
**WORK STRESS IN AUSTRALIAN PROFESSIONALS: THE ROLE OF
CULTURE, GENDER AND WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT**

Shruti Mujumdar

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

August, 2008

School of Psychology
University of Adelaide

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	viii
Declaration	x
Acknowledgements	xi
List of Tables	xiii
List of Figures	xvi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1. Overview	1
1.1 Meaning of Stress	2
1.2 Sources of Stress	4
1.2.1 Examples of Categories of Job Stressors	8
1.2.2 Theoretical Models of Occupational Stress	13
1.2.3 Non-Occupational Sources of Stress	14
1.3 Work Stress and Family Stress: A Complex Situation	18
1.4 Cultural differences in Work Stress and Work-Family Conflict (Individualism v/s Collectivism)	22
1.5 Acculturative Stress and Cross Cultural Adaptation	26
1.6 History of Indian Immigration to Australia	29
1.7 Need for the Studies	34

Chapter 2: Study 1. Occupational Stress and Work-Family Conflict	38
among Indian Immigrant Women in Australia	38
2. Overview	38
2.1 Gender, Work, and Stress	38
2.2 Introduction to Work-Family Conflict (WFC)	49
2.3 Theories of Work-Family Conflict	52
2.4 Gender Differences in Work-Family Conflict (WFC)	
and Family-Work Conflict (FWC)	57
2.5 Women in Part-Time Employment	60
2.6 Women and Work Stress in Australia	62
2.7 Culture and the Role of Social Support	64
2.8 Occupational Stress and Work-Family Conflict for	
Indian Immigrant Women in Australia	65
2.9 Need for the Study	68
2.9.1 Research Questions for Study 1	69
Chapter 3: Methodology, Results and Discussion of Study 1	71
3. Overview	71
3.1 Procedure	72
3.1.1 Participants	72
3.1.2 Measures	73
3.1.3 Interview Procedure	75
3.2 Selection of Measures	75

3.3 Data Analyses	76
3.4 Results	77
3.5 Discussion	87
3.6 Conclusions and Implications for the Next Study	98
Chapter 4: Study 2. Cultural and Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction, Job Stress, Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict	101
4. Overview	101
4.1 Differences between Household Work for Men and Women	102
4.2 Division of Labour in Households	109
4.2.1 Changing Families and Patterns of Change	115
4.3 Australian Studies of Household Labour	118
4.3.1 Cultural Differences between Australian and Indian Men Regarding Household Work	119
4.4 Gender and Cultural Differences in Job Satisfaction	126
4.4.1 Cross-Cultural Differences in Work-Family Conflict and Job Satisfaction (Spillover)	130
4.4.2 Cross-Cultural Differences in Job Stress	131
4.4.3 Cross-Cultural Differences in Work-Family Conflict and Job Stress (Spillover)	132
4.5 Aims and Hypotheses of the Present Study	134
4.5.1 Hypotheses of the Study	136

Chapter 5: Methodology, Results and Discussion of Study 2	140
5. Overview	140
5.1 Method	140
5.1.1 Participants	140
5.1.2 Measures	141
5.1.3 Procedure	143
5.2 Research Questions for the Study	144
5.3 Data Analyses	145
5.4 Results	145
5.4.1 Results of the Effects and Interaction of Culture And Gender	156
5.5 Discussion	158
5.6 Conclusion	172
5.7 Limitations and Strengths of this Study	174
5.8 Future Research	175
Chapter 6: Study 3. Crossover and Spillover among Dual Earner Couples in Australia	176
6. Definition of Crossover and Spillover	176
6.1 The Role of Gender in the Crossover Process	180
6.2 Partner Crossover Effects	182
6.3 The Present Study	184
6.4.1 Dependent Variables Used in this Study	187

6.4.2 Independent Variables Used in this Study	190
6.5 Previous Research and Gaps in Crossover Research	196
6.6 Aims and Hypotheses of this Study	198
Chapter 7: Methodology, Results and Discussion of Study 3	204
7. Overview	204
7.1 Methodology	204
7.1.1 Participants	204
7.1.2 Measures	206
7.1.3 Measures of Dependent Variables	206
7.1.4 Measures of Independent Variables	209
7.1.5 Procedure	212
7.2 Results	213
7.1.2 Descriptive Statistics	213
7.3 Analyses of Results	229
7.4 Discussion of Study 3	232
7.5 Conclusion	246
7.6 Limitations and Future Research	248
Chapter 8: Conclusion and Implications	250
8. Overview	250
8.1 Similarities and Differences between Individualistic And Collectivist Cultures	251

8.2 Gender Differences between Australian and Indian Men and Women	253
8.3 Gender Differences in Crossover Research	255
8.4 Crossover and Spillover Correlations	255
8.5 Contribution of this Research to the Work Stress Literature	261
8.6 Future Research	263
Appendices	266
Appendix A Ethics Approval	266
Appendix B Participant Information Sheet	270
Appendix C Participant Consent Form	274
Appendix D Job Satisfaction Scale	275
Appendix E Job Stress Items	276
Appendix F Work-Family Conflict Scale	277
Appendix G Interview Questionnaire	279
Appendix H Ethics Approval for Study 3	284
Appendix I Participant Information Sheet	288
Appendix J Fatigue Questionnaire	291
Appendix K Dyadic Adjustment Scale	293
Appendix L Family Organised Cohesiveness Scale	295
Appendix M Family Support Scale	297
Appendix N Family Friendly Working Arrangements	299

Abstract

Australia is one of the most popular countries for immigrants to settle. Many highly qualified Indians from India have made Australia their home, and they hold important positions in the Australian work-force.

The Australian work-force now consists not only of employees from different countries, but also of parents who try to balance their work roles and family roles simultaneously. For dual-earner families this can be difficult and could lead to increased job stress and work family conflict. Due to these cultural and gender differences, experiences in the paid work-force cannot be assumed to be the same for all employees. The purpose of this research was to investigate the role of culture and gender among working professionals in Australia and to study the interactional patterns within dual-earner couples in the Australian work-force.

This was exploratory research and was conducted using three studies. All studies were cross-sectional, and qualitative as well as quantitative measures were used for data collection. In the first study data were collected from matched pairs of 10 Australian and 10 Indian born mothers who were employed in the Australian work-force. Interviews were conducted and responses to the interview were recorded. Results suggested some significant differences in job stress, with Australian mothers experiencing more job stress than Indian mothers. Further, interview results indicated that women from both cultures were responsible for most of the household work.

Study two of the thesis combined culture and gender to investigate job satisfaction, work stress and work family conflict among Australian men and women working in the Australian work-force ($N = 58$). A 2 X 2 ANOVA was used for this. There were no cultural differences found among men and women of both cultures on measures of job satisfaction, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. However, cultural differences were observed on the job stress scale with Australian men and women experiencing more job stress than Indian men and women. There were also significant gender differences in job stress, work-family-conflict and family-work conflict. Australian men and Indian men reported higher family-work conflict. Results of this study revealed significant gender differences and therefore, the third study was designed to investigate these gender differences further.

Study three investigated the role of gender and work stress variables through crossover and spillover research. Many gender differences in predictors of fatigue, job stress and dyadic adjustment were found among couples both working in white collar professions. This study too strengthened the traditional gender role with women experiencing higher job stress and family-work conflict.

It is suggested that these findings contribute to the work-stress literature in three ways. Findings confirm that gender, rather than culture, are responsible for differences among immigrants in their perception of job satisfaction, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Findings also confirm the traditional gender role of women, who are responsible for most domestic household work, and also demonstrate that increase in work-family conflict and family-work conflict contributes to an increase in job stress among dual-earner couples. This research has provided an insight into factors contributing to both crossover and spillover among Australian dual earner professionals, an area which has not received much attention.

Declaration

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by any other person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in The University of Adelaide Library, being made available for loan and photocopying.

Shruti Mujumdar

August, 2008

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge and thank many people whose guidance and support has helped me during the course of my candidature.

I would first like to thank my supervisor Professor Helen Winefield for all her guidance, advice and expertise. I would like to thank her especially for patiently reading all my drafts and for all her invaluable suggestions. It is deeply appreciated. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Dr. Neil Kirby for all his suggestions, help and guidance.

I am very grateful to Bob Wilson from the School of Psychology, University of Adelaide for all the statistical help he has provided me.

I would like to thank my mother and father for giving me the opportunity to pursue a PhD. Without you Aai and Appa, I would never have been in Australia.

I wish to acknowledge my sister Bharati and her husband Raju for allowing me to be their guest in Adelaide, and for all the lunches, dinners and informal chats.

This thesis would not have been complete without the support of my husband Makarand who has not only encouraged me, but has truly balanced “work and family” in my absence. My

thank you also goes to my son Sarang for all his technical help and for being so patient with his mother during her candidature.

Last but not the least, I am very grateful to all my participants. Without their responses, this thesis would never have been possible.

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Matched Pairs of Australian and Indian Mothers	78
Table 3.2 Means, Standard Deviations and Significance (<i>t</i> -tests) of Comparison between Australian-Born and Indian-Born Working Mothers	80
Table 3.3 Responses to Interview Questionnaire by Australian and Indian Women Participants	81
Table 5.1 Demographic Characteristics of all Men and Women Participants	146
Table 5.2 Responses to Household and Work Survey	148
Table 5.3 Cultural Differences between Australian and Indian Participants on Job and Home Related Factors	152
Table 5.4 Gender Differences between Men and Women on Job and Home Related Factors	153

Table 5.5 Additional Questions for Indian Immigrant Men and Women	154
Table 5.6 Results of Chi-Square Tests to Determine Significant Differences among Australian and Indian Men on aspects of Cooking and Doing Housework	155
Table 5.7 Means and Standard Deviations of Culture and Gender on all Study Variables	156
Table 6.1 Family-Friendly Working Arrangements in Australia	194
Table 7.1 Employment Status and Level of Education of Participants of the Study	214
Table 7.2 Number of Children for the Couples	215
Table 7.3 Means and Standard Deviations for all Study Variables for all Couples	215
Table 7.4 Within-Individual (Spillover) Correlation Coefficients for Husbands	217

Table 7.5 Within-Individual (Spillover) Correlation Coefficients for Wives	218
Table 7.6 Crossover Correlation Coefficients for Husbands and Wives	220
Table 7.7 Predictors of Fatigue in Husbands	221
Table 7.8 Predictors of Fatigue in Wives	222
Table 7.9 Predictors of Dyadic Adjustment in Husbands	223
Table 7.10 Predictors of Dyadic Adjustment in Wives	224
Table 7.11 Predictors of Job Stress in Husbands	225
Table 7.12 Predictors of Job Stress in Wives	226
Table 7.13 Results of the Family-Friendly Policy Questionnaire for Husbands and Wives	227

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Causes of Occupational Stress	07
Figure 1.2 Levels of Qualifications for Australian and Indian Population	33
Figure 1.3 Percentage of Australians and Indians in Various Jobs in Australia	34
Figure 2.1 Model of Work-Family Conflict	51

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1. Overview

Australia is a land of immigrants with people from more than 200 countries making it their home. The participation of immigrants in the labour force has been an important area of research in Australia. This participation has been evident not only among Australian married women, but also among immigrant men and women. An increase in work-force participation among women and immigrants brings about the issue of work-stress and work family balance among dual earner couples. This issue of stress and work-family balance has been an important one for researchers. This thesis looks at the effects of culture and gender as sources of occupational stress and work family conflict among Indian immigrants in Australia and also among Australians. It also explores crossover relationships among Australian dual earner couples to find out whether the predictors of fatigue, job stress and dyadic adjustment are similar for both members of couples.

The present chapter provides a brief overview of the thesis. The chapter starts with various definitions and meaning of stress followed by a discussion on occupational stress, categories of job stressors and various theoretical models of occupational stress. Non-occupational sources of stress are also discussed. This is followed by a brief introduction to the interaction between job stress and family stress. Since the first two studies of this thesis deal with Indian immigrants in Australia, the next part of this chapter deals with cultural differences in stress and work-family conflict (Individualism v/s Collectivism), acculturative stress and history of Indian immigration to Australia and the adaptation of immigrants. The last part of this chapter makes a reference to these concepts, although they

are discussed in detail in chapters two and four. Finally, the need for the studies is also discussed.

The first part of this thesis deals with cultural differences among employed Australian and employed immigrant Indian men and women in Australia. Since no culture-based differences were found in Indian and Australian participants, the second part of the thesis took into consideration gender and studied the predictors of “crossover” and “spillover” of fatigue, job stress and dyadic adjustment from one partner to another.

1.1 Meaning of stress

Many psychologists and researchers have given numerous definitions of stress and stressors. For example, according to Aziz (2004) stress is inevitable in today’s complex life since right from the time of birth till death an individual is invariably exposed to various stressful situations. The threat of political and economic imbalances and uncertainties, unemployment, poverty, urbanisation and increased socio-economic complexities and innumerable other factors contribute to stress (Aziz, 2004).

According to The International Labour Organisation (ILO, 1993) stress has become one of the most serious health issues of the twentieth century - a problem not just for individuals in terms of physical and mental morbidity, but for employers, governments and the society at large who have started to assess the financial damage.

Although many stress researchers have attempted to define stress, yet most of them agree that stress is not very easy to define. It could mean different things to different people. However, it is found in all aspects of our lives and it just cannot be avoided. Stress lays down multiple demands on the individual and there is pressure to achieve these demands. Stress is the body’s way of responding to some kind of demand. Stress can be defined as the emotional and physiological response to stressors (Maslach, et al., 1996;

Zastrow, 1984). Stress, in essence, is a feeling of doubt about being able to cope, a perception that the resources available do not match the demands made (Bonn & Bonn, 2000). Stress is often perceived as a constraining force with which people must cope (Mulhall, 1996; Pollock, 1988). Hans Selye (1964) was the first to use the term “stress” to describe a set of physical and psychological responses to adverse conditions or influences. Selye, a pioneer in stress research, defined stress as “the nonspecific response of the body to any demands made upon it” (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992, p. 597). Stress is considered to be an internal state or a response to anything we consciously or unconsciously perceive as a threat, either real or imagined (Clarke, 1988). For the individual, the stress response is typified by physiological changes to short- or long-term unpredictable alterations in environmental circumstances, which cause a redirection of resources to vital processes and impair, or threaten to impair, homeostasis (Saplosky, 1992; Wingfield, et al., 1997).

According to Lazarus’ transactional model of stress, stress is not a property of the person, or of the environment, but arises when there is conjunction between a particular kind of environment and a particular kind of person that leads to a threat appraisal (Lazarus, 1991c, p. 3). Transaction implies that stress is neither in the environmental input nor in the person, but reflects in the conjunction of a person with certain motives and beliefs with an environment whose characteristics pose harm, threat, or challenges depending on these person characteristics (Lazarus, 1990). Transaction also implies process. The stress relationship is not static but is constantly changing as a result of the continual interplay between the person and the environment (Lazarus, 1990).

In the stress literature most scholars acknowledge that the level of stress is to a large extent a function of an individual's interpretation of the events and the uncertainty, ambiguity, and helplessness the individual ascribes to the events (Black, 1990). "Stress" or "stressor" refers to any environmental, social, or internal demand which requires the

individual to readjust his/her usual behaviour patterns (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). Stress rarely has a single source point, rather stress has been found to have many different sources. In addition, in this complex society stress influences many different areas of life (Bailey, et al., 1998). Stress can be caused by acute or chronic physical stressors, or by psychological and social stressors (Sapolsky, 1994). The majority of stressors tend to be those associated with psychological and social issues that are related to both personal and work lives (Bailey, et al., 1998).

For most people, stress is almost always considered to be a source of distress. Stress, almost always taken to be negative, has become a prominent concern in contemporary life, though the concept is rarely defined with any precision (Bryson, Warner-Smith, Brown, & Fray, 2007). However, not all stress can be considered as bad. Selye (1964, 1987) first used the term “eustress” which can be considered as “good stress.” He differentiated between eustress and distress. According to Selye (1987), distress occurs when the demands placed on the body (in the larger sense that includes both the physiological and the psychological aspects) exceed its capacity to expend energy in maintaining homeostasis. Selye (1987) proposed that whether a stressor should be a distress or eustress should be decided by an individual. Edwards and Cooper (1988) defined eustress as a positive discrepancy between perceptions and desires. Some amount of moderate stress may also be beneficial to employees and some employees may work best when they are moderately stressed. Therefore, it is for the employees to decide what is distress or eustress for them.

1.2. Sources of stress

Occupational Stress

Occupational stress is a major problem in the developed countries. In the UK the Health and Safety Executive (HSE, 2007) has estimated that half of the absenteeism which occurs at the work place is due to work stress. HSE (2007) defines work-related stress as the adverse reaction people have to excessive pressure or other types of demand placed on them.

Various definitions have been proposed to explain job related stress. Job stress can be defined as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. Job stress can lead to poor health and even injury (National Institute for Organisational Safety and Health (NIOSH), 1999). Job related stress can be conceptualized as an interactive imbalance between the individual and the individual's work environment (French, et al., 1974). Occupational stress can also be defined as the cumulative stressors in the workplace that cause psycho physiological symptoms and vulnerabilities to work injuries and disease (Stein, 2001). Job related stress seems to have emerged as a significant work place problem in a number of countries around the world (Robbins, et al., 1998; Siu, et al., 1999). As early as in 1951, Kurt Lewin observed that the characteristics of a person interact with environmental variables to determine the amount of strain experienced by individual employees and consequent effects on behaviour and health. The Person-Environment Fit (PE-Fit) model, developed by French (1973) and his colleagues, posits that strain occurs if an individual does not have abilities, skills, or resources needed to satisfy the demands of his/her work (French & Caplan, 1972; French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982). Occupational stress (OS) refers to this imbalance resulting from job-related demands and abilities (Langan-Fox & Poole, 1995). Occupational stress represents a real threat to quality of life for employees (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Dyck, 2001). Work stress occurs when there is a conflict either between two aspects of one's job, such as finishing a

large amount of work with unrealistic demands for speed and accuracy, or when job demands conflict with the demands of other roles and responsibilities, such as being at work when the employee needs to be at home with a sick parent or spouse (Halpern, 2005). On the basis of experience and research, NIOSH (1999) favours the view that working conditions play a primary role in causing job stress. However, the role of individual factors is not ignored. According to the NIOSH (1999) view, exposure to stressful working conditions (called job stressors) can have a direct influence on worker safety and health. Individual and situational factors that can help to reduce the effects of stressful working conditions include the following:

- Balance between work and family or personal life
- A support network of friends and co workers
- A relaxed and positive outlook

It is now generally acknowledged that stress is the product of an imbalance between appraisals of environmental demands and individual resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; MacKay, Cousins, Kelly, Lee & Caig, 2004). Role conflict, ambiguity, and overload frequently have been studied as antecedents of occupational stress (e.g., Brief & Aldag, 1976; Ivancevich, Matteson, & Preston, 1982; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Manning, Ismael, & Sherwood, 1981; Rosse & Rosse, 1981). Interest in work stress picked up speed in the 1960's and became heavily influenced by the work at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research (Ganster & Schaubroeck, 1991).

A number of studies have recognized the importance of occupational stress at the work place. For example, Narayanan, Menon and Spector (1999) examined stress-related incidents experienced in day-to-day work across three occupations rather than only a single occupation. They found that stressors differed across occupations and gender differences also emerged in their study. In his literature review of job stress among nurses, McVicar

(2003) found that the pattern of reported sources of stress for nurses may be changing, with relatively greater emphasis on conditions of employment, such as pay and shiftwork scheduling, which are likely to add to rather than replace previously noted sources of stress. A study in Singapore by Chan, Lai, Ko, & Boey (2000) found performance pressure and work-family conflicts as sources of work stress among professionals. These findings indicate that there are differences in work stress among different kinds of workers.

Some of the causes of occupational stress according to Murphy (1995) are:-

Categories of Job Stressors	Examples
Factors unique to the job	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • workload (overload and under load) • pace / variety / meaningfulness of work • autonomy (e.g., the ability to make your own decisions about our own job or about specific tasks) • shift work / hours of work • physical environment (noise, air quality, etc) • isolation at the workplace (emotional or working alone)
Role in the organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • role conflict (conflicting job demands, multiple supervisors/managers) • role ambiguity (lack of clarity about responsibilities, expectations, etc) • level of responsibility
Career development Career development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • under/over-promotion • job security (fear of redundancy either from economy, or a lack of tasks or work to do)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • career development opportunities • overall job satisfaction
Relationships at work (Interpersonal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supervisors • coworkers • subordinates • threat of violence, harassment, etc (threats to personal safety)
Organizational structure/climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation (or non-participation) in decision-making • management style • communication patterns

Figure 1.1: Causes of Occupational Stress

(Adapted from: Murphy, L. R., Occupational Stress Management: Current Status and Future Direction. *Trends in Organizational Behavior*, 1995, Vol. 2, 1-14).

