible to the productivity losses caused by employees' home-to-work spillover. Productivity is difficult to concretely measure in knowledge industries (Robinson and Godbey 1997:307), especially in support units like Systems and Actuarial. Friedman argues (1991:11) that productivity has "come to mean more than the classic economic definition of 'output over input.... [F]amily problems may cause worry at work, resulting in a loss of concentration and the inability of the employee to perform up to par.'" MW employees attested to spillover's negative effects. According to a female nonmanager, "[Spillover] influences
how well you work and how focused you are on what you are doing during the day.” A male coworker agreed: “[When you have spillover,] you end up making mistakes or you don’t do quite as good a job as you could have.” Indeed, the negative effects of spillover on employees’ job performance—and hence, on the firm’s productivity—are particularly important in labor-intensive information and service industries like MW, where workers account for 70 to 80 percent of all controllable costs (Friedman 1991:12).

A Comparison of the Midwest Securities Workforce with the U.S. Workforce

In terms of the representativeness of my sample, MW workers’ family composition, eldercare responsibilities, and financial resources were similar to those of the U.S. workforce, as Table 2.1 shows.6 The percent of MW employees who were married or partnered mirrored the national workforce, as did the percent who had children 18 years or younger living at home. Indeed, almost a third of each group lived in dual income households with children. In addition, thirteen percent of the MW and national labor forces provided care to elderly or disabled family members or friends at the time of the two studies. Although about six percent of MW workers were single parents compared to nine percent nationally, three times as many women as men were single parents in both studies (t-test, p ≤ .05; Bond et al. 1998:30). Finally, MW workers’ financial resources were also similar to employees’ nationwide.

---

6 I weighted the MW sample to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions. The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) is a random sample of civilian, non-institutionalized wage and salaried workers 18 years or older who resided in the contiguous 48 states.
The two labor forces differed along other dimensions, however. Mirroring the sex and race composition of the financial service industry (Smith and Maese 1998:252; Reskin and Padavic 1994:92), greater proportions of MW workers were female and white than in the U.S. labor force as a whole. MW workers were also younger and better educated than their national counterparts. Moreover, MW employees typically worked fewer hours per week than colleagues in the U.S. workforce as a whole. However, both groups reported that they worked about five hours per week longer than officially scheduled (MW's official workweek is 38.75 hours; nationally, the workweek officially averages 38.5 hours)(Bond et al. 1998:72). Finally, workers nationally were more likely than MW workers to live with family members that included parents, siblings, and in-laws.

The differences between the two labor forces' sex and age structures, household composition, and average weekly hours of paid employment may have implications for workers' domestic spillover. That is, to the extent that home-to-work spillover is grounded in domestic obligations and is related to workers' age, that women have greater responsibility for care-giving and household tasks than men, and that increased hours at work are inversely related to the time employees have to address household and familial concerns, women and men in the MW may report different levels of domestic spillover and thus request and use alternative work arrangements to different degrees compared to their national counterparts.
Entrée to Inland Enterprise

My association with Inland began informally in 1983. I met Fran, the spouse of an Inland officer, while doing volunteer work in the community. We became friends, as did our spouses and children. Over the next 15 years we socialized and vacationed together, and I had the opportunity to meet many Inland employees at Fran’s home and at community events. Fran’s husband took an interest in my research on work-home conflict as I progressed through my graduate course work in sociology. Following my candidacy in 1996, he urged me to explore research opportunities with the vice president of Inland’s Human Resources Department because Inland had recently adopted a work-home policy that offered alternative work arrangements. The vice president, with whom I was socially acquainted, agreed to discuss research options with me. At that meeting, he expressed interest in an investigation of employees’ access to and use of AWAs. Inland had not assessed the implementation nor the effects of the work-home policy since its adoption in 1994. From the corporation’s perspective, this was an opportunity to gather that information using few organizational resources.

We agreed upon Midwest Securities as the site of the research, on the firm’s work-home policy as the focus of the study, and on the assistance that Inland and MW would provide. That assistance included access to MW employees; letters of support from MW’s president and division vice presidents; use of the MW’s internal mail and voice-mail systems; use of Inland’s research department to provide random samples for focus groups, interviews, and the survey; and postage for the return of the second-round surveys. Inland
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7 I have changed the names of all individuals in this document to protect their anonymity.
also agreed that it would not have access to the collected data (see Appendix A: Letter of Agreement). The vice president appointed Dave, an Inland Human Resources manager, as my liaison. In addition to keeping Inland apprised of the study, Dave’s responsibilities included ensuring I had necessary resources and access to the appropriate employees within MW, such as the company’s vice presidents, its Human Resources officer, and her managers. Another key contact was Sally, the administrative assistant to MW’s Human Resources officer. With her knowledge of the company and her contacts with administrative assistants throughout the three MW divisions, she was the “go-to” person when I needed to arrange meetings, for example, or obtain and distribute letters of support.

Data Collection Procedures

I used archival, qualitative, and quantitative data collected from MW publications, focus groups, interviews, surveys, and participant observation to address the research questions. The triangulation of information allowed me to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants and processes influencing employees’ access to and use of AWAs, and the intrusion of workers’ domestic obligations into the workplace.

My liaisons at Inland and MW, as well as a variety of other informants, provided me with copies of Inland and MW publications, reports, survey instruments, and memoranda. I used the data to construct the interview and focus group schedules and survey instruments, to understand the formal and informal norms of the company and divisions, and to help interpret the qualitative and quantitative data.
I used two strategies to facilitate employees' participation in focus groups, interviews, and surveys. First, I collected all qualitative and quantitative data during work hours. To encourage employees' participation, MW notified all managers in the three divisions of the study and asked them to grant release time to participating workers. I have no way of knowing if all managers received the memo or agreed to grant release time to their subordinates, but the rates of participation in the data collection activities suggest managers' compliance with the request. Second, I conducted all meetings of employees in rooms centrally located in the three-building complex housing MW. The single site minimized participants' travel time and maximized the timeliness of communication through the company's internal mail system.

**Unit of Analysis**

Although the unit of analysis in my study is the individual, I draw comparisons between contexts—that is, divisions and departments—and attach the data on divisions and departments to individual data. Each division has multiple departments involving multiple managers and their subordinates.  
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9 One of the norms of the organization—and a factor making it difficult for employees to perform efficiently—is that departmental change is constant. As one informant explained, departments “vary daily as processes are reorganized, new products are developed, and managers come and go.” Change implicitly reduces workers’ ability to perform, as reporting mechanisms, job responsibilities, and workgroup coordination and communication are ambiguous, at least temporarily. A nonmanager described his position: “[There] are massive amounts of reorganization. Who works for whom.... I just got reorganized yesterday [and] I’m not sure who I work for.” Another added, “[Under the reorganization], they took [me] from one job to another, doing totally different things...[based on] the ‘other duties as assigned’ clause in our employment contract. If [I] don’t want to, well—find a new job.”
Initial Focus Group and Interview Sample and Strategy

Using interviews with managers and focus groups with nonmanagers, I gathered qualitative data on employees' perceptions of—and experiences with—flexible work arrangements and balancing the demands of home and work (see Appendix B: Schedules for Interviews and Focus Groups). MW has used both interview and focus group formats for a wide variety of internal research studies, and thus the majority of participants were familiar with the procedures. I used information gathered in these discussions, in part, to construct the survey instruments. I also drew on these qualitative data in interpreting my statistical findings.

As noted, these interview and focus group participants were employees in Midwest’s Systems, Actuarial, and Operations divisions. Inland’s Human Resource Information Service used a random-numbers computer program to identify sample pools of 120 nonmanagers (20 women and 20 men from each division) and 30 managers (5 women and 5 men from each division). During work hours, I called employees from the nonmanagerial pool until I had enlisted 10 participants for each of four 90-minute focus groups. I used the same technique to enlist 12 managers’ participation in 20-minute

---

10 I also had opportunities to talk with informants in less structured settings, such as a MW training for managers on diversity and numerous community and MW events.

11 The size of the sample pool was designed by HRIS to provide informants for all focus groups (initial and pretest) and interviews.

12 Four nonmanagers declined to participate. Nineteen others had scheduling conflicts, but they indicated they would be interested in participating in the pretest focus groups if their schedules permitted. No managers declined to participate, and those with scheduling conflicts also indicated interest in participating in the pretest focus groups.
interviews. Participation was voluntary. Although informants’ managers had been asked to grant release time for their participation, no one was under pressure to participate.

Following Morgan (1997:34), I conducted four semi-structured focus groups with a total of 34 nonmanagerial employees across the three divisions. In keeping with the principle that focus groups should be strangers who share homogeneous backgrounds, though not necessarily similar attitudes (Morgan 1997:34), I assigned nonmanagerial volunteers to focus groups based on three factors: sex, care-giving responsibilities, and MW division. Thus, the four groups were divided into those with women without care-giving responsibilities, women with care-giving responsibilities, men without care-giving responsibilities, and men with care-giving responsibilities. Each group was composed of eight to ten people, with no more than three members in any one group drawn from any one division. This minimized the risk that participants would know each other and ensured a cross-section of employees from the divisions.

I used interviews rather than focus groups with MW managers and officers, given their tighter time constraints relative to nonmanagerial employees. I conducted 18 interviews, including 11 with managers from across the three divisions, four Human Resource employees who worked at Inland and MW, and the three senior vice presidents of the Systems, Actuarial, and Operations divisions.

Six employees did not participate in their scheduled focus groups due to last-minute scheduling conflicts.

One manager did not participate in his scheduled interview due to a last-minute scheduling conflict.
One important result of the focus groups and interviews was my decision to have
slightly different versions of the survey for nonmanagers and managers. Because
managers have the discretion to implement the AWAs, their survey asked questions about
colleagues' support of, as well as managers' resources for, AWAs that were not included
in the nonmanagers' survey (see Appendix C: Managerial and Nonmanagerial Survey
Instruments).

Pretest Sample and Strategy

I pretested the surveys in two focus groups, one of managers and one of
nonmanagers from the Systems, Actuarial, and Operations divisions. Pretest focus group
members were volunteers from the original sample pools for focus groups and interviews
who had not previously participated. In both groups I sought equal representation of
women and men, participation by those with and without care-giving responsibilities, and
representation from each division. I used the same procedure to enlist participation that I
had used earlier: a phone call to potential informants and a confirmation letter to
volunteers (see Appendix D: Confirmation Letters to Interview and Focus Group
Participants). Eight MW managers and eight nonmanagers completed and commented on
the draft surveys. As with the earlier focus groups and interviews, all employees
participated voluntarily and managers granted release time to participants.

Following Converse and Presser (1986:52), the focus groups were designed as
"participating pretests" to assess the meaning of questions, task difficulty, the order of

15 All employees whom I invited to participate agreed to do so unless they had a
scheduling conflict. Ten employees volunteered for each group, but only eight ultimately
participated in each due to last-minute scheduling conflicts.
questions, skip patterns, respondents' interest, and completion time (see Appendix B: Schedules for Interviews and Focus Groups). Thus, the two pretests helped me to revise the survey format for greater clarity and ease of response, identify appropriate language for survey items, and determine survey completion time, which ranged from 15 to 25 minutes.

Survey Sample and Strategy

For the survey pool, HRIS identified simple random samples of managers and nonmanagers using a random-numbers computer program. Because my research was limited to three divisions within MW, informants in interviews and focus groups indicated that survey respondents would be concerned about confidentiality. Managers agreed, for example, that asking job titles would potentially identify a lot of people because so few employees shared the same title at the managerial level. Using a sample of managers matched with their subordinates would further contribute to concerns about confidentiality. Therefore, the pool was stratified by division and by employees' managerial and nonmanagerial status within each division, but I did not attempt to use clustered samples.

Two criteria guided the composition and size of the sample pool. First, I sought to obtain a ratio of completed managers' and nonmanagers' surveys in each division that reflected the overall ratio of managers and nonmanagers within each workforce. The sample pool from each division therefore reflected the manager:nonmanager ratio in that division. Second, my goal was a minimum of 135 completed surveys from each of the three divisions for a minimum total sample of 405 surveys. This is consistent with
Boomsma’s recommendation of samples of 400 for analyses of simultaneous equation models (1987:184). A sample size of 400 or more was also consistent with Milton’s (1986:114-5) recommendation for OLS equations similar to my conceptual model of workers’ access, and allowed for more complex OLS models should they be needed. Moreover, division samples of at least 135 respondents would allow me to conduct ordinary least squares analyses of each division separately. should I choose to do so. Because the Actuarial division was small, all Actuarial employees were included in its sample pool.

Based on the response rates of other MW surveys, HRIS randomly selected 250 employees from both the Systems and the Operations divisions to generate samples similar in size to the projected Actuarial sample. Therefore, the total sample pool for the survey was 667 MW managers and nonmanagers from across the three divisions. I administered the surveys in two rounds at work because employees are more likely to complete surveys distributed at work (with release time granted) than surveys that are distributed to their homes (Friedman 1987:24). I administered the first round in a

---

16 Milton’s technique for sample size (n) takes into account the desired level of significance (\(\alpha\)), the number of variables in the final model (k), and the anticipated overall \(R^2\). In addition, the sample should be large enough to ensure that an independent variable contributing an additional one percent of the explained variation (if entered last) be significant at the specified level (\(\Delta r^2\)) (Milton 1986:114-5). Thus, the equation is \(n = k + 1 = t^2 (1 - R^2) / \Delta r^2\). I wanted alpha to equal .05, and anticipated 20 variables in the model, an \(R^2\) of .30, and \(\Delta r^2\) equal to .01.

17 HRIS contended that the response rate of the Actuarial division was traditionally higher than the response rates of the Systems and Operations divisions. Therefore, I needed larger sample pools from Systems and Operations to generate samples equal in size to the Actuarial sample.
group setting, followed by a mail-in survey to sample pool members who had not already participated. The administration of the surveys in a group setting was advantageous for two reasons. The form of administration is typically used by MW for survey administration, so employees were familiar with it. Second, members of the sample pool identified themselves when they arrived at the survey administration site and I noted their participation. Consequently, I was able to immediately follow up with members of the pool who had not been able to participate at the assigned time.  

Prior to the group administration of the survey, three survey-related mailings were sent to MW employees using the company's internal mail system (see Appendix E: Administrative Letters of Support, Confirmation Letters, and Reminders to Sample Pool Members About the Survey). Three weeks before the survey administration, the senior vice president of each division sent a memo outlining the project to all employees in their respective division. By informing all employees, I hoped to minimize the potential reaction of sample pool members that they were being singled out. Two and a half weeks before I administered the survey, I sent a letter to employees in the sample pool inviting their participation in the survey. I assigned each sample pool member a primary date, time, and location for survey administration, and a second date to accommodate workers

---

18 Keeping track of participants in this way also allowed me to exclude one employee who wanted to participate but was not a member of the sample pool. I could not guarantee anonymity to respondents who participated in the group administration of the survey or who completed mail-in surveys. Both involved notification by internal mail and managers granted release time to participants. Moreover, other participants were present during the group administration of the surveys and coworkers were potentially present when respondents completed mail-in surveys. However, I could ensure confidentiality to all participants by guaranteeing that no one, including myself, could match individual participants with their completed surveys.
with scheduling conflicts. Both the MW officers' memos and my letter emphasized the voluntary nature of the survey and the random nature of employees' selection, and encouraged employee participation. Ten days before the survey administration, I sent a second memo to the sample pool reiterating the invitation, as well as employees' assigned dates, times, and location.

I addressed three potential logistical problems to group administration: (1) scheduling conflicts, (2) respondents' need to leave their offices to participate, and (3) the smooth administration of up to 175 surveys at a time. First, to reduce scheduling conflicts and encourage participation, MW vice presidents notified their managers of the survey dates and asked them to grant release time for their subordinates' participation. Second, to make the location convenient to MW employees (all of whom were located in the three-building headquarters complex), I administered surveys in a central meeting site at Inland's corporate headquarters. In addition, I scheduled eight survey administration periods over two days. Therefore, each employee could choose between two assigned times (one on each date). Moreover, each period was an hour long, providing leeway for respondents to take the 20-minute surveys. Third, Ohio State University colleagues provided assistance on the survey dates to ensure the smooth group administration of the surveys. They greeted respondents, kept track of which members of the sample pool participated, and distributed surveys at an administration desk outside the meeting room. I remained in the meeting room to answer participants' questions.

The administration of the surveys at work, whether in a group setting or during the follow up phase, raised the potential for two additional issues: employees' lack of privacy
to complete surveys and their concerns about confidentiality. Both workers in the group settings and those who received mail-in surveys may have lacked privacy to complete their questionnaires. To minimize the privacy issue in the group sessions, I asked that participants not sit near one another and that they not talk to each other while completing surveys. In addition, I reduced the possibility that participants who worked together would complete their surveys at the same time by assigning managers and nonmanagers to different administration sessions, and dividing and assigning nonmanagerial employees within divisions to three different administration times.

Following the group administration of the survey, I sent two mailings in MW's internal mail system to the 317 members of the sample pool who had not participated (see Appendix E: Administrative Letters of Support, Confirmation Letters, and Reminders to Sample Pool Members About the Survey). The first, sent a week after the group administration of the survey, included a letter from me and a survey with a stamped return envelope. To increase their confidence that MW would not have access to the data, I asked respondents to mail their surveys back to me at The Ohio State University. The internal mailing also included a letter from the president of the company emphasizing the voluntary nature of the survey and again encouraging participation. A week later, I sent a reminder memo through MW's internal mail system to all 317 initial nonrespondents, as I had no means of knowing who had already responded to first follow-up letter and who had not.

Confidentiality was another issue. Employees may have refused to participate if they were concerned about the confidentiality of their responses. I used five strategies to
minimize sample pool members' concerns about confidentiality and to ensure respondents of two things: that MW would not have access to the data, and that no one would be able to match participants with their answers. First, my memos to employees guaranteed participants' confidentiality. Second, I used Ohio State University colleagues rather than Inland or MW assistants to help administer the surveys. Third, employees placed their completed surveys from the group sessions into closed boxes. Fourth, follow-up surveys were mailed to The Ohio State University. Last, I included a contact phone number in the memos in order to be able to respond to questions and concerns. No members of the sample pools called with concerns.  

Survey Response

Almost three-fourths (72.6 percent) of MW employees in the total sample pool returned completed surveys (n=484), although response rates varied between divisions. Table 2.2 presents the overall response rate, the rates for each division, and the resulting sampling fractions and sample weights for the divisions.

Half (52.5 percent) of the survey pool completed surveys on the dates of the group administration. Managers' and nonmanagers' responses were consistent with the ratio of

---

19 However, ten members of the sample pools who were unable to attend their assigned group sessions called to inquire about alternative ways to participate and were informed about the follow-up procedure.

20 Four hundred and eight-six MW employees completed surveys. I discarded the survey completed by an employee who was not in the sample pool. Another survey was unusable in the analyses because the respondent did not indicate whether he had access to the AWAs.
manager to nonmanager in each division and in the sample pools (t-tests, p<.05). 21 An additional fifth (20.1 percent) of the pool returned mail-in surveys. 22

I base discussions of the demographic characteristics of the employee population represented by the three divisions on data weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions (see Table 2.2). Although the sample for the analyses in Chapters 2 and 3 is 484, the sample for the analyses in Chapter 4 is 480 because four surveys had incomplete data about respondents' use of AWAs or their home-to-work spillover. Therefore, I used a second set of sample weights in describing the entire workforce in that chapter. I did not weight data in the regression analyses because I controlled for division.

Because the analyses of employees' access to and use of AWAs required different variables and regression techniques, I discuss the variables and methods of analyses I used to investigate the determinants of workers' access to alternative work arrangements in Chapter 3. Similarly, in Chapter 4 I discuss the variables and methods of analyses I used

---

21 The ratio of managers to nonmanagers in Operations was 1:6 and in Systems it was 1:7. The Actuarial ratio was 1:1 because Actuarial promotions are based on professional tests and do not necessarily involve supervisory responsibility.

22 MW employees who completed the managers' survey in the group setting did not differ from those who mailed in their surveys by sex, race, degree of home-to-work spillover, or access to and use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting (t-tests, p<.05). In contrast, MW employees who completed the nonmanagers' survey in the group setting differed from those who mailed in their surveys by sex and their access to flextime and CWW. A higher proportion of women completed nonmanagerial surveys in the group setting than did those in the follow-up group (59 percent to 48 percent). Similarly, a higher proportion of respondents with access to flextime participated in the group setting than the follow-up (81 percent to 66 percent) and a higher proportion of those with access to CWW participated in the group setting than in the follow-up (70 percent to 57 percent).
to investigate the determinants of and relationship between MW employees' use of AWAs and their home-to-work spillover.
Table 2.1 Characteristics of Employees at Midwest and in the U.S. Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal and Household Characteristics</th>
<th>Midwest Workforce</th>
<th>National Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent female *</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent white *</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age in years *</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with some post-secondary education *</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with four-year college degree or more *</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean household income in dollars</td>
<td>$58,213</td>
<td>$58,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean weekly hours of work at MW or primary workplace *</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living with family members c *</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent married / partnered</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children ages 18 or under in household d</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children ages 12 and under in household</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children ages 5 and under in household *</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living in dual income households *</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living in dual income households with children</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of single parents *</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent currently providing eldercare</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference between MW and U.S. workforces
  (t-test, p<.05)

---

*a* Source: MW survey, 1998. Sample is weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.

*b* Source: The National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) (Bond et al. 1998)

*c* Family members include parents, in-laws, and siblings, as well as spouses/partners and children.

*d* The NSCW limits this to children under 18.

*e* Both studies define dual income as respondent’s spouse/partner working more than 20 hours a week.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Workers in Sample Pool</th>
<th>WorkersCompleting Surveys</th>
<th>Response Rate, in Percent</th>
<th>Total Workers</th>
<th>Sampling Fraction, in Percent</th>
<th>SampleWeights: Access</th>
<th>SampleWeights: Use-Spillover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>0.7241</td>
<td>0.7263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>0.2166</td>
<td>0.2163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.9565</td>
<td>1.9521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>2666</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The the number of respondents divided by the total number of employees in the division who were in the sample pool. The response rates vary between divisions ($\chi^2 15.58$, df 2).

b The number of respondents divided by the total number of workers in the division.

c The sample weight for analyses of access equals the inverse of the sampling fraction divided by the quotient of the total number of employees in the three divisions (2666) divided by the sample (484).

d The sample weight for the analyses of use-spillover equals the inverse of the sampling fraction divided by the quotient of the total number of employees in the three divisions (2666) divided by the sample (480).
In Chapter One I reviewed the demographic changes and economic issues that prompted organizations to adopt work-home policies over the past three decades. MW adopted a work-home policy in 1994 that made three alternative work arrangements available to its employees: flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting. The company’s official rationale for offering the options was to help employees “try to balance their home life responsibilities with their work demands...[and] assist [managers] as they compete for the skilled staff members they need (A Guide to Implementing Alternative Work Arrangements 1995).” As a company officer explained, the policy was designed as a work-home rather than a work-family policy

“...to address a multitude of issues involved in balancing work and home life in general...[not] just the child care issue that only touches the people who have kids. We needed to do something that cut across all our employees’ lives. And one of the best ways to do that was to really get serious about alternate work hours and locations.”

At the same time, MW emphasized that “whatever work arrangement [is] selected—traditional or nontraditional—business objectives must be met and the needs of the customer and other employees must not be compromised (A Guide to Implementing
Alternative Work Arrangements 1995).”\textsuperscript{1} Thus, MW views maintaining productivity (rather than workers’ need) as the paramount consideration for the implementation of flexible options. A senior Human Resources officer summarized the goal of the options: “[We’re] in the business of serving our customers [and] in some cases, that has to take precedence. That we can’t pinch. But...beyond that, [we need] to really get serious about more flexibility.” The vice presidents of each division expressed support for AWAs.

However, MW granted managers the discretion to make the options available to their subordinates rather than guaranteeing the universal availability of AWAs. Echoing the Human Resources officer quoted above, two 1995 memos to MW managers about the options and a concurrent Inland newsletter article about AWAs argued that some jobs do not lend themselves to flexibility. Thus, managers—who presumably are in the best positions to determine this—have the discretion to make the options available.

In sum, managers are “the ‘point men’ of a given strategy and the potential ‘fall guys’ when things go wrong” (Jackall 1988:21). Managers have the most at risk if they implement the AWAs—as well as if they do not implement the AWAs—because they have the responsibility to ensure subordinates’ short- as well as long-term productivity. This chapter focuses on factors that influence workers’ access to the options.

Three sets of factors should influence the implementation of AWAs. First, to help managers in their decision-making process, MW distributed a managerial guidebook—\textit{A}

\textsuperscript{1} The duality—and sometimes inherent conflict—between the motive to help employees meet competing responsibilities and the motive to increase net revenue is starkly illustrated in another subsidiary company of Inland. Managers there are imposing flextime and CWW schedules on workers, regardless of employees’ personal preferences, as a means to provide broader service coverage to clients. Officers in that subsidiary have also asked managers to reduce office space and costs by requiring their subordinates to telecommute.
Guide to Implementing Alternative Work Arrangements—that defined three formal criteria for implementation of the work/home policy: job suitability, employee suitability, and the cost-benefit ratio of alternative work arrangements. Second, researchers have found that contextual factors in the workplace influence employees’ access to AWAs (Hochschild 1997:96; Schwartz 1994:36-8; Rodgers 1992:191). Third, MW Human Resources officers believed that employees’ personal and household characteristics should not influence their access to flextime, CWW, and telecommuting because the policy is a work-home (rather than a work-family) program. However, prior research indicates that employers and employees are concerned about disparate treatment based on familial obligations (Khan 1994:3; Bailyn 1993:145; Grossman 1993:R8).

Therefore, I address three research questions: (1) To what extent do MW’s guidelines account for managers’ decisions to make the options available? (2) What role do other factors, such as workplace, personal and household characteristics, play in that decision-making process? (3) Do managers use the same criteria to determine the availability of each option, or do the criteria vary by AWA? Thus, in addition to job and employee characteristics related to the guidelines, I investigate factors related to the context in which employees work, as well as personal, familial, and household characteristics that may promote or restrict workers’ access to the options.

Hypotheses

The three alternative work arrangements permit flexibility in the timing and location of work. MW defines flextime as the flexible scheduling of work such that
employees begin their work daily before or after the regular starting time in their department (but not as a function of CWW or telecommuting). However, managers expect flextime workers to be present during core work hours that are established by management. In contrast, employees using compressed work week schedules work a full work week in fewer than five days. An employee using a typical CWW schedule, then, would work 10 hours for four days and have the fifth workday off. The third option is telecommuting. Telecommuters use electronic communication to perform some or most of their work away from the office setting (usually at home). Workers who telecommute may do so on an ad hoc or regular basis, and therefore may combine telecommuting with other alternative work arrangements. Managers typically expect regular telecommuters to work in the office at least one day a week, however. Thus, the options differ in the degree of flexibility they offer employees.

The Influence of Corporate Guidelines on Workers’ Access to AWAs

According to MW’s criteria for implementation of AWAs, managers should evaluate three criteria: (1) whether the job is suitable for flexible options; in other words, would nonstandard hours or location adversely affect external or internal customers; (2) whether the employee is suitable—that is, whether they have the skills to work independently; and (3) whether the benefits of employee flexibility (i.e., increased attraction and retention of skilled workers and gains in productivity) outweigh the extra supervision it may require. A nonmanagerial informant summed up the factors managers considered: “The discussions I’ve seen [between managers and subordinates] involve who

\[2\] Compressed work week schedules may also be designed for four-and-a-half day work weeks and 2-week periods.
you interact with, how they will be affected by your schedule, do you have the necessary
training, do you know how to actually do the job, do you need support from your manager
or co-workers, and how will we judge your performance."

**Job suitability.** The first of the three managerial guidelines for implementation
suggests that characteristics of employees' jobs should affect workers' access to AWAs.
Two attributes of subordinates' jobs should influence managers' decisions to make the
options available: (1) the degree jobs require workers to interact with others, measured by
supervisory responsibility and the need to interact with a variety of people; and (2) the
demands of their jobs, measured by job complexity and speed.

First, jobs that are interdependent require their holders to be available to others,
whether clients or other MW employees. As an Operations manager noted, "We need to
match our hours to our [external and internal] customers' hours.... [It is an] issue of
people not being there when others are calling for them." Another argued, "[T]here is
great value in the face-to-face interaction with members of your team." Similarly,
supervisors have a mandate to control subordinates and to be available and accessible to
them at all times (Bailyn 1993:33; Rodgers 1992:194). Therefore, job interdependency
should be adversely related to workers' access to the options whether employees'
customers are external clients or MW coworkers.

In addition, firms have an incentive to retain workers who perform demanding
jobs, such as those characterized by complexity and speed (Witkowsky 1999:226;
Friedman and Johnson 1991:16; Kingston 1990:450). And as a senior human resources
officer explained, “The competition for employees is fierce.” Consistent with MW’s rationale for implementation, demanding jobs that involve complexity and jobs that require speed—for which I assume competition for workers exists—should be positively related to employees’ access the options as a retention strategy.

**Employee suitability.** The second managerial guideline for making AWAs available relates to employees’ suitability, which I conceptualize as their ability to work independently. Two dimensions indicate employees’ ability to work independently: their organizational status and their autonomy. Prior research has shown that high status is associated with increased access to flexible schedules (Schwartz 1994:1, 13; Galinsky et al. 1993:4; Starrels 1992:265). Therefore, mirroring other studies, I expect that salary grade, a measure of status as well as compensation, should be positively related to access.

In addition, I use two measures of autonomy in the analyses for access: workers’ ability to make job-related decisions and their ability to perform jobs independently. Autonomy allows workers a say in how and when they will work. Moreover, autonomy implies that employees perform their jobs without managerial oversight, a prerequisite to employees’ use of AWAs. Thus, MW employees who are able to make job-related decisions and work independently should have greater access to the three options than colleagues with less autonomy.

**Cost-benefit ratio.** The third guideline encourages managers to evaluate the ratio of the costs of the alternative work arrangements (i.e., the need for extra supervisory

---

3 The measures of each of the criteria are relevant to other criteria, as well. For example, job complexity, a measure used for job suitability, is also related to the cost-benefit ratio and the retention of skilled workers—guideline three.
effort) relative to their benefits (i.e., productivity) when determining the options’ availability. Therefore, I examine two aspects of the cost-benefit ratio: evaluation factors related to supervisory effort, and proxies for productivity.

Prior research has found that managers often mistrust subordinates’ work ethic and resist AWAs because of concerns about productivity (Rapoport and Bailyn 1996:18; Bailyn 1993:144; Kingston 1990:446). As one MW worker said, “I’ve heard of the options, but [in] my area it’s not accepted because it takes away from productivity.” Echoing the managers in Hochschild (1997:32), MW managers in interviews and survey comments attested to the extra time and effort required for supervision of workers using the options, describing it as a “nightmare” to track schedules and to monitor subordinates’ performance. An Operations manager acknowledged, “The challenge of the flexible work schedules is the extra time it takes a manager to track productivity, schedule work, assign ad hoc assignments, etc. We already work overtime just to maintain our own workload, but add the options and you have more effort and more pressure.”

Managers also expressed frustration with the long hours they were expected to work and their inability to formally use the flexible scheduling options. An Operations manager lamented that

“[upper] management is much less sympathetic with the personal difficulties experienced by line management. We often work 60 to 70 hours of overtime a month without comp time or any other type of compensations. Burnout is common among us. Job satisfaction would be higher if some consideration were given to [managers’ use of flexible schedules].”

A similar refrain came from an Actuarial manager: “Actuarial has no formal policy about the flexible schedules except for flextime. We are overworked and under-appreciated.” A Systems manager with 22 subordinates who is a single mother of two reported that her “manager is hesitant to allow me the option of a flexible schedule because of my position. However, [a flexible schedule] would allow me to lower my stress and be more productive.”
Factors that ameliorate or exacerbate managers’ concerns about the extra effort needed to ensure productivity and maintain quality should influence managers’ willingness to make the options available. Consequently, I expect that two evaluation factors—the ease with which supervisors can evaluate the quality of subordinates’ work and, more subjectively, the degree supervisors trust their subordinates—should be positively related to workers’ access to AWAs. In addition, managers whose subordinates’ jobs are secure should be more willing to exert the extra supervisory effort the options require than managers whose subordinates’ jobs are at risk. Thus, I expect that perceived job security will also be positively related to workers’ access to the options.