1.2.1 Examples of categories of job stressors

Factors unique to the job

Factors unique to the job such as work underload and work overload are potential stressors for employees. Role overload and role underload are common features in organizational life. Role overload is a social condition in which the focal person is faced with obligations which, *taken as a set*, requires them to do more than they are able to do in the time available; role underload is a social condition in which the focal person is faced with obligations which, taken as a set, requires them to do considerably less than they are able to do in the time available (Sales, 1970). Role underload may be stressful to the underloaded individuals because of its presumably boring and uninteresting characteristics (Sales, 1970). It could also be stressful due to underutilization of employee skills. Role overload would naturally be more stressful than role underload to employees due to the

amount of work involved. Work overload can be quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative overload arises when job demands exceed the time available to complete the work. Qualitative overload on the other end refers to work role demands that are difficult or complex and involve expectations that exceed the skills and abilities (Parsuraman & Purohit, 2000).

The number of hours spent weekly in work activities has been shown to have a positive relationship with work-to-family conflict (Fu & Shaffer, 2001).

Division of labour at home

Statistics from several countries (Carlsen & Elm Larsen, 1993; Kahn, 1991) show that, because of the unequal division of labour at home, married women who are employed full time have a greater total workload than men have. Domestic overload occurs where demands created by housekeeping tasks exceed the amount of time available to complete those (Elloy & Smith, 2003). In Australia, women still tend to undertake more of the household chores and domestic duties (Bittman, 1991).

Autonomy

Autonomy has been identified as an important determinant of job satisfaction (Dwyer, et al., 1992; McCloskey, 1990; Roedel & Nystrom, 1988 & Seybolt, 1986). It has been known to increase team effectiveness by increasing team members' sense of responsibility and ownership of their work (Tata, 2000). According to Jackson (1989) high-autonomy jobs allow employees to choose how tasks are completed, when tasks are completed, and/or which tasks are completed. Low-autonomy jobs impose routine procedures for completing tasks; employees are controlled by rules that determine task priorities and sequencing (Jackson, 1989).

Role conflict and ambiguity

The effects of role conflict and role ambiguity have been researched by many researchers. Role conflict is incompatibility between the expectations of parties or between aspects of a single role. Role ambiguity is uncertainty about what actions to take to fulfil a role (Peterson et al., 1995). Role conflict refers to the existence of conflicting demands within a single role or between multiple roles. Role ambiguity implies a lack of information about a particular role and hence uncertainty regarding the expectations associated with the role (Gupta & Jenkins, 1985 & Lewis & Cooper, 1988). Role conflict and role ambiguity have been identified as antecedents of a number of job-related outcomes and behaviors (Behrman & Perreault, 1984; Steers, 1977; Steers & Mowday, 1981). These constructs have been associated with lower levels of job satisfaction, commitment, and job involvement as well as higher levels of tension and propensity to leave an organization (Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Both role conflict and role ambiguity can exist in the domestic and the work domain. This could help to explain why much of the research on dual-career role conflict has focused on work-family conflict as the primary source of role conflict (Elloy & Smith, 2003).

Role of supervision

One of the job related factors that is important in organizations is the role of supervision. Supervision has gradually shifted from the practice of controlling and directing workers to that of facilitating and supporting workers (Walton, 1992). Supporting workers has become increasingly important because the current work environment has resulted in a growing number of workers reporting work overload, stress-related illnesses, depression, substance abuse, and other personal and family problems (Banta, 1989; Hopkins, 1993; Myers, 1985; National Institute of Mental Health: NIMH, 1991; Rosse, Crown, & Feldman, 1990).

Supervisors are key people that workers go to for assistance when they are experiencing both work and personal problems (Hopkins, 1993; Rodgers & Rodgers, 1989). Moreover, many workers rely on their supervisors to help them manage their work and family responsibilities (Galinsky, 1989; Lambert & Hopkins, 1993). Therefore, workers want to know that supervisors will be sensitive and supportive of personal issues and problems because it has been argued that before an organization can truly be customer or client-centered, it must be employee-centered (Rapp & Poertner, 1992).

Supervisor support can be both emotional, involving the provision of sympathy and reassurance, and instrumental, involving practical assistance such as changing work or leave schedules to accommodate an employee's family demands (Beauregard, 2006). Such support undoubtedly has the potential to reduce work-to-family conflict, but may also directly influence employees' perceptions of family life interfering with work (Beauregard, 2006).

According to the Mayo Clinic Website (<http://www.mayoclinic.com/health/work-life-balance/WL00056>), there was a time when employees showed up for work Monday through Friday and worked eight to nine hours. The boundaries between work and home were fairly clear then. But the world has changed and, unfortunately, the boundaries have blurred for many workers. Reasons for this stated by the Mayo Clinic Staff (2006) include:

Global economy: As more skilled workers enter the global labor market and companies outsource or move more jobs to reduce labor costs, people feel pressured to work longer and produce more to protect their jobs.

International business: Work continues around the world 24 hours a day for some people. If you work in an international organization, you might be on call around the clock for troubleshooting or consulting.

Advanced communication technology: People now have the ability to work anywhere — from their home, from their car and even on vacation. And some managers expect that.

Longer hours: Employers commonly ask employees to work longer hours than they're scheduled. Often, overtime is mandatory. If you hope to move up the career ladder, you may find yourself regularly working more than 40 hours a week to achieve and exceed expectations. Moving up career ladders involves promotions and rewards. Organisational reward systems are a way in which businesses ensure that the more employees work, the more they can earn and the higher they can get promoted. Reward systems are concerned with two major issues: performance and rewards (Kerr & Slocum Jr., 2005). An employee receives feedback on his performance and good performance may get rewarded. Rewards may include bonus, salary increases, promotions, stock awards, and perquisites (Kerr & Slocum Jr., 2005).

Changes in family roles: Today's married worker is typically part of a dual-career couple, which makes it difficult to find time to meet commitments to family, friends and community.

Reviews of job stress interventions indicate that the most common approach is to focus on the individual workers and provide them with training on stress management techniques such as muscle relaxation, meditation and cognitive-behavioural skills, and a combination of these techniques (Murphy, 1988; Giga et al., 2003). However, this research will focus on job stress between partners, taking into consideration the individual as well as partner effects.

1.2.2 Theoretical Models of Occupational Stress

During the past 20 years many models of occupational stress have been developed to find out the circumstances under which stress can lead to strain, that is, the response to which is viewed as the result of an interaction between person and environment. Applied to occupational stress, the specific components of this tripartite transactional model are the work environment, the person, and strain (Guglielmi & Tatrow, 1998).

Person-Environment Fit (P-E fit) Model

This model, developed in the mid-1970s at the University of Michigan (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau, 1975; Van Harrison, 1978), suggests that strain is the result of a mismatch between the requirements and demands of the job and the person's real or perceived ability to meet those demands. Individual differences in perceptions, skills, tolerance for job pressure, and vulnerability to dysfunctional outcomes are the key modifiers of the stress-strain relationship. P-E fit theory suggests a lack of fit may result in physiological stress, or psychological stress, or both (Le Fevre, Matheny & Kolt, 2003). According to French, et al. (1991) generally, two kinds of fit are specified: (a) that between outcomes provided by the job and the needs, motives or preferences of the individual, and (b) that between the demands and requirements of the job and the skills and abilities of the worker.

Demand-Control Model

This model is also referred to as the job strain model, and was developed by Scandinavian researchers in the late 1970s (Karasek, 1979; Karasek, Baker, Marxer, Ahlbom, & Theorell, 1981; Karasek & Theorell, 1990). The two factors that determine job strain are *job demands* (workload, deadlines, etc.) and *decision latitude* (i.e., autonomy and control).

The 2 x 2 table that results from the combination of these two factors allows specific predictions about which work conditions will result in the least and in the most strain (Fletcher & Jones, 1993). The lowest amount of strain should be expected in jobs characterized by low demands and high decision latitude, whereas the greatest strain will result from the combination of high demands and low decision latitude. A key feature of the model is the synergistic relationship between demands and discretion, such that the combination of high demand and lack of control produces a strain effect greater than the additive effect of the two variables (Fletcher & Jones, 1993).

Effort-Reward Imbalance Model

In this model, proposed by Siegrist and his associates (Siegrist, 1996; Siegrist, Peter, Junge, Cremer, & Seidel, 1990), *effort* refers both to objective working conditions that are taxing (e.g., workload, deadlines) and to intrinsic attempts to cope and establish control. *Reward*, on the other hand, refers to job benefits, promotion prospects, and job security, as well as decision latitude and control. According to this model, when the amount of effort required and expended exceeds the occupational rewards attained the individual will experience stress and may suffer health problems (Siegrist, 1996). The model is based upon the premise that work-related benefits depend upon a reciprocal relationship between efforts and rewards at work (Vegchel, et al., 2005).

1.2.3 Non-occupational sources of stress

Personal sources of stress

Personal stress refers to what we do and what happens to us as individuals when we are not performing certain well-prescribed social roles such as parent, husband or employee (Wong, 1993). It includes factors like health, ageing, retirement, etc. The role of individual

characteristics, for example, social support, type 'A' behaviours and coping strategies, can also contribute to personal stress. Similarly, marital adjustment (dyadic adjustment), family cohesiveness, and even number of children can be considered as predictors of personal stress.

Sources of Family stress

Family stress is an umbrella term referring to a variety of stressors arising from relationships and the problems inherent in trying to meet child care, elder care, one's own needs and desires, spouse's needs etc. (Goldsmith, 2007). Family stress may be defined as an extension of individual stress applied to the family domain. Family stress, as such, can be defined as the state in which family members (Boss, 1987) and the family as a unit (McCubbin, H. I. & Patterson, 1982) are challenged by the environment in a way that overtakes their individual or collective resources and threatens the well-being of the family.

Family stress is a process of family change rather than simply an event or situation that happens in or to a family (Boss, 2002; Walker, 1985). Family stress encompasses all the difficulties of keeping the family together (Wong, 1993). Marital adjustment, house work, sibling rivalry, and even alcoholism and divorce can be considered as family stressors. Families engage in active processes to balance *family demands* with *family capabilities* as these interact with *family meanings* to arrive at a level of *family adjustment* or *adaptation* (Patterson, 1993). When there is an imbalance between family demands, family capabilities and adjustment, families experience stress. Koos (1946) has described the family crisis as a roller coaster ride. According to Koos, "The family moves through time doing its usual balancing act to maintain equilibrium until it encounters a crisis situation that plunges it down, down, down during a period of disorganization. Calling on

resources to halt their fall, family members reach a turning point somewhere along the line of descent and begin the climb back toward normalcy. Eventually, they recover by reaching a level of reorganization that allows them to get back to normal” (Koos, 1946). Family stress is about relationships and extends beyond the immediate family to include managing outside activities such as school events and sports and recreation (Goldsmith, 2007).

Daily hassles, life events, lack of family support, lack of family cohesion, etc. are some of the sources of family stress.

Environmental sources of stress

Environmental stress includes both living conditions and natural environments. Air and water pollution, inclement weather, crime-infested neighbourhoods, crowding and high noise level are all examples of environmental stress (Wong, 1993). Environmental stress is considered to be primarily a response to physical features of the environment. Extrinsic stress that results from changes in a-biotic factors such as temperature, climatic factors and chemical components, either naturally occurring or man-made, is regarded as the most important stress agent (Lindgren & Laurila, 2005; Sørensen et al., 2005). Commuting to work in crowded trains/buses, high levels of noise at the work place or even disorganized work places can contribute to environmental stress since this kind of stress is related to external factors in the environment. Therefore, environmental stress alone rarely leads directly to conflict. It usually contributes indirectly to conditions – political, social or economic – in society, which result in or exacerbate conflict (Department for International Development (DFID), 2000).

Financial sources of stress

Financial difficulties are a common form of stress in the lives of many (Fox & Chancey, 1998). While financial stress is more prevalent among lower socio economic status (SES) groups, households in the highest income brackets also experience financial stress (Siahpush & Karlin, 2005). For example, they may not be able to afford going out on a holiday once a year. Financial stress is perceived to be one of the most important sources of psycho-social stress because so many of the basic activities of daily life are associated with personal financial resources and their management (Peirce, Frone, Russel, & Cooper, 1996). Financial problems often affect an individual's level of work productivity and personal relationships (Williams, Haldeman, & Cramer, 1996). Furthermore, Larson (2007) states that financial stress is the number one cause of divorce among couples.

Sources of societal stress

Societal stress refers to problems experienced by large segments of a society or community, such as economic depression, poverty, drug abuse, racial tension and discrimination. These tend to be history-graded events (Wong, 1993). Reactions to societal stress may be understood in terms of the society itself – that is, governments, other agencies perhaps the populace at large manifesting itself in voting or rebelling – or as the responses of individuals to what environmental psychologists calls a cataclysmic event, one that severely affects the lives of many people at once (Suedfeld, 1997). At the societal or at the individual level breakdown can be said to occur when coping resources are exhausted but the stressor, whether distress or eustress, persists (Hobfall, 1986; Selye, 1978). This can happen because the stressor is so powerful or of such a nature that the society's or the person's strategies just don't work; or because there are too many stressors hitting the group at the same time; or the stress continues for too long (Suedfeld, 1997).

For immigrants, racial discrimination and lack of social support in a new country can be a major social cause of stress.

Sources of acculturative stress

Most immigrants may encounter many stressors during the process of immigration and adjustment to a new country. For example, adjusting to a totally new environment, learning a new language or frustration due to unemployment and lack of social support, etc. According to Hovey and Magana (2000) immigrants may feel pulled between the influence of traditional norms, values, and customs and the values, norms, and experiences in the new culture (e.g., parent–child conflict due to the child’s encountering of the new culture through school; role conflict due to a working mother).

Acculturative stress is discussed in some detail in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of this chapter.

1.3 Work stress and family stress: A complex interaction

Swiftly changing social environments confront citizens in many contemporary societies with situations which they find difficult to adjust to and to control (Bryson et al., 2007). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2002) states that critical social trends include: changed gender relations; an intensification of the demands of employment; increased individualization; and, in a neo-liberal economic environment with increased affluence and choice, more expansive social expectations of what constitutes a ‘good life’. While men are directly affected by these developments, women’s position has arguably changed more, and certainly with respect to ‘reconciling work and family life’, remains distinctive (OECD, 2002). Most research on the relationship between

work and family focuses on dual earner parents with children and the stress they may experience while performing or balancing multiple roles.

Work and family are two central domains in most adults' lives. Importance of work and family in adult men and women has been stated by many researchers. For example, Kelley and Kelley (1994) found that respondents stated their family as their main life interest. In recent years, research into the links between these two domains has grown tremendously because of the changes in the demographic composition of the workforce (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Lambert, 1990; Staines, 1980). According to Rapoport and Bailyn (1996) the struggle to have both a good family life (and personal life) and a good career arises from a dominant societal image of the ideal worker as "career-primary", the person who is able and willing to put work first and for whom work time is infinitely expandable. It was once believed that work life is separate from family life; this belief was referred to as the "myth of separate worlds" (Kanter, 1977). According to this belief, each domain is independent and could be studied independently. The separate world myth has since been modified through extensive research which has demonstrated that the two worlds are not independent and that the relationship between work and family is highly interdependent and dynamic (Huang, Hammer, Neal, & Perrin, 2004). Researchers today are recognizing the reciprocal effects of work life and home life. Not only do factors in the work sphere influence family life, but family matters also have strong effects on work life (Crouter, 1984). Therefore, work and family should be studied as an integrated whole rather than studying them separately. The understanding of this inter-connection between work and family life has led to a decrease in the traditional belief that work and family are separate spheres (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). According to Westman & Piotrkowski (1999) research in work and family spans multiple disciplines (e.g., Psychology, Sociology, Social work, Business and Nursing); within

Psychology, research has been carried out in clinical, industrial/organizational, developmental, and occupational health psychology (Westman & Piotrkowski, 1999).

Due to the entry of women into paid work, both men and women have to perform multiple roles. According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) the area of balancing paid work and family duties rests on two basic hypotheses. The role-strain hypothesis states that multiple roles create stressful conflict. The basic premise is that people have limited time and energy, and thus the more roles they have to fulfill, the greater the need to set priorities and negotiate with other parties and, consequently, the smaller the chance of meeting all expectations (Goode, 1960; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). On the other hand, the expansion hypothesis claims that multiple roles can serve as a buffer against stress (Sieber, 1974; Thoits, 1983). This happens because the alternative resources provided by multiple roles outweigh the possible stressful effects that double engagement has on wellbeing (Nordenmark, 2002).

Although stresses in the domains of work and home life are often studied in isolation, it is acknowledged that the relationship between the demands of work and home is an important source of occupational stress (Swanson, Power & Simpson, 1998). Further, Swanson et al. (1998) say that this relationship is conceived as being bidirectional, with satisfactions and stressors experienced at work having an impact on satisfactions and stress in home life, and vice versa. The relationship between home and work can alternatively be seen as 'compensatory', or negatively associated, where problems or deficiencies in one domain are compensated for in the other (Swanson, Power & Simpson, 1998). From the perspective of ecological systems theory, work and family are microsystems consisting of patterns of activities, roles, and interpersonal relationships experienced in networks of face-to-face relationships (Bronfenbrenner, 1989). This view is also supported by social scientists who argue that even if work and family are considered as separate, people do not

shed family roles, relationships and experiences as soon as they enter the realm of work (Zedeck, 1992). This happens because it is the same person who is the father, mother or worker (Burke, 1987).

Balancing work and family is not only important for women, but also for men. The different roles of men and women in work and family life affect the levels of their psychological and physical well-being (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992a; Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996; Shelton & John, 1996; Williams & Alliger, 1994). Work-family conflict (WFC) is discussed in some detail in chapter two.

Organizations too may be interested in the extent to which family interferes with work, work interferes with family and how this process occurs. It has become increasingly clear that each direction of conflict (work-to-family and family-to-work) may be predicted by different variables (Fu & Shaffer, 2001) and may also result in dissimilar outcomes (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Collins, 2001).

It is not only evident that family interferes with work and work interferes with family, but research has also shown that the work/home stress of one partner can also have an effect on the work/home stress of the other partner. This is called as a “crossover” effect. When stress in one domain of a partner interferes with the stress in another domain of the same partner, it is called as a “spillover” effect. Prior to the industrial revolution, the family economy operated as a cohesive unit; typically all family members, regardless of age or gender, were engaged in productive labour (Tilly & Scott, 1978). But with the growth of industrialization, this strategy persisted for a time, with wives, husbands, children, as well as adults, expected to earn their keep through wage labour (Moen & Yu, 2000). Industrialization has led to an increase in dual earner couples. Because of their dual responsibilities, working couples are particularly vulnerable to the problems of work-

family spillover, conflict, and crossover (Roehling & Moen, 2003). The concepts of crossover and spillover are discussed in detail in chapter 6 of this thesis.

1.4 Cultural differences in work stress and work-family conflict (Individualism v/s Collectivism)

As already mentioned, Australia is a land of immigrants. Therefore, the work-force in Australia consists of immigrants from various countries. Thus, experiences in the paid work force cannot be assumed to be the same for all.

Each culture is different and has its own unique stressors. Cultures vary not merely in terms of their physical, economic, and social environments, but also in terms of their values and ideology (Laungani, 1992). Cultures also depend on how people segregate life roles such as work and family (Hampton-Turner, 1998). People of different ethnic backgrounds possess different attitudes, values, and norms that reflect their cultural heritages (Cox, Lobel & McLeod, 1991). Cultures differ in the extent to which cooperation, competition, relationships or individualism is emphasized (Noordin, Williams, & Zimmer, 2002). Westerners live in largely industrialized societies and cultures where there is a clearly demarcated domain of work or “gainful employment” that is highly valued (Winefield, et al., 2002). A cultural belief about women’s and men’s roles combined with socio contextual circumstances are additional factors that likely shape experiences and consequences of work–family conflict (Korabik et al., 2003; Joplin et al., 2003). Most immigrants also like to maintain their cultural and ethnic identity. Ethnic identity can be conceived as a force that binds individuals to their old roots, whereas acculturation propels them towards new roots (Laroche et al., 1996). According to Hutnik (1991) the sense of ethnic identity emerges when an individual clarifies for him/herself his/her relationship to ethnicity/culture and learns to place him/herself within its socio-

cultural context. Many of our traditional ideas about “work” and “non work” are also culture bound (Winefield, A. H., et al., 2002).