In contrast, another subjective evaluation measure should decrease workers’ access to AWAs because the less workers are trusted, the less privacy and flexibility they get (Nippert-Eng 1996:162; Coser 1974:71). Thus, employees’ access to the options should be adversely affected if “facetime” is important in respondents’ workgroups. In that case, productivity and job commitment are evaluated on the basis of workers’ visible presence, not solely on performance (Bailyn 1993:45,110). Explaining the relationship between supervisory effort and facetime, a senior MW officer admitted, “[W]e still have managers who think if they can’t see the people, then how could they possibly manage the people. Once again, [we should be] looking at that whole idea of needing to be concerned with results, as opposed to...how you get them.” In sum, managers’ use of both

---

5 Although workers’ perception of the importance of facetime may also be the result of employees’ lack of access to and use of AWAs, informants said that they considered the role facetime played in their evaluations when deciding whether to request access and to use available AWAs. Thus, I include facetime as an explanatory variable.
subjective and objective evaluation techniques should be important to their decisions regarding subordinates' access to AWAs.

On the assumption that skilled and experienced workers are more productive than other workers, employers have traditionally provided benefits to attract and retain employees with job-specific skills and experience, and thereby also reduce turnover costs (Reskin and Padavic 1994:40; Galinsky et al. 1991:82). Indeed, the primary reason firms adopt work-home programs is to improve the recruitment and retention of valued employees (Witkowsky 1999:226; Galinsky et al. 1991:84; Galinsky and Stein 1990:373). A senior MW officer agreed, noting that MW is "a growing service industry in an area with a 2.5 percent unemployment rate. We need to offer incentives for productivity. Flexible work arrangements are a low-cost answer." Consequently, seniority and education, traditionally proxies for workers' expertise and productivity, should be positively associated with employees' access to the options.6

Summarizing the implicit intent of MW's managerial guidelines, a Systems manager captured many informants' perspectives: decisions about subordinates' access to the options "comes down to knowing the individual...and [having] a good idea of what is going to be accomplished."

---

6 Seniority should also increase workers' access to the options because workers who want to use the options can transfer over time to departments where the AWAs are available. A staff member in Human Resources summed it up: "People want to work in areas where management allows [flexible work schedules]. Eventually when non-supportive managers realize they're losing workers to supportive managers, [the inconsistency between workgroups] may change." Thus, some of the difference in access is attributable to workers' desire, captured in the hypothesized effect of seniority on access.
Other Important Factors

In addition to MW's formal criteria for implementation, contextual factors and workers' needs may influence managers' decisions to make the options available. I investigate the influence of two factors related to work context: division and employees' knowledge of the work-home policy. I also assess the effects of employees’ need, as indicated by their personal, familial, and household characteristics, on access to the options.

The influence of contextual factors. Contextual factors are an important influence on employees' access to AWAs (Hochschild 1997:96; Schwartz 1994:36-8; Rodgers 1992:191). For example, employees' access to work-home options within a company varies by business unit (Hammonds et al. 1997:98; Galinsky et al. 1991: 84-6). As discussed in Chapter 2, the three MW divisions I investigate differ in size, sex composition, function, the means of production, measures of productivity, and rules of operation. Operations is a customer-service shop with daily production goals. The Systems division is technologically and project based, it is highly competitive, and its workgroup values innovation. The most conservative and stable unit is the Actuarial division, where employees perform highly analytical work with ambiguous measures of productivity. The variables for division, then, capture the influence of stable characteristics of workers’ location within the company that are not explicitly measured. Given the pronounced differences between the three divisions, I expect that the organizational attributes captured by the measures of division should have a net influence on employees’ access to the options. Moreover, because workers in professional
occupations have traditionally been granted more access to AWAs than other workers (Schwartz 1994:16; Galinsky et al. 1991:85; Christensen and Staines 1990:459), I expect that Systems and Actuarial workers will have greater access to the AWAs than their Operations counterparts.

The second contextual factor that should influence MW employees’ access to AWAs is their awareness of the policy outlining the options. Policy awareness is a prerequisite to employees’ requests about the options’ availability. Indeed, an Operations manager acknowledged that “[waiting for individuals to ask about the options] has pretty much been our policy.” Yet awareness of the work-home policy is in large part based on the prominence of the options within specific workgroups, as focus group participants explained. For example, one described the typical new hire’s orientation to AWAs: “When you are hired into a department, the manager—if they have the policy—will go over it with you. You get information about the policy, but it’s not really talked about (emphasis added).” Confirming the importance of the options’ visible prominence, another informant added, “I think a lot of us are aware of [the AWAs] because so many people use [them].” Workers’ knowledge of—and their subsequent requests for the policy—often precede managers’ decisions to make the AWAs available. Therefore, respondents’ awareness of the work-home policy should be positively linked to their access to flexible scheduling arrangements.

In sum, employees’ division and their awareness of AWAs should influence managers’ decisions to make the options available. Describing the effects of the
contextual factors on colleagues' access to AWAs, one nonmanagerial informant stated, "[Access and use] depend on where you work [at MW]."

The influence of personal status and household characteristics. As noted, MW designed its policy as a work-home rather than a work-family policy to recognize the personal needs of employees with and without families. According to the guidelines, managers' assessments of workers' personal needs and responsibilities should not affect their implementation of the policy. Nevertheless, personal status, as well as familial and household characteristics, shape the nature of employees' external obligations and how those demands are viewed by others. Indeed, employers and employees in other firms have raised concerns about disparate treatment based on external obligations (Khan 1994:3; Bailyn 1993:145; Grossman 1993:R8). Therefore, I include measures of personal and household characteristics in the analyses. For example, I include workers' sex in the analyses of access to AWAs. I do not predict the direction of its effect, however, because research has suggested that women and men have equal access to most flexible work arrangements which, by design, are gender neutral (Kelly 1999:191; Schwartz 1994:16).  

MW informants provided conflicting views of the importance of family composition. One nonmanager summed up the thoughts of his colleagues who believed AWAs were "for people that have children. It seems to be more accepted if you need it because you have a family." In contrast, an Actuarial manager who had denied telecommuting access to a subordinate argued, "[She] should not be staying at home."

7 In the 1980s men had greater access to flextime than women (Christensen and Staines 1990:459), but women presumably had greater access to telecommuting which was designed to accommodate the personal and family needs of individual employees and
telecommunicating and taking care of children or elderly people. [She'll] always be deciding which is more important, the work or [her] family.” Nonmanagers discussing the relationship between work and home in focus groups summed up the opposing viewpoints, with one suggesting that “There's [managerial] bias against those with families.” Another countered, “There's also bias against those without families.” I investigate the influence of marital status, children, and elder-care responsibilities on employees’ access to the scheduling options." However, I make no predictions about their influence on MW workers' access to the AWAs given the informants' conflicting viewpoints and the conflicting evidence.

**Control variables.** I control for employees’ weekly hours of work at MW, race, age, and their household income. Weekly hours of work controls for differences in hours spent at the worksite and the affect it may have on access. In terms of race, non-minorities report greater access than minorities to flexible work arrangements except flextime (Schwartz 1994:16). However, whites comprise 90 percent of the sample, Blacks about 6 percent, Asians about three percent, and Hispanics and other races equal less than two percent of the sample. Thus, the categories of nonwhites included in the sample are likely to be too small to detect differences by race, should they exist. Age controls for life primarily used by workers for data entry and programming (Hill et al. 1996:293). I found no information about sex as a determinant of access to CWW.

8 Family composition and care-giving responsibilities were not strongly correlated with workers' access to any option. The highest correlation between the family and care-giving measures (marital status, children under age 5, children ages 6 to 12, children ages 13 to 18, and eldercare responsibilities) and access was between respondents' access to CWW and the number of children ages 13 to 18 (r=-.118).
cycle differences (Friedman 1991:22; Spilerman and Schrank 1991:56). I include household income in the analyses to control for differences in employees' ability to purchase services (e.g., care-giving and household repairs) that reduce employees' need for flexibility, and hence their requests.

Sample, Measures, and Method of Analysis

I used data collected in my employee surveys for the analyses. I based the format of the surveys, in part, on the 1992 National Study of the Changing Workforce (Families and Work Institute). I measured the variables with standard items where they were available, as Table 3.1 shows.

[Table 3.1 about here ]

I modified the wording of approximately half of the items for three primary reasons: to make the questions specific to MW, to make the questions consistent with MW terminology, and to make response categories consistent across related questions.

Measures

I measured employees' access to the alternative work arrangements with questions that asked whether flextime, compressed work week schedules, and telecommuting were available to the respondent to use. Respondents indicated whether they had access to the option (coded 1), did not have access to the option (coded 2), or did not know if they had access (coded 3).

---

9 "When you compare the men and women in the company, you are inevitably comparing a population of older men and younger women. If you do not control for age, you may think you are looking at a gender effect when what you really have is an interference of age and lifestyle differences" (Rodgers quoted in Friedman 1991:22).
I evaluated the influence of MW's first managerial guideline, the suitability of workers' jobs to AWAs, by investigating the influence of job interdependency and job demands. I measured job interdependency with two indicators. Supervisory responsibility measured the number of subordinates the respondent directly oversaw. Second, respondents indicated the extent their jobs required them to deal with a variety of people, from strongly disagree (coded 1) to strongly agree (coded 5).

I also measured the demands of workers' jobs with two indicators. I gauged respondents' perception of job complexity using a factor of three Likert-like job characteristics that are significantly correlated (p<01): ("My job is highly complex," "My job requires a high level of skill," and "My job is not repetitious."). The measure had a Cronbach's alpha of .72. A high score corresponded to high job complexity. Another characteristic indicative of a demanding job is the speed necessary to complete it. Respondents indicated that their jobs required speed using a five point scale, from strongly disagree (coded 1) to strongly agree (coded 5).

I used three measures for the managerial guideline focusing on employee suitability, that is, the ability to work independently. First, I gauged organizational status by salary grade, a measure with 9 categories (1 being the lowest grade). I

---

10 The income boundaries of the salary grades overlap, which, according to informants, is why it is used by MW workers as a status measure. Salary grade: 1 through 9 (the category boundaries were not listed in the survey):

1. $13,500 - 27,000
2. $16,000 - 33,000
3. $19,000 - 42,000
4. $24,000 - 53,000
5. $28,000 - 63,000
6. $36,000 - 78,000
7. $44,000 - 96,000
operationalized workers’ autonomy with two indicators: “I participate in making decisions that affect my work” and “I can work independently.” I coded strong disagreement 1; I coded strong agreement 5.

I investigated the influence of two aspects of the cost-benefit ratio, the third guideline: evaluation factors related to supervisory effort and proxies for productivity. I evaluated the effects of four facets of the evaluation process. I measured the ease of evaluating the quality of respondent’s work with a categorical variable (“It is easy for my immediate supervisor to evaluate the quality of work that I do”). The second measure asked respondents whether their supervisors trusted them. Responses for both questions ranged from 1 to 5, with strongly disagree coded 1 and strongly agree coded 5. Third, my measure of job security was an item that asked how likely it was that respondents would lose their jobs at MW in the next 6 months, with responses scaled from very likely (coded 1) to not at all likely (coded 4). Fourth, my binary measure of facetime asked if respondents believed that the amount of time they spent at the office, whether they are actually working or not, affected their supervisors’ evaluations of their work. I coded negative responses 0 and positive responses 1.

I used two variables to assess the influence of proxies for productivity. To measure seniority, I used an item that asked how long respondents had worked for MW. I used a seven-category ordinal variable to measure education. Having less than a high school education was coded 1, having a Ph.D. was coded 7.

8. $59,000 - 127,000
9. $72,000 - 146,000
Contextual factors. I used two indicators of the context in which employees worked. I measured division with dummy variables for the Systems and Actuarial divisions, with Operations as the reference category. I measured policy awareness with a binary variable that asked respondents if they knew about the flexible scheduling options outlined in MW’s work-home policy: flextime, CWW, telecommuting, and job sharing.\textsuperscript{11} Negative responses were coded 0; positive responses were coded 1.

Personal and household characteristics. I used five indicators of personal and household characteristics. I measured sex as a binary variable with male coded 0, female coded 1. I had four measures of respondents’ familial composition and care-giving responsibilities. I distinguished between respondents who were not currently married or living with partners (coded 0) and those who had spouses or partners (coded 1).\textsuperscript{12} I used three items to measure the number of children living in respondents households: the number of children age 5 or younger, number of children between 6 and 12, and number of children between 13 and 18. Responses for each were coded from 0 to 3 or more. To measure care-giving to elderly and disabled family and friends, I used a binary variable with no coded 0 and yes coded 1.

Controls. I had four control variables. I measured hours worked per week with an item that asked how many hours a week respondents usually worked at their MW job. I aggregated nonwhites into one category and measured race with a binary variable with white coded 0, nonwhite coded 1. I measured age with a linear transformation of the year

\textsuperscript{11} As noted, I did not analyze the fourth option offered in the work-home policy, job sharing.
respondent was born. Respondent’s household income was a measure with 12 categories.

I used the category midpoints to estimate income in dollars, taking into consideration the lower boundary of salary grade 1 for the lowest category of household income. I used Pareto’s technique (Parker and Fenwick 1983) to estimate the median for the open-ended top category of $150,000 or more, taking into consideration respondents' personal income for category 12.  

---

**For ease of interpretation, “married” includes respondents with spouses and those living with partners.**

**Total annual household income using midpoints of categories:**

1 = $16,749.50. (midpoint between lower boundary of respondent’s salary grade and upper boundary of category)
2 = $24,999.50.
3 = $34,999.50.
4 = $44,999.50.
5 = $54,999.50.
6 = $64,999.50.
7 = $74,999.50.
8 = $84,999.50.
9 = $94,999.50.
10 = $112,499.50.
11 = $137,500.
12 = (More than $150,000). Estimate: If personal income = 10 and respondent’s spouse/partner does not work outside the home, household income equals personal income. If personal income = 10 and spouse/partner does work outside the home, household income equals $176,855 (Pareto estimate of category midpoint).

Respondent’s personal income is measured with 10 categories. Category midpoints estimate income in dollars, taking into consideration the boundaries of employees’ salary grades for categories 1 and 10. I use Pareto’s technique to estimate the median for the open-ended top category of $100,000 or more (Parker and Fenwick 1983). Estimates of total personal income of category 10:

10 (More than $100,000). Estimate takes into consideration reported salary grade. If salary grade = 8, personal income=$113,500 (midpoint of gap between $100,000 and $127,000). If salary grade = 9, personal income=$136,500 (midpoint of gap between $127,000 and $146,000). If salary grade =10, personal income=$152,003.60 (Pareto estimate).
Table 3.2 provides the sample means and standard deviations of the variables in the analyses. I describe the estimation of missing values in Appendix F.

Table 3.3 shows the bivariate correlations between the variables.

Method of Analyses

As noted, I measured employees' access to flextime, compressed work week, and telecommuting with questions that asked whether flextime, compressed work week schedules, and telecommuting were available to the respondent to use. I used analysis of association (Goodman 1987; Eliason 1990; Clogg and Shihadeh 1994) between the respondents' answers to the question and their division to obtain scale values for access to the scheduling options. This allowed me to include in the analyses respondents who did not know if they had access to the options. The values obtained through analysis of association indicate a substantially better fit with the data than the corresponding independence models, as the chi squares indicate: access to flextime has a chi square of 2.53 with one degree of freedom (independence model: chi square of 75.77 with four degrees of freedom); access to compressed work week has a chi square of 10.48 with one degree of freedom; access to telecommuting, the associated value for no is 0, don't know is coded .53, and yes is coded 1.

There is an element of self selection among those with access, because managers often wait for workers to request the options before making them available. However, my use of analysis of association reduces the potential bias of self selection in that I am able to include workers in the analyses who don't know whether or not they have access.
degree of freedom (independence model: chi square of 107.61 with four degrees of freedom); access to telecommuting has a chi square of 4.18 with one degree of freedom (independence model: chi square of 80.68 with four degrees of freedom). Using the analysis of association values, I was able to treat access to each option as a continuous dimension.

I used ordinary least squares to regress MW employees' access to the three scheduling options—flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting—on measures of MW's formal implementation criteria, workplace factors, and personal and household characteristics. This method allowed me to investigate the factors that affected employees' access to each scheduling option net of other factors in the models, and the relative strength of those factors on each option. Tests of significance were at the .05 level.

Figure 3.1 depicts the conceptual model for workers' access to flextime, CWW, and telecommuting. The model includes the three sets of independent variables: (1) a set

16 The $R^2$s $\left(\frac{\chi^2_{AA} - \chi^2_{IA}}{\chi^2_{IA}}\right)$ comparing the independence models with the analysis of association models indicate the improvement over the independence models. For flextime, the $R^2$ is 96.7. For CWW, the $R^2$ is 90.3. For telecommuting, the $R^2$ is 94.8.

17 Although CWW is a subcategory of flextime, the two options differ in the flexibility they offer (two hours a day with flextime compared to up to a day a week with CWW)—and thus in their ability to address the variation in the workers' needs. Moreover, the variation in flexibility influences the degree of managerial coordination, communication, and oversight needed for each. These differences suggest that they be analyzed separately.

18 Multicollinearity can make it difficult to estimate the effects of independent variables on dependent variables because it produces large standard errors (Lewis-Beck 1980:59). I tested for multicollinearity using the variance inflation factor (VIF), condition numbers, and variance-decomposition proportions. According to accepted standards (Belsley et al. 1980:112), multicollinearity was not a problem in the analyses of access.
that operationalizes MW’s criteria for job suitability, employee suitability, and the cost-benefit ratio of implementation; (2) a set that operationalizes workplace factors that should be influential; and (3) a set of personal and household characteristics that shape the nature of employees’ external obligations and how those demands are viewed by others. I include controls in the analyses for employees’ age, race, household income, and hours worked per week.¹⁹

[MW’s formal criteria for policy implementation did not distinguish between the three alternative work arrangements. Similarly, I did not distinguish between the options when hypothesizing the effects of workgroup factors, personal and household characteristics, and control variables. Therefore, the dependent variable in Figure 3.1 represents all three alternative work options.]

---

¹⁹ I did not include personal characteristics of respondents’ managers because informants agreed that age, sex, and family composition were irrelevant to managerial support. One female officer summarized informants’ views that there were individual managers who were only “comfortable managing in a more traditional style…. In some cases it’s past experiences, and in other cases, it’s how they came. The nut of it is [the managers’] orientation. Some people are much more into structure and rules. A lot of it involves [their] philosophy about people. There are some people who trust [subordinates] until shown otherwise, and then there are people who distrust them until they get to know them well—or maybe they always distrust them.” In sum, informants consistently argued that managers whose management style incorporated trust of, and respect for, their subordinates were more likely than similarly situated colleagues to make the options available. I included two measures of subjective managerial trust: supervisory trust and whether facetime was important.
Research Findings

Descriptive Findings

MW's work-home policy was intended to help employees balance the dual demands of work and home while maintaining their productivity. MW distributed a managers' guide that outlined the criteria managers should use to determine the availability of the options. However, 30 percent of the managers across divisions did not have a copy of *A Guide to Implementing Alternative Work Arrangements*, and an additional 19 percent were unfamiliar with the criteria or thought the criteria were unclear (data not shown).  

Perceived administrative support for alternative work arrangements varied by option, as Table 3.4 shows: 79 percent of managers across divisions reported support for flextime among managers in their departments, 71 percent reported support for CWW among managers in their departments, and 56 percent reported support for telecommuting among managers in their departments.  

Thus, the option that deviated the least from traditional work arrangements engendered the most managerial support; the option that deviated the most from traditional work arrangements garnered the least support.

[Table 3.4 about here]

---

20 The survey asked managers whether or not they had a copy of the guidelines (no is coded 0, yes is coded 1) and if they had a copy, whether or not they thought the guidelines were clear (no is coded 0, yes is coded 1). I weighted the data to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.

21 The questions asked “In your department, do managers support flextime (or compressed work weeks or telecommuting)?” Respondents who answered no were asked to indicate the importance of seven possible obstacles to support; similarly, respondents who answered yes were asked to indicate the importance of seven possible reasons for support.
Table 3.5 reveals managers' perceptions of the reasons colleagues support or resist AWAs. MW managers expressing support for the options attested to the importance of the policy as a strategy to attract and retain good workers in a competitive arena (Table 3.5, left column). Employee requests and the trust managers had in subordinates were also primary reasons for managerial support of the options, with the majority in support rating each as important or very important. Conversely, managers consistently cited the options' negative impact on scheduling, productivity, and supervision in explaining the lack of perceived managerial support for the policy, with the majority of those expressing resistance rating each as important or very important (Table 3.5, right column).

Mirroring the variation in overall managerial support for the three options, MW's alternative work arrangements were not uniformly available, and workers' access to them varied between divisions, as Table 3.6 illustrates. Flextime was the most available option, and telecommuting, the least.

For telecommuting, managers also cited the impact on the quality of work among the top three reasons for support.

As Table 3.5 shows (left column), managers who reported support for the options did not cite the positive effects the options have on scheduling among the top three reasons for support, and cited the positive effect on quality of work among the top three reasons only for telecommuting.
In total, three-fourths (75.6 percent) of MW employees across the three divisions indicated that they had access to at least one of the three options (data not shown).²⁴ Moreover, three-fourths (75.7) of the employees across divisions agreed that flexible scheduling options would have a positive or very positive impact on productivity in their departments (data not shown).²⁵

Results of OLS Regressions of Employees' Access to Flextime, CWW, and Telecommuting

As expected, the corporate guidelines influenced managers' decisions to make the options available, as did the context in which employees work, which defines what is normative within work groups. Consistent with the intent of the options to help all employees balance their work and home obligations—not just those with familial responsibilities—personal and household characteristics had little influence. The determinants of the AWAs, however, varied between flextime, CWW, and telecommuting. Table 3.7 presents the regression results for MW employees' access to flextime, CWW, and telecommuting.²⁶

²⁴ I calculated this using a dummy variable coded 1 for respondents who indicated they had access to one or more of the AWAs, and coded 0 for all other respondents. I weighted the sample to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions (n=484).

²⁵ The question asked respondents what the overall impact on productivity of the AWAs would be in their department, considering all things, if the flexible work options were available to everyone in their division. Responses were negative (coded 1), negligible (coded 2), positive (coded 3), and very positive (coded 4). The mean response did not vary by division (F test, p<.05).

²⁶ The coefficients for the dummy variable representing respondents' participation in focus groups and interviews were also nonsignificant and dropped from the models for parsimony. I also tested for additive effects by sex. No patterns of interaction appeared.
Determinants of workers' access to flextime. I investigated the effects of three sets of factors on MW workers' access to alternative work arrangements: MW's managerial guidelines, contextual factors in the workplace, and personal and household characteristics (Table 3.7, column three). The influence of the managerial guidelines on flextime was limited to measures of employee suitability. Organizational status had a curvilinear effect (concave down) on workers' access to flextime. That is, workers' access to flextime increased at a decreasing rate until grade 5 (the midpoint of the salary schedule), at which point employees' access began to decrease. In addition, the ability to work independently had a negative effect on employees' access to flextime. Thus, contrary to my hypotheses, autonomy and status (at least in part) decreased workers' access to flextime. Job suitability (job demands and job interdependence) and indicators of the cost-benefit ratio (evaluation factors and proxies for productivity) had no influence. Both contextual indicators were influential, as expected. Employees in the two professional divisions—Systems and Actuarial—had greater access to flextime than their more production-oriented colleagues in the Operations division. In addition, employees' awareness of the policy increased the likelihood that they would have access to it. I found no evidence, however, that personal and household characteristics affected workers' access to flextime.

Determinants of employees' access to CWW. I examined the influence of the same three sets of factors on workers' access to CWW (Table 3.7, column four). The influence of MW's guidelines on access to the option was limited to the negative effects of
three measures of job and employee suitability. Two indicators of demanding and interdependent jobs reduced employees' access to the option: the speed required to perform one's job and the degree of supervisory responsibility the job entailed. Contrary to my hypothesis, employees' ability to work independently also decreased their access to CWW. Second, contextual factors were again influential. Systems and Actuarial employees had greater access to CWW than their Operations colleagues, and employees' awareness of the work-home policy increased the likelihood they would have access to the option. Third, in terms of personal and household characteristics, workers with eldercare responsibilities had greater access to CWW than other workers. Teenage children, however, reduced workers' access to the option. I found no evidence that the complexity of workers' jobs, the degree employees worked with diverse people, organizational status and ability to make job decisions, evaluation factors, proxies for productivity, or workers' sex, marital status, and having children ages 12 and under influenced access to CWW.

**Determinants of workers' access to telecommuting.** Indicators of MW's managerial guidelines, the context in which employees worked, and workers' personal and household characteristics all played roles in employees' access to telecommuting (Table 3.7, column five). In terms of the guidelines, indicators of employee suitability and the cost-benefit ratio affected employees' access to telecommuting. That is, workers' status increased their access to the option, as did perceived supervisory trust. In contrast, respondents who believed facetime was an important element of their evaluations were less likely to telecommute than others. Second, in terms of employees' work context, workers' division was influential in the expected way: Systems and Actuarial employees
had greater access to telecommuting than Operations employees. Third, the only personal factor that affected workers' access to telecommuting was their eldercare obligations. Employees who provided eldercare were more likely than their coworkers without eldercare responsibilities to have access to telecommuting. The analyses did not support the hypotheses that the demands and interdependence of workers' jobs, employees' awareness of MW's policy, or workers' sex, marital status, and family composition affected employees' access to telecommuting, however.

**Controls.** I controlled for employees' household income, their weekly hours of work, race, and age in my analyses of the determinants of employees' access to AWAs. The controls did not affect the availability of flextime or telecommuting. Age—a control for life cycle differences—was important, but only to CWW: the older workers became, the less access they had to CWW.⁷⁷

**Discussion**

My research addresses three questions: (1) To what extent are managers' decisions to make AWAs available to their subordinates based on MW's formal guidelines for implementation of the work-home policy? (2) Is workers' access to the options influenced by the context in which they work and subordinates' personal and household characteristics? (3) Are the determinants of employees' access consistent across the three options? As my analyses show, there are differences in the availability of the different

---

²⁷ I also investigated the possibility that age had a curvilinear effect on workers' access to AWAs, but it did not (analyses not shown).
alternative work arrangements, as well as in the factors that affect employees' access to each.

**The Influence of MW Formal Criteria on Implementation**

I found limited evidence that managers considered MW's criteria for the implementation of the firm's three alternative work arrangements when determining subordinates' access to the options (Table 3.7: Job Suitability, Employee Suitability, and Cost-Benefit Ratio panels). The first guideline encourages managers to consider the suitability of subordinates' jobs. I hypothesized that interdependent jobs would be negatively associated with access, reflecting employees' need to be available to internal and external customers. In contrast, I expected demanding jobs would be positively associated with access because corporations have an incentive to retain skilled workers. The influence of these job characteristics was limited to workers' access to CWW. As expected, supervisory responsibility reduced workers' access, but so did jobs requiring speed. Thus, I found little support for the hypothesis that job suitability influences workers' access to alternative work arrangements.

The second guideline suggests that managers consider subordinates' ability to work independently when making decisions about implementing AWAs. I hypothesized that workers' organizational status and autonomy should increase of employees' access to AWAs. Status's positive influence was restricted to workers' access to telecommuting, however. The variable had a curvilinear effect (concave down) on flextime and no effect on CWW. Contrary to my hypothesis, the ability to work independently decreased workers' access to both flextime and CWW. The ability to make job-related decisions had
no influence on access to any of the options. Thus, the evidence generally contradicts the hypothesis that managers make AWAs available to workers who can perform their jobs without oversight.

MW's third guideline encourages managers to evaluate the ratio of the costs of alternative work arrangements to their benefits when considering implementation of the options. However, proxies for productivity—workers' seniority and education—had no influence on employees' access to AWAs. Related to the costs of supervising workers on AWAs, subordinates' job security and the ease with which managers were able to evaluate the quality of subordinates' work had no influence, either. Two measures of subjective evaluation—facetime and supervisors' trust in their subordinates—had influence but only on managers' decisions to make telecommuting available. Thus, I found little empirical evidence that MW managers considered the cost-benefit ratio when making flexible scheduling options available.

In sum, a primary reason MW adopted its work-home policy was to remain competitive by retaining skilled and experienced workers on the assumption that they have firm-specific skills, and hence are more productive than other workers. However, job complexity, workers' seniority and education, their job security, and managers' ability to measure the quality of employees' work did not significantly affect employees' access to any option. As an Operations worker without access to the options explained, "In some areas employees are treated as though they can be easily replaced regardless of experience, educational background, or productivity."
In contrast, supervisory trust, facetime, the ability to work independently, the speed required in workers' jobs affected employees' access to AWAs, but none had a consistent effect on all three options. That the influence of supervisory trust and facetime is limited to workers' access to telecommuting may be explained, in part, by the lack of explicit and easy-to-use measures of individual productivity at MW. In those situations, managers are likely to "intuitively measure" productivity and have "incredible trust" in subordinates before making telecommuting available (McCullough 1999:10a). Moreover, two of the factors that are theoretically related to increased access to the options—the ability to work independently and job speed—had the opposite effects. Further research is needed to explain the adverse effects of autonomy and job speed. It is possible, however, that workers with autonomy already have built-in job flexibility—and hence do not request access to the options, a key reason managers implement the policy (Table 3.5, left column-support). And jobs that require speed may be too demanding for workers to continue for 10 hours at a time under a CWW schedule.

The Influence of Contextual Factors on Workers' Access to AWAs

Confirming prior research, two contextual attributes—employees' location within the firm and their awareness of the policy—were important determinants of employees' access to alternative work arrangements (see Table 3.7, Context panel). The bivariate pattern between division and access shown in Table 3.6 persists net of all factors which, according to MW's managerial guidelines, should make a difference. In fact, employees' division was the sole factor that had a consistent effect on flextime, CWW, and telecommuting. As expected, workers in the Systems and Actuarial divisions—two
professional divisions—had greater net access to each of the alternative work arrangements than their production-oriented counterparts in the Operations division.

The second contextual factor, awareness of the work-home policy, is an indicator of the importance of the options in the workplace and a prerequisite to employees' requests about the strategies' availability. Workers' awareness of the policy increased the likelihood that they would have access to flextime and CWW. It did not affect employees' access to telecommuting, however. The lack of the variable's influence on telecommuting is explained, in part, by the option's technological requirements. As an Operations manager acknowledged, "We don't have the system set up for telecommuting. If we did, I would [let people work from home]." In sum, my research supports prior evidence that contextual factors affect the availability of flexible work strategies, regardless of company policy.

The Influence of Personal and Household Factors on Workers' Access to AWAs

Consistent with MW's intent to create a work-home rather than a work-family policy, employees' personal and familial situation minimally affected their access to AWAs (Table 3.7, Personal/Household Characteristics panel). Workers' personal situations had no influence on their access to flextime and only limited influence on workers' access to CWW and telecommuting. The presence of teenagers decreased employees' access to CWW, the option that offers the longest workday but up to a full weekday free per week. Prior research has shown that teens are a primary distraction to their parents on and off the job, and the consequences of unsupervised time can be more drastic for them than other children (Graham 1995:B1). The 10-hour days of CWW limit parents' availability to
their children on a day-to-day basis more than flextime or telecommuting. Therefore, one explanation for the negative relationship is that decreased access to CWW reflects fewer requests by parents of teenagers than other workers, the number one reason managers support the option (Table 3.5, left column).

In contrast, care-giving responsibilities to the elderly increased employees' access to both CWW and telecommuting. One explanation for this finding is that the ability to work from home and the large block of release time that CWW offers facilitate employees' ability to meet the needs of elders, such as providing elders with transportation to doctors' appointments that must be scheduled during traditional working hours. Thus, those with eldercare responsibilities may request CWW and telecommuting more than their coworkers. Moreover, research has suggested that eldercare is seen as a more valid and less negotiable issue to workers and employers than flexibility to meet the needs of children (Shellenbarger 1997:B1; Friedman 1987:2). Having children is perceived as an individual decision—a matter of choice—whose consequences therefore rest with the individual (Kelly 1999:189; Bailyn 1993; Friedman and Johnson 1991:10; Lewis and Taylor 1996; Hochschild 1989). No choice is involved in having parents, however, and managers—with their own eldercare issues potentially looming—may be able to readily empathize with those who have elderly dependents (Ettner 1995:65; Shellenbarger 1994:A1).
Variation in the Determinants and Availability of Alternative Work Arrangements
and Related Supervisory Issues

With the exception of the influence of divisions, the determinants of managerial
decision-making varied by scheduling arrangement, as noted. The variation in
determinants of workers' access to AWAs may also be explained, in part, by differences in
the options' history within MW. For example, MW employees informally used flextime
almost two decades prior to its official implementation. As an Operations manager with
20 years experience at MW noted, "Flextime has been a part of MW ever since I can
remember.... It's become such a part of our culture that we don't have people scheduling
8 a.m. meetings." Employees also used CWW informally prior to the policy's adoption in
1994, but less widely and for a shorter period of time. Telecommuting is the newest
option and hence the least familiar to managers and nonmanagers. Summing up her
workgroup's limited support of AWAs, one MW manager declared that "my coworkers
and managers [in the department] frown on all the options except flextime. But if
managers supported [CWW and telecommuting], coworkers would, too." That flextime is
the most familiar and most accepted by management (see Tables 3.4 and 3.6) implies that
managers should be more likely to make it available based on fewer factors.