One of the most important features of Indian culture is that it is a “Collectivist” culture (Sinha & Tripathi, 1994). Australian culture on the other hand, can be termed as being “Individualist.” A salient finding of past research has been that the cultural context of most of the Eastern societies, such as India and Japan, promote a collectivist or an “interdependent” self, whereas most of the Western societies, such as the U.S., Canada and Australia promote an individualistic or an “independent” self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Individualism has been defined as a self-orientation that emphasizes autonomy (Ralston et al., 1999). Collectivism on the other hand, has been defined as group-orientation that emphasizes group interests and compliance (Ho & Chiu, 1994). According to Noordin, Williams and Zimmer (2002) in collectivistic cultures, the emphasis is on belonging to an in-group. In return for their loyalty, individuals are provided with protection and security by the in-group. In individualistic cultures, everybody is supposed to take care of himself/herself (Noordin et al., 2002). Individualist cultures tend to promote an independent self that is autonomous and self-contained. Collectivist cultures, in contrast, tend to foster an interdependent self that is part of a comprehensive social relationship and that is partially defined by others in that relationship (Kurman, 2001).

Hofstede (1980, 1991) assumes that cultural values are stable over time, which implies that distances between national cultures are stable over time as well. Collectivist cultures also hold in high importance the honour of the family, and consider the family tradition as more important than individual rights or happiness (Triandis, 1994). However, researchers like Nordstrom (1991) have argued that practices and cultural values are converging and that cultural distance may no longer be relevant.

It can therefore be assumed that certain stressors are culture specific. In Indian culture, when a problem or stressor affects an individual, it affects the whole family or even the community. In adjusting to a new culture, immigrants may experience some degree of difficulty which may cause them significant distress, a situation commonly referred to as “acculturative stress” (Kosic, 2004). This can be even more acute when the adjustment is between individualist and collectivist cultures. Immigrants can sometimes face a “culture shock.” According to Adler (1975) culture shock is not only a form of alienation, causing a problem in adaptation and adjustment, but also includes an attempt to survive and acclimatize in a second culture environment, which could be biological, social or cultural.

When a person relocates from one country to another, it is not simply a matter of transporting one's belongings and finding a place to settle; the change in lifestyle can be a stressful process that includes the loss of an established social network and/or steady employment (Fitinger & Schwarz, 1981; Kuo & Tsai, 1986). When immigrants change their country of residence, they are expected to start looking for work immediately upon arrival in order to support their families. This naturally leads to stress, and the uncertainties arising from working in a new system challenge their well-being (Williamson, 1996). Immigrants then start looking for a social support system which would help them to integrate into the new system. This support system plays an important role in the work life of migrants since they have to interact with the local born people. When immigrants get this support, they will be less stressed on their jobs and also more satisfied with their jobs. However, In “Western” immigrant countries, conventional wisdom suggests that immigrants experience an adjustment period of several years or even generations until they are integrated into the host economy (Bauder, 2003). For example, although immigrants may be highly qualified they may still be excluded from occupying certain positions in

organizations due to having overseas qualifications and lack of local experience. In Canada there is evidence that many newly arriving immigrants are excluded from upper labour-market segments because they lack experience in the Canadian labour market (Pendakur & Pendakur, 1998; Bauder, 2003). This leads to immigrants switching occupations (de-skilling) and also to loss of social status.

Australia, however, has an open and aggressive immigration policy (DeVoretz, 2006). In recent years there has been increased emphasis on skilled migration in Australia's immigration policies and programmes. The government has sought to increase the number and proportion of skilled migrants to 'balance' the immigration programme (Khoo & Mak, 2000).

According to the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) in Australia, the General Skilled Migration programme is for people who are not sponsored by an employer and who have skills in particular occupations required in Australia. The DIAC further states that all applicants must be over 18 and under 45 years of age, with good English language ability and recent work experience. They must also have qualifications and skills for an occupation listed on Australia's skilled occupation list (SOL). Many skilled immigrants from countries like India and China have taken advantage of the General Skilled Migration visa category and have permanently settled in Australia.

In Australia, unemployment rates tend to be only slightly higher among immigrants than for the Australian born people. ABS (2007) data shows that immigrants have a 5 percent rate of unemployment compared to the Australian born people which are 4 percent. Wooden (1994) explains that there are four factors for this. They are - proficiency in English, period of residence, refugee status, and country of obtaining educational qualifications. When people stay for a long time in a country, they are at par with the local

born people. However, overseas qualifications can sometimes be a major problem in finding jobs.

Census data from Australia reveals that in November 2007, 68% of recent migrants were employed compared to 66% of those born in Australia. Recent migrants with skilled visas (example, Indians) were more likely to be employed than other recent migrants, with 79% of skilled recent migrants employed in November 2007, compared with 58% for those that held family visas and 67% for all recent migrants combined. Males also had a higher rate of employment compared with females (ABS, 2007).

1.5 Acculturative stress and cross-cultural adaptation

Acculturative stress is caused by the difficulties experienced in the process of acculturation and is inversely related to psychological and physical well being (Berry, 1998; Berry & Kim, 1988; Berry, Poortinga, Segall & Dasen, 1992). Cross-cultural adaptation is defined as *a dynamic interplay between stress-adaptation and growth* (Kim, 1988).

Anthropologists define acculturation as a process of bidirectional change that takes place when two ethno-cultural (to embrace both ethnic and cultural values) cultures come in contact with one another (Thomas & Choi, 2006). The process of acculturation or adapting to the new culture was once perceived as the immersion of immigrants into the new culture. However, current acculturation models focus on the selective and multidimensional nature of the immigrant experience and process (Thomas & Choi, 2006). Some researchers argue that immigrants do not simply shed their old or native values for new ones, but rather select, shift and modify to adapt to the new environment (Buriel, 1993; Mendoza, 1989). Despite differing views, there is general consensus among researchers that acculturation is a learning process whereby at least some of the cultural

patterns of the host country are adopted (Khairullah & Kairullah, 1999; Choi, 1997; Kang, 1996).

Integration and assimilation are closely related constructs identified by researchers in the continuum of acculturation process. According to Berry (2003), integration is valuing one's own culture while at the same time interacting with the host culture. Assimilation, on the other hand, is giving up one's original culture in favour of the host culture. Ethnic assimilation can be defined as a process of boundary reduction that can occur when members of two or more societies or of smaller cultural groups meet (Yinger, 1981).

Results of studies of acculturative stress have varied widely in the level of difficulties found in immigrant groups. Early views were that culture contact and change inevitably led to stress (Berry & Annis, 1974). However, the current view is that the level of stress depends on a number of factors such as acculturation attitudes, phase of acculturation, and cultural pluralism in the host society (Krishnan & Berry, 1992). Sometimes, when two cultures (for example, Australia and Canada) are similar in certain ways, the process of acculturation becomes easier. According to Horenczyk (1996) greater cultural differences do not favor adaptation and that such differences may affect the choice of acculturation strategies. Economic and social conditions and opportunities in the host country can also lead to easy adjustment and settlement of immigrants.

According to some researchers (for example, Berry, 1994), there are four major stages of adjustment in immigrants. In the first stage immigrants are excited at having arrived in the country of their choice. The second stage is the stage of "culture shock" in which immigrants find differences between their own culture and the host country's culture. The third stage involves a period of adjustment where the immigrants begin to feel comfortable in the dominant culture. The fourth and last stage is the assimilation stage

where the immigrant has settled down comfortably and begins to feel integrated into the new culture.

Berry (1994, p.129) defines acculturation as ‘a culture change that results from continuous, first hand contact between two distinct cultural groups’. Berry and his colleagues maintain that other psychological processes such as ‘behavioral shifts’, ‘culture shedding’, ‘culture shock’, and ‘acculturative stress’ are also experienced in varying degrees by an individual undergoing acculturation (Berry, 1998). According to Lay and Nguyen (1998), acculturation specific hassles include perceptions of prejudice and discrimination, difficulties communicating in a new language, problems with family members, and conflict with other members of the cultural group. Immigrants are also expected to experience the same types of general hassles encountered every day by all individuals, such as financial worries, future decisions, and school-related problems (Lay & Nguyen, 1998). Definitions of acculturation broadly include the psychological and social change that people experience in their adjustment to a new culture. The concept has a long history in the social and behavioral sciences, and most scholars agree that it consists of multidimensional, complex social and psychological processes at both the individual and the family levels (Cabrera et al., 2006; Miranda et al., 2000; Valentine and Mosley, 2000). Researchers have added English speaking ability as a measure of assimilation and found that English language ability, whether learned before or after immigration, represents a means to upward mobility (Kossoudji, 1988).

A number of studies conducted in the U.S. and Canada indicate that although immigrants from India have adapted significantly to their environment, they have retained their taste for traditional food, along with their values concerning home, family, children, religion, and marriage (Wakil, Siddique , & Wakil, 1981; Naidoo, 1985, 1986; Saran, 1985; Sadowsky & Carey, 1987, 1988; Moghaddam & Taylor, 1987; Kurian, 1989; Segal,

1991; Kar et al., 1995/1996). In addition, many scholars claim that Asian Indian immigrants have transplanted old-world gender ideologies and clearly dichotomized gender roles in their adopted country of residence (Naidoo, 1980, 1985, 1986; Buchignani, 1983; Sodowsky et al., 1987, 1988; Ralston, 1988; LaBrack, 1988; Kurian, 1989; Agarwal, 1991; Kar et al., 1995/1996).

However, Hermans and Kempen (1998) have argued that in a period of increasing globalization, the rapid creation of multinationals, massive flows of transmigration, and border crossings, acculturation becomes increasingly complicated. Rather than thinking of immigrants as moving in a linear trajectory from culture A to culture B they suggest we think of cultures as 'moving and mixing' (p. 1117). Thus immigrants may not only need to define themselves vis-à-vis the dominant host majority but may also need to consider their relationship with indigenous host minorities as well as with previously established immigrant communities (including their own) who have retained aspects of their ethno cultural distinctiveness within the host country (Bourhis et al., 1997).

1.6 History of Indian immigration to Australia

Migration is a natural phenomenon and can also be found in animals and birds, besides being found in human beings. According to Jayaram (1998) two unique factors need to be recognized in human migration: Migration does not only mean the physical movement of people. Migrants carry with them a socio-cultural baggage which consists among other things of (a) a predefined social identity, (b) a set of religious beliefs and practices, (c) a framework of norms and values governing family and kinship organization and food habits, and (d) language. Jayaram (1998) also contends that migrants are not totally cut off from their homeland and they themselves retain physical and mental contact with their homeland.

A pervading theme of Australian history until quite recently has been the desire of Australians to see their continent more speedily populated (Pope & Withers, 1993). Population growth -which immigration was seen as accelerating - was desired for what it was believed it would bestow: stronger defense and economic development (Pope & Withers, 1993). According to a report by Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, (DIMIA, 2006) recent modeling by Access Economics confirms that the Australian Government Budget gains significantly from immigration. Continuation of the Migration Programme at the 2005-06 level would yield a cumulative benefit in excess of \$5 billion over four years and \$35 billion over 10 years (DIMIA, 2006).

Australia has a very interesting history. It has an indigenous population, a colonial (British convicts) past and a population of immigrants from over two hundred countries around the world. According to Hartley (1995), “The complex set of values, attitudes, behaviours and life experiences which people bring with them (their cultural background); the circumstances of migration; the impact of migration itself, which involves leaving behind an environment that is familiar and usually integral to how people define themselves; and Australian social and economic conditions on and following arrival.”

Historical evidence from the Department of Immigration in Australia states that Indians were brought to Australia between 1800 and 1860 initially to work as labourers and domestics. Between the years 1860 and 1901 more Indians arrived and worked as agricultural labourers and as hawkers in country towns. A number of Indians also worked in the gold fields. The Indians were mainly Sikhs and Muslims from the Punjab region in northwest India and the majority settled in Woolgoolga in New South Wales. Today, the Sikh settlement in Woolgoolga is one of the largest Indian rural communities in Australia (DIMIA, 2003).

Further DIMIA states that as early as in 1792, trade between India and Australia commenced and ships carrying Indian products, docking out of Calcutta and Madras (now Kolkata & Chennai), also had Indian crews on board (Bilimoria & Ganguly-Scrase, 1988). The East India Company achieved some success in its trade with British companies operating in Australia (Blainey, 1983, p.52). Australia's first national drink, Bengal Rum, was introduced in this way. Thus in the early years of 1800s trading ships brought loads of Indians and Chinese crews to the shores of an increasingly cosmopolitan settlement in the vicinity of Botany Bay in NSW (Bilimoria & Ganguly-Scrase, 1988). By far, the larger number of Indians came during the 19th and early 20th centuries under the scheme of recruited labourers or "coolies" as they were called, destined for the colonies. They were brought to assist with pastoral developments and to work on sugarcane plantations, and were later deployed in dairy, maize and wheat farming. Migration from India was curtailed after the Australian Government introduced the Immigration Restriction Act 1901 (DIMIA, 2003). Following India's independence from Britain in 1947, the number of Anglo-Indians and India born British citizens immigrating to Australia increased (DIMIA, 2003).

In 1966, the Australian Government changed its policies to permit non-European Indians to immigrate to Australia. European Indians are those individuals whose fathers or male ancestors are of European descent. Non-European Indians on the other hand are those who have no European ancestry and have a "dark" complexion. The new arrivals included many professionals, such as doctors, teachers, computer programmers and engineers. Unlike the early settlers, those arriving after the 1950s came from many parts of India and belonged to various religious, linguistic and cultural groups (DIMIA, 2003).

According to the 2001 Census, there were 95 460 India-born people living in Australia, making up nearly 2.3 percent of overseas born population in Australia (ABS,

2007). The 2006 Census results show that there are now 147 110 Indian immigrants in Australia, an increase of 54.1% from the 2001 census results. The largest number of Indians in Australia had settled in New South Wales followed by Victoria. The census results (ABS, 2007) also reveal that 94% of Indian immigrants spoke English very well. This is an important factor which helps in the settlement of non-English speaking people in English speaking countries. Out of the 90 050 Indian immigrants who were employed, 37.4% were employed in highly skilled jobs as compared to the total Australian population which recorded 28.7% people in the same kind of jobs (ABS, 2007). Moreover, Indians were also highly educated with 60.2% having a diploma or higher level qualifications. These higher level qualifications include degree level or higher, advanced diploma or diploma level qualifications.

Today, the India born community is culturally diverse. Over one third of the population works as professionals. The vibrant cultures of India are maintained through a range of organisations and events, including the Australia India Society of Victoria and the Academy of Indian Music (Museum Victoria).

Figures 1.1 and 1.2 show the difference in qualifications and kinds of occupation among Australians and Indians in Australia respectively. In terms of qualifications, more India-born people have degrees and higher qualifications. More India-born people have professional jobs; however, more Australia-born people have managerial jobs.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 33
of the print copy of the thesis held in
the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 1.2 Level of qualifications for Indian and Australian population

Source: Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2006.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 34
of the print copy of the thesis held in
the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 1.3 Percentage of Australians and Indians in various jobs in Australia

Source: Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2006.

1.7 Need for the studies

The concept of work and family is of specific interest in Australia since it is a country of immigrants and cultural heterogeneity. Australia has accommodated many migrants from across the world and therefore there is a need to explore the life of these immigrants after immigration. Moreover, although there have been rich insights into theories of work-family conflict, there have not been any consistent results. For example, while highlighting some gaps in the work-family linkages, Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002) have identified the narrow scope of research on gender differences in work-family experiences and outcomes based on gender-role stereotypes. Furthermore, there is also overemphasis on the individual level of analysis and limited examination of dyadic level relationships and crossover effects from one partner to another (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002). Another

limitation of the existing literature is that most of the studies have been conducted in western settings involving westerners. There have been very few studies which have studied Indians settled in an individualistic culture, especially in Australia. Again, very few studies have successfully investigated how dual earner immigrant parents achieve a balance between their work and life. Another unexplored issue is whether job demands at work and home would have the same impact on women and men among couples from non-English speaking backgrounds.

One other limitation of past work-family research is that almost all studies have placed importance on working mothers, but very few have taken the attitudes of working fathers into consideration.

Many models of family stress have not been very useful in studying stress in couples. It has been suggested that *interactional* patterns within couples should be examined to understand better what transpires between spouses, how they affect each other, and how the marital relationship is affected by such stressful events (Bodenmann, 1997; Karney & Bradbury; Lavee, 2004). Crossover research too mostly demonstrates crossover from husbands to wives and not vice versa.

To sum up, it can be said that there are three areas of work-family research that need attention. First, some attention should be given to the stress and work-family conflict of immigrants of collectivist cultures (like India) migrating to individualist cultures (like Australia). Second, work-family research must also focus on immigrant men/husbands and not just on immigrant women since not a lot is researched on *dual earner immigrant* couples. The contribution of husbands, especially when the wife is working cannot be ignored. Although there has been a lot of research on the psychological and social adjustment of Indian immigrants in Australia (see, Lakha & Stevenson, 2001; Voigt-Graf, 2004), there have been no studies investigating job stress and work-family conflict among

skilled Indian immigrants in Australia. Third, an area which so far has not received much attention especially in Australia is the study of crossover effects of factors like job stress, fatigue and lack of family cohesion/support from one partner to another (gender differences). This becomes very important as more and more couples with children are adopting the dual earner policy. Moreover, most crossover research in the past has taken into consideration only *unidirectional* crossover, i.e. from only one partner. However, this research has studied the *bi-directional* effects of crossover. There has also been no substantial research on crossover and spillover among dual earner couples in Australia. The present research thesis will therefore try to address these gaps in the literature.

The next chapter (chapter 2) will be a literature review on the concepts of work-family conflict and family-work conflict with reference to gender. A comparison of Australian women and Indian immigrant women in Australia will also be made. This is a pilot study and will be study one of the research. Chapter three will discuss the methodology, results and discussion of study one.

Chapter four (study two) of this research thesis will include a review of the literature on work-family conflict and occupational stress among Indian immigrant men in Australia. This will include a discussion on division of labour in households and a comparison will also be made between Australian men and Indian immigrant men in the Australian work-force. Similarly, the effects of gender and culture on job satisfaction and job stress will also be discussed. This chapter will be followed by a chapter (chapter five) on the methodology, results and a discussion of the results of study two.

Chapter six (study three) will deal with a review of the literature on crossover and spillover among dual earner couples. This will also include a discussion on the role of gender in the crossover and spillover process. The methodology employed, results and discussion of the results will be discussed in detail in chapter seven.

The last chapter (chapter 8) of this research thesis will include a general discussion of the whole thesis, limitations of this research and implications for future research will also be discussed.

CHAPTER 2

Study 1

Occupational Stress and Work-Family Conflict among Indian Immigrant Women in Australia

2. Overview

The aim of this chapter is to introduce the reader to the various theories that explain the causes of work-family conflict. First, the concept of gender, work and stress has been introduced. Next, the relationship between paid work and family life (work-family conflict) has been explained along with sex differences in work-family conflict. This is followed by a discussion on the theories of work family conflict and gender differences in work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Since the major focus of the study is on Australian and Indian immigrant women, reasons for work-family conflict in Australian women are discussed and then a comparison between Australian and Indian women in the Australian work-force has been made. The last part of this chapter discusses the need for the study along with the aims and hypotheses of the first study.

2.1 Gender, work and stress

Due to the entry of a growing number of married women with children in the paid work-force, an important research question has always been whether paid employment is beneficial or non beneficial for women. Paid employment is no longer considered as the sole responsibility of men. Psychological research has generally accepted uncritically the assumption that paid work will necessarily be problematic for women and not for men; it assumes that, for women, paid

work must be added to their “natural” roles as unpaid domestic workers and parents. Women who occupy all three of these roles certainly report strain and conflict (e.g., Spurlock, 1995).

There are many reasons for women entering the paid work-force. Many studies have indicated that employment can be beneficial for women. For example, a number of studies have suggested that adding an employment role to that of the homemaker benefits the health and wellbeing of women (Baruch & Barnett 1986, & Kessler & McRae 1986, cited in Aston & Lavery, 1993, p. 2 & 3., Verbrugge 1982 cited in Hibbard & Pope, 1987, p.88, Horin, 1995, p.1). Other research also indicates that employed women are noticeably healthier than non-employed and that professional women consistently rank highest in all measures of mental health (Faludi, 1994; Wolcott & Glezer, 1995).

Employment has many benefits for women, including increased financial resources, a sense of achievement, and reduced social isolation, all of which can benefit health. Some research has indicated that women who occupy multiple roles (mother, worker, spouse) experience better mental and physical health than women who occupy few roles, perhaps because with multiple roles, the stresses of one role may be offset by the rewards of another (Piotrkowski, Keita, & Becker, 1997). Women also work for economic reasons, to get out and do something and for communication and friendship. Some women also like challenges since they have a need for achievement. When women work, the family enjoys the psychological and financial benefits. Many women work because they are qualified and have the necessary skills. Work also forms a part of a woman’s identity. Paid work has been considered as a “profoundly important source of social status and self esteem” (Probert, 1998). Being an employee and co-worker may also increase a woman's contact with people who can provide social support, as well as opportunities for enhancing self-esteem and a sense of control

(Repetti, Matthews, & Waldron, 1989). In fact, in a survey by the Australian Institute of Family Studies (AIFS) 64% of women answered “yes” to the question, “If you had a reasonable living without having to work, will you still prefer to have a paid job?” (Glezer & Wolcott, 1997).