Moreover, because the AWAs deviate from standard work hours and location in
different degrees, managers' concerns about—and the complexities of—scheduling,
oversight, and subordinates' productivity are likely to vary between the options. For
example, flextime workers are present daily, employees who use CWW on a weekly
schedule are present four out of five workdays a week, and full-time telecommuters—
though rare—may be in the office as little as one day a week. Adding to the challenge, managers overseeing CWW schedules must plan and coordinate work for subordinates whose schedules vary dramatically throughout the week because employees in workgroups stagger their days off.

Not surprisingly, MW managers and nonmanagers alike noted the scheduling issues that arose from employees’ use of flexible scheduling options and that affected work group performance. Recognizing the interdependence of workers’ jobs, a nonmanagerial informant commented that “sometimes [alternative work arrangements] make it a little bit more difficult to coordinate things because you have three or four people on one project all with different schedules, days off. Getting them all together when you need them can be difficult.” A Systems manager particularly objected to CWW: “It makes my team’s job more difficult. It is a matter of them being productive…. People being off does impact the team’s ability to put forth work to do the job.” Similarly, a nonmanager mentioned the complexities introduced by flextime. “It leads to times when you can’t find somebody. You don’t know when they are coming in or if they are going to be late, especially with the flextime…. It can be very stressful.” Moreover, concerns about short-term productivity tend to overshadow potential long-term benefits of flexibility because departmental productivity may be measured weekly, while the organization measures its productivity quarterly and provides formal performance evaluations for employees annually. In sum, the determinants of the options are likely to vary, in part, because the options vary in the timing and location of work. Consequently, they require different degrees of managerial supervision, coordination, communication,
and planning—and differ in their potential to affect subordinates' job performance, and hence productivity.

Given managers' own long hours and heavy workload, a Systems manager concluded that "it takes a very generous soul to accommodate the options, in spite of all the good reasons for doing so." However, MW informants warned managers against using inconvenience as an excuse to restrict the use of alternative work arrangements that have long-term benefits. As another manager recognized, "although [flexible work schedules are] sometimes inconvenient for managers, the alternatives are worse. Managers (including myself) cannot afford to be lazy. Availability of CWW, flextime, etc., is a must if we want to attract and retain employees."

It is likely that the different technological requirements of the AWAs—unmeasured in the analyses—also affect employees' access to the three options. That is, flextime and its subcategory CWW require no additional equipment and thus no additional expenditures by MW. In contrast, MW must purchase and maintain off-site computers, modems, printers, and phone lines for employees who telecommute full time.28 Moreover, technological limitations still restrict the option's availability.29 A Systems officer noted that "we don't have the cost-effective technology that supports a true virtual corporation where people can be anywhere." Thus, unlike its effect on flextime and CWW, awareness

---

28 Informants who telecommuted on an ad hoc basis typically did so using their own equipment at home and did not ask MW to reimburse them for phone bills.

29 The basic technology for telecommuting was available in the 1970s (Hill et al. 1996:293), but line speeds for MW data transmission were so slow that full-time use, such as that by computer programmers or customer service representatives, was not practical from a productivity standpoint until the early 1990s.
of the work-home policy may have no effect on employees’ access to telecommuting because the option remains out of reach of many MW employees due to technological constraints.

**Idiosyncratic Managerial Support**

Because job, personal, household, and workplace characteristics do not explain much of the variation in MW workers’ access to flextime, CWW, and telecommuting, residual factors must be at work. As noted, almost half of MW managers across the three divisions did not have MW’s implementation guide or thought the guidelines were unclear. Managerial discretion combined with managers’ lack of information about the criteria encourages idiosyncratic decision making about the availability of the options. Indeed, anecdotal evidence suggests that idiosyncratic managerial support (unmeasured in my study) influences the availability of AWAs. For example, workers within the same department do not necessarily have equal access to flexible options. An Actuarial manager described the inconsistency within her work group. “There are five people with supervisory responsibility in my area of 15 employees. Two of those five do not support flexible work schedules [except] flextime. [And] each supervisor requires different levels of justification for using the options.” A nonmanager also emphasized the differences in managerial support of AWAs within her department, explaining that “we have different managers in our team. Some of them eat, sleep, and breathe MW, and some of them understand and are compassionate.” Managers are not immune to the idiosyncrasy of their

---

30 Managers who do not have a copy of the implementation guide, however, may be familiar with the gist of the guidelines through their experience with and observation of other managers. Thus, lack of a guidebook does not, in itself, translate into managers’ ignorance of, or disregard for, the criteria.
supervisors, either. An Operations manager-of-managers reported that she made CWW available to her subordinates and that her vice president supported CWW, but her direct supervisor "said I couldn't do it. He had a bad attitude towards all of us. He didn't want to give anyone anything.... He blocked it for me." This variation in access to the scheduling options within departments underscores the idiosyncratic nature of managerial support, and thus emphasizes the impact of managerial discretion.

Managers consistently stressed the importance of managers' attitudes for the availability of the flexible options. For example, an Actuarial manager who was able to informally rearrange his own schedule when personal obligations intruded at work noted that "it is up to the individual managers. Some are more strict than others.... [A]reas are known to be a little more strict or lenient than others...depending on the personalities of some [managers]. Some [managers] like to keep tabs on everyone, minute by minute, to make sure they are putting in their time...." Another attributed the variation in access to differences in managers' beliefs: "I don't know that it is every manager's personal belief in doing a lot of [flexible scheduling]. I think you have some of those people that say, 'Sorry about your home life. Deal with that after work.'" A Systems officer conceded, "To some, the responsibilities of management are equated to 'I need to see and touch you. I need to watch you to know that you are doing the right thing....' The [managers] that are less supportive [of AWAs] are maybe less enlightened or less experienced."

The consensus among managerial informants was that their colleagues' differing views on control and AWAs were grounded in managers' experiences. An Operations manager argued that "it is how [managers] were raised in MW. I know that is a weird
term, but some of [the managers] come from ... [work units] where you punch a time
clock.” An Actuarial manager agreed: “Supervisors [were inflexible] to them, so they feel
that it is the way that it should be.” Conversely, a managerial informant also noted that
working for managers who had supported flexibility “makes me more supportive of the
people that work for me. It gave me a really good example.” In sum, anecdotal evidence
suggests that managerial idiosyncrasy contributes to the variation in workers’ access to
alternative work arrangements. Moreover, managers attribute that idiosyncrasy to their
colleagues’ past experiences in the workplace.

Idiosyncratic implementation by individual managers and evident between
managers has had an additional consequence. Employees voiced their unsolicited
resentment in interviews, focus groups, and survey comments about the inequitable
implementation of the options. Some workers sensed favoritism. A Systems employee
argued that “alternative work schedules should be available for all employees under the
same manager, not just the favored few.” Supporting that view, a Systems manager
thought that “the flexible work policy should be administered more consistently with an
eye on its benefits, rather than sporadically, depending on management’s perspective of an
individual’s personal needs or their relationship with that individual.” Thus, although I
found no empirical evidence that personal or ascribed status as measured by gender and
race affected employees’ access to and use of the scheduling options, this does not
preclude the possibility that some MW workers have greater access to them based on

31 The four Human Resources managers and officers I interviewed welcomed my research
as a means to highlight workers’ inequitable access to AWAs. Participants in all four
focus groups also raised the issue, as did 20 survey respondents and half of the managers
whom I interviewed.
characteristics irrelevant to job suitability, employee performance, or corporate benefit, as informants suggest.

Conclusion

As gatekeepers of workers’ access to AWAs—and as those whose coordination, communication, and planning provide the basis for employees’ successful use of the options—managers are key to the implementation of MW’s work-home policy. They are also most vulnerable if AWAs’ implementation reduces productivity. MW granted managers discretion because the firm believed managers were best positioned to decide whether or not the use of AWAs would negatively affect subordinates’ job performance. In addition, granting managerial discretion is a tactic the firm may have used to increase managerial support for the work-home policy. Managerial discretion, MW’s failure to ensure managers had and understood objective implementation criteria, the lack of managerial training about the benefits of the options, the lack of individual measures of productivity, and the dearth of training about implementation and supervisory strategies have spawned idiosyncratic managerial decision-making and inequitable access. Moreover, managers’ decision-making processes are unlikely to change without good reasons to do so. As long as the organization holds managers responsible for short-term productivity and does not take into account the long-run benefits to the firm and to the employees of flexible schedules, managers lack incentive to implement the policy.

Organizational theory recognizes that garnering the support of those most affected by a change is critical for successfully implementing a new policy. A senior MW officer explained that if you “cram something down someone’s throat, it just may not go well.”
Echoing recommendations from prior research (Haas and Hwang 1995:35; Cowans 1994:6; Murphy 1993:33; Rodgers 1992:192; Galinsky et al. 1991:54; Schwartz 1994:34), a number of informants emphasized the need for managerial training focused on the benefits of flexibility and strategies for successful implementation. As a nonmanager argued, "There has not been education provided to managers on how to make [AWAs] work successfully." An Actuarial manager with a supportive boss and a flexible schedule summed up informants' recommendations, which focused on teaching managers a new way of relating to their subordinates:

I really wish that some sort of training could take place of those managers to get them to understand the give-give, win-win technique that [alternative work arrangements] can provide. This is almost critical enough that it should be required.... It is not teaching them the policies and procedures. It is basically getting them to treat people like human beings—understanding that they are not supervising machines....[N]ot like they have to keep track of the number of hours, the widgets that get produced. If you take care of the people who are doing the jobs, the number of widgets that get made will be there [and] the time will be used better.

In addition, the reasons cited by managers for perceived administrative support of AWAs in their division have implications for policy implementation. Managers' reliance on employees' requests and their own trust in subordinates may contribute to the inequitable implementation of the alternative arrangements. For example, managers' and coworkers' distrust or unsympathetic attitudes can reduce requests, and hence access. Moreover, trusted employees—the people most apt to be granted access—are likely to mirror their managers' attitudes (Kanter 1977a:49) and avoid requesting or using the options.

---

The key to anything is to establish some sense of buy-in to change.... You don't say, 'OK, everybody shift to the left. We're doing it differently.' It just doesn't work."
Finally, top MW officers are proud of the company's work-home policy and tout the options' ability to help employees balance their competing work and home obligations. One managerial informant concluded that top MW management "has come to realize that you've got to have happy people in order to have productive people. These [scheduling options] are just some of the ways. Money just does not cut it now a days. It is the time that is important." However, MW encourages managers to view subordinates' home circumstances as irrelevant to their job performance by creating policy implementation criteria that ignore the effect of employees' non-work obligations on their paid work. Ironically, this reinforces the ideology of the separation of the spheres. The policy, if implemented according to MW's guidelines, is a work policy, not a work-home policy. And as other researchers have suggested, giving managers discretion to implement the options marginalizes the policy and implies that AWAs may negatively affect productivity (Rapoport and Bailyn 1996:19).

In sum, MW has fostered an environment in which idiosyncratic managerial decision-making and the context in which employees work are key determinants of workers' access to the options. The resulting inequitable implementation of AWAs thus undermines MW's intent to use the AWAs as strategies to retain skilled and productive workers and it engenders ill will among workers. The inequitable implementation also limits the availability of work arrangements that may, in fact, enhance workers' job performance, as well as provide employees with the flexibility needed to meet their non-work responsibilities.
Table 3.1 Concepts, Measures, and Sources of Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Measures (scale)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to AWAs</td>
<td>Access to flextime/CWW/telecommuting (No, Yes, Don't know)</td>
<td>NSCW*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of AWAs</td>
<td>Use of flextime/CWW/telecommuting (No; Yes, with a written agreement; Yes, without a written agreement)</td>
<td>NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-to-Work Spillover</td>
<td>Worry about children/relative while at work</td>
<td>Model: NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worry about personal/household issues while at work</td>
<td>GSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family/household responsibilities interfere with ability to devote full attention to job (scale for three indicators: Never=1, Frequently=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Demands</td>
<td>Job complexity factor based on complexity, skill, repetition in job</td>
<td>R. Hodson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job requires speed (Strongly disagree=1, Strongly agree=5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Interdependence</td>
<td>Job requires dealing with a variety of people (Strongly disagree=1, Strongly agree=5)</td>
<td>R. Hodson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory Responsibility: Number employees respondent supervises directly</td>
<td>GSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Status</td>
<td>Salary grade (1 through 9)</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Participate in making job-related decisions (Strongly disagree=1, Strongly agree=5)</td>
<td>GSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can work independently (Strongly disagree=1, Strongly agree=5)</td>
<td>GSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Factors</td>
<td>Quality of work is easy to evaluate (Strongly disagree=1, Strongly agree=5)</td>
<td>GSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facet ime is important (No=0, Yes=1)</td>
<td>Model: NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory trust: immediate supervisor trusts respondent (Strongly disagree=1, Strongly agree=5)</td>
<td>Model: NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job security: likelihood of losing job within 6 months (Very likely=1, Not at all likely=4)</td>
<td>NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxies for Productivity</td>
<td>Seniority: Years worked for Midwest</td>
<td>NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Highest level of education attained (Less than high school=1 to Ph.D.=7)</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Informants and pretest participants indicated that spillover stemming from personal/household concerns, facetime, supervisory trust, and policy awareness were important. I could find no existing validated measures of them. Therefore, I modified similar questions from the listed sources.


* Randy Hodson, Ohio State University, in private communication.
Table 3.1 Concepts, Measures, and Sources of Survey Questions (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Measures (scale)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Context</td>
<td>Division: Work in Actuarial/Systems/Operations</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of MW's work-home policy offering AWAs (No=0, Yes=1)</td>
<td>Model: Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated levels of use: proportion allowed to use flextime/CWW/telecommuting (None=1, All=5)</td>
<td>Laborforce 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived managerial support in department for flextime/CWW/telecommuting (No=0, Yes=1)</td>
<td>Laborforce 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived reasons managers in department support flextime/CWW/telecommuting</td>
<td>Laborforce 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost savings, impact on work scheduling, supervisors' trust in employees,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact on quality of products or services, employees have asked for it,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to attract and retain employees (Not at all important=1, Very important=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived reasons managers in department do not support flextime/CWW/telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost, impact on work scheduling, impact on supervision, impact on quality of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>products or services, employees have not asked for it, some workers might resent it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Not at all important=1, Very important=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived effect on departmental productivity if all AWAs used (Negative=1, Very positive=4)</td>
<td>Laborforce 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job control</td>
<td>Hours of work per week at NW</td>
<td>GSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Household Characteristics</td>
<td>Number of children in the household less than 6 years old (0 to 3 or more)</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children in the household, ages 6 to 12 (0 to 3 or more)</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children in the household, ages 13 to 18 (0 to 3 or more)</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide care to elderly or disabled (No=0, Yes=1)</td>
<td>NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital status (Not married/partnered=0, Married/partnered=1)</td>
<td>NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race (white=0, nonwhite=1)</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours per week household members available to help (linear transformation of spouse's hours at work)</td>
<td>GSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>NSCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total annual household income in dollars (12 categories)</td>
<td>Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous participation in interview or focus group for project (No=1, Yes=1)</td>
<td>Model: Inland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Variable Measurement, Means, and Standard Deviations (n=484) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Alternative Work Arrangements (scale values for each response)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to flextime:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know=.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes=1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to compressed work week:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know=.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes=1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to telecommuting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know=.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes=1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Alternative Work Arrangements (scale values for each response) (n=480)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use flextime:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No=-.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, with a written agreement =-.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, without a written agreement=.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use compressed work week:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No=-.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, with a written agreement =-.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, without a written agreement=.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use telecommuting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No=-.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, with a written agreement=.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, without a written agreement .003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-to-Work Spillover: Latent variable based on three indicators^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(scale: Never=1 to Frequently=4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Worry about children or other relative while at work:</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Worry about personal, family, or household issues while at work:</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| III. Family or household responsibilities interfere with ability to devote full attention to job: | 2.01 | .79                

* Source: MW Survey, 1998

Sample size is 480 because four surveys had missing values for the dependent variables in the analyses of use and spillover.
### Table 3.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job complexity factor based on three questions. Alpha=.72. (range: -3.36 to 1.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job is highly complex: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job requires a high level of skill: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job is not repetitious: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job requires speed: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job requires dealing with a variety of people: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Responsibility: Number of people respondent supervises directly</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (salary grade): 1 (low) through 9 (high)</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in making job-related decisions: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can work independently: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work is easy to evaluate: <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facetime: time spent at the office affects evaluation of work  No=0 Yes=1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust: immediate supervisor has a high level of trust in respondent <strong>Strongly disagree=1 Strongly agree=5</strong></td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security: likelihood of losing job within 6 months <strong>Very likely=1 Not at all likely=4</strong></td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority: Years worked for Midwest</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Highest level of education attained <strong>Less than high school=1 Ph.D.=7</strong></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Context: Division and Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Actuarial division  No=0 Yes=1</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Systems division  No=0 Yes=1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Operations division  No=0 Yes=1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of all four AWA options:  No=0 Yes=1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated level of departmental use of flextime: <strong>None=1 All=5</strong></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated level of departmental use of CWW: <strong>None=1 All=5</strong></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated level of departmental use of telecommuting: <strong>None=1 All=5</strong></td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88 Table 3.2 continued on next page.
Table 3.2 (continued)

**Other Work-related Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of work per week at NW (range 20 to 60)</td>
<td>43.04</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effect on productivity if AWAs used: Negative=1 Very positive=4</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal and Household Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Male=0</th>
<th>Female=1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in the household less than 6 years old: 0 to 3 or more</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in the household, ages 6 to 12: 0 to 3 or more</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in the household, ages 13 to 18: 0 to 3 or more</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide care to elderly or disabled:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status: Not married/partnered=0 Married/partnered=1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per week other members of household are available to help (range: 0 to 150)</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years (range: 20 to 65)</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total annual household income in dollars, coded as midpoints of categories and taking into consideration the constraints of the salary bands</td>
<td>64,874</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 Correlations of Dependent and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.379*</td>
<td>0.428*</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.300*</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of CWW</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.408*</td>
<td>0.457*</td>
<td>0.156*</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Flextime</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.266*</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.054*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Flextime</td>
<td>-0.142*</td>
<td>-0.380*</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.247*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Telecommuting</td>
<td>0.198*</td>
<td>0.228*</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.221*</td>
<td>0.149*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Telecommuting</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
<td>0.436*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-to-work Spillover</td>
<td>0.200*</td>
<td>0.260*</td>
<td>0.280*</td>
<td>0.280*</td>
<td>0.200*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Division</td>
<td>0.156*</td>
<td>0.239*</td>
<td>0.319*</td>
<td>0.311*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Division</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
<td>0.304*</td>
<td>0.304*</td>
<td>0.311*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Division</td>
<td>0.201*</td>
<td>0.352*</td>
<td>0.352*</td>
<td>0.311*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Awareness</td>
<td>0.183*</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use CWW</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
<td>0.228*</td>
<td>0.228*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use Flextime</td>
<td>0.216*</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Telecommute</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
<td>0.182*</td>
<td>0.182*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Supervise</td>
<td>0.133*</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
<td>0.109*</td>
<td>0.109*</td>
<td>0.216*</td>
<td>0.216*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked/Week</td>
<td>0.117*</td>
<td>0.133*</td>
<td>0.133*</td>
<td>0.216*</td>
<td>0.216*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Complexity (factor)</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Requires Speed</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job: Works with People</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Work Independently</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.092*</td>
<td>0.092*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Make Job Decisions</td>
<td>0.092*</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease Evaluating Work</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet ime Important</td>
<td>0.137*</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Trust</td>
<td>0.117*</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Nonwhite</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
<td>0.179*</td>
<td>0.179*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.167*</td>
<td>0.166*</td>
<td>0.166*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Under Age 6</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Ages 6-12</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Ages 13-18</td>
<td>0.124*</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care-giving: Elderly</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Partnered</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Household Help</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.110*</td>
<td>0.110*</td>
<td>0.110*</td>
<td>0.110*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Household Income</td>
<td>0.217*</td>
<td>0.259*</td>
<td>0.259*</td>
<td>0.259*</td>
<td>0.259*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n 484 483 484 483 484 483

*significant, p<.05

Source: M/W survey, 1998

Table 3.3 continued on next page.
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home-to-Work Spillover</th>
<th>Systems Division</th>
<th>Actuarial Division</th>
<th>Operations Division</th>
<th>Policy Awareness</th>
<th>Levels of Use: CWW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access: CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-to-work Spillover</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Division</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Division</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.487*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Division</td>
<td>0.115*</td>
<td>-0.552*</td>
<td>-0.460*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Awareness</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.131*</td>
<td>0.150*</td>
<td>-0.277*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use CWW</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.426*</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.441*</td>
<td>0.208*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use Flextime</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.232*</td>
<td>0.206*</td>
<td>-0.432*</td>
<td>0.184*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Telecommute</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.184*</td>
<td>0.223*</td>
<td>-0.400*</td>
<td>0.168*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.146*</td>
<td>0.352*</td>
<td>-0.484*</td>
<td>0.254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Supervise</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.128*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.107*</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked/Week</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills (factor)</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.225*</td>
<td>0.119*</td>
<td>-0.343*</td>
<td>0.148*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Requires Speed</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job: Works with People</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.113*</td>
<td>-0.212*</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.122*</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.154*</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Work Independently</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.098*</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.102*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Make Job Decisions</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.092*</td>
<td>0.094*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease Evaluating Work</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facetime Important</td>
<td>0.229*</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.113*</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Trust</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>0.113*</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.168*</td>
<td>0.230*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Nonwhite</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.115*</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.255*</td>
<td>-0.287*</td>
<td>0.152*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.128*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Under Age 6</td>
<td>0.234*</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Ages 6-12</td>
<td>0.144*</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Ages 13-18</td>
<td>0.139*</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care-giving: Elderly</td>
<td>0.115*</td>
<td>0.105*</td>
<td>-0.103*</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Partnered</td>
<td>0.143*</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Household Help</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Household Income</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.205*</td>
<td>-0.250*</td>
<td>0.175*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 482

*significant, p<.05

Table 3.3 continued on next page.
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levels of Use: Flextime</th>
<th>Levels of Use: Telecom</th>
<th>Salary Grade</th>
<th>Number Supervise</th>
<th>Seniority</th>
<th>Hours Worked per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access: CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use Flextime</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Telecommute</td>
<td>0.312*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade</td>
<td>0.240*</td>
<td>0.268*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Supervise</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.391*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>0.161*</td>
<td>0.115*</td>
<td>0.294*</td>
<td>0.124*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked/Week</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.328*</td>
<td>0.320*</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills (factor)</td>
<td>0.187*</td>
<td>0.238*</td>
<td>0.380*</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.161*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Requires Speed</td>
<td>-0.125*</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.153*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job: Works with People</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.156*</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
<td>0.090*</td>
<td>0.208*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.103*</td>
<td>-0.125*</td>
<td>-0.095*</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Work Independently</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.090*</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Make Job Decisions</td>
<td>0.109*</td>
<td>0.151*</td>
<td>0.270*</td>
<td>0.166*</td>
<td>0.204*</td>
<td>0.158*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease Evaluating Work</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.167*</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-0.156*</td>
<td>-0.106*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facetime Important</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>-0.090*</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Trust</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.210*</td>
<td>0.177*</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.127*</td>
<td>0.090*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.295*</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Nonwhite</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.176*</td>
<td>-0.114*</td>
<td>-0.123*</td>
<td>-0.095*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.096*</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.482*</td>
<td>0.123*</td>
<td>-0.174*</td>
<td>0.094*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.112*</td>
<td>0.100*</td>
<td>0.238*</td>
<td>0.164*</td>
<td>0.604*</td>
<td>0.137*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Under Age 6</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.102*</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-0.091*</td>
<td>-0.104*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Ages 6-12</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.163*</td>
<td>0.152*</td>
<td>0.125*</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.106*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Ages 13-18</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
<td>0.098*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care-giving: Elderly</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.094*</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Partnered</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.139*</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Household Help</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Household Income</td>
<td>0.177*</td>
<td>0.187*</td>
<td>0.659*</td>
<td>0.323*</td>
<td>0.311*</td>
<td>0.275*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{n} = 423 \quad 338 \quad 428 \quad 477 \quad 483 \quad 484\]

*significant, p<.05

Table 3.3 continued on next page.
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access: CWW</th>
<th>Use of CWW</th>
<th>Access: Flextime</th>
<th>Use of Flextime</th>
<th>Access: Telecommuting</th>
<th>Use of Telecommuting</th>
<th>Home-to-work Spillover</th>
<th>Systems Division</th>
<th>Actuarial Division</th>
<th>Operations Division</th>
<th>Policy Awareness</th>
<th>Level: Use CWW</th>
<th>Level: Use Flextime</th>
<th>Level: Telecommute</th>
<th>Salary Grade</th>
<th>Number Supervise</th>
<th>Seniority</th>
<th>Hours Worked/Week</th>
<th>Job Skills (factor)</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Complexity</td>
<td>Job Requires Speed</td>
<td>Job Works with People</td>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>Able to Work Independently</td>
<td>Able to Make Job Decisions</td>
<td>Ease Evaluating Work</td>
<td>Facetime Important</td>
<td>Supervisory Trust</td>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>Race: Nonwhite</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Children Under Age 6</td>
<td>Children Ages 6-12</td>
<td>Children Ages 13-18</td>
<td>Care-giving: Elderly</td>
<td>Married/Partnered</td>
<td>Hours of Household Help</td>
<td>Total Household Income</td>
<td>0.280*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.266*</td>
<td>0.185*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>0.098*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p < .05

Table 3.3 continued on next page.
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ease Evaluating Work</th>
<th>Facetime Important</th>
<th>Supervisor Trust</th>
<th>Sex: Female</th>
<th>Race: Nonwhite</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access: CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-to-work Spillover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use CWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Use Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Telecommute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Supervise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked/Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills (factor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Requires Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job: Works with People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Work Independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Make Job Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ease Evaluating Work 1.000
Facetime Important -0.045 1.000
Supervisory Trust 0.255* -0.086 1.000
Sex: Female 0.049 0.012 -0.067 1.000
Race: Nonwhite -0.044 0.075 -0.084 0.093* 1.000
Education -0.106* -0.077 0.009 -0.365* 0.001 1.000
Age -0.087 0.028 0.091* 0.038 -0.102* -0.158*
Children Under Age 6 0.015 -0.023 0.096* -0.089 -0.044 0.084
Children Ages 6-12 0.020 0.021 0.032 -0.047 -0.063 -0.048
Children Ages 13-18 0.033 0.051 0.016 -0.013 -0.037 -0.006
Care-giving: Elderly -0.031 0.077 -0.019 0.033 -0.046 0.009
Married/Partnered -0.028 -0.009 0.073 -0.040 -0.100* -0.014
Hours of Household Help 0.000 -0.005 0.057 -0.200* -0.041 -0.023
Total Household Income -0.098* -0.071 0.166* -0.140* -0.142* 0.244*

n 473 480 456 482 472 482

*significant, p<.05

Table 3.3 continued on next page.
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Children Under Age 6</th>
<th>Children Ages 6-12</th>
<th>Children Ages 13-18</th>
<th>Care-giving Elderly</th>
<th>Married/Partnered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.141*</td>
<td>0.159*</td>
<td>0.139*</td>
<td>0.132*</td>
<td>0.573*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.264*</td>
<td>-0.119*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.139*</td>
<td>0.375*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.229*</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.308*</td>
<td>0.153*</td>
<td>0.112*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.098*</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>0.132*</td>
<td>0.573*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.306*</td>
<td>0.100*</td>
<td>0.127*</td>
<td>0.093*</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n 474 484 484 483 484 483

*significant, p < 0.05

Table 3.3 continued on next page.
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.159*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 477

*significant, p≤.05
Figure 3.1 Conceptual Model of Employees' Perceived Access to Alternative Work Arrangements

MW's Formal Criteria for Policy Implementation

Employees' Environment: Division, Department and Policy Awareness

Employees' Personal and Household Characteristics

Employees' Perceived Access to Flextime, CWW, or Telecommuting

* Formal criteria: job demands (job complexity and job requires speed) and interdependence (job requires working with diverse people and job involves supervisory responsibility); status (salary grade); autonomy (ability to work independently and ability to make job-related decisions); evaluation factors (ease of evaluating job quality, facetime important, supervisory trust, and job security); proxies for productivity (seniority and education); job control (hours worked per week).

b Work context: division (Systems and Actuarial with Operations as referent) and policy awareness.

c Personal and household characteristics: sex, marital status, children ages 5 and under, children ages 6 to 12, children ages 13 to 18, care-giving to elderly/disabled, and controls (race, age, and household income).
Table 3.4 Percent of Managers Reporting Managerial Support for Flextime, Compressed Work Weeks, and Telecommuting in Their Departments, by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Systems Managers</th>
<th>Actuarial Managers</th>
<th>Operations Managers</th>
<th>Total Managerial Workforce*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of managers reporting managerial support for flextime in their departments, by division ($\chi^2$ 7.11, 2 df)</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of managers reporting managerial support for CWW in their departments, by division ($\chi^2$ 15.50, 2 df) *</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of managers reporting managerial support of telecommuting in their departments, by division ($\chi^2$ 12.48, 2 df) *</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent varies across divisions ($\chi^2$, p≤.05)

Source: MW survey, 1998

* Weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.
Table 3.5 Reasons Managers Report Support and Nonsupport for Alternative Work Arrangements among Managers in their Departments (n=125)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support(^b)</th>
<th>No Support(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In your department, if managers do support the option (flextime, CWW, and telecommuting) how important is each of the following reasons?</td>
<td>Scale: Not at all important=1 to Very Important=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In your department, if managers do not support the option (flextime, CWW and telecommuting), how important is each of the following reasons?</td>
<td>Scale: Not at all important=1 to Very Important=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers in the department do support flextime due to</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Managers in the department do not support flextime due to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cost savings 2.0</td>
<td>The cost 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on work scheduling 3.3</td>
<td>(1) Impact on work scheduling 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Supervisors' trust in employees 3.4</td>
<td>(3) Impact on supervision 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on quality of products or services 3.3</td>
<td>(2) Impact on quality of products or services 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Employees have asked for it 3.8</td>
<td>Employees have not asked for it 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) To attract and retain employees 3.7</td>
<td>Some workers might resent it 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=98)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Work Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers in the department do support CWW due to</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Managers in the department do not support CWW due to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cost savings 1.9</td>
<td>The cost 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on work scheduling 3.2</td>
<td>(2) Impact on work scheduling 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Supervisors' trust in employees 3.6</td>
<td>(3) Impact on supervision 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on quality of products or services 3.4</td>
<td>(1) Impact on quality of products or services 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Employees have asked for it 3.8</td>
<td>Employees have not asked for it 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) To attract and retain employees 3.7</td>
<td>Some workers might resent it 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=89)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers in the department do support telecommuting due to</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Managers in the department do not support telecommuting due to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cost savings 1.9</td>
<td>The cost 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on work scheduling 3.1</td>
<td>(1) Impact on work scheduling 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Supervisors' trust in employees 3.8</td>
<td>(3) Impact on supervision 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Impact on quality of products or services 3.4</td>
<td>(2) Impact on quality of products or services 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Employees have asked for it 3.2</td>
<td>Employees have not asked for it 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) To attract and retain employees 3.2</td>
<td>Some workers might resent it 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=70)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MW survey, 1998

\(^a\) Weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.

\(^b\) The three most frequent responses are indicated by (1), (2), and (3).
### Table 3.6 Percent of MW Employees Reporting Access to Alternative Work Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Flextime</th>
<th>Systems Division</th>
<th>Actuarial Division</th>
<th>Operations Division</th>
<th>Entire Sample</th>
<th>Total Workforce*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No access / don't know</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have access</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>67.30</td>
<td>2 df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Compressed Work Weeks</th>
<th>Systems Division</th>
<th>Actuarial Division</th>
<th>Operations Division</th>
<th>Entire Sample</th>
<th>Total Workforce*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No access / don't know</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have access</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>2 df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Telecommuting</th>
<th>Systems Division</th>
<th>Actuarial Division</th>
<th>Operations Division</th>
<th>Entire Sample</th>
<th>Total Workforce*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No access / don't know</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have access</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>67.85</td>
<td>2 df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N | 178 | 140 | 166 | 484 | 484 |

* Percent varies across divisions ($\chi^2, p<0.05$)

Source: MW survey, 1998

* Weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.
## Table 3.7 OLS Regressions of MW Employees’ Access to Flextime, Compressed Work Week (CWW'), and Telecommuting on MW Guidelines, Work Context, and Personal/Household Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES</th>
<th>Hypothesized Effect</th>
<th>Flextime Access</th>
<th>CWW Access</th>
<th>Telecommuting Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Job Suitability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Complexity</td>
<td>+ .022 (.022)</td>
<td>.031 (.024)</td>
<td>.017 (.024)</td>
<td>.035 (.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job: Requires Speed</td>
<td>+ -.011 (.022)</td>
<td>-.063** (.024)</td>
<td>-.113 (.025)</td>
<td>-.043 (.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Interdependence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job: Working with Diverse People</td>
<td>- -.020 (.021)</td>
<td>.006 (.023)</td>
<td>.011 (.024)</td>
<td>.021 (.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Responsibility</td>
<td>- -.008 (.006)</td>
<td>-.019** (.007)</td>
<td>-.135 (.007)</td>
<td>-.057 (.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Employee Suitability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade</td>
<td>+ .140** (.053)</td>
<td>.021 (.020)</td>
<td>.039** (.020)</td>
<td>.223 (.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade* Grade</td>
<td>- .012* (.005)</td>
<td>- .056** (.020)</td>
<td>-.116 (.021)</td>
<td>-.050 (.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Work Independently</td>
<td>+ -.042* (.018)</td>
<td>-.056** (.020)</td>
<td>-.116 (.021)</td>
<td>-.050 (.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Make Job Decisions</td>
<td>+ .029 (.020)</td>
<td>.010 (.022)</td>
<td>-.020 (.023)</td>
<td>-.028 (.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Cost-Benefit Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Evaluating Work Quality</td>
<td>+ -.007 (.018)</td>
<td>.022 (.020)</td>
<td>.011 (.020)</td>
<td>.003 (.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facetime Important</td>
<td>- -.012 (.034)</td>
<td>-.044 (.037)</td>
<td>-.083* (.038)</td>
<td>-.050 (.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Trust</td>
<td>+ .013 (.024)</td>
<td>.040 (.026)</td>
<td>.058* (.027)</td>
<td>.105 (.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>+ -.000 (.029)</td>
<td>.010 (.032)</td>
<td>-.008 (.033)</td>
<td>-.011 (.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity (Proxies)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority at MW</td>
<td>+ .003 (.003)</td>
<td>-.001 (.004)</td>
<td>-.018 (.004)</td>
<td>.069 (.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>+ -.008 (.019)</td>
<td>.015 (.021)</td>
<td>-.013 (.021)</td>
<td>-.034 (.021)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Midwest Survey, 1998

* Following Long (1997:17), I do not include standardized coefficients for dichotomous variables because it is not realistic to talk about a one standard deviation unit change for a measure that has values of zero and one.
### Table 3.7 Access (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER FACTORS</th>
<th>Hypothesized Effect</th>
<th>Flextime Access</th>
<th>CWW Access</th>
<th>Telecommuting Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job (Control)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked per Week (control)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.001 (.003)</td>
<td>-.004 (.003)</td>
<td>-.063 (.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Context: Division and Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Division (compared to Operations)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.174*** (.048)</td>
<td>.361*** (.052)</td>
<td>.245*** (.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Division (compared to Operations)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.254*** (.055)</td>
<td>.319*** (.061)</td>
<td>.214*** (.062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of AWA Policy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.130* (.054)</td>
<td>.132* (.059)</td>
<td>.045 (.060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal/Household Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female compared to male)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.021 (.037)</td>
<td>.026 (.041)</td>
<td>- .016 (.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.049 (.042)</td>
<td>.018 (.046)</td>
<td>.042 (.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children ages 5 and under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.031 (.028)</td>
<td>.054 (.031)</td>
<td>-.006 (.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children ages 6 to 12 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.005 (.028)</td>
<td>-.008 (.031)</td>
<td>-.016 (.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children ages 13 to 18 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.041 (.044)</td>
<td>.043 (.048)</td>
<td>-.095* (.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care-giving to Elderly/disabled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.044 (.053)</td>
<td>.121* (.058)</td>
<td>.122* (.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (nonwhite compared to white) (control)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.028 (.057)</td>
<td>-.059 (.063)</td>
<td>.089 (.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (control)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.001 (.003)</td>
<td>.026 (.003)</td>
<td>-.007* (.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income (control)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.096 (.000)</td>
<td>-.000 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>.237 (.311)</td>
<td>.833 (.310)</td>
<td>-.243 (.314)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adj. R² | 16.5% | 25.9% | 23.4% |
| S.E.E. | .353 | .391 | .395 |

n = 484

* p ≤ .05
** p ≤ .01
*** p ≤ .001
CHAPTER 4
DETERMINANTS OF MW EMPLOYEES' USE OF ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS AND THEIR HOME-TO-WORK SPILLOVER

In this chapter I investigate MW employees' use of three alternative work arrangements and their home-to-work spillover. Home-to-work spillover is negatively related to job performance (Kelly 1999:183; Starrels 1992:268; Friedman 1991:11; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991:60; Schultz et al. 1988). The underlying premise of MW's work-home scheduling options is that job flexibility could reduce employees' work-home conflict by permitting workers to more conveniently organize and address their home-based responsibilities around their work. Therefore, I investigate three related questions about factors that affect workers' use of the scheduling options and the relationship between employees' use of AWAs and their home-to-work spillover: (1) What determines employees' use of MW's alternative work arrangements? (2) What factors influence employees' home-to-work spillover? (3) What is the relationship between employees' use of the options and their domestic spillover?

My first research question focuses on the determinants of employees' use of AWAs. The three alternative work arrangements permit flexibility in the timing or location of work, but they vary in the flexibility offered and the perceived risks associated
with their use—and hence in the costs and benefits to the employees with home-to-work spillover. For example, managers permitting flextime typically allow subordinates the opportunity to begin working up to two hours earlier or two hours later than the normal starting time in their department. Workers are generally expected to adhere to the same schedule each day, however. In contrast, employees on CWW schedules work a full work week in four 10-hour days, although workers may design CWW for two-week periods. However, employees on CWW schedules are expected to be available on their days off during the workweek and may be called in for mandatory overtime. Telecommuters occasionally or regularly perform their work away from the office—usually at home—although those who routinely use the option are expected to work in the office on scheduled days each week. Regardless of their scheduling arrangements, managers expect employees to perform “on demand” overtime.

Employees interested in using AWAs must consider two key questions: “How will use of an AWA affect my job performance and the evaluation of that performance?” and “How will use of an AWA affect my personal/home life?” I examine three sets of factors that should influence employees’ use of AWAs: (1) job characteristics and responsibilities that should influence workers’ ability and need to use flexible arrangements; (2) workplace factors that should affect the perceived risk employees associate with use of the options; and (3) personal and household factors that should affect employees’ need to use the options.

Second, I investigate the predictors of workers’ domestic spillover. Two groups of factors should affect the frequency that domestic concerns intrude at work: (1) the
personal, familial, and household characteristics that contribute to spillover; and (2) factors related to employees' jobs that affect their ability to address domestic concerns during traditional hours of work.

Third, there is widespread consensus that employees' use of alternative work arrangements and their work-family conflict are related. Indeed, MW's assumption that alternative scheduling options help workers balance their dual obligations implies interdependent outcomes between use of the options and workers' spillover. However, research has generally failed to consider this reciprocal effect. Social scientists typically model the relationship as recursive, focusing on how AWAs affect employees' well-being as a result of work-to-home conflict or how AWAs affect the tangible outcomes of home-to-work conflict on the job, such as retention and absenteeism (Schwartz 1994:20; Christensen and Staines 1990:460-9). In contrast to prior research, I use three simultaneous equation models to analyze the hypothesized reciprocal relationships between spillover and the three scheduling options offered by MW's work-home policy.

**Hypotheses**

**Determinants of Employees’ Use of Alternative Work Arrangements**

*Job characteristics that affect employees' ability and need to use AWAs.* The nature of workers' jobs influence how much their schedules can deviate from standard hours and location—and thus should influence their decisions regarding the use of AWAs.

---

1 In the only research that I am aware of that uses a structural equation model, Leiter and Dunup (1996) investigate the effect of change in respondents' circumstances on spillover as a supplement to their longitudinal study of health care professionals' spillover. They do
For example, employees who must be available to coworkers and customers should be less likely than other workers to use options that take them away from traditional worksites and schedules. Therefore, I expect that jobs that involve working with a variety of people should be negatively related to workers’ use of the options. Similarly, while organizational authority and status are associated with increased trust and privacy (Nippert-Eng 1996:162; Coser 1974:71), they also convey the expectation of greater commitment, availability, and responsibility (Bailyn 1993:33; Rodgers 1992:194). As a MW employee explained, those in authority “feel like they have to be here every day…to resolve whatever the issue [is].” The degree of workers’ supervisory responsibility, a measure of both job interdependence and authority, should decrease employees’ use of the options. In addition, those with higher status have inherent flexibility in their work that may make alternative work arrangements superfluous. As a manager acknowledged, “I can manipulate my schedule…as long as my responsibilities are covered.” Consequently, I expect salary grade, an indicator of status, to be negatively linked to employees’ use of the options, as well. In sum, jobs that require employees to work with others, as well as factors that indicate organizational status and authority, should negatively affect workers’ use of scheduling arrangements that reduce the traditional time they spend in the workplace.

In contrast, demanding jobs and jobs that involve autonomy should be associated with increased use of the AWAs as workers seek to maintain their productivity, as well as not investigate the feedback effects between home-to-work spillover and respondents’ use of AWAs.
balance their work and home obligations. As a Systems nonmanager with a complex job requiring speed explained, "Flexible scheduling has been very helpful in keeping me focused and [it] improved my productivity at work." An Operations manager, discussing her subordinates' use of CWW, concurred: "[My subordinates'] jobs are very stressful. They felt they would die without [CWW's] day off." And a nonmanagerial telecommuter—also in a complex job requiring speed—believed that "the two days I work from home are my most productive workdays, since there aren't any interruptions and the relaxed environment helps my attitude." Thus, I expect that workers in jobs characterized by complexity and the need for speed should use the options more than their counterparts in less demanding jobs. In addition, workers accustomed to making job-related decisions should use AWAs more than employees with less autonomy because such independence is a prerequisite to use. In sum, jobs that are demanding should increase workers' need to use the options, and those with autonomy should increase workers' ability to use AWAs. Both, then, should be positively related to employees' use net of other factors.

Factors affecting the perceived risk associated with employees' use of the options. Many workers believe that using AWAs will jeopardize their careers because managers often associate the options' use with reduced productivity and commitment.

---

2 Employees with complex jobs also use flextime to avoid "work-to-work" spillover—that is, interruptions by coworkers. For example, an Operations manager in a complex job got in early each day because he could have "6:15 a.m. to 8 a.m. alone, before everyone else gets in. [It's] the prime time to get things done."

3 I used a second measure of autonomy, employees' ability to work independently, in the analyses of access, but excluded it from the structural equation analyses. Whereas the ability to make job-related decisions must precede workers' self-initiated use of AWAs, the causal order of employees' use of the options and their ability to work independently is
(Hochschild 1997:97; Hammonds et al. 1997:98; Sellers 1996:56; Rapoport and Bailyn 1996:16; Schwartz 1994:27-31; Galinsky et al. 1993:89; Rodgers 1992:184; Galinsky 1991:50). As a Systems manager acknowledged, "[Employees] worry about how it looks to others" when they use an AWA. Although MW managerial informants agreed that they did not consider subordinates' use of the options in their evaluations, managers and nonmanagers alike noted that administrators sometimes send subtle messages of disapproval about employees who use the options. A nonmanager asserted that "[managers resent workers who leave at 5 pm. They feel they are less committed."

Another argued, "People who [use the options] are not trusted by either coworkers or managers." Indeed, one Actuarial nonmanager believed that "AWAs would be frowned upon greatly in my area. Subtle management disapproval keeps me from [even] asking if the options are really available." In sum, consistent with prior research—and regardless of the reality of the risk—some informants hesitated to use the options because they thought AWAs sent a negative message to their managers. Thus, factors related to employees' ambiguous. In addition, the variable was not significant in the analyses of the simultaneous equation models.

One manager captured the perspective of her colleagues: "I don't see [use of AWAs] coming into play during evaluations at all. I don't think that it should."

Managers in particular believed that except for flextime, their use of AWAs was risky. For example, an Actuarial manager used flextime to "come and go as [I] please within certain limits. I've never had a problem here with management or the area that I work in." In contrast, a Systems manager thought that using CWW jeopardized advancement "when we hit first line management and higher.... I don't know if it is forbidden." Another manager of six employees concurred: "Most of the people who have taken advantage of these arrangements have had far less supervisory responsibility than my job has." A unit manager with responsibility for 11 employees summed up the consensus: "Our management crew isn't excited about us [using CWW or telecommuting].... I don't think any of our managers use CWW.... No [manager] is [regularly telecommuting] that I
evaluation, proxies for workers' productivity, and the context in which employees work should ameliorate or exacerbate that perceived risk.

Supervisors directly influence their subordinates' success in an organization (Baron 1984:495) through the evaluation process. Consequently, I investigate the influence of three evaluation factors that may ameliorate or exacerbate the perceived risk of using AWAs: (1) the perceived importance of facetime, regardless of employees' actual performance, (2) the ease with which supervisors can evaluate the quality of subordinates' work, and (3) employees' perception of supervisory trust. Jobs that are evaluated on the basis of facetime should be negatively related to MW workers' use of the options. As a manager-of-managers acknowledged, some managers "want to see [their subordinates] when they get in and see that they stay late...[or] they think the workers are slacking." Conversely, performing work that is easy to evaluate and enjoying the trust of their supervisors should reduce the risk employees associate with use of the options—and lead to employees' increased use of AWAs.

Proxies for employees' productivity should also decrease the risk workers associate with using the options. Firms institute flexible scheduling options primarily to retain skilled workers and maintain productivity (Witkowsky 1999:226; Schwartz 1994:6; Morgan and Milliken 1992:240; Galinsky et al. 1991:84; Galinsky and Stein 1990:373). As a nonmanager explained, the options "help retain good people who might look elsewhere for employment or drop out of the workforce because of the outside work issues tugging on them." Thus, seniority and education, traditionally proxies for workers'..." Employees interested in advancing in the hierarchy thus must consider the potential negative effect that using the options, particularly CWW and telecommuting,
skill and productivity, should increase workers' value to the firm, reduce the perceived risk of using the options, and have a net positive influence on employees' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting.

Employees' perceived job security should also be positively related to workers' use of the options. The more secure workers' believe their jobs are, the less they should fear taking the risks that are associated with using AWAs (Bankert and Googins 1996:47).

Different business units within the same organization have different expectations and norms about work-home policies (Hochschild 1997:96; Galinsky et al. 1991:84-6). Thus, contextual factors should affect whether employees use the options, in part by reducing the risks associated with use (Hammonds et al. 1997:97-8; Glass and Fujimoto 1994:28; Schwartz 1994:35-9, 46-7, 52; Rodgers 1992:189, 191; Starrels 1992:261). I investigate the effects of two contextual variables: employees' division and the estimated may have on their careers.

I ran models in which I excluded education from the use equations in order to see if education were a proxy for the Actuarial (r=.255), Systems (r=.043), and Operations (r=-.287) divisions, and hence absorbing some of the influence of division. The effects of division did not change in models without education. Therefore, I retained education in the models of workers' use of spillover as a proxy for productivity.

In addition, the causal order of workers' seniority and their use of AWAs is ambiguous. Firms offer alternative work arrangements as retention strategies. Thus, it is conceivable that workers who use the options stay longer at MW. However, I found no evidence that managers considered seniority when deciding which employees had access to the arrangements (see Chapter 3). Anecdotal evidence, however, suggests that managers give MW workers with seniority priority in scheduling, such as choosing their day off with a CWW schedule, which may influence employees' use of the options. Therefore, I include the variable in the analyses of use.

Following the initial analyses in which seniority was significant only for workers' use of telecommuting, I excluded seniority from all simultaneous equation models. I found no changes in the predictors of workers' spillover or in their use of flextime and CWW, but the influence of age became significant—presumably as a proxy for seniority.
levels of use of the flextime, CWW, and telecommuting in respondents' departments. As noted, the three divisions differ in function, size, and rules of operation. Schwartz (1994:66) argued that these attributes influence employees' use of AWAs, their perceptions about the use of AWAs, and the ramifications of using AWAs. Thus, just as division influenced individual managers' decisions to make the options available (see Chapter 3), I expect that the organizational attributes captured by division will influence employees' use of the scheduling options.

My second contextual measure is the estimated level of departmental use of the options. The level of use of an AWA reflects the decisions of managers throughout respondents' departments to allow access to, and hence use of, the option by respondents' coworkers. The measure, then, indicates respondents' perceptions of collective managerial support within their departments for the options. The higher the estimated level of use, the less perceived risk respondents should associate with using the options. Moreover, the informal norms of the department and coworkers' ingroup comparisons shape workplace behavior and employees' sense of entitlement (Lewis 1997:21; Starrels 1992:261; Major 1989:110; Baron 1988:494), underscoring the positive influence that the estimated levels of use should have. A Systems managers summed up the effects of the two contextual factors: "[The viability of AWAs] comes from an environment that accepts that work isn't the end all and be all.... It is created within an organization, within specific departments, and [by] the management teams that run [them]."

(*r*=.604)—in the analysis of telecommuting. Therefore, I retained seniority in the final SEMs of use because it, rather than age, is theoretically related to use.
The influence of workers' personal and household characteristics on need.

Workers typically rank flexibility as a key strategy to help them to meet both home and work obligations (National Report on Work and Family 1999:45; Friedman 1991:38; Galinsky and Stein 1990:375). Summing up the comments of many MW informants, a male nonmanager stated, "Without alternative work arrangements, it would be very difficult to balance work and family time. That balance...[helps both] the individual and the company." A male employee in the Actuarial division concurred, emphasizing that an AWA "affords time to resolve issues that may conflict with normal working hours."

Insofar as MW employees' personal and household obligations vary, their need for the flexibility that AWAs offer should also vary. Thus, I investigate three personal and household factors that should affect employees' need for flexibility, and hence their use of AWAs: (1) work-home conflict manifested by home-to-work spillover, (2) workers' sex, and (3) household income. Home-to-work spillover captures the effects of respondents' inability to devote full attention to their jobs due to the intrusion of family and care-giving concerns. As a female nonmanager explained, "[Spillover] influences how well you work and how focused you are on what you are doing during the day." Therefore, it should be positively related to workers' use of AWAs because the options provide employees with flexibility to perform potentially competing work and home responsibilities. Nevertheless, the effects of spillover on employees' use of AWAs may differ between options because the three arrangements vary in flexibility—and thus the arrangements may vary in their ability to address home-to-work spillover.
The second personal characteristic, sex, should also influence employees' net use of alternative work arrangements. Women, as primary care-givers, want more flexibility in their jobs than men do, on average—and they are more likely to use it than similarly situated males (National Report on Work and Family 1999:45; Galinsky et al. 1993:86, 89; Chapman 1987:35). In addition, the net effect of sex on employees' use of flexible work options should reflect gendered family and household obligations not explicitly measured in the models, such as the responsibility for planning and coordinating children's activities (Leslie et al. 1991:208). Thus, I expect that women will use flexible work options more than similarly situated men.

Finally, household income is an indicator of respondents' ability to purchase services, such as child care and repair work, that reduce the need for flexible schedules (Hochschild 1997:230; Friedman 1991:23; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991:32; Coverman 1983:632). As one manager acknowledged, "I am fortunate that the level of my income allows me...to help smooth over some of those (household) things.... [Otherwise] I would have to rethink how I juggle and balance things." Consequently, I expect household income should be negatively related to employees' use of alternative work arrangements.

Control Variables. In predicting employees' use of the options, I control for workers' race and age. The number of nonwhites included in MW sample is likely to be
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7 This is also related to rational economic choice that dictates that since women tend to earn less than men, women are more likely than men to use options that might cast doubt upon their commitment to their jobs. For example, women are more likely than men to work part-time and job share (Bond et al 1998:70; Presser 1989:526).
too small to detect differences by race, should they exist. Age controls for life cycle differences (Friedman 1991:22; Spilerman and Schrank 1991:56; Raabe 1990:483).

Factors Influencing Employees’ Home-to-Work Spillover

I expect that MW employees’ home-to-work spillover will be grounded primarily in home factors, although characteristics of workers’ jobs may mitigate or aggravate domestic interference. The majority of MW employees have family ties and related obligations. For example, 80 percent of MW employees have children, spouses, eldercare responsibilities, or some combination of these familial and care-giving obligations that they may occasionally or regularly worry about. Moreover, of MW employees with spouses/partners, eight out of ten (83 percent) had partners who worked at least 20 hours a week. Thus, most MW workers do not leave a nonemployed spouse at home to deal with the needs of their families. As a manager with 17 years experience explained, “If you have something going on at home, it is really hard to forget the worries and concentrate on work issues.” I investigate two sets of factors that should influence workers’ domestic spillover: (1) family composition and care-giving responsibilities, and (2) job characteristics that may affect the intrusion of domestic responsibilities at work.

The influence of family and care-giving responsibilities. Workers’ sex, as well as their family composition and marital status, should influence their vulnerability to domestic spillover at work. Sex remains the primary determinant of household and caregiving tasks. Women bear primary responsibility for day-to-day, inflexible household and childcare tasks (Bond et al. 1998:2; Shelton and John 1996:308; Manke et al. 1994:666; Galinsky et al. 1993:47-50; Shelton 1992:147-8; Leslie et al. 1991:208;
Nevertheless, there is conflicting evidence regarding whether home-to-work spillover is greater for women than men (Ferber and O’Farrell 1991:55). Some researchers have found that women, as primary caretakers, experience more spillover at work than men (Galinsky and Bond 1996:97; Friedman 1991:22; Pleck 1985). Other research suggests that similarly situated men report as much, if not more, stress and spillover at work than their female counterparts (Reskin and Flack 1996:16; Barnett 1994:655; Galinsky et al. 1991:112; Bolger et al. 1989). Women and men are rarely similarly situated, however. In addition, the effect of sex on spillover will reflect gendered family and household obligations not explicitly measured in the models. Thus, net of other factors in the models, I expect that women should experience more home-to-work spillover than men.

The composition of MW employees’ families and their care-giving responsibilities should also increase their home-to-work spillover. The unpredictable day-to-day needs of children tend to make caregiving a continuous obligation and on-call work (Spain and Bianchi 1996:168; Presser 1995b:300), although children of different ages need different types of care and supervision (Glass and Estes 1997:292; Friedman 1991:20). And the needs of dependent elders may be even more variable than those of children (Ettner 1995:65). Institutional supports outside the workplace are missing, however, for caregivers to children and the elderly (Ettner 1995:66; Galinsky et al. 1991:120-1; Friedman 1991:29-30; Googins 1991:221). Mirroring previous research in work-family conflict, I expect that workers with children and elder-care responsibilities will be more vulnerable to

---

8 The studies use a variety of measures of home-to-work spillover, none of which is identical to mine.
home-to-work spillover than their colleagues without dependents (Reskin and Flack 1996:16; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991:60; Galinsky et al. 1991:119, 123; Friedman 1987:42).

Although researchers assume that marital status affects spillover at work, there is little evidence about its effect on the frequency that familial and domestic concerns intrude at work. Having a spouse or partner to integrate into the work-home framework of obligations may increase respondents' home-to-work spillover because there is an additional person to whom workers are emotionally and logistically related. Conversely, having a spouse/partner may reduce employees' domestic spillover by providing employees with an additional resource to address familial and household concerns. Therefore, I do not predict the effect of being married/partnered on workers' domestic spillover.

Three other personal and familial characteristics should affect employees' vulnerability to home-to-work spillover: workers' age, the hours per week other household members are available to assist in familial and household obligations, and household income. First, I expect that age will have a curvilinear relationship (concave down) to spillover because workers' daily involvement with family members increases with the birth of their children, but daily time devoted to childcare decreases as children grow older (Robinson and Godbey 1997:191-2; Thompson and Walker 1991:81).

Second, the number of hours other adults in the household are available to share

---

9 Women's household labor, for example, increases seven to nine hours a week when they get married while men's household labor is unaffected (Shelton 1992:66). In the absence of children, however, women's household tasks are likely to be routine, predictable demands.
household and care-giving responsibilities (i.e., availability of spouses or housemates net of their paid hours at work) should decrease the frequency that respondents worry about personal, familial, and household concerns. In fact, a nonmanager who lived alone argued that being alone “is harder—much harder—because you have to leave [work] for everything.”

Third, workers' household income should also mitigate the disruptive effect that spillover has on work. Financial pressure is itself a source of spillover. As one nonmanager argued, “None of us get paid enough....[and with inadequate income] when I'm at work, I think...of all my bills.” Moreover, income permits employees to purchase services that they would otherwise need to perform, such as child care and food preparation (Hochschild 1997:230-1; Friedman 1991:23; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991:32; Coverman 1983:632). And the larger the household income, the more affordable are higher-quality services (Galinsky and Stein 1990:370) that alleviate worry. In sum, I expect that the frequency respondents worry about familial and household issues should have a curvilinear relationship to workers' age, and spillover should be inversely related to the temporal and financial resources workers have available to address domestic issues.

The influence of job characteristics. Job flexibility and job demands should also influence workers' vulnerability to spillover at work (Jacobs and Gerson 1999:79; Reskin and Flack 1996:16; Friedman 1991:17-18; Googins 1991:51). For example, research has found that home-to-work spillover is less likely as employees move up the organizational
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10 Heimer (1996:259) argues that employees are not be able to buy services that alleviate unexpected and emergency circumstances. While this is undoubtedly true to some extent, financial resources enable the purchase of higher-quality goods and services, thus reducing
hierarchy (Friedman 1991:24). Thus, two factors associated with organizational status—autonomy and salary grade—should decrease the frequency that employees' concerns about personal, familial, and household issues intrude into the workplace. Autonomy, indicated by the ability to make job-related decisions, grants employees the discretion to manage their workloads and address domestic issues as needed. Similarly, net of other job and personal characteristics, the higher status indicated by salary grade may permit workers to rearrange their schedules to fulfill domestic obligations, thereby reducing the frequency of interruption (Friedman 1991:23; Galinsky et al. 1991:85). Status may also provide employees with buffers such as secretaries and voice mail that limit interruptions (Nippert-Eng 1996:144). Therefore, insofar as autonomy and status provide workers with the flexibility to meet competing obligations, they should decrease employees' work-to-home spillover.

Alternative work arrangements that provide workers with scheduling flexibility should also help employees fulfill the dual demands of home and work (Hill et al. 1996:298; Rodgers 1992:197). For example, a male nonmanager, touting the advantages of being on a flexible schedule regardless of familial composition, noted that "there are a lot of things that you can only take care of during business hours, and if you are working during business hours, you can't deal with those other things." Thus, I expect that employees' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting will reduce the frequency that personal, familial, and household concerns interrupt their work. Yet to the extent that the likelihood of their failure. Financial resources also permit workers to reserve back up services for emergency occurrences, such as childcare for snow days.
options vary in their flexibility and thus in their ability to help workers address domestic issues, their effects on spillover may differ.

Finally, two dimensions of employees' job demands should decrease domestic interruption at work. Both complex jobs and supervisory roles that involve interacting with others require greater concentration than other jobs. Therefore, they should be inversely related to the frequency that external concerns intrude into the workplace.

In sum, job characteristics may affect employees' vulnerability to spillover in two ways: by imposing or removing tangible or intangible barriers to the intrusion of domestic concerns at work, and by providing or denying employees flexibility to address personal, family, and household issues.

Controls for the analyses of home-to-work spillover. I control for the effects of division and education on employees' home-to-work spillover. Division controls for differences in sampling fractions between the Systems, Actuarial, and Operations units. I also control for education, which is associated with factors that may affect spillover, such as participation in housework and sex role attitudes (Presser 1994:358, South and Spitze 1994:339; Huber and Spitze 1983).¹¹

Sample, Measures, and Method of Analysis

Sample

I used data collected in my employee surveys for the analyses. I excluded four cases from my analyses because the respondents had missing values on one or both
dependent variables. Thus, my analyses of workers’ use of alternative work arrangements and their home-to-work spillover involved 480 respondents.

**Measures**

I measured employees’ use of each of the scheduling options with a question that asked if flextime (or CWW or telecommuting) were available, did respondents personally use this option? Responses included no (coded 1); use of the option without a written agreement (coded 2); and use of the option with a written agreement (coded 3). I assigned a no value to respondents who did not have access.

I operationalized the concept of home-to-work spillover as the intrusion of domestic concerns into the workplace. I measured it with three Likert-like indicators (“In the past year, how often have you worried about your children or other relative while at work,” “How often in the past year have your worried about personal, family, or household issues while at work,” and “In the past year how often have family or household responsibilities interfered with your ability to devote full attention to your job”). Responses ranged from never (coded 1) to frequently (coded 4). I assigned a value of 1 to respondents who replied that the questions were not applicable. The indicators are substantially intercorrelated with Pearson coefficients averaging about .53.

I measured the estimated levels of departmental use of the options with items that asked what would be the largest proportion of workers in respondents’ department who would be allowed to use flextime/CWW/telecommuting if they wanted to, from none (coded 1) to all (coded 5). I measured hours of household help available to the
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11 Education typically decreases the time women devote to household tasks and increases the time men devote to household chores.
respondent as a linear transformation of number of adults in the household and spouses'/partners' hours of work a week at all paid jobs. I assigned adults in the household a value of 80 hours of availability per week minus the number of hours they work per week. I assumed that roommates worked 40 hours per week.

The measures of other job, employee, workgroup factors, and personal and household characteristics that I used in my analyses of workers' use of AWAs and their spillover correspond to the measures that I used in the analyses of access. The sources of the measures are included in Table 3.1. The measures' means and standard deviations are included in Table 3.2, and their correlations are included in Table 3.3. I describe the estimation of missing values in Appendix F.

Method of Analysis

MW's assumption that alternative scheduling options help workers balance their dual obligations implies simultaneous and interdependent outcomes between workers' use of the options and their spillover. Estimation of the determinants of and relationship between domestic spillover and of each AWA requires two regression equations. Thus, structural equation models (SEMs) were appropriate for my analyses (Hoyle 1995:1; Berry 1984:9; Asher 1983:12).

Figure 4.1 is a conceptual model of hypothesized relationships between employees' home-to-work spillover and their use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting. I estimated a nonrecursive model for each alternative work arrangement. I used one conceptual model for all three scheduling options because workers must evaluate the same set of factors regarding their use of each option, despite differences in the flexibility and hence in
the associated risk of using the three AWAs. Similarly, the hypothesized determinants of domestic spillover were consistent across scheduling options.

[Figure 4.1 about here – conceptual model]

As noted, I measured employees' use of each of the scheduling options with a question that asks if flextime (or CWW or telecommuting) were available, did respondents personally use this option. I used analysis of association (Goodman 1987; Eliason 1990; Clogg and Shihadeh 1994) to obtain scale values for employees' use of the scheduling options. The models fit the data well, as their chi squares indicate: the chi square for workers' use of flextime is 2.90 with one degree of freedom; for employees' use of compressed work week, the chi square is .98 with one degree of freedom; and the chi square for workers' use of telecommuting is 1.07 with one degree of freedom. Using the

\[12\] The values identified by the analysis of association for employees' use of a compressed work week are: "no," coded -.696; "yes, with a written agreement," coded -.023; and "yes, without a written agreement," coded .718. Use of flextime: "no" is coded -.646, "yes, with a written agreement" is coded -.109, and "yes, without a written agreement" is coded .755. Use of telecommuting: "no" is coded -.709, "yes, with a written agreement" is coded .706, and "yes, without a written agreement" is coded .003.