According to Glass & Fujimoto (1994) labour force participation provides material rewards in the form of wages and benefits, and may provide social rewards in the form of prestige, external recognition, personal autonomy, and interpersonal authority. For these reasons, labour force participation is believed to increase individual self esteem and marital power, thus explaining the general relationship between employment and improved mental health (Glass & Fujimoto, 1994). This would mean that when women enter the paid workforce, they would have the power to make their husbands share domestic responsibilities with them. Yet, as early as in 1966, Gavron concluded from her study of middle- and working-class wives, "House wives, no matter how arduous housework actually proves to be, do not feel themselves to be at work". Therefore, marital power depends upon the husbands and wives and how the husband looks at his wives' paid employment.

Work plays a major role in people's lives and wields an important influence on their sense of well-being and identity (Barling, 1990; Feather, 1990). It provides a medium by which people identify themselves in society (Szymanski, Ryan, Merz, Trevino, & Johnston-Rodriguez, 1996); and can be influenced by economic, societal, cultural and individual factors. Researchers like Winefield, Winefield, Tiggemann and Goldney (1993), have shown that work is integrally involved in the process of identity development and self-esteem. Kielhofner (1995) has noted that a person's identity is a function of his or her validated social roles, particularly those associated with occupation.

Despite research showing advantages of women's employment, there is opposing research on the participation of women in the labour force. For example, employment may subject individuals, especially women to close supervision, harassment, unrewarding work tasks, child care difficulties, and the like. Similarly, lower pay, more part-time and casual work and less security are also characteristic features of women's employment. Women's jobs, in particular, are more likely to exhibit these negative features, limiting the positive effects of employment (Ross & Mirowsky, 1988). According to French (1992), family responsibility involves caring and nurturing of others, amongst a myriad of other tasks. Whether married or single, it is women who are chiefly responsible for the physical and emotional tasks of looking after others, especially children and elderly relatives. Employed mothers frequently experience stresses such as difficulty in finding adequate childcare, or having a sick child minded, and guilt over lack of time for their families (Russell & Schofield, 1989).

The role of the extended family can play an important role in helping women deal with the tasks of looking after their family, children and work. Extended families can provide a support system whereby some of the responsibilities can be shared by other members of the family. For example, due to the high cost of child care and lack of subsidy in Britain, parents rely on external unpaid sources like relatives, friends and neighbours to take care of their children (Dex, Clark & Taylor, 1995). In their study of families in four Asian countries, Asis et al. (1995) found that the contribution of the elderly towards household chores, particularly care of grandchildren, was recognized across all the participating countries – Taiwan, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. However, due to factors like globalization of jobs, immigration, etc., the role of the extended family has also changed. Many families have become nuclear, i.e. only parents and children and no other extended family living together.

Similarly, many families have now also become non-traditional and have thus lost the help and support from their extended family.

The effects of gender on work-related stress have been investigated in a number of studies (Jick & Payne, 1980; Quick & Quick, 1984; Quick et al., 1997). Jick and Mitz (1985) reviewed 19 studies of gender differences in occupational distress in the workplace in which men experienced more severe physical distress. According to Baruch, Biener and Barnett (1987) because stress research has tended to focus on men, the workplace has both implicitly and explicitly been identified as the primary stressor. They further state that the home, in contrast, has been viewed as a sanctuary, as a benign environment in which one recuperates from problems at work. Thus, typically female roles, such as wife, mother, homemaker, are somehow 'natural' and free from undue stress (Baruch, Biener & Barnett, 1987). In a meta-analysis of the literature on this concept, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) reported that conflict between work and family was a stronger predictor of life satisfaction for women than men. Gender differences in occupational stress were also reported by Narayanan, Menon and Spector (1999), who found that interpersonal conflict played a greater role in causing job stress for women than for men.

Barnet and Baruch (1985) pointed to the importance of role overload for women, which they define as the general sense of having so many role demands or obligations that the individual feels unable to perform them all adequately. These authors and others (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Crosby, 1991) obtained results suggesting that employed mothers are frequently vulnerable to this type of stress (Erdwins, Buffardi, Casper & O'Brien, 2001). Many of the studies on women concern employment and occupational status or rough measures of workload in relation to a number of dependent variables, the implication being

that employment or occupation *per se* is stressful for women (Haw, 1982). It is certainly not the case that more roles automatically mean more stress. For example, Forgays and Forgays (1993) found that women who combined paid work, marriage, and motherhood were actually less stressed than married mothers without paid employment. Multiple role occupancy provides both stress and satisfaction in women's lives; several researchers have shown that women with multiple roles report both more strain and more satisfaction than those occupying only one (e.g., Gerson, 1985; Park & Liao, 2000).

The traditional family balanced work and family interaction by gender segregated roles. In recent times, compelling economic and ideological reasons have rapidly propelled mothers into the work place and this has been accompanied by the markedly slower entry of male workers into domestic and nurturing roles (Ferree, 1990; Pleck, 1984). Although there has been some research into the husband's participation in home life (Coltrane & Ishii-Kuntz, 1992), most of the research has focused on the worker-mother role (Menaghan & Parcel, 1990). The reason for this is not simply the rate at which changes have occurred for female roles but the ramifications this shift has for the organization of the family including spousal well-being, child development and household division of labour (Menaghan & Parcel, 1990). Indeed, many authors feel that adding work demands to continuing home responsibilities presents role overload or role conflict for females (White, 1995).

Children need care and attention which varies according to their age. Very young children may need more care and attention than older children. Supervision and care of children may interfere with the time a mother can spend on employment. The presence of children can complicate the process of balancing work and family demands. In addition to the organization of child care and after school activities, children become ill and parental time and

energy are needed for ordinary daily nurturing and support (Glezer & Wolcott, 1999). Although there are jobs where women can work and take care of their children simultaneously, such jobs are not the norm in industrialized countries (Brewster & Rindfuss, 2000). Therefore, women have to manage multiple roles which are difficult and inevitably lead to stress and aversive feelings (Frone, 2003).

Traditionally, top management positions have always been occupied by men rather than women. Yet today, more women are entering into this male-dominated area. However, although there are an increasing number of women who enter the workforce and an increasing number of managerial positions, women's access to leadership positions remains limited (Eagly et al., 2003). Research has shown that most women face stress due to their entry into this male dominated world and the comparison of their experiences with those of their male counterparts (Davidson & Cooper, 1983). The concept of the "glass ceiling" (Davidson & Cooper, 1983) stops women from climbing up career ladders and occupying leadership positions. Reasons for this include gender role discrimination by society and their family. Sometimes, women themselves do not want to achieve leadership positions. Davidson and Cooper (1983) have identified the following five major sources of work stress in women employees:

1. Factors intrinsic to the job

These factors include job overload and underload, managerial leadership and being able or unable to attend training. For example, although it is myth, training is considered as a waste on women as eventually they will leave work for marriage and children (Crampton & Mishra, 1999). Leadership roles have always been viewed as distinctively male in nature (Alimo-

Metcalfe, 1998). This can be a disadvantage for women. Apparently, women can be labelled 'bossy' whereas for the same behaviours men are labelled 'leaders'. (Davidson & Cooper, 1983).

Role overload generally occurs when women are unable to balance their work and family roles. Numerous studies have found that women managers are frequently subjected to work overload due to the pressure to work harder to prove themselves against their male counterparts (Larwood & Wood, 1977; Terborg, 1977; Harlan & Weiss, 1980). A British survey (Hunt, 1975) of management attitudes and practices towards women at work revealed that most men held the view that a woman is likely to be inferior to a man as an employee. Although there is no evidence to show that women are less efficient managerial leaders than men (Petty & Bruning, 1980), problems can evolve from male and female subordinates who feel uneasy working for a female superior.

2. Role in the organization

Women managers are more susceptible to role stress than men are due to the multiple role demands inherent in running a career and a home and family. This happens because women balance work and family roles together. Irrespective of their position in organizations, married women with children usually occupy a higher level of household responsibilities. Larwood and Wood (1977) believe time demands impose a tighter schedule on the personal lives of executive women than on men, the women being less able to relax at the end of the day. Moreover, Ritzer (1977) noted that it was the women in upper levels of the organization who tended to experience significantly greater amounts of 'internal strain', due to conflicting role demands on their time and energy.

3. Relationships at work

Studies propose that as a minority group, females may face particular difficulties and problems in their relationships at work (Harlan & Weiss, 1980). In a questionnaire survey by Marilyn Davidson, 135 senior female executives listed in *Women's Who's Who*, one question dealt with the level of stress experienced in working relationships with superiors, peers and subordinates. The highest degrees of stress were reported in working relationships with superiors. The sex of the superior did not influence the level of stress faced by the woman.

4. Career Development

This refers to the impact of over promotion, under promotion, status incongruities, lack of job security, thwarted ambition, etc. (Cooper & Marshall, 1978; Marshall & Cooper, 1979). Satisfaction with promotional opportunities and salary has been found to be associated with increases in self esteem and job commitment (Bhagat & Chassie, 1981). Nevertheless, women are generally found clustered in low status management and are therefore more prone to the frustrations linked with blocked career development (Thakray, 1979).

5. Organizational structure and climate

This includes such factors as restrictions on behaviour, office policies, lack of effective consultation and no participation in the decision making process (Davidson & Cooper, 1981b). It has been found that women in management often find it difficult to break into the male-dominated '*old boy*' network and therefore are denied the contacts, opportunities, policy information, etc. which it provides. In fact, there is now a policy movement originating from

the USA which advocates networking for women in the professions (Davidson & Cooper, 1983).

The relationship between gender, work and stress is complex. Several factors appear to magnify the impact of stress on women, chief among them being the preponderant role that women still play in the provision of family care (International Labour Organization, ILO, 2002). It is well established that the total workload of women who are employed full-time is higher than that of full-time male workers, particularly where they have family responsibilities (ILO, 2002).

In addition to their family responsibilities, other factors also tend to make women more vulnerable to work stress (ILO, 2002). These include:

- Lower levels of control in their jobs, since the great majority of women still tend to occupy less senior jobs than men;
- The proliferation of women in high stress occupations, such as nursing, teaching and work with visual display units (VDUs);
- The higher proportion of women who work in precarious forms of employment. According to Vasco et al. (2003) precarious forms of employment include forms of work involving atypical employment contracts, limited social benefits & statutory entitlements, job security, low job tenure, low wages & higher risks of ill-health;
- The prejudice and discrimination suffered by many women who are in more senior positions, such as managerial jobs, both as a result of organizational and corporate policy and from their colleagues at work.

Although fathers are spending more time with their children and on house hold chores than they did 20 years ago, the gender gap is still significant. Galinsky and Bond (1997) found

that 80% to 90% of married working women reported primary responsibility for cooking, cleaning, and shopping, and that two thirds had primary responsibility for bill paying. Even when child care or household cleaning services were used, women still had responsibility for their arrangement. Working women still retain primary responsibility for dependent care and household chores. Women are far more likely than men to report taking time from work to address their children's needs (83% v 22%), and are more likely to have elder care responsibilities (Galinsky & Bond, 1997).

Women's participation in the workforce is increasing all around the world (cf., Adler & Izraeli, 1994; Davidson & Burke, 2004). This trend is resulting in the transformation of traditional gender roles and raising concerns about the psychological well-being of women and men who are experiencing role overload and work-family conflict (Elloy & Smith, 2003; Staines, Pleck, Shepard, & O'Connor, 1978). Women, today are educated, have some work experience and thus would like to have more desirable jobs which are better paying and also have better career prospects. However, only a minute proportion of those in the senior ranks of occupational hierarchies in the corporate world are women, even though in most industrialized countries women constitute close to (and in some cases more) than 40 percent of the labour force (Talmud & Izraeli, 1999). As women increase their paid work time, they do not achieve a corresponding one-to-one reduction in their unpaid work hours. Nor have men increased their share of unpaid work at the same rate that women have increased their share of paid work (Colman, 1998; Sirianni & Negrey 2000). Neither the division of workload at home nor the "male career model" for success on the job has changed, putting women at a disadvantage in the workplace (Sirianni & Negrey, 2000).

2.2 Introduction to work-family conflict (WFC)

Understanding the relationship between work and family has been the focus of a lot of research since work and family are two interrelated aspects of most adults' lives. In recent years, research into the links between these two domains has grown tremendously because of the changes in the demographic composition of the workforce (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Lambert, 1990). Due to the entry of more married women with children into the work-force, the topic of how families balance their work and family lives has been an interesting subject of research. Traditionally, work and family were considered as separate domains (Frone, 2003). It meant that employers did not consider the importance of employees' family life relevant to their work life. However, today this concept has changed. Work and family are no longer considered as different, but rather linked with one another.

Over the past 20 years there has been a virtual explosion of research on the relationship between paid work and family life, as economic and social factors have combined to change work and family roles (Westman & Piotrkowski, 1999). The influx of women into the work place has led to a growing recognition that work and family are not completely separate spheres of life (Piotrkowski, 1979; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971). According to Rapoport and Bailyn (1996), 'The struggle to have both a good family life (or personal life) and a good career arises from a dominant societal image of the ideal worker as "career primary", the person who is able and willing to put work first and for whom work time is infinitely expandable.'

Work and family conflict has been defined as "a form of inter role conflict in which role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect"

(Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Thus, when one devotes extra time and energy to the work role (or the family role), the family role (or the work role) is assumed to suffer. This leads to role overload. Roles provide individuals with a framework on which to develop a sense of meaning, purpose and agency (Reitzes & Mutran, 1994). Role overload is said to occur when the number of demands from all roles makes satisfactory performance in each role unlikely (Berger, Cook, DelCampo, Herrera, & Weigel, 1994). Many researchers have distinguished between work-interference-with-family (WIF or WFC) and family-interference-with-work (FIW or FWC) (e.g., Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991). WIF occurs when work related activities interfere with the home domain, for e.g. changing plans with family members because of the job or not being able to spend time with the family due to job demands. FIW is said to arise when family or home responsibilities interfere with the work domain, for e.g. spending time at the job making arrangements for family members, or feeling tired on the job due to family demands. Although WFC and FWC are strongly correlated with one another, they are conceptually and empirically distinct constructs (Duxbury, Higgins & Lee, 1994). Therefore, predictors of WFC (job demands, job responsibilities, etc.) are work domain variables whereas predictors of FWC (number of children living at home, marital status, etc.) are mainly family domain variables (Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998).

According to some research (e.g., Adams, King, & King, 1996) work-family conflict can be considered as being bi-directional, i.e. work can interfere with family and family can interfere with work (see Figure 2.1). However, recent researchers like Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) believe that WFC can be multidimensional with effects from the work domain influencing WIF conflict and effects from the family domain influencing FIW

conflict. Consistent with the majority of the literature, this thesis has considered work-family conflict as bi-directional.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 51
of the print copy of the thesis held in
the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 2.1 Model of work-family conflict (Luk & Shaffer, 2005)

Work and family conflicts and tensions can occur as the result of role overload or role interference when there is not enough time or energy to meet the commitments of multiple roles or the expectations and demands if the two roles conflict (Duxbury & Higgins, 1994). For workers with family responsibilities, time appears to be the major constraint of those who are combining paid work with family responsibilities- time for children, time with partners,

time for elderly parents and time for household chores, personal leisure and meeting the demands of work (Duxbury & Higgins, 1994). Work and family conflict has been associated with various negative outcomes including burnout (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Conley, 1991), unpleasant moods (Williams, & Alliger, 1994), job and life dissatisfaction (Perrewe, Hochwarter, & Kiewitz, 1999) and decreased family and occupational well being (Kinnunen, & Mauno, 1998). Work/life conflict may include issues such as difficulties faced related to child-rearing, other kinship responsibilities or stressful life events (Hobson et al., 2001). Although both men and women experience work-family conflict, women report more conflict than men do (Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Lundberg, Mardberg, & Frankenhaeuser, 1994; Williams & Alliger, 1994). This happens because women appraise threatening events as more stressful than men do (Miller & Kirsch, 1987; Ptacek, Smith, & Zanas, 1992). Furthermore, women have been found to have more chronic stress than men (McDonough & Walters, 2001; Turner et al., 1995; Nolen-Hoeksema, Larson, & Grayson, 1999) and are exposed to more daily stress associated with their routine role functioning (Kessler & McLeod, 1984). Women are also more likely to report home and family life events as stressful (Oman & King, 2000).

2.3 Theories of work-family conflict

In order to understand the reasons for work-family conflict, many researchers have put forward explanatory theories of it. One theory explains work-family conflict resulting from interrole conflict, while another explains it in terms of loss of resources like objects and personal characteristics. The Ecological perspective states that work-family conflict is an interaction between the person and environment, while the gender role perspective states that

due to their gender, women will perceive their jobs to be threatening to their family roles. While all the theories explain the reasons for work–family conflict, there is no one theory that can be said to be the best.

Role Theory

This theory was put forward by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal in 1964. Role theory states that experiencing ambiguity and/or conflict within a role (intrarole) will result in an undesirable state. Role theory also proposes that multiple roles lead to personal conflict (interrole) as it becomes more difficult to perform each role successfully, due to conflicting demands on time, lack of energy, or incompatible behaviors among roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1986; Kahn et al., 1964). However, role theory has some limitations when applied to the work-family situation. For example, role theory has paid less attention to family roles, which is, by definition, essential to understanding work–family conflict (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). Furthermore, role theory does not directly specify moderating variables which might buffer the relationships between work and family stressors and stress outcomes (Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

Conservation of Resources Theory (COR)

This theory was developed by Hobfall (1989). The COR model proposes that individuals seek to acquire and maintain resources. Stress is a reaction to an environment in which there is the threat of a loss of resources, an actual loss in resources, or lack of an expected gain in resources (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). Resources include objects, conditions, personal characteristics, and energies. According to Hobfall (1989) the COR model proposes that

interrole conflict leads to stress because resources are lost in the process of juggling both work and family roles. These potential or actual losses of resources lead to a negative “state of being,” which may include dissatisfaction, depression, anxiety, or physiological tension (Hobfoll, 1989). According to the COR model, some resources like marriage are very valuable; but more children at home means less time and resources (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). However, individuals try to minimize this loss by trying to replace the threatened resource. For example, when individuals experience more job stress due to balancing work and family roles, some type of behaviour, such as planning to leave the work role, is needed to replace or protect the threatened resources (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999).

Ecological Systems Theory

According to this theory, work-family experience is a joint function of process, person, context, and time characteristics (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1986, 1999). Ecological theory suggests that each type of characteristic exerts an additive, and potentially interactive, effect on an individual's work family experience. Contextual factors in both work and family micro systems are often found to be independently associated with work-family conflict. For example, a higher level of negative person environment interactions (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994) such as work or family pressure is found to be associated with more work-family conflict (Frone et al., 1992).

Gender Role Theory

According to gender role theory, women are more likely to see the family role as part of their social identity than men do (Bem, 1993; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). Moreover, as

women's roles in the workplace have increased, the expectations placed upon them in the family role have not diminished (Hochschild, 1997). Thus, according to Lazarus (1991) when work impinges on family demands (WIF), women are more likely than men to develop a negative attitude toward the work because the job is more likely to be viewed as threatening a central social role. Men on the other hand, are unlikely to use this information to form work attitudes, because they are less likely to experience a threat to self if the job interferes with family time. This is not to say that men do not find WIF unpleasant, but rather that perceptions of WIF are less likely to lead to attributions of blame because the interference is less damaging to social identity and thus, less self-threatening (Lazarus, 1991).

To sum up, models of work-family conflict propose that (a) work family conflict arises when demands of participation in one domain are incompatible with demands of participation in the other domain, and (b) this conflict can have an important effect on the quality of both work and family life (Burke, 1988; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983). In addition, recent research in this area explicitly recognized that relationships between work and family are bidirectional. That is, work can interfere with family, and family can interfere with work (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992a; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Kanter, 1977). The growing body of occupational stress research regarding the relationship between work and family has suggested that there are interconnecting and possibly reciprocal influences between these two domains (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1987; Kanter, 1977). However, most measures of work-family conflict have measured work-family and family-work conflict in one scale (non-directional). Due to this, it cannot be predicted whether the same variables measure work-family or family-work conflict.