The order of the values derived using the analysis of association is not consistent across AWAs. For example, the derived values are in the same order for the use of flextime and CWW. "No" is approximately -.7; "yes, with a written agreement" falls close to zero; and "yes, without a written agreement" is approximately .7 for both AWAs. For telecommuting, "no" is also approximately -.7. However, the order for the two measures of "yes" are reversed: "yes, without a written agreement" is close to zero, and "yes with a written agreement" is approximately .7.

Informants suggested that this difference is due to the nature of the arrangements. That is, flextime and CWW are more widely accepted and used more regularly than telecommuting. Informants also reported that only managers whose styles are "by-the-book" and who are suspicious of their subordinates or the options request written agreements for flextime and CWW. In contrast, employees who telecommute regularly are likely to have formal agreements with their managers, regardless of managerial style, due to the supervisory and financial issues involved in working off-site with company equipment. According to informants and participant observation, however, the majority of
values derived by the analysis of association, I could treat employees’ use of each AWA as a continuous dimension that I analyzed with SEM regression.

The use of structural equation models also allowed me to operationalize home-to-work spillover as a latent variable constructed from three indicators. I fixed the first item’s parameter at one. Therefore, the latent variable spillover was on the same scale as its measured indicators (MacCallum 1995:23). The proportion of the variance in each indicator explained by home-to-work spillover in the measurement model is equal to its squared multiple correlation coefficient (Bollen 1989a:200). With $R^2$'s equal to .50, .56, and .54, the indicators are substantially correlated with the concept.

I included correlated disturbance terms in the models, as well, because it is likely that I omitted variables from the equations that affect both home-to-work spillover and the use of the alternative work arrangements. The models did not include variables whose causal order with respect to the use of AWAs is ambiguous, such as the ability to work independently, hours of work per week, and hours spent on household chores and caregiving.

The degree the options deviate from traditional work arrangements varies. This variation has implications for the risk workers’ associate with using each, as well as the flexibility each offers. For example, factors that affect employees’ use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting may differ. Therefore, I used three SEMs—one to analyze the telecommuters are occasional users who do not have formal agreements with their managers.

13 I tested each equation in the models separately for multicollinearity using the variance inflation factor (VIF), condition numbers, and variance-decomposition proportions in OLS
determinants of and relationship between spillover and each of the alternative work arrangement. All tests of significance were at the .05 level.

I constrained the effect of flextime on spillover because its effect on spillover was positive in the initial simultaneous equation model of the two. Since this is theoretically improbable, I constrained flextime’s effect to zero, the highest non-positive value possible. The determinants of spillover in the constrained SEM were generally consistent with the determinants of spillover in an OLS regression with flextime as an independent variable, and I report the results of the constrained SEM for flextime here.¹⁴

I did not limit my analyses to employees with access to the options for two reasons. First, restricting the sample to those with access to an AWA would eliminate many workers who experience spillover. Second, employees’ access to an AWA is a component, rather a predictor, of their use of option. That is, there is a perfect association between a subgroup of workers: those who use the option and those with access to it. Thus, limiting each analysis to workers with access to the AWA would bias the estimates of the effect of its use on domestic spillover and the effect of spillover on its use.

I used the Amos Version 3.6 program for analyses.¹⁵ The maximum likelihood function provided by the program is the most widely used fitting function for SEMs, with regressions. Multicollinearity was not a problem in the OLS analyses of use or of home-to-work spillover.

¹⁴ The influence of children ages 6 to 13 was insignificant (β=.105, SE=.065) in the OLS regression of spillover when I constrained flextime’s influence to zero. The effects of the other variables in the OLS model were consistent with their effects in the simultaneous equation model.
asymptotically unbiased, consistent, efficient, scale invariant, and scale free estimates (Bollen 1989a:107-9). The unique predictors in the equations for respondents' use of AWAs were characteristics of the job (job speed and working with diverse people), the estimated level of departmental use of the AWA, seniority, job security, and evaluation factors (the ease of evaluating the quality of respondents' work, supervisory trust, whether facetime is important). The unique predictors in the equations for spillover were respondents' marital status, family composition (numbers of children ages 5 and under, children ages 6 to 13, and children ages 13 to 18), caregiving to the elderly, age squared, and potential hours of household help.

Research Findings

My analyses investigated three things: (1) characteristics that affect employees' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting; (2) characteristics that affect employees' home-to-work spillover; and (3) the relationship between employees' use of each alternative work arrangement and their domestic spillover.

Descriptive Findings

MW employees' use of AWAs. Workers' use of the three arrangements varied between options and between divisions, as Table 4.1 shows.

[ Table 4.1 about here ]

\[^{15}\] I used the Amos program rather than LISREL or EQS for two reasons. First, Amos is a stand-alone program that I can use on a personal computer. Second, Amos can read data from an SPSS working file.
Employees were twice as likely to use flextime as to use CWW or telecommute.\textsuperscript{16} Use of each option, however, may be regular or occasional—and the parameters of that use may or may not be formalized in written agreements between managers and their subordinates. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the conditions under which employees used flextime or CWW did not vary according to whether or not they had written agreements—other than that their managers wanted the time frames in writing. In contrast, those who telecommuted regularly were likely to have formal agreements outlining such things as reimbursement guidelines for phone lines, the conditions under which MW provided the equipment, and employees' commitment to provide office space. As a managerial informant explained, "They still want [telecommuting] highly documented. I'm not sure they feel extremely comfortable with it." Thus, although 19 percent of all MW employees telecommuted, one indicator of the number of workers who did so on a regular basis is the percent who have formal agreements to telecommute.

Three percent of the workforce—or 16 percent of all telecommuters—had written corporate agreements to telecommute.\textsuperscript{17} This suggests that most MW telecommuters do not use the option regularly. Informants explained that workers who occasionally need blocks of uninterrupted work time to complete such things as subordinates' evaluations or special projects telecommute on an ad hoc basis, as do employees who want to complete after-hours work at home for such things as reading and responding to their e-mail.

\textsuperscript{16} Weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions (n=480).

\textsuperscript{17} This is consistent with prior research that found that typically three percent of the employees in firms that offered telecommuting actually worked off-site, presumably regularly (Galinsky et al. 1991:86). Other research has found that 19 percent of the labor
MW employees' home-to-work spillover. Because responsibilities at home are typically gendered, I expected that spillover would vary by sex net of other factors. As Table 4.2 shows, a number of work, familial, and household factors vary by sex.

Female employees were more likely than their male colleagues to live with family members, including in single-parent and dual-income households. Male employees worked longer hours per week at their paid jobs, on average, but female employees worked longer hours per week at unpaid (household) jobs. Women and men had similar financial resources, and similar percentages of women and men were married and had children of differing ages.

The majority of MW employees experienced the intrusion of familial and household concerns while at work, as Table 4.3 shows. For example, more than half of MW's employees reported that they sometimes or often worried about their children or other relatives at work (56.7 percent) and that they sometimes or often worried about personal, family or household issues at work (54.4 percent). However, mirroring force sometimes or regularly work at home (Bond et al. 1998:101), but it is not clear that all of these workers telecommute.

18 However, women reported providing an average of 6.5 hours of elder care a week—significantly more than men's 3.7 hours a week (t-test, p<.05).

19 Male and female respondents' estimates of time spent performing their paid work and their unpaid tasks at home are likely to be overestimated. Robinson and Godbey (1997:93) report that although both women and men over-estimate their hours of paid work, women's over-estimation of their hours in the paid labor force is greater than men's. Conversely, Press and Townsley (1996:26) report that both husbands and wives overestimate their hours of household work, although men's over-estimation of their household labor is greater than women's. Without a comparative analysis of women's and
women’s greater household responsibilities and their greater presence in dual-income households with children, female employees were significantly more likely than their male counterparts to report that they worried about their children, relatives, personal, and household obligations.

Yet the majority of both women and men also reported that these concerns rarely or never interfered with their job concentration. Only a quarter of the workforce reported that personal, familial, and household concerns sometimes or often interfered with their ability to concentrate on their work (27.6 percent). Only seven percent of the employees across the divisions reported that they never experienced any of the three indicators of spillover.

men’s over-estimation of work on the job and at home, I cannot determine how the total over-estimates differ by sex.

By definition, external concerns intruding at work divert employees’ focus from their jobs. Additional research is needed to explain the discrepancy between the number of employees who report worrying about family and household issues at work and the smaller number who report those worries interfering with their concentration. One possibility is that workers are hesitant to acknowledge how often their concentration is reduced. That is, the “moral importance of work” dictating that work time is more important than family time (Daly 1996:90-1) and thus the social desirability of reporting little distraction at work are likely to negatively affect employees’ reports of loss of concentration. Alternatively, the time lost to each interruption over the course of a day or week may seem inconsequential to employees. In total, however, the time absorbed by the sum of all workers’ spillover is likely to result in a significant loss of focus on work—and hence, a loss of organizational productivity.

Compared to their colleagues with spillover, those without domestic interference were less likely to have children of any age group, were less likely to be single parents or dual-income parents with children, and less likely to have eldercare responsibilities (t-tests, p≤.05) (n=480, weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions). Slightly more than half (53 percent) of those reporting no spillover were female. Of those reporting no spillover, only 7 percent (or about half a percent of the total workforce) had children age 18 or under at home. In fact, of those with children, all but one respondent had children ages 6 to 12—the age group for which the most daycare options exist.
Determinants of Employees' Use of AWAs

I expected that three sets of factors would influence workers' use of AWAs. First, I hypothesized that the nature of employees' jobs and their job demands would influence employees' ability and need to use the options. Second, because management often links employees' use of AWAs with reduced commitment and productivity, I expected that variables associated with the perceived risk of using the AWAs would influence the use of AWAs. These include attributes of (1) employees' evaluation process, (2) proxies for their productivity, and (3) contextual factors. Third, I hypothesized that personal and household factors would affect employees' need to use MW's alternative work arrangements.

Analyses of the simultaneous equation models provide three summary conclusions that I explore more fully in the Discussion section. First, the context in which employees work is a key influence on workers' use of AWAs. Second, the determinants of employees' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting vary between options. Third, although employees' home-to-work spillover stems primarily from workers' personal status, familial, and care-giving responsibilities, job flexibility can mitigate the intrusion of domestic concerns into the workplace.

Figures 4.2 to 4.4 depict the causal models for the reciprocal effects of employees' home-to-work spillover and their use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting, respectively.

[Figure 4.2 about here]

About nine percent had eldercare responsibilities and 61 percent were married. Just over half of those reporting no spillover (54 percent) had spouses or partners who worked for pay.
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I report the SEM regression results for the equations of employees' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting in Table 4.4 and the SEM regression results for the equations for home-to-work spillover in Table 4.5. In both tables, I report the coefficients for the model incorporating flextime in column three, the coefficients for the CWW model in column four, and the coefficients for the model with telecommuting in column five. The measures of fit indicate that the models fit the data well.

I initially tested for the additive effects of sex in the equation of workers' use of AWAs and the additive effects of sex and marital status in the spillover equations. None had consistent effects across models, which suggests that any effect capitalized on chance. Therefore, I did not include them in the final analyses.

Following Hoyle (1995:15), I evaluated the models to the observed data using five goodness-of-fit tests. The $\chi^2$ test, the most common index of fit, is sensitive to sample size and number of variables in the models, and thus is an inadequate statistical test of model fit (for a summary of the discussion see Hoyle 1995). Consequently, I report four additional measures of fit. Two measures compare a baseline (or independence) model with the estimated model (Arbuckle 1997:563). (1) IFI is Bollen's (1989b) incremental fit index. IFI values close to 1 indicate a good fit. (2) NFI: The Bentler-Bonett (1980) normed fit index. NFI values close to 1 indicate a good fit. Another measure is the AGFI, or adjusted goodness of fit index. The AGFI is a variation of Jöreskog and Sörbom's goodness of fit index (1984) that takes into account the degrees of freedom available for testing the model. The upper limit of the AGFI is one, indicating a perfect fit. The measure is not bounded below by zero, however. The last goodness-of-fit measure is RMSEA and CI(90), which together are a measure of model adequacy that compensates for the effect of model complexity (MacCallum 1995:30). RMSEA is the root mean square error of approximation. A RMSEA of about .05 or less indicates a close fit of the model relative to its degrees of freedom, with up to .08 or less indicating a reasonable error of approximation (Browne and Cudeck 1993). I indicate the lower and upper limits of a 90-percent confidence interval on the population value by (LO 90) and (HI 90).
Determinants of workers’ use of flextime. I found evidence that the nature of workers’ jobs, the context in which employees worked, and employees’ personal status influenced their use of flextime, although not always as I had hypothesized (Table 4.4, column three). As expected, workers’ autonomy increased employees’ use of the option. Contrary to my hypothesis, however, organizational status also had a positive effect on the use of flextime. Both contextual factors were important. The perceived level of flextime use in respondents’ department was positively associated with respondents’ use of the option. In addition, location within the firm played a role in use of the AWA: workers in the Systems division used flextime less than their colleagues in the Operations division. The sole personal or household characteristic that affected flextime use was workers’ sex. In contrast to my hypothesis, women used flextime less than similarly situated men (one-tailed, \(p < 0.05\)). The demands of workers’ jobs, job interdependency, the proxies for productivity, evaluation factors, household income, and employees’ home-to-work spillover had no influence on workers’ use of flextime.

Determinants of workers’ use of compressed work weeks. The nature and demands of workers’ jobs, contextual factors at work, other factors influencing perceived risk, and personal and household characteristics all played a role in employees’ decisions to use CWW, as expected (Table 4.4, column four). In terms of the nature and demands of jobs, job complexity was positively related to workers’ use of the option, while supervisory responsibility was negatively related to its use. One contextual factor, the acceptability of CWW in respondents’ departments (indicated by the estimated levels of use), increased workers’ use of the option. Two other measures associated with the
perceived risk of using CWW were important. Workers' perception that they were evaluated on the basis of facetime decreased the likelihood that they would use the AWA. However, education (a proxy for productivity) increased respondents' use. And consistent with my hypotheses for the effects of personal and household characteristics, women were more likely to use the option than similarly situated men, while increased household income decreased employees' use of CWW. Contrary to expectations, however, a number of factors had no influence: jobs that required speed and those that involved working with diverse people, workers' status and autonomy, division, workers' seniority and job security, and the ease of evaluating the quality of respondents' work and the perceived supervisory trust.

**Determinants of workers' telecommuting.** Employees' home-to-work spillover and four factors associated with the perceived risk of telecommuting influenced workers' decisions to telecommute, as hypothesized (Table 4.4, column five). Workers' domestic spillover increased their use of the option. Similarly, two contextual indicators influenced MW employees' decisions to telecommute. The estimated level of use in respondents' departments was positively related to workers' use. In addition, division was important: Systems workers telecommuted more than their Operations counterparts. One proxy for productivity—experience—also increased the likelihood of telecommuting, as expected. However, employees who believed facetime was important to their evaluations were less likely to telecommute than other employees. The demands of workers' jobs, the interdependence of jobs, workers' status and autonomy, workers' education and job security, the ease of evaluating the quality of respondents' work and the perceived trust of
their supervisors, respondents' sex, and household income had no influence on employees' decisions to telecommute.

**Summary.** As expected, the nature of workers' jobs, factors associated with the perceived risk of using the options, and employees' sex, domestic spillover, and household income affected workers' use of AWAs. With the exception of the effect of the estimated levels of use, however, the variables inconsistently influenced workers' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting.

**Determinants of Employees' Work-to-Home Spillover**

**The influence of personal and household characteristics.** As expected, personal and familial characteristics were consistently important determinants of employees' home-to-work spillover (see Table 4.5, Personal/Household Characteristics panel). Women, traditionally the primary emotional and physical care-givers in families, experienced more spillover than similarly situated men. Thus, the bivariate patterns between workers' sex and their spillover remained stable in the reciprocal analyses net of all other variables in the models.

My survey is based on respondents' self reports, limiting my data to employees' perceptions, however. Respondents' reports of the frequency they experience home-to-work spillover thus may be overestimated or underestimated, as are time estimates of paid employment or housework, (Robinson and Godbey 1997; Press and Townsley 1996). If employees consistently over- or underestimated domestic spillover, this limitation should
not influence the general pattern that women experience more spillover than similarly situated men.\textsuperscript{24}

Family composition and care-giving responsibilities also affected the likelihood of spillover. Having minor children, regardless of age group, increased employees' spillover at work. Indeed, the presence of children ages 5 and under was a strong predictor of spillover in all three equations (flextime Beta=.303, CWW Beta=.303, and telecommuting Beta=.338). Similarly, employees who provided elder care also experienced more spillover than their non-caregiving counterparts. These determinants help explain the demographics of workers who had no spillover. Those reporting no spillover had no preschoolers or teens at home, and comparatively few elementary-age children and elder-care responsibilities.

Being married or partnered, however, had no net influence on employees' spillover. This nonsignificant finding could be the result of off-setting effects: having a

\textsuperscript{24} The more familiar respondents are with events and tasks, the more accurate are the estimates of time and frequency (Robinson and Godbey 1997; Press and Townsley 1994). Thus, research has found that men's overestimation of time at work is less than women's (Robinson and Godbey 1997:93), and women's overestimation of time spent on household tasks is less than men's (Press and Townsley 1996:26). Extending this pattern to home-to-work spillover, if respondents' estimates of spillover are overestimated, the gap between women's estimates and reality is likely to be smaller than men's because women are more familiar with care-giving and household tasks. That is, women have greater responsibility for domestic obligations, are more likely to shape their work around their familial obligations due to the potential for spillover, and are more likely to miss work due to problems with childcare than their male counterparts (Presser 1995a:592; Presser 1995b:313). Thus, the general pattern of the effect of sex on spillover remains the same if respondents overestimate spillover.

As noted, however, the moral importance of work and the social desirability of not acknowledging that home interferes with work are likely to negatively affect employees' reports of spillover. This implies that respondents' reports of spillover may be underestimated. However, underestimation of spillover would not affect my conclusion...
spouse or partner should increase workers' domestic obligations and concerns, while simultaneously providing a partner to help address personal and household issues.

As expected, age had a curvilinear relationship (concave down) with home-to-work spillover for the SEMs with flextime and CWW. That is, employees' spillover typically increased at a decreasing rate until they reached age 33 (in model with flextime) and age 34 (in the model with CWW). Workers' spillover then began decreasing at an increasing rate. Age did not have a curvilinear effect in the model of spillover with telecommuting.

My analyses found no support for the hypotheses that household resources affect the frequency that employees worry about their personal, familial, and household obligations at work. Neither household income nor the amount of time other household members were available to provide assistance was related to spillover. Thus, although financial and temporal resources should reduce workers' routine obligations for which substitutes can be purchased or that others can perform, such resources are not likely to mitigate workers' intangible concerns grounded in emotional ties—particularly concerns that involve pressing issues with family and friends.

---

25 In the SEM with flextime, the coefficient of age on spillover for employees 20 years old was β=.026; for employees 60 years old, β=.054. In the SEM with CWW, the coefficient of age on spillover for employees 20 years old was β=.028; for employees 60 years old, β=.052.

26 Therefore, I report the results of the spillover model incorporating telecommuting with a linear specification of age for parsimony. I also investigated the possibility that respondents' age would have a curvilinear effect on their use of AWAs (analyses not shown), but it did not.
Consistent with MW’s intent, however, the analyses provide evidence that flexible work arrangements are effective strategies to reduce work-home conflict. Indeed, employees’ use of CWW (Beta= -.428) and telecommuting (Beta= -.297) were comparatively strong determinants of the intrusion of personal, familial, and care-giving concerns at work. Thus, workers who used CWW and telecommuting reduced their home-to-work spillover and were presumably able to concentrate more fully on their jobs.

In addition to flexibility in job scheduling, flexibility on the job reduces workers’ domestic spillover. For example, employees’ ability to make job-related decisions consistently reduced spillover in each model of spillover. Indicators of job demands and status, however, had no net influence on domestic spillover in the simultaneous equation models. Therefore, I found no evidence that job factors other than flexibility aggravate or mitigate employees’ spillover.

Summary. My analyses show that the frequency that domestic concerns intrude into the workplace stems primarily from workers’ sex, family circumstances, and care-giving responsibilities. Although indicators of job demands had no influence, flexibility at work—particularly the use of CWW and telecommuting—reduced home-to-work spillover, just as the AWAs were designed to do.

Discussion

In this chapter I used three structural equation models to investigate the determinants of workers’ use of the three scheduling options outlined by MW’s work-
home policy, the determinants of their home-to-work spillover, and the interdependent relationship between the two outcomes. I draw three conclusions from the analyses.

**Work Context Is Important**

Confirming previous research, I found strong support for the hypothesis that the context in which employees work affects employees' use of alternative work arrangements. I investigated the influence of two contextual factors: division within the firm and the estimated levels of use in respondents' departments for the options. As expected, the organizational attributes captured by division influenced employees' use of the options, although the influence was inconsistent between AWAs. Systems workers used flextime less than their counterparts in Operations, minimally supporting prior research that workers may be perceived as unprofessional if they use alternative work arrangements (Hochschild 1999:97; Seller 1996:56; Rodgers 1992:194; Schwartz 1994:31). But perhaps not surprisingly, as the most technologically advanced (and equipped) workgroup in the company, Systems employees telecommuted more than Operations workers, albeit with greater access to the option.

The estimated departmental level of use, the second contextual factor, captures the perceived collective support of managers. It, too, affected MW employees' use of the scheduling options. In fact, the estimated levels of use were among the strongest predictors of workers' use of flextime (Beta=.316), CWW (Beta=.245), and telecommuting (Beta=.327)—and the only indicator that had a consistent effect on each
option. As expected, the more normative use of an alternative arrangement was in employees' departments, the more likely workers were to risk using the option. However, it is probable that this, in part, reflects a selection effect: workers may transfer to departments where options are available, as noted in Chapter 3, and where use of the options is accepted.

Determinants of AWAs

Second, the determinants of employees' use of AWAs vary between options except for the consistent positive effect of the estimated departmental levels of use. For example, characteristics of workers' jobs and workers' position in the organizational hierarchy inconsistently affected employees' decisions to use the options (Table 4.4, Job Factors Influencing Need and Ability to Use AWAs panel). The influence of job demands and job interdependence was restricted to employees' use of CWW. Similarly, employees' organizational status and autonomy influenced only their use of flextime. None of the indicators of job factors related to employees' need and ability to use AWAs influenced workers' decisions to telecommute. Thus, I found limited support for the hypothesis that interdependent jobs decrease employees' use of AWAs. I found no support for the hypothesis that organizational status decreases use of the options because the effect of status on flextime use was positive. I also found only minimal support for the hypotheses

---

27 In OLS regressions of workers' use of the options limited to those with access (not shown), the level of departmental use was also the only variable that consistently affected the three options.

28 I will explore further the importance of employees' self selection and transfers in future focus groups and interviews.
that demanding jobs and those providing autonomy were associated with increased use of AWAs.

Factors associated with the perceived risks of using the options also had inconsistent effects on employees' use of AWAs (Table 4.4, Job Factors Related to Perceived Risk panel). Division was important to workers' use of flextime and telecommuting, but its effects differed between divisions and options. Facetime, the sole factor related to workers' evaluation that had influence, adversely affected the use of both CWW and telecommuting, but it had no effect on the use of flextime. The variable's negative effects were centered, then, on the two options that most noticeably reduce the traditional time that workers spend in the office. This finding may reflect the increased risk employees associate with using options that take them from the office for the comparatively large blocks of time that CWW and telecommuting offer if managers evaluate workers on the basis of time spent in the office. The effects of the two proxies for productivity were limited to education's positive relationship with workers' use of CWW and seniority's positive relationship with employees' telecommuting. Like the evaluation factors, neither proxy influenced employees' use of flextime, the option that deviates the least from traditional hours and location of work. Thus, the analyses provided moderate support for the hypothesis that factors that reduce the perceived risk associated with using the options are influential, but they provide little support for the idea that workers use the options as retention strategies.

Finally, evidence that personal and household characteristics influenced workers' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting varied between options (Table 4.4,
Personal/Household Characteristics panel). Spillover's sole effect was its positive influence on telecommuting, the option offering workers the most opportunity to interweave work and home responsibilities. Household income was important, but only to workers' use of CWW. In contrast, sex influenced both the use of flextime and of CWW, but in opposite ways.

Explanation. The degree that each option deviates from traditional work arrangements—and hence the degree of flexibility each option offers to meet workers' needs and the implicit differences in perceived risk of using the various options—help explain the variation in AWAs' determinants. Each option offers a different degree of flexibility. In terms of workers' use, then, the desirability of an option and its ability to reduce spillover depend on the congruence between users' need and the flexibility the option offers (Christensen and Staines 1990:471; Bohen and Viveros-Long 1981:147). Flextime allows employees to address domestic concerns at the beginning or end of the day. With limited flexibility, the option offers the least benefit to employees with family responsibilities, the basis for home-to-work spillover (Galinsky et al. 1991:130; Presser 1989:534; Bohen and Viveros-Long 1981). In contrast, CWW schedules provide workers with a comparatively larger weekly or biweekly block of time in which to attend to personal and familial concerns. However, CWW employees must be available on their days off for work—and may lose that time, which limits the inherent flexibility the option purports to offer. As one nonmanager explained, "[Managers] can cancel your CWW. They can call you up that morning or the night before." A manager agreed: "If you use
Informants across divisions welcomed telecommuting as a strategy allowing them to be available to their families at opportune times. Workers typically telecommuted on an ad hoc basis rather than as their regular work arrangement, however. Nevertheless, a manager who occasionally worked from home praised telecommuting’s flexibility: “If I need to work at home [in the morning so I can] take my son to the doctor, I can do that. [My boss] has set up a number of people in our area with a home office for that situation.” Another manager occasionally and informally allowed her subordinates to telecommute: “We don’t have anyone that [regularly] works at home. When [telecommuting] has been done, it has been on a very informal basis. Something may come up and a person…call(s) in and ask(s) to work at home for the day.” Thus, telecommuting allows MW workers to integrate their home and work obligations, even if the option is used only on a short-term basis.

Finally, MW employees understand that some managers believe subordinates’ use of alternative work arrangements make managers’ jobs more complex (see Table 3.5, right column)—and that complexity, in turn, may affect their own jobs and evaluations. One nonmanager noted that AWAs frustrate her boss, and “when he gets frustrated, I get

---

29 Informants who used the option fell into five main groups: (1) caregivers who used their day off to take chronically ill spouses, children, or parents to doctors’ appointments; (2) employees with long commutes; (3) employees who had been working long hours without comp time, and who thus used the option to reduce their workweek to approximately 40 hours; (4) employees who used it for childcare-related reasons (e.g., to give their spouses a day off or to be with their children during the daytime over summer break); and (5) employees who found it convenient to have a large block of time on a weekday to attend to personal and household tasks.
frustrated…. When he is happy, I’m happy. It makes my job a lot easier.” Similarly, another informant described how a coworker on CWW “drives my boss nuts” on the days the coworker is not in the office—a reaction that implicitly inhibits others’ use. And presumably the more an option deviates from traditional hours and location, the more complex supervision becomes. A manager who was opposed to CWW because the different schedules “make my team’s job more difficult” also believed that “flextime does not affect scheduling at all.” In terms of managers’ experience overseeing telecommuters, one nonmanager summarized the consensus among informants: “A few people, not in my area…come in one day a week and work at home the rest. I know that [telecommuting] is available and people have taken advantage of it, but I don’t know a lot of people who have.”

Another manager acknowledged that “it is harder to evaluate someone when they are not on site. You can’t just sit down and see how they are doing. You actually have to schedule a meeting.” In sum, concerns about AWAs’ effect on supervision (and by implication, on employees’ productivity) are reflected in the differences in managerial support for and workers’ access to the options—and thus in the risk employees associate with their use. The variation in risk between options, then, is likely to influence the determinants of the options’ use.

The variation in flexibility between options, as well as differences in perceived risk associated with their use, may also explain men’s greater use of flextime and women’s greater use of CWW. Insofar as paid employment is central to the identity of more men than women (Ferber and O’Farrell 1991:44), men have more at stake in maintaining the

---

30 As noted, technical considerations also restrict telecommuting because the technology to allow workers to regularly telecommute (rather than on an ad hoc basis) is still not
appearance of commitment to work. Conversely, to the extent that parental identity is
more salient to women than men (Simon 1992) and their household responsibilities are
greater, women have more at stake in meeting their household obligations. Thus, men—
who presumably need less flexibility to meet home-based obligations—may prefer flextime
which offers comparatively little risk, while women may need the greater flexibility that
CWW offers, regardless of risk.

In sum, the saliency of job and personal characteristics should vary between
options for two reasons. First, flextime, CWW, and telecommuting offer different degrees
of flexibility that appeal to workers with differing needs, whether those needs are related
to spillover or not. Second, the perceived risk associated with using the options should
also vary between options and contribute to the variation in their determinants.

The Nature of Home-to-Work Spillover

My third conclusion is that home-to-work spillover stems primarily from domestic
obligations, but alternative work arrangements are effective strategies that reduce the
intrusion of domestic concerns into the workplace. As expected, workers’ family
composition, their responsibilities to the elderly, and being female rather than male
increased the likelihood of experiencing domestic spillover. Indeed, the strongest
determinant of spillover in the flextime and telecommuting models was the presence of
children ages 5 and under, and it was the second strongest predictor of spillover in the
CWW model. It may be that the difficulties parents face with preschoolers’ childcare
needs underlie the strength of the influence of children ages 5 and under on spillover, as
previous research has suggested (Bond et al. 1998:137; Galinsky et al. 1993:65; Galinsky
uniformly available throughout MW. 143
et al. 1991:116). Moreover, researchers have suggested that men's home-to-work spillover is comparatively low because women's is comparatively high. That is, if women assume responsibility for domestic concerns during the working day, men do not have to (Emlen and Koren 1984). Workers' financial and temporal resources, however, had no net effects on spillover. One explanation for this lack of influence may be that home-to-work spillover—a measure of employees' intangible emotional concern—differs in nature from other, more concrete indictors of home-to-work conflict such as tardiness and absenteeism. Thus, whereas employees may purchase or find substitutes to perform tasks that interfere with their work, even the substitution of services may not be able to significantly alleviate employees' worry about their external responsibilities.

Job factors that provide flexibility at work decrease the intrusion of domestic issues on the job, as expected. Because domestic spillover is negatively related to job performance, employers and managers should welcome evidence that job autonomy and the use of CWW and telecommuting significantly decrease the frequency that employees' personal, familial, and household concerns intrude at work. That flextime was not an effective strategy to reduce spillover, however, is evidence that alternative work arrangements vary in their usefulness to employees experiencing work-home conflict. However, I have assumed that employees' spillover precedes and induces employees to use alternative work arrangements, and I used cross-sectional data based on that assumption. But spillover is not static and will increase or decrease over time as workers' involvement with, and concerns about, family and friends change—regardless of employees' schedules. Thus, workers who use flextime, the option offering the least
flexibility, may find that it is inadequate to blunt the demands of increasing work-home conflict.\textsuperscript{31}

**Conclusion**

Social scientists, employers, and employees have assumed that work-home conflict and the use of flexible scheduling options are related, but my analyses suggest that the nature of that relationship depends on the scheduling option used. For example, the relationship between workers' use of CWW and their spillover was recursive: CWW arrangements decreased employees' home-to-work spillover, but spillover did not increase workers' use of CWW arrangements. The relationship between MW employees' telecommuting and their home-to-work spillover was reciprocal: telecommuting decreased their spillover, and their spillover increased the likelihood that they would telecommute. Flextime and spillover, however, had no significant relationship. Thus, spillover differently affects employees' use of AWAs, and the options' effects on spillover vary.\textsuperscript{32}

The variation in the options' ability to reduce spillover is likely to be grounded in the degree of flexibility each offers. However, alternative work arrangements' ability to help workers achieve balance is compromised if employees use the options for work-

\textsuperscript{31} In addition, more workers have access to the flextime than other AWAs. Thus, many workers with spillover are constrained by access to use flextime for issues that may not be amenable to the limited flexibility the option offers.

\textsuperscript{32} I have investigated the effect of one facet of work-home conflict, home-to-work spillover, on workers' use of the options. A complete assessment of the relationships between work-home conflict and AWAs would involve employees' use of AWAs in reciprocal models of work-to-home spillover. Work-to-home spillover should have a greater influence on workers' use of AWAs than home-to-work spillover because it is more prevalent (Bond et al. 1998:116; Leiter and Durup 1996:41; Galinsky et al. 1993:71).
related reasons, such as mandatory overtime. Yet a number of informants using flextime began their workdays early in order to complete required overtime and still be finished by the end of the traditional workday. Informants on CWW also used the option to reduce their overtime. That is, what had been overtime with a traditional schedule became the normal workday with a CWW—but the employees were then able to end their workweeks early.\textsuperscript{33} Similarly, informants who telecommuted on an ad hoc basis frequently did so to reduce their overtime at the worksite, not their total time working. As one nonmanager explained, “Telecommuting in my area is only for after-hours work or when on vacation at home.... [It] would be nice to have it as an option for a normal day.” Echoing this, a single manager with custody of his children explained, “I have home access where I can dial in to work. Even on days that I’m off, I can do a lot of things...making sure people are getting what they need and answering questions.” However, to the extent that the scheduling options are used to complete mandatory overtime work, they are primarily a work policy.

Managers play critical roles in the implementation of MW’s work-home policy, both in workers’ access to and use of flexible scheduling options. In addition to the ill will among workers stemming from their inequitable access to AWAs, unsolicited anecdotal evidence also suggests that some managers lack the skills necessary to successfully oversee and coordinate work between employees on traditional and alternative arrangements. Managerial ineptitude causes resentment for two groups of workers: those

\textsuperscript{33} This is also beneficial to the company. An Operations manager decried the expected weekly hours worked of 60 to 70 hours a month without comp time: “Burnout is common among managers...[but] team members were given the option to work CWW schedules in order to reduce the level of overtime, and it worked.”
whose jobs are complicated by their managers’ inability to plan for and coordinate work, and those whose colleagues misuse AWAs. First, both employees who used alternative work arrangements and those who did not resented extended work hours stemming from the uneven flow of work. Managers and nonmanagers noted that employees on CWW schedules could have their days off canceled if the work flow increased. As one worker complained, “They can call you up that morning or the night before and tell you that you are not going to get the day off.” Another employee chose not to use a compressed work week because “if I took advantage of CWW, I was expected to be available on all days off.” Others charged that employees working standard schedules also paid a price for the uneven flow of work and lack of coordination between workers. An Actuarial manager on flextime noted that “management has been very unsuccessful at balancing flexible work schedules with necessary overtime. People not on CWW are required to work overtime with little if any compensation, while those on CWW get their days off. This has created a great deal of resentment.” In sum, the unpredictable flow of work that causes unplanned overtime precipitates the resentment of workers, whether or not they are using alternative work arrangements. Although this is, in part, determined by external clients, informants argued that managers’ lack of skill and the resulting inability to coordinate work between employees on traditional and alternative schedules exacerbate the problem.

A second criticism among informants about coworkers’ use of AWAs was that managers did not hold employees who abused the options accountable. For example, an

---

34 Eleven survey respondents and three of the four focus groups raised the issue of overtime grounded in uneven and poorly planned work. Six survey respondents and three focus groups commented on coworkers’ unchecked abuse of AWAs.
Operations manager witnessed "a number of people routinely abusing the flexible scheduling options ... with an adverse effect on productivity," but there were no consequences for the abusers. Nonmanagers worried about the personal and organizational consequences of unchecked abuse. As one explained, "If you know the people...abusing it, then that makes you never want to ask for it. You know that is part of the stereotype of the person using that program." Another feared "that abuse may cause MW to cut [the policy] out completely." Managers I interviewed described how they had addressed abuse, typically by reviewing expectations with wayward employees and monitoring their performance. Managers revoked the options as a last resort.

As one informant succinctly concluded, "The success or failure of [AWAs] depends on managers' attitudes and how well the program is managed." Managers are a key influence in both workers' access to and use of AWAs. As gatekeepers of the policy's implementation, they have the discretion to determine workers' access to AWAs. In addition, the consistently strong positive effect of the estimated level of departmental use underscores the importance of managers' perceived collective support on employees' use of flextime, CWW, and telecommuting. Finally, managers' ability to plan for and coordinate work between employees on different schedules is essential to the effective functioning of workgroups using AWAs.

Despite differences in the flexibility that the alternative arrangements offer, workers' access to and use of each is grounded in the "primacy of work" (Kofodimos 1997:59). Work-related factors are the primary determinants of MW managers' decisions
to make the options available, and maintaining or increasing productivity is allegedly managers' paramount consideration. And despite managerial protestations to the contrary, nonmanagers and managers alike believed that using the options may cause their supervisors to question their productivity and commitment—and hence jeopardize their careers. Employees desiring to use the options must implicitly justify that use negatively: that is, by arguing that using an AWA will not affect their work. Ignored in the equation are the AWAs' positive influence on workers' home-to-work spillover—which, in turn, should positively affect users' work. Therefore, the ability of CWW and telecommuting to reduce workers' domestic spillover provides a strong argument in favor of implementation of the alternatives by corporations concerned with their bottom line.
As an observed variable, workers' use of an AWA is represented by a box. As a latent variable, workers' spillover is represented by an oval. Multiple measures of spillover provide more information about the concept than any one measure could contribute. Straight arrows in the path diagram indicate a (hypothesized) causal relationship between variables. In figures representing the regression results, hypothesized causal relationships that are nonsignificant are represented by dashed straight lines. Curved two-headed arrows indicate a covariance between two variables that is unexplained in the model. The ε's indicate measurement error—that is, a recognition that the indicators of spillover are not perfect measures of the underlying concept. Errors in the equations are indicated by ζ's.

Work factors: division; job factors (job complexity, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, and use of AWA). Personal factors: sex, marital status, children aged 5 and under, children ages 6 to 12, children ages 13 to 18, care-giving to elderly/disabled, household income, potential hours of household help, age, age², and controls (race and education).

Work factors: work context (division, estimated levels of departmental use); job characteristics (job complexity, job requires speed, job requires working with diverse people, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, seniority, education, ease of evaluating quality of respondents' work, supervisory trust, importance of facetime, job security). Personal factors: home-to-work spillover, sex, household income, age, and control (race).
| Table 4.1 Percent of MW Employees Who Use Alternative Work Arrangements, by Division * |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Employees' use of flextime *     | Systems Division | Actuarial Division | Operations Division | Respondents in Sample | Total Workforce |
| Don't use                        | 57.0            | 42.1            | 66.3            | 55.9            | 62.3            |
| Use with or without a written agreement | 43.0            | 57.9            | 33.7            | 44.1            | 37.7            |
| $\chi^2$                         | 17.17, 2 df     |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Employees' use of compressed work week * | Don't use       | 65.4            | 86.4            | 88.0            | 79.2            | 81.8            |
| Use with or without a written agreement | 34.6            | 13.6            | 12.0            | 20.8            | 18.2            |
| $\chi^2$                         | 32.32, 2 df     |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Employees' use of telecommuting* | Don't use       | 64.2            | 72.1            | 88.0            | 74.6            | 80.6            |
| Use with or without a written agreement | 35.8            | 27.9            | 12.0            | 25.4            | 19.4 c          |
| $\chi^2$                         | 24.96, 2 df     |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| n                               | 176             | 139             | 165             | 480             | 480             |

* Percent varies across divisions ($\chi^2$, p≤.05)

Source: MW survey, 1998

---

* Four surveys had missing values on one or both of the dependent variables. Thus, the sample size is 480.

b Weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.

c About three percent of telecommuters have formal work agreements; about 16 percent telecommute informally without written agreements. This suggests that only about three percent use the option regularly.
Table 4.2  Personal and Household Characteristics of Midwest Employees, by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Total Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent nonwhite</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (range 20 to 65 years)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean education (7 categories)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years at Midwest (range 13 to 38)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean household income in dollars</td>
<td>$56,426</td>
<td>$61,182</td>
<td>$58,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean weekly hours of work at MW</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean weekly hours of work at other jobs</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean weekly hours of unpaid household labor</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean weekly hours of paid and unpaid work</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living with family members such as a spouse, sibling, parent, in-law, child</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent married or living with partner</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children ages 18 or under in household</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children ages 5 and under in household</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children ages 6 to 12 in household</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children ages 13 to 18 in household</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living in dual income households</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living in dual income households with children</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of single parents</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent providing eldercare</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 283 197 480

* Varies by sex (t-test, p ≤.05)

Source: MW survey, 1998

* Weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.

b I define dual income households as those in which respondents’ spouses/partners work more than 20 hours a week.

c Women provide more hours of care a week, on average (6.5 hours), than men do (3.7 hours) (t-test, p ≤.05).
Table 4.3 Percent of MW Employees Reporting Home-to-work Spillover, by Sex *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>Percent of MW employees who worry about their children and relatives at work:</th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Total Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Never</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rarely</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sometimes</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean response (scale: 1 to 4) * | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.4 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.</th>
<th>Percent of MW employees who worry about personal, family, or household issues at work:</th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Total Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Never</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rarely</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sometimes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean response (scale: 1 to 4) * | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III.</th>
<th>Percent of MW employees whose personal, family, or household concerns interfere with their concentration at work:</th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Total Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Never</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rarely</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sometimes</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean response (scale: 1 to 4) | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |

\( n \) | 283 | 197 | 480 |

* Varies by sex (t-test, \( p \leq 0.05 \))


* Weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions.
Figure 4.2 Structural Equation Model of Employees' Home-to-Work Spillover and Their Use of Flextime Schedules

Work Factors: Division and Job Characteristics

Personal and Household Factors

Work Factors Affecting Need, Ability, and Risk of Using AWAs

Personal and Household Factors

Employees' Home-to-Work Spillover

Employees' Use of Flextime Schedules

Chi square: 150.46 (71 df)  IFI: .99  RMSEA: .048
p=.000  AGIF: .86  CI (90): .038-.059
n=480  NFI: .97

*I constrained the effect of flextime on home-to-work spillover to zero. I indicate the standardized coefficients of the measures of spillover.

* Work factors: division, job factors (job complexity, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, and use of AWA). Personal and household characteristics: sex, marital status, children aged 5 and under, children ages 6-12, children ages 13-18, care-giving to elderly/disabled, household income, potential hours of household help, age, age², and controls (race and education).

* Work factors: work context (division, estimated levels of departmental use); job characteristics (complexity, job requires speed, job requires working with diverse people, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, seniority, ease of evaluating quality of respondents' work, supervisory trust, importance of flextime), and job security. Personal and household characteristics: home-to-work spillover, sex, education, household income, and controls (race and age).
Figure 4.3 Structural Equation Model of Employees' Home-to-Work Spillover and Their Use of Compressed Work Week Schedules

Figure 4.3 Structural Equation Model of Employees' Home-to-Work Spillover and Their Use of Compressed Work Week Schedules

Chi square: 144.28 (67 df)  
p=0.000  
n=480

IFI: .99  
AGIF: .87  
NFI: .97  
RMSEA: .049  
CI (90): .038-.060

---

1 I indicate the standardized coefficients of the measures of spillover.

2 Work factors: division; job factors (job complexity, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, and use of AWA). Personal and household characteristics: sex, marital status, children aged 5 and under, children ages 6-12, children ages 13-18, care-giving to elderly/disabled, household income, potential hours of household help, age, age^2, and controls (race and education).

3 Work factors: work context (division, estimated levels of departmental use); job characteristics (complexity, job requires speed, job requires working with diverse people, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, seniority, case of evaluating quality of respondents' work, supervisory trust, importance of face time), and job security. Personal and household characteristics: home-to-work spillover, sex, education, household income, and controls (race and age).
Figure 4.4 Structural Equation Model of Employees’ Home-to-Work Spillover and Their Use of Telecommuting

- Home-to-Work Interference I
- Home-to-Work Interference II
- Home-to-Work Interference III

Employees’ Home-to-Work Spillover

Work Factors: Division and Job Characteristics

Personal and Household Factors

Work Factors Affecting Need, Ability, and Risk of Using AWAs

Personal and Household Factors

Employees’ Use of Telecommuting Arrangements

Chi square: 136.42 (67 df)  
p= .000  
n=480

IFI: .98  
AGIF: .87  
NFI: .96  
RMSEA: .047  
CI (90): .035-.058

* I indicate the standardized coefficients of the measures of spillover.

b Work factors: division; job factors (job complexity, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, and use of AWA). Personal and household characteristics: sex, marital status, children aged 5 and under, children ages 6-12, children ages 13-18, care-giving to elderly/disabled, household income, potential hours of household help, age, age², and controls (race and education).

c Work factors: work context (division, estimated levels of departmental use); job characteristics (complexity, job requires speed, job requires working with diverse people, supervisory responsibility, salary grade, ability to make job-related decisions, seniority, ease of evaluating quality of respondents’ work, supervisory trust, importance of face-time), and job security. Personal and household characteristics: home-to-work spillover, sex, education, household income, and controls (race and age).
Table 4.4 Structural Equation Regression Analyses of Employees' Use of Alternative Work Arrangements (AWAs) on Job, Personal, and Household Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factors Influencing Need / Ability to Use AWAs</th>
<th>Hypothesized Effects</th>
<th>Flextime Use</th>
<th></th>
<th>CWW Use</th>
<th></th>
<th>Telecommuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>(S.E.)</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Complexity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>(.024)</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Requires Speed</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>(.037)</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>(.023)</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Interdependence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Requires Working with Diverse People</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>(.035)</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
<td>-.104*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status and Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.069**</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>(.020)</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Make Job Decisions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.059*</td>
<td>(.032)</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Factors Related to Perceived Risk of Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Context: Division and Levels of Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Division (compared to Operations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Division (compared to Operations)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.199**</td>
<td>(.082)</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>(.093)</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Level of Departmental Use</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.174***</td>
<td>(.026)</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>(.018)</td>
<td>.090***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proxies for Expertise and Productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>(.003)</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>(.021)</td>
<td>.050**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>(.046)</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Evaluating the Quality of Work</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>(.019)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Trust</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>(.025)</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet ime Important</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>(.056)</td>
<td>-.080*</td>
<td>(.037)</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MW Survey, 1998

* Following Long (1997:17), I do not include standardized coefficients for dichotomous variables.
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Table 4.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal/Household Characteristics</th>
<th>Flextime Use</th>
<th>CWW Use</th>
<th>Telecommuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesized</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-to-Work Spillover</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.011 (.077)</td>
<td>.012 (.052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female compared to male)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-.137* (.062)</td>
<td>.140*** (.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (control - nonwhite compared to white)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.076 (.094)</td>
<td>-.062 (.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.003 (.004)</td>
<td>-.001 (.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-.000* (.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²: 150.459  144.276  136.42  df: 71  67  67
IFI: .99  .99  .98
AGFI: .86  .87  .87
NFI: .97  .97  .96
RMSEA: .048  .049  .047
CI (90): .038 -.059  .038 -.060  .035 -.058
n: 480  480  480

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

In the analyses of employees' use of AWAs, the results presented are based on structural equation models with disturbance terms set to covary (all nonsignificant). The binary variables controlling for respondents' participation in focus groups and interviews were also nonsignificant and dropped from the models for parsimony. The program was unable to reach minimization or failed when all dummy variables controlling for the estimates of missing values were included in each model. I tested individual dummies for each variable in each analyses. In the analysis of flextime use, the dummy variable controlling for the estimated missing values of estimated levels of departmental use of the option (β=-.321, S.E.=.086) was significant. The CWW analyses had no significant missing value dummies. The dummy for those cases with estimated values for job security was significant in the equation for use of telecommuting (β=-.130, S.E.=.051).
Table 4.5 Structural Equation Regression Analyses of Employees' Home-to-Work Spillover on Division, Job, Personal and Household Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Context: Division</th>
<th>Spillover with Use of Flextime</th>
<th>Spillover with Use of CWW</th>
<th>Spillover with Use of Telecommuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Effects</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
<td>β (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Division (control) (compared to Operations)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.197 (.104)</td>
<td>-.018 (.139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Division (control) (compared to Operations)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.126 (.118)</td>
<td>-.155 (.126)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized Effects</th>
<th>β (S.E.)</th>
<th>β (S.E.)</th>
<th>β (S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Complexity</td>
<td>.033 (.046)</td>
<td>.065 (.051)</td>
<td>.044 (.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Responsibility</td>
<td>-.006 (.014)</td>
<td>-.005 (.015)</td>
<td>-.020 (.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>.001 (.040)</td>
<td>.012 (.042)</td>
<td>.022 (.041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Grade</td>
<td>-.096* (.043)</td>
<td>-.107** (.046)</td>
<td>-.093* (.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Make Job-Related Decisions</td>
<td>-.114 (.375)</td>
<td>-.128 (.298)</td>
<td>-.112 (.298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of AWA</td>
<td>-.778* (.000)</td>
<td>-.428 (.000)</td>
<td>-.627* (.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal/Household Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized Effects</th>
<th>β (S.E.)</th>
<th>β (S.E.)</th>
<th>β (S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female compared to male)</td>
<td>.172* (.087)</td>
<td>.282** (.107)</td>
<td>.185* (.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.162 (.115)</td>
<td>.158 (.116)</td>
<td>.127 (.118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MW Survey, 1998

* Following Long (1997:17), I do not indicate standardized coefficients for dichotomous variables.

The effect of flextime on spillover was positive in the initial regression after I controlled for significant dummies for estimates of missing values. Since this is theoretically improbable, I constrained the effects of flextime use to zero, the highest non-positive value possible. The results of the constrained model of spillover and flextime were consistent with those in the models of CWW and telecommuting.

In the analyses of home-to-work spillover, the binary variables for respondents' participation in focus groups and interviews were nonsignificant and thus dropped from the models for parsimony. So, too, were the dummy variables controlling for the estimated missing values in the three analyses.
Table 4.5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal/Household Characteristics (continued)</th>
<th>Spillover with Use of Flextime</th>
<th>Spillover with Use of CWW</th>
<th>Spillover with Use of Telecommuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Effects</td>
<td>( \beta ) (S.E.)</td>
<td>( \beta ) (S.E.)</td>
<td>( \beta ) (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children ages + 5 and under</td>
<td>0.370*** (0.065)</td>
<td>0.368*** (0.067)</td>
<td>0.409*** (0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children ages + 6 to 12 years old</td>
<td>0.120* (0.066)</td>
<td>0.124* (0.067)</td>
<td>0.174** (0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children ages + 13 to 18 years old</td>
<td>0.309** (1.011)</td>
<td>0.306** (1.02)</td>
<td>0.398*** (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care-giving to Elderly/disabled</td>
<td>0.397** (1.122)</td>
<td>0.406** (1.124)</td>
<td>0.427*** (1.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income - .000 (0.002)</td>
<td>-.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-.000 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Hours of Household Help</td>
<td>0.066* (0.038)</td>
<td>0.068* (0.038)</td>
<td>0.02 (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - .001* (0.000)</td>
<td>0.066* (0.036)</td>
<td>0.068* (0.036)</td>
<td>0.02 (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (nonwhite compared to white) (control)</td>
<td>0.012 (1.130)</td>
<td>0.067 (1.140)</td>
<td>0.025 (1.158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (control) 0 - .081 (0.043)</td>
<td>-.081 (.043)</td>
<td>-.115 (.049)</td>
<td>-.087* (.044)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 \) 150.459 144.276 136.42
\( df \) 71 67 67
IFI .99 .99 .98
AGIFI .86 .87 .87
NFI .97 .97 .96
RMSEA .048 .049 .047
Cl (90) .038 - .059 .038 - .060 .035 - .058
n 480 480 480

* \( p \leq .05 \)
** \( p \leq .01 \)
*** \( p \leq .001 \)
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The demographic composition of the workforce has dramatically changed over the past three decades as social, economic, and technological changes have drawn women into the labor force. The majority of workers no longer leave behind a nonemployed spouse or partner to deal with the demands of home and family. Thus, firms' expectations of finding ideal workers who can "set aside personal and emotional considerations [on the job]" (Kanter 1977:22) are out of synch with reality. Work-home conflict in the form of home-to-work spillover negatively affects workers' job performance (Friedman 1991:11-4; Galinsky et al. 1991:115-7). Many employees cannot afford to reduce their work hours, however (Ferber and O'Farrell 1991:126; Presser 1989:535). Moreover, employees may not want to jeopardize their careers by cutting back (Lewis 1997:16; Haas and Hwang 1995:28; Schwartz 1994:32-4).

In response to the changing demographics and needs of the workforce, some employers have implemented alternative work arrangements to recruit and retain productive workers, and to reduce the negative effects of employees' work-home conflict on job performance (Witkowsky 1999:204; Kelly 1999:169; Galinsky et al. 1991:82-3). Employees, for their part, use flexibility at work as a primary strategy to meet the dual
obligations of home and work (National Report on Work and Family 1999:45; Galinsky 1992; Rodgers 1992:186; Galinsky and Stein 1990:375). By making their work and home schedules more complementary, employees are able to reduce scheduling conflicts and thus more conveniently and effectively perform both work- and nonwork-related obligations (Bailyn et al. 1997:14; Starrels 1992:260; Friedman 1991:51-3).

Using qualitative, quantitative, and archival data collected in a case study of a Midwest Securities, a financial services organization, I investigated three questions: (1) what are the determinants of workers' access to three alternative work arrangements, (2) what are the determinants of workers' use of AWAs, and (3) what are the determinants of employees' home-to-work spillover. I found that although the work-home policy offering the AWAs was company-wide, managers had the discretion to implement the options. The firm's paramount consideration was meeting business objectives and customers' needs (whether internal or external clients). Productivity, then, was to guide managers' decisions about subordinates' access to the options. MW provided managers with three criteria to guide decisions about workers' access to the AWAs: job suitability, employee suitability, and the cost-benefit ratio to the corporation. Because the policy was designed as a work-home rather than a work-family policy, it was to be available to all employees who met the criteria, not just those with family responsibilities. Employees could decide whether or not to use available options.
Contributions of the Research

Corporate policies can be effective only if they are implemented and used. Thus, firms interested in AWAs as strategic tools to help their employees balance work-home obligations need to know the factors that affect the availability, as well as the use, of AWAs. Little research, however, has examined the two critical decision-making points that shape AWAs' effectiveness in the workplace: managers' decisions to make AWAs available and employees' decisions to use AWAs. My study thus contributes to our understanding of the totality of circumstances that affect AWAs' relationship with work-home conflict.

Second, social scientists have studied the relationship between AWAs and work-home conflict as if it were one directional. This is unrealistic, however. The premise of work-home policies is that employees' spillover and their use of AWAs are interdependent: use of AWAs should reduce employees' spillover, and employees with spillover should use AWAs to help balance their work-home conflict. I address this gap in research by estimating causal models that allowed a reciprocal relationship between employees' spillover and their use of AWAs.

Third, like other facets of home-to-work conflict—such as tardiness and absenteeism—the frequency that employees' personal, household, and familial concerns intrude at work has the potential to affect job performance. Indeed, we can expect the global economy with its 24-7 work schedules to aggravate this aspect of home-to-work spillover within our labor force, which is dominated by workers with familial obligations. Sparse research has focused on this component of employees' home-to-work spillover,
however, or the effectiveness of AWAs designed to ameliorate it. My study, then, expands our understanding of the nature of home-to-work spillover and its relationship to flexible scheduling options.

Summary of Findings

Analyses of Employees' Access to AWAs

Managerial support for and workers' access to the options varied between alternatives. Managers reported substantially more administrative support for flextime (79 percent) than for CWW (71 percent) and telecommuting (56 percent). Managers also reported that supervisors' trust in subordinates, employees' requests, and the use of AWAs to attract and retain workers were the key reasons managers in their departments supported AWAs. Conversely, the obstacles to support, according to managers, were the options' negative impact on work scheduling, supervision, and the quality of products or services produced.

Workers' access to the options paralleled the differences in perceived managerial support for AWAs. Workers had the greatest access to flextime (65 percent of employees across the divisions), followed by CWW (44 percent), and telecommuting (33 percent). In total, three-fourths of all employees across the three MW divisions had access to at least one of the options.

I addressed three research questions about factors that affect employees' access to flextime, CWW, and telecommuting: (1) To what extent do MW's guidelines account for managers' decisions to make the alternative work arrangements available? (2) What role
do other factors, such as workplace, personal and household characteristics, play in that decision-making process? (3) Do managers use the same criteria to make to determine the availability of each option, or do the criteria vary by AWA?

**Determinants of access to AWAs.** I found inconsistent statistical evidence that the MW's managerial guidelines explained the variation in employees' access to AWAs. In terms of job suitability, I expected that job demands would increase workers' access to the options as managers sought to retain skilled workers. However, the only characteristic that had influence was the speed workers' reported that their jobs required. Contrary to my hypothesis, the influence of job speed was negative and solely affected the availability of CWW. I hypothesized that another facet of job suitability—job interdependence—would decrease workers access to AWAs. It, too, had limited influence. Supervisory responsibility reduced workers' access, but again only to CWW. I expected that three indicators of employee suitability (that is, the ability to work independently) would increase workers' access to the options. Status increased workers' access to telecommuting and initially increased their access to flextime. However, the effect of status on flextime became increasingly negative after employees reached the middle salary grades. And contrary to my expectations, workers' ability to work independently reduced their access to flextime and CWW. In terms of the cost-benefit ratio, two evaluation factors had influence, but only on telecommuting. As expected, supervisory trust increased workers’ access, and the importance of facetime decreased workers’ access to telecommuting.
The effects of employees' personal and household characteristics on their access to AWAs were minimal. Workers with teenagers had less access to CWW than their colleagues without teens. In contrast, workers with eldercare responsibilities had greater access to CWW and telecommuting.

Consistent with prior research, the context in which employees worked influenced their access to the options (Hochschild 1997:96; Hammonds et al. 1997:98; Schwartz 1994:36-8; Rodgers 1992:191; Galinsky et al. 1991: 84-6). For example, division had a consistent influence across all three models. That is, workers in the more professional Systems and Actuarial divisions had greater access to AWAs than their production-oriented counterparts in Operations. Employees' awareness of the policy was also important, increasing workers' access to flextime and CWW.

Analyses of Employees' Use of AWAs and Their Home-to-Work Spillover

One indication of the popularity of alternative work arrangements is the percentage of workers who used available options. Across the three divisions, 80 percent of employees with access used AWAs.1 In total, then, 61 percent of the workers in the three divisions used at least one of the options regularly or occasionally. Employees were twice as likely to use flextime (37.7 percent), however, as they were to use CWW (18.2 percent) or telecommute (19.4 percent).

---

1 Considering only respondents with access to at least one AWA (n=366, weighted to adjust for differences in sampling fractions between divisions), I determined the percent of employees who used AWAs with a dummy variable indicating use of one or more options (no coded 0, yes coded 1).
Domestic concerns intruding at work divert employees' focus from their jobs. Indeed, depending on the frequency of employees' domestic spillover (and hence the loss of focus), the negative influence of spillover on individual and organizational performance may be substantial. That the majority of MW employees reported that they sometimes or often had domestic concerns spill over at work thus has implications for job performance. Intriguingly, the majority also reported that home-to-work spillover rarely or never interfered with their job concentration.

I investigated three related questions about factors that affect workers' use of the scheduling options, their domestic spillover, and the relationship between workers' use and their home-to-work spillover using models that allow reciprocal effects: (1) What determines employees' use of MW's alternative work arrangements? (2) What factors influence employees' home-to-work spillover? (3) What is the relationship between employees' decisions to use the options and their domestic spillover?

**Determinants of workers' use of AWAs.** I examined three sets of factors associated with employees use of AWAs: job factors influencing workers need and ability to use AWAs, job factors related to the perceived risk of using AWAs, and personal and household characteristics that should affect need. The influence of job and personal factors related to workers' ability and need to use the options differed between AWAs. The expected positive influence of high organizational status and autonomy—job factors associated with workers' ability to use the options—was limited to employees' use of flextime. The influence of job demands was restricted to the positive effect of job complexity on workers' use of CWW. The interdependent nature of jobs indicated by
supervisory responsibility decreased workers’ use, as expected, but only of CWW schedules.

The influence of variables hypothesized to affect the perceived risk workers associate with using AWAs was also generally inconsistent between options. For example, I expected that workers’ education and seniority—proxies for productivity—would increase their use of the options. Education’s positive influence was limited to workers’ use of CWW. Similarly, seniority’s positive influence was limited to employees’ telecommuting. Of the three evaluation factors included in the models, facetime alone was important. As hypothesized, it reduced workers’ use of CWW and telecommuting, but it had no effect on the use of floxttime. Workers’ division had conflicting effects. That is, Systems workers used flextime less than their colleagues in Operations, but they telecommuted more. The sole factor that consistently influenced employees’ use of the options was an indicator of the context in which they worked: the perceived level of use of each option increased respondents’ use of the option.

Finally, the influence of employees’ personal and household characteristics varied between AWAs, too. For example, women used flextime less—but CWW more—than similarly situated men. Household income had a negative effect, as expected, but only on workers’ use of CWW. Conversely, home-to-work spillover increased workers’ telecommuting, as hypothesized, but had no effect on the use of flextime and CWW.

**Determinants of employees’ home-to-work spillover.** I investigated two sets of factors hypothesized to affect employees’ home-to-work spillover: personal and household characteristics, and job factors. Home-to-work spillover stems primarily from domestic
obligations, as expected. Confirming my hypothesis, women experienced more spillover than similarly situated men across models incorporating the three AWAs. In addition, providing eldercare and having children (regardless of age group) increased employees’ domestic spillover net of other factors. Age was also important in models of spillover with flextime and CWW: until workers reached their mid-30s, spillover increased at a decreasing rate. The relationship between age and spillover then became negative.

As hypothesized, job flexibility—manifested in workers’ autonomy and their use of alternative work arrangements—enhanced employees’ ability to balance their home and work obligations. Employees’ ability to make job-related decisions consistently decreased their domestic interference across models. Employees’ use of CWW and telecommuting also reduced their domestic spillover. In sum, workers’ personal status, familial composition, and care-giving responsibilities contributed to their home-to-work spillover, but workers’ job flexibility mitigated that spillover.

The relationships between work-to-home spillover and the use of AWAs.
Employers and employees have assumed that work-home conflict and the use of flexible scheduling options are related, but the nature of that relationship has not been clear. Understanding the causal connections between home-to-work spillover and AWAs will help employers devise effective strategies to address workers’ domestic spillover, and it will provide evidence to advocates of AWAs that flexible scheduling options reduce workers’ spillover.

My analyses suggest that the relationship between employees’ domestic spillover and their use of an AWA depends on the scheduling option. In my analyses,
telecommuting had a reciprocal relationship with domestic spillover. Telecommuting reduced employees' spillover, and spillover increased workers' telecommuting. The relationship between CWW and spillover was recursive. CWW scheduling decreased employees' home-to-work spillover. Flextime and spillover, however, had no significant relationship. CWW and telecommuting, then, are effective strategies employers can offer and workers can use to reduce spillover at work. Moreover, workers with spillover are likely to increase their telecommuting.

Conclusions and Discussion

My analyses provide evidence for five summary conclusions.

Work Context Is Important

First, my study confirms research that the context in which employees perform their work is a key influence on both managers’ decisions to make the options available and employees’ decisions to use AWAs (Hammonds et al. 1997:98; Bailyn 1993; Schwartz 1994:36-8; Rodgers 1992:191; Starrels 1992:260; Galinsky et al. 1991: 84-6). Both contextual variables in the access models (division and policy awareness) were important, as were the contextual variables in the use models (division and estimated levels of departmental use of the options). Indeed, employees’ division was the only consistent predictor of workers’ access to AWAs. Similarly, the estimated level of departmental use of each AWA was a strong and consistent predictor across models of use. The context in which MW employees work, then, shapes employees’ access to and use of alternative work arrangements.
The importance of contextual factors underscores the schism between MW's official adoption of the Human Resources' policy and evidence of organizational support for it. For example, top MW and Inland officers I interviewed expressed pride in the company's work-home policy and touted AWAs' ability to help employees balance their competing work and home obligations. However, few MW respondents could identify any senior MW or Inland officer who publicly advocated for AWAs. No informants could identify an officer who used an AWA. Informants could not identify specific articles or other information that they had received from MW or Inland about AWAs, either. Indeed, only two memos announcing the policy were sent to managers and supervisors in the spring of 1995, and a single article announcing the policy appeared shortly thereafter in the corporate newsletter. Moreover, half of the MW managers across the three divisions either did not have *A Guide to Implementing Alternative Work Arrangements* or thought the managerial guidelines were unclear. Finally, the employee handbook devotes only one of 400 pages to the policy and procedures for employees' use of AWAs (see Appendix G).