According to Michie (2002) the demands on the individual in the workplace reach out into the homes and social lives of employees. Michie further states those long, uncertain or unsocial hours, working away from home, taking work home, high levels of responsibility, job insecurity, and job relocation all may adversely affect family responsibilities and leisure activities. This is likely to undermine a good and relaxing quality of life outside work, which is an important buffer against the stress caused by work. In addition, domestic pressures such as childcare responsibilities, financial worries, bereavement, and housing problems may affect a person's robustness at work. Thus, a vicious cycle is set up in which the stress caused in either area of one's life, work or home, spills over and makes coping with the other more difficult (Michie, 2002). Women are especially likely to experience these sources of stress, since they still carry more of the burden of childcare and domestic responsibilities than men (Hall, 1994). According to the scarcity hypothesis women will have greater stress levels than men if they continue to have greater responsibility than men for family and household tasks while gainfully employed (Berger et al., 1994).

But this is not always the case. The expansion hypothesis (Barnett & Baruch, 1987) contradicts the scarcity hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, employment could potentially offset some of the hassles of family life, and the support of family members could lessen the impact of problems at work. When this occurs, women and men who are employed would be expected to have less stress than those not employed (Berger et al., 1994). There has been support for the expansion hypothesis. Researchers like Thoits (1983) have found that employed married women have lesser stress than single or unemployed women.

The literature from many countries suggests that it is not simply total hours of work that add to stress and work-family conflict, but the intensity and combination of demands and

responsibilities (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington 1989; Field & Bramwell 1998). The few studies that have specifically examined work as the source of conflict for both men and women suggest that women tend to experience significantly more work-family conflict than men (see Burley, 1995; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). Similar inconsistencies are found in studies examining the relationship between career role importance/commitment and reported work family conflict. On one hand, Holahan & Gilbert (1979) found career commitment to be unrelated to perceived work-family conflict for both men and women. In contrast, Beutell and Greenhaus (1983) found that the more important a man's work was to him, the *more* work-family conflict he had. For women, it was just the opposite. International comparisons of the employment rates of men and women show that the female/male employment ratio is substantially lower among parents than at other times in the life course (Gray, 2000). This reflects the lower employment rates of women, and the higher rates of men, when there are young children present in a household (Gornick, 1999). However, it is not simply employment rates that are lower. Even when women are involved in employment, many have reduced employment such as part-time or casual work, and lack of access to family friendly workplace initiatives (Gray, 2000). Women may have less scope for such role bargaining, both because they generally have a lower position and income than their partner and because the social construction of gender makes motherhood less negotiable than fatherhood (Gronlund, 2007).

2.4 Gender differences in work-family conflict (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC)

The role of gender in work-family conflict is not very well established. The rational model of work-family conflict predicts that men should experience more work-to-family conflict than

women, because men tend to spend more time in work activities than women (Jacobs & Gerson, 2000). For women relative to men, conflict between work and family roles is higher because women spend more combined time on work and family activities (Frone, Russel & Cooper, 1992; Hammer, Allen, & Grisby, 1997). Pleck (1977) suggested that roles from the work domain are more likely to intrude into the family domain for men, whereas for women, roles from the family domain are more likely to interfere with the roles from the work domain. Thus, men would experience more WFC and women would experience more FWC. However, it can also be argued that women experience more WFC than men because women take primary responsibility for the family and thus spend more time in family activities (Scott, 2001). Other research has shown that not only do women experience more WFC (Guttek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991), but they may also experience more FWC than men (Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee, 1994). In a study of WFC, role salience and women's well-being, Noor (2004) found that FWC is more significant than WFC. Her reasoning for this finding is that on one hand women would like to be good mothers and not allowing work to interfere with their family activities. But on the other hand, they would also like to be good workers and not allowing family demands to interfere with their work commitments. Between these two conflicts, it seems that FWC rather than WFC is more related to the well being of women (Noor, 2004). According to Frone, Russel and Cooper (1992) FWC is a threat to constructing or maintaining a desired job-related self-image that has direct implications for an individual's overall sense of well-being. Therefore, this is more significant to these women rather than the threat of not being caretakers of the family.

Antecedents for WFC and FWC may be different for men and women. For example, due to the normative nature of gender roles, an individual whose behaviour is inconsistent

with others' gender role expectations is often subject to negative judgments from others (Mueller & Yoder, 1997). Antecedents of WIF include long hours, lack of supervision, and other work role stressors and characteristics. Antecedents of FIW are more likely to be family role stressors such as elder care, or single parenting (Boyar, Maertz, Jr., Pearson, & Keough, 2003; Huang, Hammer, Neil, & Perrin, 2004). Similarly, predictors for WFC and FWC for men and women may also be different. For example, Duxbury and Higgins (1991) found that work involvement and family conflict were stronger predictors of work family conflict for women than for men, and that family involvement and work expectations were stronger predictors of work-family conflict for men than for women. Another study by Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) revealed that levels of job insecurity and supervisor support were predictive of work-to-family conflict for women, but not for men.

These gender differences in the predictors of WFC for men and women could be due to the traditional gender role differences and expectations associated with both the sexes. Even in employment, women are still primarily responsible for the home and family (Noor, 2004). A review and discussion on household labour has been written in chapter 4 of this thesis.

There are very few studies which have reported no gender differences in WFC or FWC. Eagle, Miles and Icenogle (1997) and Kinnunen, Geurts and Mauno (2004) reported no gender differences in WFC. Eagle et al. (1995) suggest that there may not have been any gender differences in their study because of a greater mutual empathy that couples share and this empathy may have been created from a decrease in time as a resource for each spouse to spend in their respective, traditionally occupied domains.

It could be said that work-family conflict is of dual-gender relevance and that change in social conceptions of gender, parenthood, and work identity may be the cause of it (Beach,

1989). For example, many couples work full-time, get work home from office, and look after children when the other partner is busy. Thus men and women adapt to work roles and family roles as and when the need arises.

In sum, it can be concluded that there is no conclusive evidence for gender differences in either WFC or FWC. However, women and families do have their own ways of balancing these differences. For example, women may choose to work part-time, or even have fewer children. The next section discusses these points.

2.5 Women in part-time employment

Most women work part-time for many reasons. Some women may work part-time voluntarily. They may work part-time to enjoy both work and home life to the full (Dex, Clark, & Taylor, 1994). Part-time employment makes it easier to reconcile family responsibilities with employment, with the added advantage of maintaining a link with working life without taking a break (Bolle, 1997). Some women work part-time due to circumstances. For example, not being able to organize suitable childcare as childcare may be very expensive. Sometimes, breaks in employment and part-time work when children are young tend to confine women to a narrow segment of the labour market reducing their chance of returning to their previous full-time occupation (Ginn et al., 1996).

There is documented evidence that part-time jobs are worse than full-time jobs in terms of pay, opportunities, fringe benefits, etc (Dale & Joshi, 1992). Part-time employees have lower hourly wages; are ineligible for certain social benefits; career prospects are more limited and it may leave them only marginally better off than if they were unemployed (Bolle, 1997).

Despite evidence of part-time employment not being very attractive, a lot of past research has also shown that women who work part-time are very satisfied with their work and family roles. For example, research by Higgins et al. (1992) found that men and women who were satisfied with their work, their family, and the balance between the two, tended to have higher levels of life satisfaction. Similarly, Lero and Johnson (1994) reported that mothers who worked part time were twice as likely as their full-time counterparts to claim that they were very satisfied with the balance between their work and family lives. Higgins, Duxbury and Johnson (2000) also found support for part-time work which enabled a balance between work and home among Canadian public and private sector employees.

However, it does not necessarily mean that only women who work fewer hours can balance their work and family lives well. Marks and McDermid (1996), using a sample of employed mothers, showed that those who were more "role balanced," who "enjoy every part of their life equally well," worked the same number of hours as the less balanced, and they reported less overload, had higher self-esteem, and lower depression levels.

As in many countries like the US and Canada, surveys in Australia have found a preference among working parents for shorter working hours (Thorntwaite, 2004). She also further states that the strongest preference among parents with dependent children is the modified dual-earner model with one parent employed full-time, while the other employed part-time. It is usually the mother who takes part-time employment since she is primarily responsible for domestic unpaid labour. According to Glezer and Wolcott (2000), women are reluctant to change this arrangement. This may be because when women participate in the paid work-force on a part-time basis, it is more flexible as they can divide their time between their

work and home. Part-time employment thus disguises a woman's paid work and maintains the image of a perfect homemaker (Kessler-Harris & Sacks, 1987).

2.6 Women and work stress in Australia

During the post war years, there has been an increased participation of women in the Australian work-force. One reason for this could be due to women being highly educated (Grey et al., 2002). Another reason could be due to increased need for financial security in the family. Although not empirically documented in Australia, there has been an attitudinal change and acceptance of working women and mothers.

Over the last 20 years, patterns of paid work across Australia have significantly changed. In 1980, 45 percent of Australian women worked outside the home. By 2000, this had increased to 54 percent (Pocock, 2000). By February 2007, 57.6 percent of women were employed in the Australian work-force (ABS, 2007). Yet, most policy in Australia is based on the myth of "separate worlds". Men work as paid employees whereas women work in the unpaid sphere of doing the housework and looking after the children. In Australia, 40% of employed women are married and have dependent children. Being married or being in a permanent relationship is viewed as both normal and desirable (Lee & Powers, 2002). Caring for children is stressful but, especially for those women who find the role enjoyable and rewarding provides benefits that may improve women's ability to cope with stress and strain from the occupancy of other roles (Lee & Powers, 2002). For example, Barnett, Marshall, and Singer (1992) found that reductions in job quality led to increased distress among single women, but not among those with husbands and children.

Despite the high social and personal value placed on motherhood, women who combine motherhood and paid work roles do report high levels of role strain (e.g., Reifman, Biernat, & Lang, 1991). On the other hand, longitudinal survey research from the United States (Waldron, Weiss, & Hughes, 1998) and the United Kingdom (Weatherall, Joshi & Macran, 1994) has found no evidence that the combination of motherhood and paid employment had any negative effect on physical health.

Some pressure points faced by Australian working women given by Pocock (2000) are:

- Being torn: Juggling, not balancing
- 'No time for me'
- Sick children and accidents
- Travelling to work
- Exhaustion
- Having babies
- Breastfeeding at work
- Childcare

In Australia, occupational segregation has remained high, such that the growth in a 'female' industry (such as community services) is likely to have larger impacts on employment of women than for men (Lewis & Shorten, 1987). Likewise, decline in a 'male' industry (such as manufacturing) are not as likely to impact negatively on women as it is on men (Lewis & Shorten, 1987). Part-time employment of women has also increased. This could be attributed to technological changes and productivity changes such that work in services – including banking and retail – and other industries has adapted to make greater use of part-time and casual work (Dawkins & Norris, 1995; Simpson, 1994).

In a study on Australian professional women, Langan-Fox and Poole (1995) found that women with families (especially those with two children) appeared to find children and family an important 'buffer' or coping mechanism of pleasant distraction, and the 'compensatory' hypothesis, of particular roles offsetting the negative effects of other less pleasant roles, seemed to be at work. Further, they also found that although married women with children faced considerable difficulties from husbands and from children (particularly when there were more than three children), their motivation and enjoyment of work were not adversely affected.

As already discussed in Chapter 1, Australia is a country of immigrants. It is a country where people from different cultures have settled and made it their home. The next two sections discuss the differences between Individualistic (Australian) and Collectivist (Indian) cultures.

2.7 Culture and the role of social support

According to Keinan & Perlberg (1997) one's national culture influences the intensity of the impact stressors have on individuals. Research in cultural psychology has shown that the norms that govern the nature of relationships differ greatly across cultures (Taylor, et al., 2004). For example, in Western cultures (Individualistic), people are encouraged to act in the way they deem appropriate and thus maintain their distinctiveness. In contrast, individuals are encouraged to focus on their relationships and act to maintain harmony within a group in more interdependent cultures, such as in East Asia (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). Indian women (Collectivist culture) therefore, provide a strong contrast to Australian women (Individualist culture) in many ways that are relevant to the job stress process, for example, in

terms of social support from family. There is a growing body of research and interest in social support and its relation to stress and strain (Winnubust & Schabracq, 1996). Studies support theoretical notions that social support can aid stress resistance by supplying people with the information that they are loved, appreciated, and part of a network of caring individuals (Cobb, 1976). The role of the Indian extended family in the amount of work stress experienced, daily hassles, and health is an important research topic (Evans, Palsane, & D'Souza, 1983) and has been examined by some researchers. Kamal, Phil, and Jain (1988) investigated the role of perceived stress as a function of family support. They found that joint (extended) families provided more social support, resulting in less work stress and mental illness than single families. This suggests that the joint family system among Indians maybe perceived as a condition of social support and as a potential culture-based medium for reducing stress.

Sinha (1986) observed that for many individuals in India centrality of family and work were negatively related. As Mishra, Ghosh, and Kanungo (1990) have pointed out, in countries like India centrality of the individual's family role in life has often relegated work life to a secondary role. For a vast majority, even now women's jobs and career are largely a function of male preferences and family circumstances (Ratnam & Jain, 2002).

2.8 Occupational stress and work-family conflict for Indian immigrant women in Australia

While social class and ethnicity are significant factors in determining the opportunities for, and lifestyles of, immigrant families in Australia today, gender is also central. Any study of

the immigrant family in Australia must focus on the differential impact of gender relations within different social class and ethnic contexts (Collins, 1993).

The topic of work-family conflict among Indian immigrant women has not been studied specifically from the Indian migrant women's point of view. Indian women have traditionally emphasized homemaking, and worked within the framework of the family system. However, with changing social dynamics, women are joining the workforce in big numbers (Aziz, 2004). This means that they have to balance their family as well as professional roles. There is also a growing body of literature on the inferior position of Non English Speaking Background (NESB) immigrant women who often enter the work force for the first time in Australia (De Lepervanche, 1984). As a worker and mother and wife in a society where racism and sexism are persistent (Jayaram, 1998), immigrant women experience what de Lepervanche (1991:146) calls the "triple jeopardy" of ethnicity, class and gender. The experiences of immigrant women are critical to understanding immigrant families in Australia. For most immigrant families, immigration to Australia means more than a change in climate and hemisphere. As Non English Speaking Background (NESB) women move to the work place, the structure of family relationships changes (Storer, 1985). Mothers have to assume responsibilities of work as well as house management and child-raising. Three-fourths of the migrant women have migrated on account of marriage which often means giving up either studies or employment (Ratnam & Jain, 2002). These immigrant women have to adapt to a new culture and start studies or look for employment all over again. The *culture shock theory* by Oberg (1960) suggests that immigrants from different cultural societies undergo greater difficulties with their adjustment than those with a similar cultural back ground.

A recent study by Craig (2007) found that in Australia, women from a non-English-speaking background and women who live in rural areas both have longer (paid and unpaid) working weeks than other women. That is, being a recent immigrant or living in a rural area creates more work time differences between women than between men (Craig, 2007). This means that women's lives are divided by ethnicity and location and thus stress could have a different impact on them compared to men.

Both immigrant men and women have to cope with migration stress, but unlike their male counterparts, immigrant women have to additionally cope with the stressors associated with the expectations and performance of their multiple roles such as mothers, wives and employees (Salgado de Snyder, Cervantes, & Padilla, 1990).

Work and family issues are related to cultural beliefs, norms, and values, especially with respect to gender roles (Aryee, 1992; Lobel, 1991; Rosenbaum & Cohen, 1999; Skitmore & Ahmad, 2003; Treas & Widmer, 2000; Williams & Best, 1990). It has been established that within India, patriarchal ideology, familistic value orientations and traditional gender role preferences provide the normative framework for behaviour (Desai & Krishnaraj, 1987).

With the increasing involvement of women in the workforce, cultural values and norms with respect to gender roles have been undergoing a rapid transition. Women and men in professional jobs are trying to adjust to the "modern" norms of gender roles while keeping the traditional values of familialism and collectivism intact (Aycan & Eskin, 2005).

Australia and India are culturally two different countries. According to Korabik, Lero and Ayman (2003) and Joplin, Shaffer, Francesco, and Lau (2003), cultural beliefs about women's and men's roles combined with socio contextual circumstances are additional factors that likely shape experiences and consequences of work-family conflict. There are specific

cultural differences between Indian women and their Australian counterparts. For example, in Asian cultures women are given a secondary and submissive position with authoritarian and patriarchal family structures, and this is made legitimate by claiming that it is “part of culture” (Bhopal, 1997; Brah, 1996). This means that the desires and wishes of Indian women should honour the family traditions. Clearly then, it becomes important to study and compare work stress and work-family conflict among these two culturally diverse nationalities.

2.9 Need for the study

As the number of working women with young children at home and dual-career households rise, so too does the need for research in this field. Attention to the causes and potential reduction of stress due to work family conflict also becomes important. A lot of research has been conducted in the area of work and family, but most of it has been carried out in Western societies (Yang, Chen, Chio, & Zou, 2000). Some studies have also been conducted on immigrants and expatriates. There have also been studies on Vietnamese, Turkish and Filipino women in Australia (Victoria). These studies have addressed issues of cross-cultural maternal depression (see, Small, Lumley & Yelland, 2003). There have been a few studies of acculturation and adjustment of Indian immigrants in Australia. For example, Lakha and Stevenson (2001) studied the adjustment and food habits of Indians in Melbourne; while Voigt Graf (2004) studied the settlement experiences of Indians from four different states in India in Australia. However, no major research has addressed the question of job stress and work-family conflict among Indian immigrants in Australia. There is a need to explore the needs of Indian immigrant women entering the Australian life and the Australian work-force. With the

increasing intake of Indian immigrants in Australia, the study of their conflicts, job satisfaction, acculturation and assimilation becomes very important.

2.9.1 Research questions for study 1

The main research questions of the first study were:

1. The immigration policy of Australia is such that it considers only skilled immigrants from India. Therefore, most Indian women who have migrated to Australia are highly educated and qualified and most of them work in professions which match their qualifications. However, immigration not only means adjusting to the host country socially, but also adjusting to the jobs offered by the host country and giving up jobs of the native country. This includes rate of pay, flexible working hours, supervision, co-workers, etc. Thus, the first question that can be asked is:-

Are Indian women, more satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs as compared with their Australian counterparts?

2. Due to not having much social support and getting into jobs dominated by Australians, do these women face any kind of job stress and stress related to racism on the job?

Are Indian women more stressed with their jobs than Australian women and do they experience any job stress due to racism at the work place?

3. Indian (collectivist) culture is quite different from Australian (individualist) culture. The joint (extended) family in India has always provided support to its family members. However, the immigrant women in Australia do not have this social support system unlike the Australian

women. Indian women have left their home country and come to live in a totally different country and culture.

Are there any cultural differences between work to family and family to work conflict between Australian women and Indian immigrant women due to lack of social support for the Indian women?

The next chapter will answer these questions and discuss the methodology, procedure, results employed to study work-family conflict among Indian immigrant women in Australia. This will be followed by a discussion of the results.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology, Results and Discussion of Study 1

3. Overview

This section discusses the methodology, procedure, results and discussion of a study on work-family balance among Indian immigrant women in Australia. The conceptual framework of this study was designed to evaluate similarities and differences between job satisfaction, job stress and work-family conflict among Australian and Indian working women. The method of employing quantitative as well as qualitative data was chosen as it was a pilot study and the sample was small.

According to Cresswell (1994) research including a qualitative study followed by a quantitative study is particularly useful because the grounded theory developed from qualitative studies can be critically examined and generalisations explored through a wider quantitative survey. Research that includes qualitative data also has certain other advantages. Qualitative studies are well suited to exploratory research and can effectively tackle questions requiring description, interpretation and explanation (Dick, 1990; Lee et al., 1999). Quantitative data on the other hand, enables the researcher to numerically measure multiple dependent and independent variables for the purpose of analysis using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques (Babbie, 1992).

“Matched pairs” of women participants were recruited. Indian women who were known to the researcher were each asked to recruit an Australian woman from the same office/work place, who was more or less similar to her in terms of age, work & responsibility. An advertisement for Indian women volunteers for this study was also placed in the Indian

Community Newsletter of South Australia. Data were collected over a period of eight months in 2005 and were analysed using Independent Samples t test.

3.1 Procedure

3.1.1 Participants

Participants were selected from Adelaide and Melbourne as these were two important places where Indians have settled down and the researcher had contact and access to them. Participants in this study were ten Australian-born and ten Indian-born mothers employed in the Australian work force. All Indian participants had migrated through the General Skilled Migration Programme in Australia. Each of the women had to meet the following criteria:

Indian migrant women who have settled in Australia and are part of the Australian work force.

Australian women who are brought up in Australia and are part of the Australian work force.

Women of both nationalities should be approximately of the same age and be working in the same organization.

They will either be married or living with a significant other with at least one child at home.