In sum, there is sparse evidence of overt corporate support for the policy, and this subtly influences both the availability and use of alternative work arrangements. Because the context of work influences managers' decisions about making the options available, the lack of overt support undermines MW's and Inland's avowed desire for policy implementation. Similarly, the lack of overt support influences workers' decisions about requesting and using the options. Prior research, my analyses, and MW informants suggest that more explicit support of the AWAs at the corporate, division, department, and workgroup level would increase MW employees' requests for and use of the options.
by reducing the perceived risk attached to the use of AWAs (Haas and Hwang 1995; Schwartz 1994; Starrels 1992:260-1). This contrasts with Hochschild’s argument (1997) that employees resist AWAs because they prefer work to home.

The Variation in AWAs’ Flexibility Has Implications for Managerial Support

The degree alternative work arrangements deviate from tradition work arrangements also has implications for their implementation. Managers reported the most support among their colleagues for flextime (the option that deviates the least from traditional work arrangements) and the least support for telecommuting (the option that deviates the most). Workers’ access to the options mirrors these differences in perceived managerial support: workers had the greatest access to flextime and the least access to telecommuting. The options’ history within the firm reflects this pattern, as well. Workers had informal access to flextime for decades. CWW was also informally available, but less widely or for as long. Access to telecommuting was rare prior to the adoption of MW’s work-home policy.

Indeed, the complexities of overseeing subordinates using nontraditional work arrangements are a key reason managers did not support AWAs. It is easy to understand why. Managers must be able to coordinate schedules, design reasonable and equitable workloads for subordinates, and build in sufficient time frames for the completion of work. The greater the number of subordinates who use AWAs—and the greater the variety of options used—the more complicated it becomes for managers to perform their jobs and ensure productivity. Managers who rely on direct control of their subordinates and who use traditional means of evaluating job performance (such as hours at work) are ill
equipped to oversee employees using AWAs. Thus, these managers are unlikely to support AWAs and, a priori, they are unlikely to effectively manage workgroups whose members use alternative work arrangements.

**Managerial Idiosyncrasy Influences Implementation**

By definition, managers with the discretion to implement the options also have the opportunity to make idiosyncratic decisions. Moreover, managers' lack of information about the implementation criteria encourages idiosyncratic decision making. A variety of evidence establishes that managerial support for AWAs is, in part, idiosyncratic. For example, residual factors must be at work because job, personal, household, and workplace characteristics do not explain much of the variation in MW workers' access to AWAs. In addition, MW informants agreed that workers performing the same job within departments and within workgroups did not have equal access to the options. Managers within the same work group, for example, required different levels of justification before making the options available to their subordinates. And informants at all job levels acknowledged that some managers refused to make AWAs available to anyone, regardless of the job, employee, cost-benefit ratio, or AWA. Managers' idiosyncratic decision making, however, results in the inequitable implementation of MW's work-home policy.

**Implementation as a Work-Home Policy**

Consistent with MW's intent to create a work-home rather than a work-family policy, employees' personal and household characteristics had little influence on workers' access to the options. Women and men, married and single workers, and those with and without children under the ages of 13 had equal access to the options. The only personal
characteristic that increased workers' access to AWAs—specifically, to CWW and telecommuting—was employees' responsibility for eldercare. Thus, there is little support for employers' and employees' concerns that work-home policies unfairly benefit employees with family and care-giving obligations (Khan 1994:3; Bailyn 1993:145; Grossman 1993:R8).

**Work-Home Policy's Effectiveness Is Ambiguous**

From the firm's point of view, the effectiveness of MW's work-home policy is ambiguous. MW adopted the policy to help employees balance their work and home obligations and thereby increase the recruitment and retention of skilled workers. Productivity was the paramount consideration for managers determining workers' access to the options. As a strategy to reduce work-home conflict, the policy is successful: CWW and telecommuting decrease the frequency that workers' domestic spillover interferes with their work. I found no evidence, however, that managers considered workers' skill or productivity (indicated by education and seniority as proxies) when determining the availability of the options. In addition, my study could not evaluate the effect of AWAs or spillover on job performance because MW lacks measures of individual workers' productivity.²

² Individual measures of productivity in knowledge jobs such as those of Systems and Actuarial workers are virtually nonexistent. Projects are the “products” and completion on time is the measure of performance. With constantly changing projects and timeframes, the ambiguous definition of “outcomes” make it difficult to gauge short-term productivity. Operations workers' productivity can be more easily measured by the number of transactions they complete within a specified timeframe, but Operations does not use individual measures of productivity.
Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

Additional research is needed to address questions left unanswered due to the limitations of my study.

Temporal Limitations

Studies of employee spillover and its negative relationship to job performance have assumed that workers' domestic interference precedes and induces employees to use AWAs. Our social world is not always so orderly, however. For example, workers who initiate an AWA for one reason, such as personal convenience, may find themselves with increased spillover stemming from the addition of care-giving responsibilities later (e.g., the birth of a child or the illness of a parent).

Unfortunately, the cross-sectional design of this study does not allow me to analyze the relationships between employees' use of alternative work arrangements and workers' domestic spillover over time. Longitudinal analyses incorporating pre- and post-measures of employees' spillover based on time diaries (for accurate measures of spillover) and workers' use of alternative work arrangements—in tandem with qualitative information about changes in employees' spillover—would clarify the causal relationships.

Employees' Access to AWAs

Research in firms where access is universal and employees' use of AWAs has no negative career implications is also necessary to further define the nature of the relationships between spillover and AWAs. Not all MW employees who would like to use AWAs had access, nor did all employees who had access to the options feel free to use them. However, limiting my analyses to workers with access would have eliminated
employees with domestic interference and therefore biased the options' effects on home-to-work spillover—as well as spillover's effect on the AWAs. Indeed, the determinants of employees' use of the options and the determinants of their spillover (and hence the nature of the relationship between spillover and the use of AWAs) would be unbiased only if two conditions were met: (1) all employees in the sample had access to the options, and (2) employees perceived no risk in using the options. This is not the case in my study, however. Thus, the limited implementation of the options and the perceived risk of using AWAs restricts my study's findings about the determinants of and causal relationships between spillover and workers' use of AWAs.

**Selection Bias**

My sample pool did not include former employees who had resigned or been fired because of their work-home conflict. Evidence that those employees had been using AWAs would undermine my finding that workers' use of AWAs reduces their spillover. MW does not perform exit interviews, however, so there is no data about the reasons the employees left. Thus, I am unable to clarify whether the exclusion of these workers from the sample pool biased my results. Future interviews with MW human resources personnel and former MW employees will help determine the extent of the bias.³

---

³ Turnover at MW is approximately 16 percent, although it tends to be higher in the Operations division than elsewhere. Anecdotal evidence suggests that MW offers more flexibility than many other area firms, and that employees value it. Indeed, one informant related that she had left MW for more pay, but came back to the firm because it offered the flexibility she needed to balance work and home obligations.
Generalizability

MW mirrors other firms across the country in its rationale for adopting the policy and the implementation process it uses. Like other firms, MW adopted the policy as a means to recruit and retain employees for its labor-intensive workforce in an area with a low unemployment rate (Witkowsky 1999:226; Galinsky et al. 1991:81). And like other firms that permit AWAs, managers have the discretion to implement the options so that access is not universal (Hochschild 1997:96; Rodgers 1992:191; Starrels 1992:261; Galinsky et al. 1991:84-6).

In addition, my study involves three distinct divisions that reflect a variety of work contexts across firms. That is, the divisions’ goals, rules of operation, measures of productivity, size, workforce composition, and culture differ. Therefore, the analyses take into account variations between production and support units, between customer- and technologically-oriented units, between professional and nonprofessional units, between predominantly female and predominantly male workgroups, and between hierarchical and less bureaucratic workgroups. The divisions also represent a variety of modes of production that allow workers varying degrees of flexibility in their schedules.

Moreover, key findings of my study confirm prior research. The context in which workers perform their jobs is an important influence on workers’ access to and use of AWAs (Hochschild 1997: 25; Schwartz 1994:41-2; Bailyn 1993; Kingston 1990:443; Raabe 1990:483-4). Management’s and managers’ support of the options, in part idiosyncratic, plays a pivotal role in AWAs’ implementation (Hochschild 1997:32; Gallo 1993:29; Bailyn 1993; Rodgers 1992:189; Kingston 1991:446; Christiansen and Staines
AWAs vary in their ability to reduce spillover (Raabe 1990:462; Friedman 1987:1). This agreement with prior studies' findings suggests that the main results of my case study are generalizable to other firms that do not make AWAs available to all employees.

Nevertheless, Midwest Securities may be unique in ways that restrict the generalizability of my findings. MW is a rapidly growing for-profit financial services organization within a highly competitive industry. MW's predominantly female workforce holds white-collar "knowledge jobs" that involve the creation and management of information. Research involving both service and manufacturing firms, then, is needed to further define the influence that managerial idiosyncrasy, work context, and workers' needs have on employees' access to and use of AWAs. Similarly, across-firm research using reciprocal analyses will refine our understanding of the relationship between the workers' spillover and their use of AWAs.

Expanding the Research Focus

Many facets of the work-home nexus remain to be examined. My study suggests three areas in particular. First, reciprocal analyses are needed that incorporate time-series data for a variety of measures of home-to-work spillover (such as psychological distress, absenteeism, and lack of energy at work)—as well as the full range of alternative work arrangements (including options involving reduced time on the job). This would expand our understanding of the relationships between AWAs and work-home conflict in general, and help firms design comprehensive and effective work-home policies.
Related to that, the absence of concrete measures of individual productivity in MW leaves unanswered key questions about the relationships between productivity, spillover, and AWAs. Indeed, it is difficult for firms to see the connection between individual and organizational productivity, between spillover and productivity, and between AWAs and productivity in the absence of such measures. Thus, longitudinal research is needed in firms that have such measures to accurately gauge the effects of spillover and AWAs on workers' job performance over time.

Finally, managerial discretion lies at the heart of the idiosyncratic implementation of work-home policies. To more fully understand the roots of managers' idiosyncratic support, future research needs to assess specific managerial experiences and characteristics (such as managers' background in the firm and personal traits) that shape managers' attitudes about AWAs and about subordinates who use them. I was unable to use clustered samples of managers and their subordinates, but such samples would avoid potential bias introduced by respondents' perceptions about such things as their managers' decision-making processes.

**Recommendations**

The influence of management permeates the design, implementation, and use of a firm's work-home policy. Senior management defines the rationale and purpose of the policy. Top management also decides who has the power to implement the policy. When firms grant managers the discretion for implementation, employees infer that senior management believes alternative work arrangements may cause problems for managers.
and the company (Lewis 1997:15-6; Rapoport and Bailyn 1996:19). And if AWAs complicate managers' and coworkers' jobs, workers' use of AWAs may indeed be a problem. This risk becomes a part of the corporate culture that subsequently affects managers' support of the AWAs, as well as workers' requests for and use of the options. Yet by granting managerial discretion, firms foster idiosyncratic—and thus inequitable—access to and use of the options.

Firms that want to reduce the risk managers and workers associate with AWAs, as well as assure the equitable implementation and effective use of AWAs, should pursue two strategies. The first is to adopt the work-home policy as an integral corporate strategy related to productivity, and publicize the policy as such. The second is to ensure that the managers have the skills and tools necessary to equitably and effectively implement the policy.

**Integrating and Marketing the Work-home Policy**

First, top management must emphasize its faith in, and support of, alternative work arrangements by making the work-home policy a key corporate strategy. That is, if firms believe that AWAs are important tools to recruit and retain valued employees and increase workers' efficiency, the work-home policy needs to be implemented and publicized as an integral corporate strategy to improve productivity. Adoption of work-home policies as human resource programs marginalizes the programs, because the policies are then only peripherally linked to employee and corporate performance (Rapoport and Bailyn 1996:12). This separation of work-home policies from core corporate policies also
appears to pit employees’ work-home balance against organizational productivity (Bailyn 1993:121).

To underscore management’s support of AWAs and the options’ effectiveness, firms can market the work-home policy within the company. Research has suggested that a “champion”—a top officer who publicly advocates for and educates others about the options—is important to the successful implementation of work-home policies (Rodgers 1992:191; Galinsky et al. 1991:50). Internal publications can also regularly highlight AWA “success stories” to inform employees of the procedures for and outcomes of the work-home policy. Similarly, new employees’ orientations and managerial trainings should make it clear that top management supports employees’ requests for the options, managers’ decisions to make the options available, and employees’ decisions to use the options.

In keeping with Kanter’s (Kanter 1977a:63) thesis of homosocial reproduction with its “pressures for on-site and off-work conformity” among managers—and mirroring the approach in cutting-edge family-friendly firms (Conlin 1999:94; Shellenbarger 1999:B1; Biddle 1999:A1; Shellenbarger 1997c:B1)—perhaps the most effective way to achieve managerial support of a work-family balance is to have top management model it. A MW manager described the influence of the firm’s top executives on managerial and company norms: “If the CEO of the company starts wearing shorts [to work], we’ll all start wearing shorts.” Thus, if firms want employees to balance their work-home obligations and believe AWAs will help them achieve that balance, officers and managers
need to demonstrate their belief in and acceptance of AWAs by using them. More than any other strategy, top management’s use of AWAs signals that alternative schedules are normative, and that employees’ use of AWAs does not hinder career advancement. As a senior MW officer argued, “More and more, the senior executives—in particular—need… to have their boss say, ‘Hey, it’s not all work. I have these responsibilities at home, and I can’t be here at such-and such a time because of them.’ [We’ve got to learn] it’s OK to say that.”

**Ensuring Managers Have the Necessary Skills and Tools for Policy Implementation**

The second strategy to reduce inequitable access to the options and to ensure the effectiveness of AWAs focuses on the managers who are responsible for policy implementation. If firms are serious about implementing AWAs, they must ensure that managers have the skills and tools needed to oversee workers on alternative schedules. For example, if firms want managers to use a specific set of criteria when determining the availability of AWAs, the companies must make sure managers have and understand the criteria. In addition, job-related problems that result from employees’ use of AWAs (such as workgroup delays, uneven work loads and overtime among workers, and employees’ abuse of the options) are rooted in poor planning, coordination, communication, and employee training. As other researchers have argued, managerial training that addresses these issues should reduce managers’ resistance to AWAs and increase their ability to supervise workers using a variety of work arrangements (Cowans 1994:6; Schwartz 1994:56; Rodgers 1992:192). Restructuring work may also decrease the potential for

---

4 The firms include some of the largest companies in the U.S., such as IBM and AT&T, as well as smaller companies experiencing rapid growth, such as Apple.
problems. MW managerial and nonmanagerial informants agreed, for example, that working in teams and employee cross-training fostered increased cooperation, communication, and accomplishment within workgroups whose members used AWAs.

If firms tie their work-home policies in any way to productivity or the recruitment and retention of productive employees, they must provide managers with individual measures of employees' short-term and long-term productivity to accurately gauge the effects of employees' use of AWAs. In the absence of such information, managers who must ensure productivity have little cause to make the options available, particularly if implementation threatens to complicate supervision. Similarly, employees without such measures have little data upon which to build a case for their use of options.

Conclusion

My research provides evidence that AWAs reduce home-to-work spillover. However, firms that value the timeframes of employees' work—traditional schedules and linear career paths—rather than the results of that work, and the constant availability of workers and mandatory overtime rather than strategic planning and staffing—must change their values before alternative work arrangements can become normative work arrangements.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER OF AGREEMENT

The balance of work and home responsibilities is a major issue for workers across the United States, and one that receives constant attention in industry journals. Employers and human resource personnel in all industries are exploring strategies to help their employees achieve a balance among their obligations and thus promote productivity in the workplace.

The Inland Enterprise recognizes that each one of its employees faces the competing demands of work and home, regardless of their familial status. Thus, the Enterprise Management Council has adopted policies for flexible work arrangements that apply to employees throughout the Enterprise. Ms. Meg Flack, a researcher from The Ohio State University, will conduct a case study on the effectiveness of the Enterprise’s flexible work arrangements in reducing home-to-work conflict and promoting job satisfaction, commitment, and hence, productivity. This research will be conducted under the supervision of Dr. Lowell Hargens, Professor of Sociology, The Ohio State University.

In order to demonstrate the Enterprise’s commitment to its work/home policies and promote the timely collection and analysis of data, the Inland Enterprise agrees to:

- Provide sponsorship for the project, i.e., a letter in support of the project from the vice president of Human Resources, to potential participants. Sponsorship will continue for one year from the date of execution of the study.
- Provide release time for employees to participate in focus groups, interviews, and a survey. The Office of Human Resources uses focus groups, interviews, and surveys for a wide variety of research studies, and flexible work arrangements are official corporate policies. Thus, no stigma will be attached to those who choose to participate in these discussions or the survey.
- Provide meeting space(s) for focus groups, interviews, and the administration of the survey.
- Provide assistance in identifying a pool of potential participants from which Ms. Flack will solicit participants for focus groups, interviews, and a survey.
- Provide Ms. Flack with a temporary Inland ID as a researcher to facilitate entry to the buildings.
The Enterprise agrees to:
- Provide Ms. Flack with a temporary internal mail address and voice mail number to facilitate internal communications.
- Provide pre-approved direct services and materials, such as envelopes, address labels, and copies of the survey.
- Provide Ms. Flack with access to the inter-office mail system.
- Allow Ms. Flack access to pre-approved, non-confidential archival materials, e.g., newsletters and employees demographics.

The Inland Enterprise and its affiliates will:
- Not provide clerical assistance to Ms. Flack.
- Not pursue or ask for data that identifies individuals.
- Not participate in the analysis or interpretation of results.
- Not compensate Ms. Flack nor provide reimbursement for ordinary business expenses.

Ms. Flack will:
- Present the Enterprise with a final report of the analysis of the aggregate data within one year after study completion.
- Preserve the anonymity of Inland Enterprise in all presentations and publications outside the Enterprise that may arise from this project.
- Collect all data and maintain the data's confidentiality and anonymity in accordance with the procedures and guidelines of The Ohio State University’s Human Subjects Review Committee.
- Protect the identity of all individuals who participate in the study.

______________________________________ date ________________
Vice President, Human Resources

______________________________________ date ________________
Meg Flack, Researcher
APPENDIX B

SCHEDULES FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

Schedule for General Nonmanagerial Focus Groups and Managerial Interviews

1. How do you experience home-to-work conflict? Concrete examples –

2. Are there other ways that you can think of that personal/home obligations may intrude on people's paid work?

3. What factors at home/personal life increase your ability to balance your home and work obligations?

4. What factors at home/personal life decrease your ability to balance your home and work obligations?

5. What factors at work increase your ability to balance your home and work obligations?
   [Probe: informal norms and pressures in the workplace/at home that affect workers’ vulnerability to domestic interference and their use of alternative work arrangements?]

6. What factors at work decrease your ability to balance your home and work obligations? [Probe]

7. The Enterprise offers a number of flexible work policies – flextime, flexplace, job sharing, and compressed work week. [Probe: Why are they offered? Who put them in place? The process you should use? Champions?]


9. If you used a flexible work environment, what effect do you think it would it have on you? On: balance work/home obligations? Job satisfaction/commitment? Ability to get work done? Advancement? Relations with coworkers and manager?

10. What effect do you think it would have on your coworkers?

11. Are there other things that I should know that we haven't covered?

12. Before we end, of the points raised today, which feels the most relevant to your particular situation?
Schedule for Pretest Focus Groups

Please note the time we begin on the top of your survey, and the time you complete the survey. As you are answering the questions, please consider the following points.

Here [on posted newssheets] are key things to look for:

1. Meaning: Is the question confusing? If so, why?
2. Word choice: Is the meaning of the word(s) clear?
3. Skip patterns: Might people skip this question? What suggestions do you have?
4. Task difficulty: Is the question hard to answer? Too hard? Any suggestions?
6. Typos: Did you see any typographical errors?
7. Order of questions: Is the transition from any one question to another hard to follow? What suggestions do you have?

On the pages provided at the end of the survey, please answer the following [on newsprint and also attached to the survey]:

1. Order of sections: Did any transitions from one section to another seem hard to follow? Did any of the sections seem to drag? What suggestions do you have?
2. Respondent interest: What did you think of the length of the survey? What recommendations do you have?
3. Were there any sections in which you felt that the respondent would have liked the opportunity to say more? If yes, please explain.
4. Other comments or suggestions?

When everyone is finished, we will go back through the survey together and discuss these issues.
APPENDIX C

MANAGERIAL AND NONMANAGERIAL SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Survey of Managerial Employees

This survey asks about your knowledge of and experience with Midwest's flexible work policies, and your efforts to balance work and personal or home responsibilities.

- The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete.
- YOUR RESPONSES WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. No one at Midwest will see your individual responses or have access to any individual data.
- Please drop your completed survey in the Survey Box by the door as you leave. Thank you!

Please circle the number of your answer or fill in the blank as appropriate.

I. The first section asks about your job and your job responsibilities.

1. About how long have you worked for Midwest?
   _______ years

2. About how long have you worked in your current department?
   _______ years

3. How many hours per week do you usually work at your Midwest job?
   _______ hours

4. How many hours a week do you usually work at other paid jobs in addition to your job at Midwest? (If none, write "0").
   _______ hours

5. In which area do you currently work at Midwest?
   1. Systems
   2. Actuarial
   3. Operations

6. Please circle your pay band: A B C D E F G H I Don't Know

7. As an official part of your main job, do you supervise other employees?
   1. No (Skip to question 8)
   2. Yes

   7a. How many people do you supervise directly?
   _______ people

   7b. Do you determine the pay or promotions of any of the people you supervise directly?
   1. No
   2. Yes
7c. Of the people you directly supervise, do any of those people supervise anyone else?
   1. No (Skip to question 8)
   2. Yes

7d. Counting all the levels of supervision beneath yours (including the one immediately under you), how many people are responsible to you both directly and indirectly?
   ______________________ Number of people

8. In the past year, how much budget did you control? (If none, write "0")
   $__________________________

9. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about your job?

   | Strongly | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly | Don't
   | disagree | agree     | agree   | agree  | disagree | know
   | 1       | 2        | 3       | 4      | 5       | 8

   a. I can work independently
   b. I participate in making decisions that affect my work
   c. I can set my own work hours
   d. It is hard for me to catch up when I miss a day at work
   e. It is easy for my immediate supervisor to evaluate the quality of work that I do.
   f. Having my work interrupted by coworkers or other job-related activities makes it harder for me to do my job
   g. Being interrupted at work by personal or family obligations makes it harder for me to do my job

10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about your job?

   | Strongly | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly | Don't
   | disagree | agree     | agree   | agree  | disagree | know
   | 1       | 2        | 3       | 4      | 5       | 8

   a. My job is very repetitious
   b. My job requires me to deal with a variety of people
   c. My job requires a high level of skill
   d. My job requires speed
   e. My job is highly complex
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II. The second section asks questions about your efforts to balance your work and personal or home responsibilities.

11. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I feel uncomfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my immediate supervisor...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My immediate supervisor accommodates me when I have personal or family business, such as a medical appointment or a meeting with a child's teacher...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My immediate supervisor is responsive to all employees' personal or family needs...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My immediate supervisor is fair in responding to all employees' personal or family needs...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. If I had to do significant extra work to accommodate the personal or family needs of co-workers, I would feel resentful...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. If my supervisor helped me accommodate my work and my home responsibilities, it would influence any decision I made about continuing to work here...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. In my division there is an unwritten rule that female employees can take care of personal matters on company time...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. In my division there is an unwritten rule that male employees can take care of personal matters on company time...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. If I have a problem managing my work and home or personal responsibilities, the attitude in my division is &quot;you made your bed, now lie in it.&quot;...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. My immediate supervisor has a high level of trust in me...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. I have a high level of trust in my immediate supervisor...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. This section asks questions about Midwest's policies for alternative work arrangements: telecommuting, job sharing, compressed work week, flextime.

12. Are you aware of Midwest's policies for alternative work arrangements (telecommuting, job sharing, compressed work week, and flextime)?
   1. No
   2. Yes

12a. Do you have a copy of *A Guide to Implementing Alternative Work Arrangements*?
   1. No (Skip to question 13)
   2. Yes

12b. Are the guidelines in *A Guide to Implementing Alternative Work Arrangements* clear?
   1. No
   2. Yes
   3. Don't know

13. Now I'd like to ask about the availability to you and your personal use of the alternative work options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Is the option available for you to use?</th>
<th>If yes, do you personally use this option?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telecommuting: Using electronic communication to perform some or all of your work away from the office, at your home or at another site.</td>
<td>1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know</td>
<td>1. No 2. Yes, without a written agreement 3. Yes, with a written agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Job sharing: Sharing the responsibilities and requirements of one job with another person.</td>
<td>1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know</td>
<td>1. No 2. Yes, without a written agreement 3. Yes, with a written agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Compressed work week (or alternate work week): Working a full work week in 4 or fewer days. This may also be designed for 2-week periods.</td>
<td>1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know</td>
<td>1. No 2. Yes, without a written agreement 3. Yes, with a written agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Flextime: Beginning work daily before or after the regular starting time in your work unit, but not as part of the other 3 options.</td>
<td>1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know</td>
<td>1. No 2. Yes, without a written agreement 3. Yes, with a written agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13e. Please specify your typical work schedule:

___________________________________________

13f. If you personally use any of these flexible options, please indicate the one most important reason why (for example, "am going to school," "to avoid traffic hassles," "personal convenience," "elder care", etc.):

___________________________________________
14a. In your department, do managers support telecommuting, that is, supervisees using electronic communications to perform some or all of their work away from the office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. No</th>
<th>2. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If managers do not support telecommuting, how important is each of the following reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Impact on supervision</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have not asked for it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Some workers might resent it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If managers support telecommuting, how important is each of the following reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost savings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supervisors' trust in employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have asked for it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. To attract and retain employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14b. In your department, do managers support job sharing, that is, two supervisees sharing the responsibilities and requirements of one job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. No</th>
<th>2. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If managers do not support job sharing, how important is each of the following reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Impact on supervision</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have not asked for it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Some workers might resent it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If managers support job sharing, how important is each of the following reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost savings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supervisors' trust in employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have asked for it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. To attract and retain employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14c. In your department, do managers support their supervisees using a compressed or alternate work week, that is, working a full work week in 4 or fewer days (which may also be designed for 2-week periods)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. No →</th>
<th>2. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If managers do not support compressed work weeks, how important is each of the following?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Impact on supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have not asked for it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Some workers might resent it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If managers support compressed work weeks, how important is each of the following reasons?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost savings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supervisors' trust in employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have asked for it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. To attract and retain employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14d. In your department do managers support flextime, that is, supervisees beginning work daily before or after the regular time of the work unit, but not as part of the other 3 options?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. No →</th>
<th>2. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If managers do not support flextime, how important is each of the following reasons?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supervisors' trust in employees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have not asked for it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Some workers might resent it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If managers support flextime, how important is each of the following reasons?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost savings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact on work scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supervisors' trust in employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Impact on quality of products or services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees have asked for it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. To attract and retain employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. In your department, what is the largest proportion of the workers who would be allowed to use each option if they wanted to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A few</th>
<th>About half</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telecommuting..................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Job sharing....................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Compressed work week..........</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Flextime.......................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. All things considered, if all 4 flexible work options were available to everyone in your division, what do you think the overall impact on productivity of flexible work options in your department would be?

1. Very positive
2. Positive
3. Negligible
4. Negative
5. Don't know

IV. The next section asks how you feel about your job.

17. On a scale of 1-5, how satisfied are you with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The balance between your work and your personal or family life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. On a scale of 1-5, how committed are you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Not at all committed</th>
<th>Extremely committed</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Your job?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The person you report to?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your co-workers?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The kind of work you do?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Your customers or the public you serve?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. To what extent do you agree with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I am willing to work harder than I am required to in order to help this company succeed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I feel very loyal to this company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I would take almost any job to keep working for this company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My values and the company's values are very similar.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I am proud to be working for this company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I would turn down a similar job elsewhere for more pay in order to stay with this company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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20. Do you believe that the amount of time you spend at the office, whether you are actually working or not, affects your supervisor's evaluation of your work?
   1. No
   2. Yes

21. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?
   1. Take the same job without hesitation
   2. Have some second thoughts, but would take the same job
   3. Probably would not take the same job
   4. Definitely not take the same job

22. To what extent have you made sacrifices in your personal or family life for the sake of your job at Midwest?
   1. Not at all
   2. Not much
   3. To some extent
   4. To a good extent
   5. To a very great extent

23. To what extent have you made sacrifices in your job at Midwest for the sake of your personal or family life?
   1. Not at all
   2. Not much
   3. To some extent
   4. To a good extent
   5. To a very great extent

24. How likely is it that you will lose your job at Midwest in the next 6 months?
   1. Not at all likely
   2. Somewhat unlikely
   3. Somewhat likely
   4. Very likely
   5. Don't know

IV. This section asks about your household and personal/home responsibilities.

25. Do other adults live in your household?
   1. No (Skip to question 26)
   2. Yes

   25a. The other adult(s) with whom I live are:
       1. Only my spouse or partner
       2. Both a spouse/partner and another adult (specify the other adult, for example, "roommate", "adult child", etc.):
       3. Only another adult (specify, for example, "roommate," "adult child," etc.):

   (Skip to question 26)

   25b. If you have a spouse or partner, how many hours do they usually work per week at all paid jobs? (If your spouse or partner does not work for pay, write "0" and skip to question 26)
   ______ hours
25c. All things considered, how do you view your job in relation to your spouse/partner's paid job?
   1. My job is much more important
   2. My job is somewhat more important
   3. Our jobs are equally important
   4. His/her job is somewhat more important
   5. His/her job is much more important

26. How many children age 5 or under do you have currently living at home?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. Three or more

27. How many children between the ages of 6 and 12 do you have living at home?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. Three or more

28. How many children between the ages of 13 and 18 do you have living at home?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. Three or more

29. Are there any children in your family (whether living with you or not) for whom you currently provide care?
   1. No (Skip to question 30)
   2. Yes

29a. On a typical day that you were at work last week, about how many hours did you spend caring for children? (If none, write "0")
       ________ hours

29b. On a typical day that you were not at work last week, about how many hours did you spend caring for children? (If none, write "0")
       ________ hours

30. Are there any family members or friends (whether living with you or not) for whom you provide special care due to things like a disability, illness, old age, etc.?
   1. No (Skip to question 31)
   2. Yes

30a. If yes, how many total hours last week did you spend talking to, taking care of, or arranging care for this person or persons? (If none, write "0")
       ________ hours per week

31. On a typical day that you were at work last week, about how much time did you spend on household chores, for example, cooking, yardwork, running errands, paying bills (but excluding time spent caring for children or other family members or friends)? (If none, write "0")
       ________ hours
32. On a typical day that you were not at work last week, about how much time did you spend on household chores, for example, cooking, yardwork, running errands, paying bills (but excluding time spent caring for children or other family members or friends)? (If none, write "0")

__________ hours

33. Thinking back over the last 3 months, have you missed any days of work or parts of days NOT COUNTING VACATION DAYS THAT YOU USED FOR VACATION?

1. No (Skip to question 34)
2. Yes

33a. If you missed work but were not on vacation, what was the reason for missing work? (If you can't remember the number of days exactly, provide your best estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of days missed</th>
<th>Number of days you missed a full day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Own illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Child's illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Problem with child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Elder care responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other personal/family responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (Please describe below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. People sometimes experience difficulty balancing work and personal or family obligations. In the past year, please indicate how often have you experienced each of the following because of your personal or family responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reduced the number of hours you worked each week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Rearranged your work hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Refused overtime or extra hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Refused travel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Turned down an interesting work assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Had problems with your supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Had problems with your co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Worried about your children or other relative while at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Had family or household responsibilities interfere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Because of your personal or family life, how often in the past year have you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Been in a worse mood than you would like to be at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Done less well on a task at work than you would like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lacked energy for doing your job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Had trouble concentrating on your job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Worried about personal, family or household issues while at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. The last section asks for demographic information for statistical controls.

36. What is your gender?
   1. Male
   2. Female

37. What race do you consider yourself?
   1. Asian
   2. Black (African American)
   3. Hispanic (Latino/a)
   4. White (non-Hispanic)
   5. Other (Please specify): _______________________

38. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   1. Less than a high-school diploma
   2. High-school diploma
   3. Some college (no degree)
   4. Two-year college degree
   5. Four-year college degree
   6. Master's or professional degree
   7. Ph.D.