It is assumed that by having a child and a husband or a significant other living with the women, they may be able to answer questions relevant to family stress, family support and work-family conflict.

Indian women should have also been a part of the Indian work-force before migrating to Australia.

3.1.2 Measures

The survey questionnaires were designed to assess Job Satisfaction, Job Stress, Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict for each participant. The scales used to measure these variables were adapted from various previous studies. Reliability statistics and examples of items for each scale are provided below.

Job Satisfaction: To measure Job Satisfaction among the women, the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) by Warr, Cook & Wall (1979) was used. This scale consists of 15 items which describe different aspects of the job. The scale has an internal consistency reliability score (Cronbach's Alpha) of .88. The items used a 7-point response scale (from 1= Extremely Dissatisfied to 7= extremely satisfied) with higher scores showing more satisfaction. Representative items of job satisfaction scale include-

How happy are you with (please tick any one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The physical work conditions.

Your rate of pay.

The amount of responsibility you are given.

Job Stress: To measure this factor, the 12 item Job Stress Index (JSI) by Bernas & Major (2000) was used. The Cronbach's Alpha for this scale was .94, showing high reliability. The items used a 5-point Likert response scale (from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree) with higher scores indicating higher stress. Examples of job stress items are-

*I work under a great deal of tension.*___

*I have too much work to do.*___

*I feel “burned-out” after a full day of work.*___

Work-family conflict: To assess work-family conflict, the 22 item Work-Family Conflict Scale developed by Kelloway, Gottlieb and Barham (1999) was used. This scale consisted of items which integrated the work and family balance. The items used a 5-point Likert response scale (from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating higher conflict. The Alpha score for this scale was .93.

The Work Family Conflict Scale was divided into work-family conflict (W→F Conflict) and family-work conflict (F→W Conflict). The first 11 items of the scale measured W→F interface, while the last 11 items measured F→W interface. Sample items of W→F scale are-

*I have to change plans with family members because of the demands of my job.*___

*Job demands keep me from spending the amount of time I would like with my family.*___

*To meet the demands of my job, I have to limit the number of things I do with my family members.*___

Representative samples of F→W item are-

*I would put in a longer workday if I had fewer family demands.*___

*My family demands interrupt my work day.*___

*When I am at work, I am distracted by family members.*___

Cronbach's Alpha for the W→F Conflict measure was .91, while it was .82 for the F→W Conflict measures.

3.1.3 Interview procedure

Each participant was interviewed personally and the data were recorded and then transcribed for analysis. Interviews were conducted at the participants' work place ($N = 11$), while others were conducted at participants' residence ($N = 11$). The interviews were recorded on audiotape and transcribed later. All the participants had given permission to have their interviews recorded. None of the interviews took more than 30 minutes and at the end of the structured interview each woman participant was given time to make any other comment she wished to make. Four participants (3 Indian & 1 Australian) were interviewed before completing the questionnaires and 16 afterwards. This was because the four women participants were busy and preferred being interviewed before filling in the questionnaires.

3.2 Selection of measures

The Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) was chosen to measure job satisfaction since this questionnaire measured the degree to which a person reported satisfaction with intrinsic and extrinsic features of the job. This scale has been used successfully in the past by many researchers. For example, the JSS was successfully used to study organizational climate in 42 manufacturing companies in the UK by Patterson, Warr, & West (2004). This scale was used by them because the JSS covers principal job features (physical working conditions, opportunity to use your ability, etc.).

Moreover, this scale is also culture sensitive. It has been used successfully by Parnell and Hatem to measure job satisfaction among Egyptian managers in 1997. Similarly, in a study by the Health and Safety Executive, UK in 2003, the JSS has been used to study call centre employees in England who belonged to various ethnic groups like Whites, Asians, Blacks and others.

The job stress questionnaire was selected because it focused on experienced job stress rather than stressful job characteristics. The Job Stress Index by Bernas and Major (2000) was selected to measure job stress since this scale is also a culture sensitive scale. For example, Nangle, Kelley, Fals-Stewart and Levant (2003) used this scale to measure job stress among 75 couples who were of European-American, African-American, Latino, and Asian-American origin. Nangle et al reported an alpha of .94 for fathers and .84 for mothers.

Since the work family conflict scale (Kelloway, Gottlieb & Barham, 1999) measured work-family conflict as well as family-work conflict on a single scale, it was selected as a measure for this research. Although the cross-cultural validity of the scale is not known, the original scale had a high reliability and validity.

It was not considered necessary to have a highly culture sensitive scale since the first two studies of the thesis compared Australian and Indian men and women in the Australian work force. Furthermore, the Indian participants were fluent in English and were white collar professionals working along with their Australian counterparts.

3.3 Data Analyses

First, the reliability of each measure was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each scale. After that independent sample t tests were used to find out the similarities and

differences between Australian and Indian women on work-family and family-work, job satisfaction and job stress. Independent samples t test were used since it was considered to be the best method for comparing two samples not really related to one another. All data was analysed using SPSS 14.0 for windows.

3.4 Results

Participants were 20 women aged between 25-52 years ($M = 38.3$, $SD = 6.36$). They were occupied as health professionals, teachers and in the field of information technology. Each group of 10 women had a total of 20 children ($M = 2$, $SD = 0.73$). Women participants were specifically chosen from this age group, since at this age issues related to children and spouse are more relevant. Indian women had immigrated to Australia between 1990-2003.

Independent Samples t tests were used to compare the participants on the Job Satisfaction Scale, Job Stress Index and the Work Conflict Scale.

Demographic characteristics of Australian and Indian women participants are reported in Table 3.1. Test results (means and standard deviations) and comparisons for the two groups are reported in Table 3.2 for the Australian and Indian participants. Responses to interview questions are summarized in Table 3.3.

Table 3.1

Demographic Characteristics of matched pairs of Australian and Indian Mothers

Pair number	Nationality	Age	No. of children	Self (FT/PT)	Spouse (FT/PT)
1	Aus	37	2	PT	FT
1	Ind	38	3	PT	FT
2	Aus	40	3	FT	FT
2	Ind	40	2	FT	FT
3	Aus	36	2	PT	FT
3	Ind	36	2	FT	FT
4	Aus	44	3	FT	PT
4	Ind	42	1	FT	FT
5	Aus	48	1	FT	PT
5	Ind	45	3	FT	FT
6	Aus	44	2	FT	FT
6	Ind	36	2	FT	FT
7	Aus	32	2	FT	FT
7	Ind	32	1	FT	FT
8	Aus	35	2	FT	FT
8	Ind	32	2	FT	FT
9	Aus	26	1	FT	PT
9	Ind	33	2	FT	FT

10	Aus	40	2	PT	FT
10	Ind	42	2	PT	FT

Note: FT = Full Time, PT = Part Time

As Table 3.1 shows, three Australian women worked part time while seven Australian women worked full-time. Among the Indian women participants, two women worked part time while eight women worked full-time. Part-time women employees worked for about 22-30 hours a week, while full-time employees worked for 30-49 hours a week. Although the wives were full-time workers spouses of three Australian women worked part-time. Spouses of seven Australian women worked full-time. However, husbands of all 10 Indian women participants worked full-time.

Table 3.2 summarises the means, standard deviations and significance (t-tests) of test results of women participants of study 1.

Table 3.2

Means, Standard Deviations and Significance (t-test) of Comparison between Australian-born and Indian-born working mothers

Scale	Australian		Indian		df	t	Sig
	N = 10		N = 10				
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)			
JSS total	77.90	(11.01)	72.80	(13.38)	18	.93	.36
JSI total	35.80	(12.87)	25.10	(6.24)	18	2.37	.03*
WFC	22.60	(9.49)	27.70	(8.09)	18	-1.29	.21
FWC	24.20	(10.23)	24.10	(6.01)	18	.03	.98

*Note: $p < .05$, JSS = Job Satisfaction, JSI = Job Stress Index, W→F = Work Family Conflict, F→W = Family work Conflict

Results of the Job Satisfaction Scale (Table 3.2) did not show any statistical significance. It can thus be assumed that women of both nationalities are quite satisfied with most aspects or facets of their job. The results of the Job Stress Index however did suggest statistically

significant results ($t = .03, n = 20, p < .05$), with Australian women reporting more job stress than Indian women.

The Work Conflict Scale was divided into two parts to identify work interference with family (W→F) conflict and family interference with work (F→W) conflict. However, no statistically significant results were found with these two variables implying that both Australian and Indian women were matched in their experiences of work-family conflict and family-work conflict.

Table 3.3 summarizes responses of interview questions

It must be noted that women participants could give multiple answers to some questions. For example, “What are the reasons for taking leave from work?” or “How do you spend your weekends?” Similarly, questions regarding spousal support in helping with household work and cooking also generated multiple responses.

Table 3.3

Response to Interview Questionnaire by Australian and Indian Women Participants

Mother's experiences $N = 20$	No. of cases with the experiences	
	Australian	Indian
Questions regarding work		
• Money is main motivator for work	2	2
• Job satisfaction is main motivator	8	8

• To keep oneself occupied	0	0
• Very happy with their jobs	4	4
• Fairly happy with their jobs	3	4
• Not happy with their jobs	3	2
• Almost always bring home work from office	2	3
• Sometimes bring home work from office	2	2
• Never bring home work from office	6	5
• Have taken stress leave from work	2	0
• Never taken stress leave from work	8	10
• Sick children is main reason for leave	10	10
• Sick spouse is main reason for leave	0	0
• School holidays are the main reason for leave	5	7

Questions regarding family and personal life

• I am the major decision maker in the house	0	0
• Spouse is the major decision maker	0	0
• Decisions are made by both	10	10

How do you spend your weekends?

• Weekends are spent shopping	10	10
• Weekends are spent looking after children	2	2
• Weekends are spent cleaning the house	10	10
• Weekends are spent entertaining	4	8
• Weekends are spent just relaxing	0	0
• Go on a holiday every 6 months	0	0
• Go on a holiday once a year	10	10
• Never go on a holiday	0	0

Questions regarding work-family balance

• Partner/husband works	10	10
• Partner/husband does not work	0	0
• Partner/husband works full time	7	10
• Partner/husband works part time	3	0
• Partner/husband works casual	0	0
• Partner/husband works white collar	7	10
• Partner/husband works blue collar	3	0
• Always get family support	10	10
• Sometimes get family support	0	0
• Never get family support		

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| • Partner's job is more stressful than mine | 5 | 8 |
| • My job is more stressful than my partner's job | 3 | 0 |
| • Both our jobs are equally stressful | 2 | 2 |

How often do you help with housework?

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|----|
| • Help everyday | 10 | 10 |
| • Sometimes | 0 | 0 |
| • Only on weekends | 0 | 0 |
| • Never help with household chores | 0 | 0 |

How often do you cook for the family?

- | | | |
|--------------------|----|----|
| • Almost always | 10 | 10 |
| • Sometimes | 0 | 0 |
| • Only on weekends | 0 | 0 |
| • Never | 0 | 0 |

How often does your husband/partner-

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| • Help everyday with housework | 4 | 2 |
| • Sometimes help with housework | 3 | 4 |
| • Help only on weekends with housework | 3 | 2 |

- Never help with housework 1 3

How often does your husband/partner-

- Almost always cook for the family 2 0
- Sometimes cook for the family 5 2
- Cook only on weekends 4 2
- Never cook for the family 1 6

Additional questions for Indian immigrant women	Yes	No
• Did you face any kind of racial discrimination at the work place?	0	10
• Did you have to get your skills/qualifications assessed to be able to work in Australia?	5	5
• Was it difficult for you to find a job in your Area of expertise when you first arrived in Australia?	5	5

The following questions were recorded on tape.

Have your family roles changed after coming to Australia? And has it affected the level of fatigue you experience?

Did you find any cultural differences between working in India and in Australia? Which country do you think has a more flexible work culture?

How have you organized your life in relation to the bi-cultural experience? Were you readily accepted in the Australian culture?

Additional questions for Australian women (recorded on tape)

Do you mix around with Indian immigrants in your office?

Do you think that you are at an advantage in terms of employment over immigrants?

Results in Table 3.3 of personal interviews of all participants ($N = 20$) reveal some interesting similarities and differences between Australian and Indian women working in the Australian work-force. Most similarities were gender based. For example, although all 20 women worked, looking after sick children was totally their responsibility. These women always had to take time off from work to be with their children when they were sick. Again, cooking for the family daily was also the women's duty. None of the participants spent their weekends just relaxing.

Other similarities include working for job satisfaction, spending their weekends shopping and cleaning their house, going on a holiday once a year and having spouses who were employed. All women participants got family support from their husbands and children.

Three major differences between women of both cultures include three Australian women having spouses who worked part-time and in blue collar professions. However, all Indian women participants had husbands who worked full-time and were in white-collar jobs. The second difference was that two Australian women had husbands who almost always cooked for the family. But none of the Indian women had husbands who would regularly cook for the family. In fact, six Indian women had husbands who never cooked at all. Again, three Indian women had husbands who never helped with household work as compared to only one Australian woman whose husband never helped in the house. The third difference was

observed in the fact that two Australian women had taken stress leave from work, whereas none of the Indian women had done so.

3.5 Discussion

Western (individualist) and non western (collectivist) cultures were expected to show some similarities (e.g. priority to family) and differences (e.g. kinds of jobs husbands do) in their beliefs about work and family. This was an exploratory study and its primary aim was to investigate and compare the extent to which these similarities and differences really existed between Australian (western) and Indian (non western) cultures especially on the basis of culture. The results revealed more similarities and only a slight difference between both the cultures.

Culture or nationality was taken to be the independent or grouping variable. This variable was hypothesized to be the most important one in determining differences and similarities between the women. The other variables were the test variables. They were job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict.

The first research question addresses the issue of job satisfaction among Indian immigrant women. As the results show, there is no significant difference between women of both nationalities. Indian women do not seem to be any less satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs than Australian women. There are a number of reasons for this. Jobs today are becoming more diverse racioethnically. According to Bhuian and Islam (1996), Exter (1989) and Cox (1993) racioethnic minorities, immigrants, and expatriates are becoming a more sizable part of the global workforce. This means that there are fewer chances of racial discrimination at the work place. Consistent with this finding, none of the Indian women participants in this study

claimed any kind of racial discrimination at the work-place. Neither were the Indian women excluded from organizational resources due to their colour or nationality. In fact, when Australian women participants were asked if they mixed with Indian women at their work place, an Australian doctor participant said, *“Yes, I have no problem. I work in a hospital and so always come in contact with a couple of other Indian doctors. They are quite professional so it’s fine.”*

Another Australian doctor had the following to say about her Indian colleague-

“My colleague is an Indian immigrant and she is very nice. Before she joined the hospital I had no idea about Indian culture. It’s kind of nice to get to know different cultures.”

An Australian IT specialist participant said that, *“My boss is an Indian man and I have to report to him. Being in the IT sector, mixing with Indians is inevitable. I like to taste their food which they carry to office.”*

All the 20 women participants in this study were happy with most of the characteristics of their jobs. For e.g., 85% of the total women were happy with the recognition they got for their work. All the mothers (100%) were also satisfied with their fellow workers. Overall or general job satisfaction describes a person’s overall affective reaction to the set of work and work-related factors (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). The facets of job satisfaction involve workers’ feelings toward different dimensions of the work and work environment (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992).

Another reason for there being no significant relationship in on the job satisfaction scale between the women of different cultures could also be because the Indian women were doing jobs that matched their skills. Although five (50%) of the Indian women had to get their qualifications assessed, they were happy that they did it since it enabled them to work in the

field of their choice. As participant number six (Indian) stated, *“I knew that if I had to live and work here, I had to pay the fees and get my skills assessed.”*

Three other Indian participants were qualified doctors, dentists and an occupational therapist. However, they had to study again and pass exams to get into the Australian workforce. Despite that, they were happy with their jobs.

Quoting the Indian doctor participant, *“It was quite difficult to sit the exams again. I am a qualified doctor from India with good clinical experience. But if I did not pass the exams, I would have to forget medicine and look for a different job.”*

When Australian women were asked if they felt that they were at an advantage in terms of employment compared to immigrants, the following responses were obtained.

I guess so. My colleague told me that she had to reappear for exams in spite of being qualified (participant 1, doctor).

I think so especially in the teaching field. I don't know if I am discriminating, but I think Australian students prefer Australians to teach them especially English (participant 2, school teacher).

I can't say. Maybe it depends upon your qualifications and job experience (participant 7, psychiatrist).

However, the Australian IT specialist said that, *“No way! At least not in the IT sector. I am in minority here.”*

The first research question can thus be answered that Indian immigrant women as well as the Australian women are equally satisfied with their jobs. However, this finding does not

support previous research. For example, a study in USA by Fox and Stallworth (2005) found that racial minorities (including Asian Indians) faced a lot of ethnic workplace bullying by the “white” community. Similarly even in Britain, many studies have shown that Indian women have faced a lot of racial discrimination at the workplace (e.g. Rana, et al., 1998; Wrench & Modood, 2000). A study conducted on South Asian managers and professional women in Britain (see Rana et al., 1998) found that South Asian women had an additional burden to prove their competence, especially as they face barriers to their career progression. Additionally, Rana et al. (1998) also found that Indian women managers and professionals faced a lot of racial discrimination in their work-place. There could be one possible explanation for this. India was ruled by the British for more than 250 years. The British being “white” had started discriminating against the “brown” Indians since that time and it is prevalent in some form even today. Australia on the other hand is a land of immigrants. It has seen immigrants like the Greeks and Italians arriving from the early eighteenth century. Therefore, Australians have learned to work and live harmoniously with immigrants. This finding is consistent with past research by Evans and Kelley (1991) on immigrants in Australia. They found no economic discrimination against Indian immigrants in Australia. In addition, their study also found that all ethnic groups, immigrants as well as their Australian-born children receive jobs and earnings commensurate with their education, experience, and skills. Or it just could be that since the Indian women in this study were highly educated and professionals, they did not face any kind of racism or discrimination. Perhaps, it may be totally different for other immigrant women from non English speaking backgrounds with lower educational qualifications as they may have experienced racism in their jobs. But, this is not always the case in other countries.

The Job Stress Index (JSI) administered to the women revealed that Australian mothers faced more job stress compared to Indian mothers. This was a surprising finding, considering that it were the Indian mothers who had to prove themselves to be accepted into the Australian work-force. One reason for Australian women to have more job stress than Indian women could be due to the fact that all Indians are used to the difficult work conditions in India. The population and competition in their home country makes survival quite stressful. Indians are used to working hard right from their school days. According to McGowan (2005), education in India is a complex and remarkable system which few children escape. ‘Play’ school begins at the age of two and a half, but it is a rare institution that allows children to play. Even at this tender age, children are expected to sit quietly in straight rows, listen to their teacher and to do pages of homework everyday (McGowan, 2005). Another reason could be due to the male dominance in Indian society where husbands are considered as the primary bread winners and women, although employed, take on secondary roles. Therefore, it may have been easier for Indian women to cope with job stress as their jobs were stress-free.

When asked if there were any differences between working in India and Australia, some Indian women made the following comments-

“Culturally, the work culture is very different in the medical field. There are many technical things which only doctors will understand. But working here (Australia) can be more stressful sometimes (participant 1, doctor).”

“The number of children that I teach here are far less than the number I taught in India. Also, I think that Indian students respect their teachers more than Australian students. However, I

think working in Australian schools is easier than working in Indian schools as things are more structured here (participant 2, school teacher)."

"The big difference is that I work only from 8.30 am-5pm in Australia. In India, I would work late nights and sometimes even on a Saturday, depending upon the urgency of the project. But the nature of work in both countries is similar (participant 3, IT specialist)."

Another Indian participant who is an Occupational Therapist was also happy working in Australia. She said, *"There was a total difference in the way of working. I have more autonomy and choice here than I had in India. Back there, everything had to be reported to my immediate boss everyday. I would say that I had his support and knew that if anything went wrong, then I would not be the only person to blame! However, I think things are more structured in Australia so it is easier to work here."*

An Indian participant who was a dentist said, *"In Australia we are more accountable for all decisions and consent of patient is very important. In India we could make decisions which we thought were best for the patient without consulting the patient. Since we only manage a handful of patients in Australia, I think working here is easier."*

A similar opinion was voiced by another Indian participant who was a doctor.

"The numbers of patients that I treat in Australia are lesser than the numbers I have witnessed in India. I have not really worked in India, but have done my internship there so I know the situation. I think working in Australia is better." The same doctor participant however, was

not happy with the hours of work in Australia- *“The working hours are very rigid in Australia. I leave home at about 8am and get back only at 6.30 pm. By that time my child is so tired and hungry that he tends to get quite cranky.”*

In general, compared to their jobs in India, most Indian participants were quite happy and less stressed with their jobs in Australia.