39. In which category was your 1996 personal pre-tax income from all sources?
   1. Under $19,999
   2. $20,000-29,999
   3. $30,000-39,999
   4. $40,000-49,999
   5. $50,000-59,999
   6. $60,000-69,999
   7. $70,000-79,999
   8. $80,000-89,999
   9. $90,000-99,999
   10. More than $99,999

40. In which category was your 1996 household pre-tax income from all sources?
   1. Under $19,999
   2. $20,000-29,999
   3. $30,000-39,999
   4. $40,000-49,999
   5. $50,000-59,999
   6. $60,000-69,999
   7. $70,000-79,999
   8. $80,000-89,999
   9. $90,000-99,999
   10. $100,000-124,999
   11. $125,000-150,000
   12. More than $150,000

41. In what year were you born? 19_______

42. Have you previously participated in an interview or focus group for this project?
   1. No
   2. Yes

43. Please add any comments. Use the back of the page.

   - THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION -
Survey of Non-Managerial Employees

This survey asks about your knowledge of and experience with Midwest's flexible work policies, and your efforts to balance work and personal or home responsibilities.

- The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete.
- YOUR RESPONSES WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. No one at Midwest will see your individual responses or have access to any individual data.
- Please drop your completed survey in the Survey Box by the door as you leave. Thank you!

Please circle the number of your answer or fill in the blank as appropriate.

I. The first section asks about your job and your job responsibilities.

1. About how long have you worked for Midwest?
   ______ years

2. About how long have you worked in your current department?
   ______ years

3. How many hours per week do you usually work at your Midwest job?
   ______ hours

4. How many hours a week do you usually work at other paid jobs in addition to your job at Midwest?
   (If none, write "0".)
   ______ hours

5. In which area do you currently work at Midwest?
   1. Systems
   2. Actuarial
   3. Operations
   4. Other (please specify) ____________________

   5a. If "Other" or not sure, what is your job title? ____________________

6. Please circle your pay band: A B C D E F G H Don't Know

7. In your job, do you mainly work alone or with other people?
   1. Work alone (Skip to question 8)
   2. Work with other people

   7a. How many people would you say you work with on a day-to-day basis?
      ______ people

   7b. Are there other people in your work group who are able to perform your job if you are not there?
      1. No
      2. Yes
7c. As an official part of your main job, do you supervise other employees?
   1. No (Skip to question 8)
   2. Yes

7d. How many people do you supervise directly?
   ______ people

7e. Do you determine the pay or promotions of any of the people you supervise directly?
   1. No
   2. Yes

8. In the past year, how much budget did you control? (If none, write "0")
   $________

9. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about your job?

   | Strongly | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly | Don't |
   | agrees   | agrees   | agrees  | agrees | agrees   | know  |
   |__________|__________|________|________|__________|_______|
   |__________|__________|________|________|__________|_______|

   a. I can work independently
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   b. I participate in making decisions that affect my work
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   c. I can set my own hours at work
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   d. The quantity of work in my job is controlled by the machines (such as phone lines or computers) I work with
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   e. It is hard for me to catch up when I miss a day at work
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   f. It is easy for my immediate supervisor to evaluate the quality of work that I do
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   g. Having my work interrupted by coworkers or other job-related activities makes it harder for me to do my job
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   h. Being interrupted at work by personal or family obligations makes it harder for me to do my job
   1  2  3  4  5  8

10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about your job?

   | Strongly | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly | Don't |
   |__________|__________|________|________|__________|_______|
   |__________|__________|________|________|__________|_______|

   a. My job is very repetitious
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   b. My job requires me to deal with a variety of people
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   c. My job requires a high level of skill
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   d. My job requires speed
   1  2  3  4  5  8
   e. My job is highly complex
   1  2  3  4  5  8
II. The second section asks questions about your efforts to balance your work and personal or home responsibilities.

11. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (5)</th>
<th>Don't Know (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I feel uncomfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My immediate supervisor accommodates me when I have personal or family business, such as a medical appointment or a meeting with a child's teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My immediate supervisor is responsive to all employees' personal or family needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My immediate supervisor is fair in responding to all employees' personal or family needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. If I had to do significant extra work to accommodate the personal or family needs of co-workers, I would feel resentful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. If my supervisor helped me accommodate my work and my home responsibilities, it would influence any decision I made about continuing to work here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. In my division there is an unwritten rule that female employees can take care of personal matters on company time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. In my division there is an unwritten rule that male employees can take care of personal matters on company time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. If I have a problem managing my work and home or personal responsibilities, the attitude in my division is &quot;you made your bed, now lie in it.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. My immediate supervisor has a high level of trust in me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. I have a high level of trust in my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. This section asks questions about Midwest's policies for alternative work arrangements: telecommuting, job sharing, compressed work week, and flextime.

12. Are you aware of Midwest's policies for alternative work arrangements (telecommuting, job sharing, compressed work week, and flextime)?
   1. No
   2. Yes

13. Now I'd like to ask about the availability to you and your personal use of alternative work options.

   Option | Is the option available for you to use? | If yes, do you personally use this option?
   ------- | ------------------------------------ | -------------------------------------
   a. Telecommuting: Using electronic communication to perform some or all of your work away from the office, at your home or at another site.
   1. Yes → 1. No
   2. No
   3. Don't know → 2. Yes, without a written agreement
   3. Yes, with a written agreement

   b. Job sharing: Sharing the responsibilities and requirements of one job with another person.
   1. Yes → 1. No
   2. No
   3. Don't know → 2. Yes, without a written agreement
   3. Yes, with a written agreement

   c. Compressed work week (or alternate work week): Working a full work week in 4 or fewer days. This may also be designed for 2-week periods.
   1. Yes → 1. No
   2. No
   3. Don't know → 2. Yes, without a written agreement
   3. Yes, with a written agreement

   d. Flextime: Beginning work daily before or after the regular starting time in your work unit, but not as part of the other 3 options.
   1. Yes → 1. No
   2. No
   3. Don't know → 2. Yes, without a written agreement
   3. Yes, with a written agreement

   e. Please specify your typical work schedule:

   f. If you personally use any of these flexible options, please indicate the one most important reason why (for example, "am going to school," "to avoid traffic hassles," "personal convenience," "elder care", etc.):

14. In your department what is the largest proportion of the workers who would be allowed to use each option if they wanted to?

   Option | None | A few | About half | Most | All | Don't know
   ------- |------ |------ |----------- |------ |----- |-----------
   a. Telecommuting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8
   b. Job sharing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8
   c. Compressed work week | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8
   d. Flextime | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8
15. All things considered, if all four flexible work options were available to everyone in your division, what do you think the overall impact on productivity of flexible work options in your department would be?
   1. Very positive
   2. Positive
   3. Negligible
   4. Negative
   5. Don't know

IV. The next section asks how you feel about your job.

16. On a scale of 1-5, how satisfied are you with:
   a. Your job?
   b. The balance between your work and your personal or family life?

17. On a scale of 1-5, how committed are you to:
   a. Your job?
   b. The person you report to?
   c. Your co-workers?
   d. The kind of work you do?
   e. Your customers or the public you serve?

18. To what extent do you agree with the following?
   a. I am willing to work harder than I am required to in order to help this company succeed.
   b. I feel very loyal to this company.
   c. I would take almost any job to keep working for this company.
   d. My values and the company's values are very similar.
   e. I am proud to be working for this company.
   f. I would turn down a similar job elsewhere for more pay in order to stay with this company.

19. Do you believe that the amount of time you spend at the office, whether you are actually working or not, affects your supervisor's evaluation of your work?
   1. No
   2. Yes

20. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?
   1. Take the same job without hesitation
   2. Have some second thoughts, but would take the same job
   3. Probably would not take the same job
   4. Definitely not take the same job
21. To what extent have you made sacrifices in your personal or family life for the sake of your job at Midwest?
   1. Not at all
   2. Not much
   3. To some extent
   4. To a good extent
   5. To a very great extent

22. To what extent have you made sacrifices in your job at Midwest for the sake of your personal or family life?
   1. Not at all
   2. Not much
   3. To some extent
   4. To a good extent
   5. To a very great extent

23. How likely is it that you will lose your job at Midwest in the next 6 months?
   1. Not at all likely
   2. Somewhat unlikely
   3. Somewhat likely
   4. Very likely
   5. Don't know

IV. This section asks about your household and personal/home responsibilities.

24. Do other adults live in your household?
   1. No (Skip to question 25)
   2. Yes

24a. The other adult(s) with whom I live are:
   1. Only my spouse or partner
   2. Both a spouse/partner and another adult (specify the other adult, for example, "roommate", "adult child", etc.): __________________________ (Skip to question 25)
   3. Only another adult (specify, for example, "roommate", "adult child", etc.): __________________________ (Skip to question 25)

24b. If you have a spouse or partner, how many hours do they usually work per week at all paid jobs?
   (If your spouse or partner does not work for pay, write "0" and skip to question 25)
   _______ hours

24c. All things considered, how do you view your job in relation to your spouse/partner's paid job?
   1. My job is much more important
   2. My job is somewhat more important
   3. Our jobs are equally important
   4. His/her job is somewhat more important
   5. His/her job is much more important

25. How many children age 5 or under do you have living at home?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. Three or more
26. How many children between the ages of 6 and 12 do you have living at home?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. Three or more

27. How many children between the ages of 13 and 18 do you have living at home?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. Three or more

28. Are there any children in your family (whether living with you or not) for whom you provide care?
   1. No (Skip to question 29)
   2. Yes

   28a. On a typical day that you were at work last week, about how many hours did you spend caring for children? (If none, write "0")
       __________ hours

   28b. On a typical day that you were not at work last week, about how many hours did you spend caring for children? (If none, write "0")
       __________ hours

29. Are there any family members or friends (whether living with you or not) for whom you provide special care due to things like a disability, illness, old age, etc.?
   1. No (Skip to question 30)
   2. Yes

   29a. If yes, how many total hours last week did you spend talking to, taking care of, or arranging care for this person or persons? (If none, write "0")
       __________ hours last week

30. On a typical day that you were at work last week, about how much time did you spend on household chores for example, cooking, yardwork, running errands, paying bills (excluding time spent caring for children or other family members or friends)? (If none, write "0")
    __________ hours

31. On a typical day that you were not at work last week, about how much time did you spend on household chores, for example, cooking, yardwork, running errands, paying bills (excluding time spent caring for children or other family members or friends)? (If none, write "0")
    __________ hours

32. Thinking back over the last 3 months, have you missed any days of work or parts of days NOT COUNTING VACATION DAYS THAT YOU USED FOR VACATION?
   1. No (Skip to question 33)
   2. Yes
32a. If you missed work but were not on vacation, what was the reason for missing work? (If you can't remember the number of days exactly, provide your best estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of days you missed a few hours of work</th>
<th>Number of days you missed a full day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem with child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder care responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal/family responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please describe below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. People sometimes experience difficulty balancing work and personal or family obligations. In the past year, please indicate how often have you experienced each of the following because of your personal or family responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reduced the number of hours you worked each week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Rearranged your work hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Refused overtime or extra hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Refused travel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Turned down an interesting work assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Had problems with your supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Had problems with your co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Worried about your children or other relative while at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Had family or household responsibilities interfere with your ability to devote full attention to your job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Because of your personal or family life, how often in the past year have you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Been in a worse mood than you would like to be at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Done less well on a task at work than you would like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lacked energy for doing your job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Had trouble concentrating on your job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Worried about personal, family or household issues while at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. The last section asks for demographic information for statistical controls.

35. What is your gender?
   1. Male
   2. Female

36. What race do you consider yourself?
   1. Asian
   2. Black (African American)
   3. Hispanic (Latino/a)
   4. White (non-Hispanic)
   5. Other (Please specify):
37. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   1. Less than a high-school diploma
   2. High-school diploma
   3. Some college (no degree)
   4. Two-year college degree
   5. Four-year college degree
   6. Master's or professional degree
   7. Ph.D.

38. In which category was your 1996 personal pre-tax income from all sources?
   1. Under $19,999
   2. $20,000-29,999
   3. $30,000-39,999
   4. $40,000-49,999
   5. $50,000-59,999
   6. $60,000-69,999
   7. $70,000-79,999
   8. $80,000-89,999
   9. $90,000-99,999
   10. More than $99,999

39. In which category was your 1996 household pre-tax income from all sources?
   1. Under $19,999
   2. $20,000-29,999
   3. $30,000-39,999
   4. $40,000-49,999
   5. $50,000-59,999
   6. $60,000-69,999
   7. $70,000-79,999
   8. $80,000-89,999
   9. $90,000-99,999
   10. $100,000-124,999
   11. $125,000-150,000
   12. More than $150,000

40. In what year were you born? 19_____

41. Have you previously participated in an interview or focus group for this project?
   1. No
   2. Yes

42. Please add any comments. Use the back of this page if necessary.

- THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION -
CONFIRMATION LETTERS TO INTERVIEW
AND FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

Sample Confirmation Letter to Participants in Managerial Interviews

November 24, 1997

Dear (manager’s name),

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the 90-minute focus group on flexible work arrangements. I am looking forward to hearing your perceptions and experiences, both as a manager of other employees and as an individual who also deals with home and work responsibilities. I will meet you:

Date: Tuesday, November 12, 1997
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Place: Main Building, MW Conference Room, 4th Floor

I want to assure you of several things. First, your participation in this interview is voluntary. You will be one of a number of managers from across Midwest divisions who will be discussing their perceptions of, and experiences with, flexible work arrangements and balancing the demands of home and work. If at any point during the discussion you want to end your participation, you may do so. Second, the record I make of the interview will remain confidential. No one at Midwest or Inland will have access to the record of the discussion, and you will not be identified by name in any report. Midwest and Inland will only receive a summary report in which the results of all interviews, focus groups, and a survey will be grouped together.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at my Ohio State phone number (292-6681), or my temporary Midwest phone number (9-6099). If you find you need to reschedule the interview, please let me know as soon as possible.

Again, thank you for helping make this research possible. Your participation will help Midwest and Inland design a workplace that encourages a balance between work and home obligations.

Sincerely,

Meg Flack, Researcher
The Ohio State University
Sample Confirmation Letter to General Focus Group Participants of Nonmanagers

November 1, 1997

Dear (nonmanager's name),

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the 90-minute focus group on flexible work arrangements. I am looking forward to hearing your perceptions and experiences. Our group will meet:

Date: Tuesday, November 12, 1997
Time: 8:30 - 10:00 a.m.
Place: Main Building, MW Conference Room, 4th Floor

I want to assure you of several things. First, your participation in this focus group is voluntary. You will be part of a group of 8-10 nonmanagerial employees from across Midwest divisions who will be discussing their perceptions of, and experiences with, flexible work arrangements and balancing the demands of home and work. If at any point during the discussion you want to end your participation, you may do so. Second, your supervisor will grant you release time to participate. You will not be asked to put in overtime to make up for your participation. Third, the record I make of the focus group will remain confidential. No one at Midwest or Inland will have access to the record of the discussion, and participants will be coded by number, not identified by name. Midwest and Inland will only receive a summary report in which the results of focus groups, interviews, and a survey will be grouped together.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at the my Ohio State phone number (292-6681), or my temporary Midwest phone number (9-6099). If you find you cannot participate in the focus group, please let me know as soon as possible.

Again, thank you for helping make this research possible, and contributing information that will help Midwest and Inland design a workplace that encourages a balance between work and home obligations.

Sincerely,

Meg Flack, Researcher
The Ohio State University
Sample Confirmation Letter to Pretest Focus Group Participants

November 26, 1997

Dear (employee's name),

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the focus group! The group will critique a draft survey designed to evaluate the effectiveness of Midwest's flexible work arrangements in helping employees balance home and work responsibilities. Your comments and perceptions will be used to refine the survey, which will later be administered to a random sample of Midwest employees. The group will meet:

Date: Wednesday, December 10  
Time: 1-2 p.m.  
Place: Main Building, MW Conference Room, 4th floor

I want to assure you of several things. First, your participation in this focus group is voluntary. You will be part of a group of 9-12 managers (nonmanagers) from across Midwest divisions who will take part in the group. If at any point during the discussion you want to end your participation, you may do so. Second, the record I make of the focus group will remain confidential. No one at Midwest or Inland will have access to the record of the discussion, and participants will not be identified by name. Midwest and Inland will only receive a summary report in which the results of interviews, focus groups, and the survey will be grouped together.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at my Ohio State University number (292-6681) or at my temporary Midwest phone number (9-6099). If you find you cannot participate in the focus group, please let me know as soon as possible.

Again, thank you for helping make this research possible, and contributing information that will help Midwest and Inland design a workplace that supports employees' efforts to meet work and home obligations.

Sincerely,

Meg Flack, Researcher  
The Ohio State University
APPENDIX E

ADMINISTRATIVE LETTERS OF SUPPORT, CONFIRMATION LETTERS, AND REMINDERS TO SAMPLE POOL MEMBERS ABOUT THE SURVEY

Sample Letter from Vice Presidents to Sample Pool Members in Support of Survey

December 28, 1997

TO: All Systems employees
FROM: (division vice president)
RE: Alternative Work Arrangements Study
Balancing the Demands of Work and Home

Midwest adopted formal policies for flexible work arrangements about three years ago. The goal of the alternative work environment policies (A.W.A.) is to help employees balance their home and work responsibilities, and thus increase workers' job satisfaction and productivity. Meg Flack, an independent researcher and doctoral candidate in sociology at Ohio State, is conducting an evaluation of the effectiveness of those policies. The Midwest senior management team and the Enterprise Office of Human Resources support this evaluation.

Randomly selected individuals from the Systems office will be invited to participate in a 20-minute survey. The survey will be administered January 20 and 21 during the work day in Jeffers Auditorium and supervisors will provide release time for their direct reports' participation.

Employees' participation is entirely voluntary. Midwest and Inland will not have access to any individual data collected; individual data collected in the survey will remain confidential. Participants' identities will be protected in all reports.

I encourage you to support this research if you are selected to participate in the survey on January 20 or 21. Based on the survey results, Midwest and Inland will be able to design jobs, work arrangements, and organizational environments that help employees meet competing home and work responsibilities. By doing so, we will foster job satisfaction and commitment, and thus enhance our productivity.

Thank you, in advance, for your help with this project.
Sample Letter to Sample Pool Members About Group Administration of Survey

January 5, 1998

Dear Midwest Employee,

As (vice president of the division) indicated in his memo to Systems employees last week, Midwest is evaluating the effectiveness of its flexible work arrangements in helping employees balance their home and work responsibilities. As an independent researcher, I am conducting that evaluation under the supervision of Professor Lowell Hargens of The Ohio State University. Although I am not affiliated with Midwest, the senior management of the Systems office and the Enterprise's Office of Human Resources supports this work.

Over the past few months, a random sample of Midwest employees has participated in focus groups and interviews to help design a survey for this evaluation. Now a random sample of Midwest employees from across different Midwest divisions has been selected to participate in that survey. You are one of a number of managers (nonmanagerial employees) being asked to give their opinions in the survey. Participation is voluntary.

In order that the results represent the experiences of people at Midwest, your participation is important. Release time will be granted for your participation and the survey will take about 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential and no one will be able to identify you by your answers. Indeed, no one at Midwest or Inland will see your answers and your name will never appear in any report about the survey or the evaluation.

The survey will be administered:

- Date: January 20, 1998 (Tuesday)
- Time: 8:30 - 9:30 a.m.
- Place: Main Building, Midwest Auditorium

If you are unable to participate at that time, a make-up session is scheduled for:

- Date: January 21, 1998 (Wednesday)
- Time: 11:30 - 12:30 a.m.
- Place: Main Building, Midwest Auditorium

If you have any questions or need to arrange an alternate time, please contact me at Ohio State University (292-6681) or at my temporary Midwest phone number (9-6099). Thank you for making this research possible, and contributing information that will help Midwest and Inland design workplaces that help employees meet their work and home obligations.

Sincerely,

Meg Flack, Project Researcher
The Ohio State University
Sample Reminder to Sample Pool for Group Administration of Survey

To: Randomly selected MW managers (nonmanagers)

Date: January 10, 1998

Reminder:

You have been randomly selected to participate in the survey evaluating MW’s flexible work policies. Participation is voluntary. You are asked to take the 20-minute survey any time between:

Date: January 20, 1998 (Tuesday)
Time: 8:30 - 9:30 a.m.
Place: Main Building, Midwest Auditorium

If you are unable to participate at that time, a make-up session is scheduled for:

Date: January 21, 1998 (Wednesday)
Time: 11:30 - 12:30 a.m.
Place: Main Building, Midwest Auditorium

Answers will be confidential and your supervisor will grant release time for your voluntary assistance. MW will not have access to the data. If you have a question or need to arrange for an alternate time, please contact me at Ohio State University (292-6681) or at my temporary Midwest extension (9-6099).

Thank you for making this evaluation possible!

Meg Flack, Project Researcher
The Ohio State University
Midwest President’s Letter of Support to Follow-up Survey Group Members

January 26, 1998

TO: Midwest employees

FROM: (company president)

RE: Alternative Work Arrangements Study:
Balancing the Demands of Work and Home

The enclosed survey is part of a study to evaluate the effectiveness of Midwest’s flexible work arrangements and their ability to help employees manage both work and home responsibilities. The Midwest senior management team and the Enterprise Office of Human Resources support this evaluation.

Because the survey involves a small sample of Midwest employees who were selected at random, the research depends upon each individual filling out and returning their survey. Supervisors will provide release time for their direct reports’ participation. Midwest and Inland will not have access to any individual data collected; individual data collected in the survey will remain confidential. Participants’ identities will be protected in all reports.

Participation is voluntary. I encourage you to support this research, however. Based on the survey results, Midwest will be able to design jobs, work arrangements, and organizational environments that help employees meet competing home and work responsibilities. By doing so, we will foster job satisfaction and commitment, and thus enhance our productivity.

Thank you in advance for your time and support of this important research.
January 26, 1998

Dear Midwest Employee,

Your thoughts and experiences count! You are part of a small random sample being asked to give their opinions in a survey evaluating the effectiveness of MW’s flexible work schedules in helping employees balance their home and work responsibilities. Your participation is voluntary and important—whether or not you use a flexible work schedule.

I am sending it to you because I recognize it is difficult to find a convenient time for everyone in the sample pool to take the survey in a group setting. Release time will be granted for your participation. The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete.

Please complete the survey at your earliest convenience and return it by February 2 in the enclosed stamped envelope. Your responses will be confidential and no one will be able to identify you by your answers. Indeed, no one at Midwest will see your answers, and your name will never appear in any report about the survey.

Thank you! Your perspective will help Midwest design a workplace that helps employees meet both their work and home obligations.

Sincerely,

Meg Flack, Project Researcher
The Ohio State University
Reminder to Follow-up Survey Group Members

- SURVEY REMINDER -

If you’ve already completed and returned your survey about MW’s flexible work policies, thank you very much!
If not...

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN YOUR SURVEY ABOUT MW’S FLEXIBLE WORK POLICIES AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE!

Participation is voluntary.
All information is confidential.

Thank you -

Meg Flack, Project Researcher
OSU Department of Sociology
300 Bricker Hall
190 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210-1353
614-292-6681
Appendix F

Estimation of Missing Values (MV) for Independent Variables

Dependent Variables:
Cases with MVs on the dependent variable are excluded from the regression analyses of that dependent variable.

Independent Variables: Missing values are estimated separately for managers and nonmanagers.

1) Job demands and interdependence:
   a. Job demands: Scale: 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)
         My job ...
         requires a high level of skill. MV: nonmanagers - none; MV: managers - mode by area and sex
         is highly complex. MV: nonmanagers - none; MV: managers - mode by area and sex
         is not repetitious. MV: none
      2. Job speed: My job requires speed. MV: none

   a. Job Interdependence:
      1. My job requires me to deal with a variety of people. Scale: 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)
         MV: none
      2. Supervisory responsibility: How many people do you supervise directly?
         - For number directly supervise: if no supervisory responsibilities, number directly supervised = 0
         - For those with missing values on "Do you supervise," number directly supervised:
         MV: nonmanagers - median by area and sex MV: managers - none

2) Ability to work independently:
   a. Status: Salary grade: 1 through 9 (boundaries of categories not listed in the survey)
      1. ($ 13,500 - 27,000)
      2. ($ 16,000 - 33,000)
      3. ($ 19,000 - 42,000)
      4. ($ 24,000 - 53,000)
      5. ($ 28,000 - 63,000)
      6. ($ 36,000 - 78,000)
      7. ($ 44,000 - 96,000)
      8. ($ 59,000 - 127,000)
      9. ($ 72,000 - 146,000)
      Regression imputation for missing values:
      MV: Nonmanagers - adj. $^2 = 62.8$ percent (independent variables: area, supervisory responsibility, personal income, education)
      MV: Managers - adj. $^2 = 70.6$ percent (independent variables: area, total supervisory responsibility, personal income)

   b. Autonomy:
      1. Ability to make job-related decisions: I participate in making decisions that affect my work.
         Scale 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) MV: none
      2. Ability to work independently: I can work independently. Scale 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)
         MV: nonmanagers - none MV: managers - mode by area and sex
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3) Cost-Benefit Ratio - Factors Affecting Perceived Risk

a. Evaluation factors
1. Ease of evaluation: It is easy for my immediate supervisor to evaluate the quality of work that I do.
   Scale 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)
   MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex   MV: managers - mode by area and sex
2. Supervisory trust: My immediate supervisor has a high level of trust in me.
   Scale (1-5): 1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree
   MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex   MV: managers - mode by area and sex
3. Facetime: Do you believe that the amount of time you spend at the office, whether you are actually
   working or not, affects your supervisor's evaluation of your work? 0=No 1=Yes
   MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex   MV: managers - mode by area and sex

b. Proxies for Productivity
1. Seniority: About how long have you worked for Midwest? _______ years
   MV: nonmanagers - mean by area and sex   MV: managers - none
2. Education: What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   1=Less than high school 2=High school 3=Some college 4=Two-year college degree
   5=Four-year college degree 6=Master's or professional degree 7=Ph.D.
   MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex   MV: managers - mode by area and sex

Work Context: Division and Department Measures
Division: In which area do you currently work at MW? 1=Systems 2=Actuarial 3=Operations
Transformed into dummies for Systems and Actuarial divisions, with Operations as the reference category. MV - none.

Perceived managerial support. Managers with MVs were assigned the mean value for their area.
1) In your department, do managers support their supervisees using a compressed workweek? 0=No 1=Yes
   Systems =.87   Actuarial =.85   Operations =.61
2) In your department, do managers support their supervisees using flextime? 0=No 1=Yes
   Systems =.87   Actuarial =.96   Operations =.70
3) In your department, do managers support their supervisees telecommuting? 0=No 1=Yes
   Systems =.78   Actuarial =.74   Operations =.42

Estimated levels of departmental use: Scale: 1=None 2=A few 3=About half 4=Most 5=All
1) In your department what is the largest proportion of the workers who would be allowed to use a compressed
   work week if they wanted to?
   MV: nonmanagers - median by area and sex   MV: managers - median by area and sex
2) In your department what is the largest proportion of the workers who would be allowed to use flextime if
   they wanted to?
   MV: nonmanagers - median by area and sex   MV: managers - median by area and sex
3) In your department what is the largest proportion of the workers who would be allowed to telecommute if
   they wanted to?
   MV: nonmanagers - median by area and sex   MV: managers - median by area and sex

Other job-related factors:
Weekly hours worked at MW: How many hours per week do you usually work at your MW job? _______
   MV: nonmanagers - mean by area and sex   MV: managers - none
Other Job-related factors (continued):

Policy awareness: Are you aware of MW's policy for alternative work environment (telecommuting, job sharing, compressed workweek, and flextime)?

0 = No 1 = Yes

MV: nonmanagers - mean by area and sex  
MV: managers - none

Job security: How likely is it that you will keep/not lose your job at MW in the next 6 months?


MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex  
MV: managers - mode by area and sex

Personal Status

What is your gender? 0 = male 1 = female

MV: nonmanagers - mode by area  
MV: managers - mode by area

Race: dummy for race with white as reference group.

0 = white 1 = nonwhite

MV: nonmanager - mode by area  
MV: manager - mode by area

Transformation of: What race do you consider yourself?


Age: linear transformation computed from the year born.

MV: nonmanagers - regression imputation: adj. $R^2 = 43.3$ percent  
(independent variables: division, experience, education, children age 13-18, eldercare, hours of childcare on workday, hours of childcare on non-workday, balance between work and family)

MV: manager - regression imputation: adj. $R^2 = 54.1$ percent  
(independent variables: division, experience, children under age 6, children age 13-18, eldercare, sex, supervisory responsibility)

Family Composition

Marital Status: 0 = not married/partner 1 = married/with partner

Transformation of: The other adult(s) with whom I live are:

1. Only my spouse or partner 2. Both a spouse/partner and another adult 3. Only another adult

If answer = 1 or 2, married/with partner = 1

MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex  
MV: managers - mode by area and sex

Number of Children

1) Number of children living in the household age 5 or younger (0 to 3 or more)

MV: none

2) Number of children living in the household between the ages of 6 and 12 (0 to 3 or more)

MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex  
MV: managers - mode by area and sex

3) Number of children living in the household age 13 to 18 (0 to 3 or more)

MV: nonmanagers - mode by area and sex  
MV: managers - mode by area and sex

Elder care responsibilities: Are there any family members or friends (whether living with you or not) for whom you provide special care due to things like a disability, illness, old age, etc? 0 = No 1 = Yes

MV: nonmanagers - mean by area and sex  
MV: manager - none
Household Characteristics
Total annual household income using midpoints of categories:
1 - $ 16,749.50.
2 - $ 24,999.50.
3 - $ 34,999.50.
4 - $ 44,999.50.
5 - $ 54,999.50.
6 - $ 64,999.50.
7 - $ 74,999.50.
8 - $ 84,999.50.
9 - $ 94,999.50.
10 - $112,499.50.
11 - $137,500.
12 = More than $150,000. Estimate: If personal income = 10 and respondent's spouse/partner does not work outside the home, household income equals personal income. If personal income = 10 and spouse/partner works outside the home, household income equals $176,855 (Pareto estimate of category midpoint).
I used regression imputation for MVs.
MV: nonmanager - regression imputation: adj. $^{2} = 54.9$ percent
(independent variables: division, hours worked weekly, age, personal income, spousal hours of work, children ages 13-18, sex, sex*personal income, whether perform child care, salary grade)
MV: manager - regression imputation: adj. $^{2} = 68.7$ percent
(independent variables: division, experience, supervisory responsibility, personal income, education, spousal hours worked)
Potential hours of household help: a linear transformation of the number of hours respondent's spouse/partner usually work per week at all paid jobs.
MV spouse hours: nonmanagers - mean by area and sex MV spouse hours: managers - mean by area and sex
Miscellaneous
Impact of AWAs on productivity: All things considered, if all four flexible work options were available to everyone in your division, what do you think the overall impact on productivity of flexible work options in your department would be? 1. Negative 2. Negligible 3. Positive 4. Very Positive
MV: nonmanagers - median by area and sex MV: managers - median by area and sex
Participation in interview or focus group: Have you previously participated in an interview or focus group for this project? 1. No 2. Yes
MV: nonmanagers - none MV: managers - mean by area and sex

1 Midpoint between lower boundary of respondent's salary grade and upper boundary of category.
APPENDIX G

EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK: ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS

Alternative Work Environment

Flextime
Flexible work scheduling allows adaptable start and end times as established by management. A standard number of hours must be worked within a set time period. Start and stop times may be changed on a daily, weekly, monthly, or annual basis as needed. Core times when employees are expected on the job will be established by management.

Compressed Work Week
A compressed work week usually involves a full-time work schedule that is compressed into fewer than five work days. Examples are: four 10-hour days or three 13-hour days.

Telecommuting
Telecommuting is defined as job production performed outside of the office, traditionally, in the employee’s home or alternate location. Office equipment is provided by the company. Production standards and supervisory relationships are defined by management and reviewed periodically for continued applicability. The employee is expected to come into the office on a regular basis for communication needs and to maintain a sense of relationship with the overall operation.

Job Sharing
Job sharing occurs when one job is performed by two people sharing the responsibilities and requirements of a particular job. Job parameters are determined by management and agreed to by the job share participants.

There may be some instances where AWE arrangements will not be compatible with business needs. Local management will determine the suitability of the various AWE offerings. In many cases, however, an AWE may result in an improvement in production or service, and business objectives will not be affected adversely. There may also be AWE opportunities within the management ranks.

These flexible work arrangements provide a proactive opportunity to address the multifaceted lives of our employees. If you are interested in participating in an AWE, notify your manager.