Three Australian women participants had husbands/partners who did part time jobs and blue collar jobs. Thus these women had to work hard to be able to sustain their own jobs. The cumulative demands of performing roles of being the major “bread winner”, a spouse and a mother could have lead to job stress among these women. All the Indian women on the other hand, had husbands who were working full time and in white collar professions. Thus, since they were not the major earners of the house, they might not have been as stressed on their jobs as the Australian women. Another way of answering this could be that since all the Indian women were working in an occupation of their choice, job stress could be less. Unlike the Australian women participants, none of the Indian mothers were the main earners of the family. Thus, Indian women may be enjoying doing their jobs and therefore may not find too many pressures on it. Or it could be due to the informal life style in Australia, which may result in them and their spouses experiencing more control over their environment (Elloy, 2001). It could also be their way of adapting to the host country.

However, it can be argued that just like the Australian women participants, even the Indian women participants had multiple role functions to perform. They were also spouses, mothers, employees, etc. so why should they not experience job stress too? Again, Indian women in this study did not have any domestic help or even other extended family support that Australian women had.

For me family roles have remained the same. In fact, I would say it has become more tiring here (Australia) due to additional responsibility of children and no paid domestic help available (Indian, doctor).

The joint family system in India lends support to working women with the elders looking after the children and household work. However, one Indian participant had the following to say about support from extended family.

“My mother-in-law would help me in India. But I am happy to be in Australia without any interference from my extended family. However, I only wish my husband would also contribute to household work as much as I would like him to do. With no paid domestic help easily available in Australia, it gets quite difficult to manage things all on my own.” (Indian, IT specialist).

Another participant also had a similar opinion. *“I can’t say whether I miss the social support of my mother-in-law or like it here without her. But, I do miss my domestic maid.” (Indian, IT consultant)*

I think family roles have increased more in Australia due to the birth of my children. My husband has also taken up a job that requires him to travel so yes, I do get very tired (Indian, dentist).

I do the same house work and office work that I did before. My husband never helped me in India, though he does occasionally help me in Australia. But, since I choose to work part time, I can manage things as well as my three daughters (Indian, occupational therapist).

Four Australian women on the other hand, had their mothers/extended family living close by. These women were fortunate enough to get help from them.

Mum does come over and do my laundry sometimes. She also picks up my twins from school and stays with them till I return home (Australian, doctor).

My in-laws live just behind my house. I can always depend upon them to take care of my children (Australian, teacher).

When I know that I will be late, I call up mum and she willingly keeps dinner ready for us. Many times she helps Alan (my husband) clean up after dinner too. Don't know if I could manage without her! (Australian, IT specialist)

All the participants were matched in their ages, jobs and occupational status. Yet, 40% of Australian mothers felt there was too much pressure on them to get things done. None of Indian mothers felt the same. Another interesting finding was that the Australian mothers who reported pressure had no social support from their extended families. The remaining 60% who got support from their mothers or mothers-in-laws did not report such pressures. Nine (90%) Indian mothers got no support from their extended families, since their extended families were all back in their home country. Despite that, not even one of them reported any kind of pressure on their jobs. The reason being that immigrants, who have migrated voluntarily, normally come mentally prepared to live without any social support in a foreign land. They are ready to adjust to the kind of life that their host country offers. Most of the immigrant women have to “restart” their lives. Two Indian mothers in their interview very rightly stated, “*What is the use of hoping for any kind of support, when we know that there will not be any?*”

Lack of support from extended family like parents and in-laws for Indian women could also be attributed to the Australian Government's immigration policy. This policy allows for "skilled migration" from immigrants below the age of 40. The points test ensures that qualified and skilled immigrants below the age of 40 get maximum points. This naturally means that parents of these immigrants may not get easy entry into Australia, except as visitors.

The third research question states that Indian immigrant women will face more work-family and family-work conflict than Australian women. However, the results show more similarities than differences. These similarities may be due to a few reasons. Firstly, it has been suggested that individuals from more collective cultures (Indian women) experience fewer conflicts between work and family than white, middle-class workers because they view work as a necessary and vital component of assuring family well-being (Grzywacz et al., 2007). Secondly according to Grzywacz et al. (2007) immigrants from collectivist cultures also have a tendency to view work and family as integrated. Interview responses of the women participants also revealed that they have arranged their family lives in a way to reduce work-family conflict. For example, one Indian participant who kept her children in after-school care said, *"Since I come from Mumbai (a very cosmopolitan city), I would have made similar arrangements for my family had I been in India."*

Another participant said that *"In India my parents and my in-laws lived in smaller towns away from where I lived, so I had to make adjustments. However, I did not have children in India."*

Questions regarding husband's help in household work were also asked to the participants. There were differences in the responses of the Australian and Indian women suggesting differences in culture.

I wish my husband would at least do the cooking on a Sunday so that I can relax a little (Indian, IT specialist).

My husband would rather order a takeaway meal rather than cooking at home (Indian, dentist).

Another Indian doctor participant said, “*My husband is very happy with my cooking and does not feel that he could eat the food that he makes. However, I wish he would at least give it a try!*”

However, the Indian IT consultant said that not only did her husband help with the cooking, but also made a vegetable dish every night.

My husband cooks on weekends, but it's more of easy things like 2 minute noodles or pasta. But I'm not complaining! (Indian, occupational therapist)

Australian participants however had different opinions.

My husband does not cook any main meals, but he does make food for the children (Australian, IT specialist).

The Australian participant who was a doctor said that, “*I am quite lucky. My mum helps out at times and my husband also loves to cook. So, I don't have to worry about the cooking*”.

The Australian teacher participant also said that her husband loved to make different cuisines and thus did most of the cooking.

Some work–family scholars argue that the burden of combining work and family is greatest among non-professional and marginalized workers, such as immigrants, because their jobs offer little flexibility or other family friendly resources (Heymann, 2000; Lambert, 1991). Similarly, Ralston (1997) has also found that Indian women suffer triple discrimination – being women, being immigrants and being members of a minority group. However, as the

results of this study show, this does not hold true for Indian immigrant women. Very few Indian women are marginalized or are non-professional. This is due to the immigration policy of Australia. Since there is a shortage of skills in Australia, the Australian government has developed policies to target migrants to fill up those shortfalls (Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, DIMIA, 2005). DIMIA also wants immigrants with a fairly proficient level of English. All the Indian women participants were well educated, were fluent in English and had come to Australia because of their spouses. It was a conscious decision made by the couple. Therefore, adjustment may have been far easier than had it been an individual decision.

3.6 Conclusion, limitations and implications for the next study

Clearly as this study shows, culture does not seem to be an important part in determining job satisfaction, work-family conflict, and family-work conflict. The inflow of immigrants into a country is a function, among other things, of the rewards that it can offer relative to the immigrant's country of birth and other potential host countries (Borgas, 1987). Also, it could be possible that this sample of Australian and Indian women were able to juggle and manage the demands from the home and work fronts. The findings of this study are consistent with previous research that demonstrated that South Asians (e.g., Aycan & Kanungo, 1998; Berry, 1998; Krishnan & Berry, 1992), and cultural groups in general (e.g., Berry et al., 1989), tend to prefer integration. This is also consistent with the Australian government's policy of multiculturalism, where immigrants can retain their culture and heritage and can still be a part of the Australian society. *Unity in Diversity* (2003) is the government's key statement on cultural diversity policy. Indian women seem to have adjusted and assimilated themselves not

only into the Australian way of life but also in the Australian work-force. Thus, the hypothesised culture of origin differences is wiped out. The more integrated and assimilated immigrants are, the more they are satisfied with what the host country has to offer. Although they came from NESB backgrounds, Indian women had assimilated well in the Australian work-force as well as in the Australian way of life. Moreover, house work still remains the domain of the woman. Culture has no role to play in it. Men may “help out” but are less likely to know what needs doing and when (Halpern, 2005).

Prior studies have investigated the role of occupational stress and work family conflict among other migrant communities in Australia, UK and US. The present study extends previous research by investigating the role of Indian migrant working mothers in Australia, an area which so far has not received much consideration. In this study, the husbands of all the Indian women participants were in full time white collar professions, but several of the Australian husbands were not. So, perhaps it is the couples’ or even the family work- home balance which needs to be investigated.

This study has some limitations. Firstly, since it was a pilot study, the number of participants was small ($N=20$). Thus generalizations cannot be made for all Australian women and Indian immigrant women. Secondly, all the women participants were white collar professionals. Perhaps, women in blue collar jobs would show different kinds of conflict and stress than the participants of this study. It would also be worth studying women who are doing temporary and casual jobs. Another limitation is that all Indian women participants of this study were fluent in English. It could be that there may be significant cultural differences among immigrants from non English speaking backgrounds. Thirdly, this was an exploratory study and only suggestions can be made regarding the results.

The next study will gather similar information from matched pairs of Australian and Indian fathers. Comparisons will also be made between Australian and Indian women, and Australian and Indian men. Maybe gender has a more important effect on women's work attitudes and culture on men's work attitudes.

CHAPTER 4

Study 2

Cultural and Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction, Job Stress, Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict

4. Overview

The present chapter deals with job satisfaction, job stress and work-family conflict among Australian men and women and Indian immigrant men and women in the Australian workforce. The present study was undertaken to find out if cultural and/or gender differences would be more evident among Australian and Indian immigrant men and women. Results of the previous study (study 1, chapter 3) did not reveal any apparent cultural differences among employed Indian and Australian women but only suggested that Australian women experienced more job stress than Indian women. Interview results of the first study showed that women from both cultures were responsible for most of the household work. Therefore, this study was undertaken to find out if cultural differences in job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict, and family-work conflict as well as in division of household labour would be more evident among employed Australian men and Indian immigrant men. This study was also designed to investigate the effects of culture and gender on the same measures.

In the first part of the chapter, the differences between household work for men and women are introduced and discussed. The second part deals with the division of labour in households. Then, research on cultural differences and similarities between Australian men and Indian immigrant men regarding household work are reviewed and discussed. Cultural

differences on job satisfaction and job stress are also discussed in this section. Finally, aims and hypotheses of the study are discussed.

4.1 Differences between household work for men and women

One important research question has been the study of household work. According to Coltrane (2000), human existence depends on the routine activities that feed, clothe, shelter, and care for both children and adults. In other words, unpaid family work is as important as paid formal work. Moreover, people spend equal amounts of time in paid work as well as in unpaid domestic labour (Robinson & Godbey, 1997).

Wives spend substantially more time than their husbands on family work, even though women do less and men do slightly more now than 20 years ago (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer & Robinson, 2000). There are a few reasons for this. Women's education level has increased in the past 20 years. Therefore, their participation in the paid labour force has also increased. This would mean that as education increases, women's time spent on household work decreases. Researchers like Brines (1994) and Shelton and John (1996) have found a negative correlation between women's education and household labour time. Another reason could be that since women spend more time in paid employment, their time in household work has decreased. The wife's hours of market work affects the couples' housework hours, increasing her husband's housework, decreasing her own housework, and reducing the housework gap (Bianchi et al., 2000). Men have also increased their time in household labour, but this is due to the participation of their wives in paid labour (Bianchi et al., 2000). It is also more acceptable for men today to cook and clean and make a home-cooked meal (Bianchi et al., 2000). Technological innovations in household goods like dishwashers, washing machines,

vacuum cleaners, microwave ovens, etc. may have also reduced women's time in household labour compared with women's time spent in housework before these inventions. Therefore, although women today are spending lesser time on domestic work than they did in the past, women are still responsible for majority of the household tasks.

Women tend to perform the majority of housework and childcare, and are often responsible for supervising tasks and making sure that everything gets done (Buunk, Kluwer, Schuurman, & Siero, 2000; Coltrane, 2000; Hochschild & Machung, 1989). Recent research confirms that family work is sharply divided by gender, with women spending much more time on these tasks (housework, childcare, etc.) than do men and typically taking responsibility for monitoring and supervising the work even when they pay for domestic services or delegate tasks to others (Coltrane, 2000). For example, a mother can request her older children to look after the younger siblings or even help with some household chores. However, research has shown that women are actually hesitant to delegate work to others. This is because women themselves may believe they must maintain some standard in order to show caring for family members (DeVault, 1991; Thompson, 1991). Therefore they may take pride in doing the cooking and cleaning for the family.

In general, most research indicates that regardless of their employment status, women continue to bear the major household responsibilities and perform multiple roles as worker, homemaker, mother and wife. Another important observation is that even in dual earner families, men continue to retain their main breadwinner or provider status (Bharat, 1995). Research on men's roles within the family is increasing, but findings are blurred and complex when taking account of race, ethnicity, religion, region, and social classes (Booth & Crouter, 1998; Hochschild & Machung, 1989). According to DeVault (1991) much of women's work is

more “invisible” whereas much of men’s work is more “visible” and likely to attract appreciation for being creative. DeVault (1991) further says that housework is a kind of family work that is organized quite differently from labour market work, and cannot be defined in terms of its most obvious, mechanical parts; it is this invisible work that forms the basis of group life. Most of men’s work is visible since it is a part of a formal job which is recognized by the government, especially for tax purposes. However, it is important to note that behind every visible instance of task accomplishment is the invisible orchestration that defines it, sets its standards, and oversees its completion (Mederer, 1993). These invisible tasks include “behind the scenes” work like careful planning, management, allocation of tasks and completing them on time (Coltrane, 1989; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Any research that studies household division of labour, must take these “invisible”, albeit important tasks into consideration.

Although men and women occupy multiple roles, research on the relationship between multiple roles and well-being has been limited almost exclusively to women (Fallon, 1997). This is because most past research focuses on the multiple roles that women perform, while for men research only focuses on the paid work that men perform. Researchers from a wide range of disciplines (psychology, sociology, anthropology) have attempted to isolate the causes and consequences of this division of household labour for men and women and for family functioning (Coltrane, 2000; Shelton and John, 1996) but have used different measures and methods. These measures and methods include time diaries, personal interviews and survey questionnaires. All three methods have given mixed results regarding consequences of division of labour. For example, time diaries can only be useful if filled in at the correct time.

Retrospective time diaries have no value. However, quality of these methods is improved by the use of narrowly defined tasks (Shelton & John, 1996).

Housework has been described from a literary perspective, as disagreeable physical labour, which like the "Torture of Sisyphus" has to be repeated again and again (de Beauvoir, 1968, p. 451). This is indeed true as certain household chores like cooking, looking after children or the elderly have to be done on a daily basis and other activities like cleaning, shopping, etc. must mostly be done at least on a weekly basis. Most researchers define household labour as unpaid work that contributes to the well-being of family members and maintenance of their home (Shelton & John, 1996). According to Coltrane (2000) most research focuses on the more restricted category of *housework*, which consists of physical activities such as cleaning, laundry and cooking. Few studies include the other components of household labour- childcare, emotional labour such as providing encouragement or advice, and mental labour such as planning or household management. Household labour may be better conceptualized as the creation of a household in which family members are cared for (DeVault, 1991; Ferree, 1990; Thomson, 1991). DeVault describes the nature of family work as largely mental, spread over time, and mixed in with other activities, often looking like other things. Their allocation to family members within households is a major way families construct gender (Coltrane, 1989; West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Balancing the demands of paid work and home responsibilities has become a principal daily task for a steadily growing number of employed adults (Fallon, 1997). Striking changes in the nature of families and the workforce, such as rising numbers of dual career couples and working mothers with young children, have increased the likelihood that both male and female employees have substantial household obligations as well as major work responsibilities

(Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1998). Gender differences in work and family experiences have been a consistently important theme in work–family research (Lewis & Cooper, 1999). According to studies by Atkinson and Huston (1984) and Presland and Antill (1987), men working long hours outside the home typically, and not surprisingly, devote less time to household chores and child-care tasks than do other men. However for women, labour market hours translate only into a small reduction in family work and the amount of time devoted to child care tasks remain unchanged (Presland & Antill, 1987). Moen and Sweet (2003) argue that although women are increasingly contributing income to families, a wife’s economic contribution remains secondary to that of her husband across the life course. They also add that her labour force opportunities are often of lower priority than her husband’s. When a husband goes to work, he fulfills his duty of an employee and also the duty of being the bread-winner of the family. Whereas, when a wife goes to work, her primary duty is still her house and family. There is however little participation of men in household tasks; the majority of men report being more psychologically involved with their families than they are with their occupations (Pleck, 1985). This contradiction is due to the fact that men perceive their provider role to be an important factor contributing to their family role too. However for women, their work and family roles are not mutually supportive. So women may find difficulties in separating work and family roles and thus experience more stress in balancing work and family roles together (Pleck, 1985).

According to Raley et al. (2006) most couples are “neo-traditional” with wives who do some market work but continue to adapt their careers to accommodate their husbands’ labor market opportunities and family responsibilities. But Nock (2001) argues that couples are moving swiftly in the direction of equally shared breadwinning. He coined the term

“MEDS,” which stands for *marriages of equally dependent spouses*, or marriages where each spouse contributes 40%–59% of the family income.

In societies like the U.S. and Australia, this concept is known as “egalitarianism” which means a belief in equality, implying doing the same things and receiving the same rewards (Drago, Tseng, & Wooden, 2004). An egalitarian ethos in the U.S. would imply that men and women *should* devote equal time to paid employment and to family (Drago et al., 2004). Evidence of such a belief among families that claimed to be egalitarian was found by Hochschild (1989). However, she was disappointed to learn that the families were in fact neo-traditional, with women still performing the “second shift” (Drago et al., 2004).

There is growing scholarly interest in the erosion of men's roles as primary breadwinners and their undertaking a more complex and differentiated set of familial responsibilities, including those of house-hold labour (e.g., Coltrane, 1996). Many researchers in the past (e.g. Blood & Wolf, 1960; Coverman, 1985) have suggested that if the husband has more resources (education, occupational position) relative to the wife, then he should do less domestic labour. In fact, the resource theory is used most commonly to identify division of household work. According to this theory, the more resources women command, the less tolerant they are about imbalance in household labour, especially unbalanced management (Mederer, 1993). But since many women with dependent children prefer to work part-time, their economic resources will naturally be lower than men, making them responsible for doing housework. Researchers like Blood & Wolf (1960) and Coverman (1985) have also pointed out that the more traditional the husband's sex role attitudes, the less domestic labour he performs. According to Brines' (1994) model of economic exchanges, the person with the least time and the most economic resources should perform the least household labour. This

would mean that when men perform the provider role, women will do more household work. We would then expect that when women enter the work force, and contribute to the household income, house work would be shared between both partners. There is also some evidence suggesting that men who adhere to a traditional sex role ideology perform fewer household chores than do men whose sex role ideology is characterized as nontraditional (Perruci, Pottes & Rhoades, 1978; Huber and Spitze, 1983). This can also be called the gender ideology approach. According to many researchers like Blair & Lichter (1991), Brayfield (1992), Lennon & Rosenfield (1994) and Mederer (1993), women primarily do the tasks that traditionally have been thought of as “women’s work” (e.g., cooking, laundry, house cleaning), whereas men primarily do “male” tasks (e.g., yard work, auto maintenance). However, Rubin (1976) reported no evidence of a relationship between men’s sex role ideology and behavior. Beck-Gernsheim (2002) argued that many of the traditional patterns of family life have changed and that personal choice and individualization have overtaken the old certainties rooted in tradition, religion and biology. Extensive research has also shown that over time, both men and women have become more egalitarian and less traditional in their gender-role attitudes (Ciabattari 2001; Fan & Marini 2000; Loo & Thorpe 1998; Wu & Baer 1996). The level of importance placed on marital, familial and occupational roles determines the degree of traditionalism and egalitarianism among women and men (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). Among egalitarian men, marital, family and occupational roles are of equal importance, and they view themselves as participants in all spheres of life. However, among traditional men who perceive themselves as “breadwinners,” occupational roles are of primary importance (Stickney & Conrad, 2007). The next section discusses how egalitarian and traditional men divide household labour.

4.2 Division of labour in households

The division of labour in households has been extensively debated (for a review see Sullivan, 2000). Most researchers interested in work-family conflict have been interested in the field of housework with the main question being, “do men and women share household tasks equally?” Issues such as housework and sex-segregated roles, economic productivity, attaining satisfaction, emotional well-being, and the issues of stress, burden, equity and conflict at the family level are also subjects that raise interest among researchers (e.g. Mederer, 1993; Kluwer, Heesink, & van de Vliert 1996).

The division of household labour has been long studied as interplay between work and family and as an embodiment of gender relationships in that particular society (Hu & Kamo, 2007). Any research on gender and family must take into consideration the division of household labour. The traditional division of labour between mothers and fathers has been defended, in part, by the presumption that there is comparability between what each endures in their respective domains: She "slaves" at home; he "slaves" at the office or shop (Larson, Richards, & Perry-Jenkins, 1994).

The first researchers to study division of labour in households were Blood and Wolfe in 1960. They reported that in homes where wives were employed in paid work, men did more at home. Their explanation was that, “since most household tasks are humdrum and menial in nature, the chief resource required is time.” According to Nock (2001) historically, husbands and wives were heavily dependent on each other to manage a farm or run small family businesses. Only in the mid-20th century did couples develop highly differentiated family roles. Gershuny and Robinson (1988) have suggested that this may have happened due to perceptions of equity associated with the entry of women in the paid work-force. It could also

be due to technological changes which are related to innovations in household equipment and service provision (Gershuny & Robinson, 1988). But there are mixed opinions about whether such innovations have really decreased women's time in domestic work. Some researchers like Bose et al. (1984), Day (1992) and Jackson (1992) have called these household goods as "labour saving devices". Other researchers feel that innovations in household technologies have only reallocated women's time in the form of new household tasks like toilet and tub cleaning (Jackson, 1992; Schor, 1991). Technical innovations may have reduced women's time in household labour in more industrialized countries. But it may not be so in lesser developed countries where money to buy these goods is a major constraint. In India, paid domestic work is cheaper than buying and maintaining these white goods. Therefore, these "labour saving" devices may not be worth the investment.

According to Baxter (2002) two kinds of models dominate attempts to explain the allocation of household labour. The first model put forward by Walby (1986) and Brines (1994) is the economic exchange model. This model states that women perform housework in exchange for economic support. Men provide income for the household and women in turn perform unpaid domestic work. This is a very rational model of division of labour. The expectation of this model is that as women's time in paid labour increases and their contribution to the household income increases, the division of labour in the home will become more equal (Baxter, 2002).

Yet, the economic exchange model can be challenged. For example, this model is concerned with power differences. This means that the person who contributes more economically to the family would have more bargaining power. It would be natural to assume that men would have more power since they spend more time at the work place than women

(Baxter, 2002). Therefore, there would be reduced contribution to household labour on the part of men since domestic work will be considered as unpleasant and unrewarding (Hartmann, 1981). But, in her previous study Baxter (1992) found that the more time women spend in paid labour, the less time they devote to unpaid labour. Thus, the economic exchange model can be considered as gender neutral (Baxter, 2002). Whoever (husband/wife) contributes more to the household income gets to do less of domestic work.

The second model of household allocation of labour is the gender display model or “doing gender” developed by Berk (1985), West and Zimmerman (1987) and Ferree (1990). This model points to the symbolic construction of house work as women’s work and as a display of a woman’s love for her family and subordination to her husband (Berk, 1985; Ferree, 1990). Berk (1985) has argued that the marital household is a “gender factory” where besides accomplishing tasks, housework produces gender through the everyday enactment of dominance, submission and other behaviours symbolically linked to gender. This gender identity is produced as men and women carry out routine household tasks (Ferree, 1990) and therefore gendered division of household labour is thought of as fair even though it may be unequally distributed.

In Australia, this theory has received some support. Bittman, England, Folbre, Sayer, & Matheson (2003) found curvilinear relationships between relative earnings and housework hours only in the case of married women but not in the case of married men. They found that when women contribute half of the income and even when they contribute their full income, it does not reduce household work for women. In fact, their hours of unpaid work go up by five to six hours per week. Yet, Bittman et al’s. (2003) study contradicts the findings by Baxter (1992) who found that in Australia, when women perform more paid labour, they devote less

time to unpaid labour. However, there is no evidence of cultural differences among participants in both these studies.

It is generally agreed that women now do approximately three quarters of household work, a pattern that is evident across all western nations (Szalai, 1972; Berk, 1985; Baxter, 1997). At the same time, though, there is debate about whether the amount of time that men and women spend on domestic labour has changed over time (Gershuny and Robinson, 1988; Bittman, 1995; Bianchi et al., 2000; Sullivan, 2000). Predictions that as women entered the paid workforce men would take on more of the household labour have largely failed to eventuate. Despite a massive movement by women into the paid workforce over the last 60 years, men have not increased the time they spend in domestic labour by a corresponding amount (Bittman, 1999; Bianchi et al., 2000; Baxter, 2002). Many researchers like Yogev (1981) and White, Booth and Edwards (1986) argue that although wives do more household work during their married lives, the disparity between their contribution and that of their husbands appears to be greatest in the early child-rearing years and least in the pre-parental and post-parental years. This is consistent with research that has shown that women perform more of the housework when they are married and when they become parents, whereas men tend to perform less housework when they marry and assume a smaller share of the household work after their wives have children (Coltrane, 2000).

Most research tends to suggest that women's hours of housework are declining (due to women's entry into the paid work-force, convenience shopping, etc.), but there are mixed views about whether men's hours of housework have changed. Some research has found that men's housework contribution has increased (Gershuny and Robinson, 1988; Robinson and Godbey, 1997; Bianchi et al., 2000; Sullivan, 2000), while others have found virtually no

change in men's contribution (Shelton, 1992; Bittman, 1995). Gershuny and Robinson (1988) using time-budget surveys, studied dual earner couples in the USA and the UK and found that in both countries men's contribution to household work had increased. However, it is not clear whether the participants were blue collar or white collar employees. Robinson and Godbey's (1997) study consisted of American couples and they found that men's participation in domestic work had increased due to two reasons. Firstly, since women's participation in paid work had increased, their time in unpaid work had decreased. Secondly, there is also some degree of cultural change in attitudes towards women's work. Therefore, it is acceptable today if men prepare a hot meal at home, or even do the laundry.

Bittman (1995) says that the only area where men have increased their share is in child care. Fathers are spending more time in looking after their children than they did a few years back. Further, Bittman also states that women are trying to reduce their time in domestic unpaid work by working out how to do so themselves. However, women have also increased their time in masculine activities like car maintenance.

Cross-cultural research on division of household labour has given mixed results. For example in America, studies on cross-cultural division of labour have revealed that African-American families are more egalitarian in the division of labour than European-American families (Shelton & John, 1996). In Taiwan, a study consisting of random samples showed that married women regardless of their employment status still do most of the household work (Hu & Kamo, 2007). Additionally, they found a non-linear relationship between income and household work. In Taiwan, when the wife makes relatively more money in comparison to her husband, she spends more time on the household work, but her husband not necessarily less. But, this study does not measure the number of hours respondents spend in paid labour or in

household tasks so it is difficult to point out the occupations in which people spend more time and the effect it will have on household work.

In Australia too there are mixed opinions about men's participation in house work and child rearing practices. According to Bittman (1995), Dempsey (2000) and Pocock (2003), women take a larger proportion than men of workload, especially the responsibilities related to domestic work and childcare. However, Grbich (1995) and Talbot (2005) argue that there has been some change and that men are involved in most types of domestic labour especially childcare. Dempsey (2000) compared small town Victorian (rural) men of the 1980s and Melbourne (urban) men in 1998. He found that in both cases even when women were working full-time in paid employment, they did most of the household work with men acting as their assistants. While not having the burden of "owning" the tasks, men may have gained a sense of fulfillment from reducing their partner's burden by helping her out (Goodnow & Bowes, 1994). Dempsey also found that in both rural and urban settings women were primarily responsible for looking after the children. Grbich's (1995) study was a cross-cultural study of immigrant couples from England, Sweden and Bolivia and also of men and women of Anglo-Australian origin who were occupied in blue collar and white professions in the Australian paid work-force. Her study found that across all four cultural groups childcare was solely performed by 69 percent of the male respondents. The reason she states is the change in attitude of men towards women's jobs.

To sum up, it can be said that there is clear evidence that division of domestic labour has received mixed reviews with some researchers saying that men have not increased their contribution in unpaid domestic work, while other researchers have confirmed that men have

increased their contribution in some fields, especially child care. Gender has no specific site or context; it infuses all of life (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

4.2.1 Changing families and patterns of change

Families around the world are changing. For example, the ways that mothers and fathers look after children are continuously changing. The adoption of more egalitarian gender ideologies began in the affluent west and is expanding to other areas of the world (Murray, 2002). The global workforce now includes a much greater proportion of dual-earner couples who have responsibility for the care of children or elderly dependents (Hill & Henderson, 2004). In large corporations, there has been a dramatic increase in the percentage of dual professional couples in which both partners have careers, not just jobs (Elloy & Mackie, 2002). According to Baxter, Hewitt and Western (2005) simultaneously navigating the demands of the workplace and the home has become more complex for both men and women in many cultures. However, it can be argued that despite changes in the family structure, household work still remains the domain of the female. Patterns within households appear to have undergone very little change. In particular, gender stratification within households appears relatively untouched by the changes that have taken place in patterns of household formation and dissolution (Baxter et al., 2005). Rather than men taking on a greater share of the load, women's increased labour force participation has been associated with women reducing their time on housework as a way of coping with the dual burden of paid and unpaid work (Western & Baxter, 2001; Baxter, 2002). For example, due to readily available and take away foods, women's time in cooking may have reduced. Mechanization of household labour (although it has got mixed reviews) may have also reduced women's time in unpaid labour substantially.

There is evidence for some degree of flexibility in domestic arrangements, whereby men take on more of the domestic work when women change their employment status either from non-employed into part-time employment or from part-time to full-time employment (Gershuny, 1995a). An interesting finding by Sullivan (2000) reveals that the men who consistently made the highest contribution (both absolutely and relatively) to time spent in cooking and cleaning were those in professional/technical households where both partners were working full time. Yet, in her study even she (Sullivan, 2000) found that despite substantial reductions in the *ratio* of female to male participation in cooking and cleaning both sets of tasks none the less remain highly gendered, with women contributing several times more time than men.

It is not always men's refusal to do housework that can be blamed for the unequal division of labour in households. Using various measures of family work, research consistently has found that despite their greater participation, and regardless of employment status, most women do not perceive housework allocation as unfair (Benin & Agnostinelli, 1988; Berk, 1985; Hochschild, 1989; Pleck, 1985). Although the vast majority of both men and women now agree that family labour should be shared, few men assume equal responsibility for household tasks (Coltrane, 2000). On average, women perform two or three times as much housework as men, and the vast majority of men, as well as most women, rate these arrangements as fair (Coltrane, 2000). It can be argued that this is because most husbands are employed for more hours and earn more income than do their wives (as is the case in this research). A lot of research has argued that couples maintain their traditional division of labour because they value each other's labour in dissimilar gender-specific ways (Sanchez, 1994). Thompson's (1991) theoretical work suggests that within marital relationships, gender differences in entitlement cause women and men to value each other's

work differently, to allocate work to achieve differing outcomes, to compare their work against different referents and to justify inequitable divisions of labour. Moreover, according to Sanchez (1994) empirical and theoretical work suggests that when constructing fairness perceptions, women do not feel entitled to value their own labour efforts as much as they value men's efforts. Major (1993) argued that women are relatively satisfied with an unequal division of housework because the distribution (a) matches their comparison standard, (b) is perceived as justifiable, or (c) matches what they are socialized to want or value from their relationship. Another viewpoint of various researchers regarding 'fair' and 'unfair' division of household labour is that it is the women themselves who have felt obligated to perform household tasks and thus contribute to unequal division of household labour. The reason here may be the standard of housework. For example women may feel that men's contribution in household work may not be up to their standards. This may lead to work overload. Ferree (1991) suggests that gender inequality and overload can be reduced if standards are lowered. But there is evidence that women themselves may believe they must maintain some standard in order to show caring for family members (DeVault, 1991; Thompson, 1991). DeVault also says that housework is associated with a woman's feminine identity. Therefore, it could be reasonable to conclude that sometimes women themselves tend to devalue their own house work and labour-force employment in comparison to men's household work and employment.

Just as cross-cultural research on division of household labour has given mixed results, time spent on housework by spouses also differs across nations. For example in the USA, husbands spent 29 percent of their time in housework, whereas in Japan, husbands spent only 13 percent of their time in domestic labour (Kamo, 1994). Yet, even in the most egalitarian countries like America and Norway, women still perform most of the housework (Batalova &

Cohen, 2002). In Britain, a recent study on housework revealed that women on average spend 16.97 hours on housework per week, while men spend only 5.14 hours. Across all countries and cultures women contribute more towards household work compared to men.

4.3 Australian studies of household labour

Australian studies of household labour distribution consistently reveal that women do more domestic labour than men, even when both partners are working full time (Bittman, 1995). In Australia it appears that the gender division of labour is subject to considerable variation in relation to men's and women's employment status. But even when men's and women's traditional roles in paid employment are reversed, such as when men are employed part-time and women are employed full-time, women still spend longer hours on housework than men (Baxter et al., 2005). They claim that gender is still the key determinant of who does domestic labour with women continuing to far out perform men in this area. Many Australians also agree on a “traditional” arrangement of sharing household work. For example, Bittman and Lovejoy (1993) found that 36% of women and 42% of men agreed that men should be the principal breadwinner outside the home and the wife should have primary responsibility of the children and the home. In 1993, Bittman and Lovejoy in their study of Australian couples found that 97% of women and 89% of men agreed that if both husband and wife work, they should share equally the house work and childcare. Their study also revealed that 87% of women and 84% of men agreed that men and women should do equal amount of work in the house (Bittman & Lovejoy, 1993).

In their research on post-familial families¹ in Australia, Baxter, Hewitt and Western (2005) found that the gender division of time on housework is most traditional in married households. They also found that men, who are single, divorced, widowed or in de-facto relationships do more domestic work than married men. Even a recent study of working couples in Australia by Baxter, Hewitt and Haynes (2008) found that irrespective of their marital or parenthood status, women still do more housework than men. But for men there is considerable stability in housework hours across most life course transitions. Rather, married men's time in housework only declines as additional children are born. Even modern domestic appliances have not reduced Australian women's time in household labour (Bittman, Rice & Wajcman, 2004); since these appliances are meant to increase output and not save time in domestic labour. For example, due to these appliances people want cleaner clothes, tastier meals and good-looking houses. In short, due to these technological inventions people have increased their standard of living, but have not reduced time spent in housework.

4.3.1 Cultural differences between Australian and Indian men regarding household work

Across most cultural groups, men are considered to be the primary provider for the family, and earning income is said to be their foremost contribution to the family (Engle & Breaux, 1998; UNICEF, 1995). Even in families in which both parents are employed, the father is still often

¹*This term was coined by Beck-Gernsheim (2002) to mean those families that live in an individualized society and in which a marriage that lasts for a lifetime is not the only foundation for a family life. Such a family may include spouses living apart or even same sex parents.*

viewed in his traditional role as the primary provider (Perry-Jenkins & Crouter, 1990). Men are not relinquishing their provider-role duties but continuing to hold the “psychological responsibility” for the financial stability of the family even when the wife is employed and women are not taking on the duty to provide (Haas, 1986; Hood, 1983, 1986). This may be partly due to men retaining their roles as primary bill payers, financial decision makers and also main mortgage contributors. There is evidence that even when both spouses earn equal, women still consider themselves as co-providers (see Tichenor, 1999). This means that in most cases men consider themselves as providers thus paying for household utility bills, etc. In most societies, women are assigned and restricted to the home as their primary occupational sphere (Blaxall & Reagan, 1976; Hauser & Featherman, 1977).

Eastern and western cultures differ in substantial ways (Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, & Kai-Cheng, 1997) and one primary difference between the east and the west has been the influence of religious beliefs on the work ethic. While western cultures emphasize personal duty and responsibilities towards oneself, eastern cultures emphasize commitment to family and the group (Ralston et al., 1997). In western cultures, gendered division of labour is not strictly enforced; gendered division of labour in these societies is described primarily as balanced, cooperative, and complementary in nature (Rao & Rao, 1985).

Indian society is still largely traditional in beliefs and values, especially with regard to women’s position in society (Chitnis, 1988). Indian family life and Indian fatherhood norms are shaped by a long, venerated cultural tradition that places high value on family unity and compliance with family norms (Bharat, 1997; Mandelbaum, 1970; Mane, 1991). However although still identified as head of the family, the authority of men is less absolute in the urban middle class. (Desai, 1993; Ramu, 1988; Sriram & Krishna, 2000).

Although it has been shown that in general, the amount of household work performed by women far exceeds that performed by men; this is especially true in a traditional society like India, since cultural norms and values associated with family work are highly significant. The norm is that women are solely responsible for performing housework without exception (e.g. Srivastava 1978; Jain 1985; Sharma 1986; Ramu 1989). For Indian men, their contribution to household work is minimal. Tradition has it that men should not do any kitchen work. In fact, a study of time use data collected in six states in India shows that, regardless of region (urban or rural), women in India bear all of the responsibility for domestic work – men account for less than 5 percent of all domestic or care-giving activities (Narasimhan & Panday, 2000). In many traditional Indian families, the participation of men in child care is not only considered shameful for fathers, but also reflects negatively on the woman's efficiency and her capacity to be a good wife (Derne, 1995). However, men may take care of education of older children as this task is not gender specific (Sourabh, 2007).

Among Indians, Hinduism is the predominant religious system and it therefore influences individuals' work ethics to a great extent. Most Indians have certain cultural beliefs about their family obligations. In Asian (Indian) cultures, obligation to one's family is ingrained in the philosophy of life and is valued by all in the society irrespective of class and caste. Four concepts—*dharma*, *karma*, *maya*, and *atman*—guide this philosophy (Murphy & Murphy, 1968; Sharf, 1996). *Dharma* means a code of conduct, a way of living which is necessary to sustain the universe. *Karma* means to do, perform or act. Each person is accountable for his own actions and words. *Maya* is a Sanskrit term meaning an illusion which blinds us to reality. *Atman* can be defined as the true self. It means to be a part of the wider world like the community, family, etc. Other meanings of *Atman* include the soul, breath,

mind, body, etc. An important part of Dharma is the duty of the men to provide for the family and for the women to maintain the family. Hindu work ethics also place an emphasis on hard work, thrift, sense of duty, respect for family, and avoidance of unethical means of wealth accumulation (Srinivasan, 1994). In this philosophy, gender roles and expectations are very different for men and women in India. The husband is generally considered as the head of the family, while the wife is the dutiful mother who looks after the husband, children and the extended family, if any. It has been established that within India, patriarchal ideology, familistic value orientations and traditional gender role preferences provide the normative framework for behaviour (Desai & Krisnaraj, 1987). Further, they state that Hinduism legitimizes this set of norms by providing a particular ethos and world view. This world view considers the family as a sacred and private sphere. Male dominance and female subordination are considered as part of natural order of things. This traditional Indian philosophy is still evident in many Indian households even today. For example, Indian men still prefer staying in joint families for the sake of duty and mutual support and strongly believe in their parent's choice of career and spouse (Jain & Belsky, 1997). Similarly, regardless of the wife's employment status, wives appear to be more traditional than husbands - at least in the sense that the former report a greater influence of traditional institutions and collectivities (such as religion and caste) in their lives (Ramu, 1987).

In India, there is a strong division of family responsibilities between the public sphere and domestic sphere. According to Ramu (1987), Indian men held dominion over activities outside the home (public sphere), including income generation and civic relationships, and women held primary responsibility for activities in the home sphere. Even when wives are employed, men in middle class families are still perceived – with striking unanimity by both

wives and husbands – to have the duty of being the primary provider, and mothers are perceived to hold primary responsibility for the home and family (Ramu, 1988; Suppal, Roopnarine, Buesig, & Bennett, 1996; Bharat, 1997; Seymour, 1999). As a result of the division of spheres between men and women, Indian fathers' role in day to day parenting has been described as ambiguous and peripheral (Kakar, 1978).

Bharat (1995) conducted a study on Indian career women and their spouses, and non career women and their spouses. She found that the career women just like the non career women, ranked domestic roles higher for the wife and lower for the husband, while the provider role was higher for the husband and lower for the wife. Despite their higher position on resources of education, income and occupation, career women perceived their domestic duties as much more important than the task of sharing the economic burden with their husbands (Bharat, 1995). For them, being a “co-provider” was only secondary to their role as mother and homemaker even though their economic contribution was significant (Bharat, 1995). According to Bharat, their husbands also expressed the same opinion of their wife's provider and domestic roles. Similarly, Rao (1990) also found that it was not the wife's employment that lead to marital conflict, rather it was the extent of agreement between spouses on attitudes to work and family roles (Rao, 1990).

Findings by Bharat (1995) and Ramu (1986) suggest that working couples in India continue to be governed by the traditional values and norms of gender roles. Ramu's (1986) study participant consisted of blue collar women employees while Bharat's (1995) study sample consisted of white collar employees. Therefore, despite their level of education and employment status, Indian women are still traditional in their attitudes about gender roles.

Whether or not Indian men and women still hold the same traditional cultural beliefs regarding household work even after migration to western countries, especially Australia, would make an interesting study. A study of Indian immigrants in America by Agarwal (1991) revealed that the second generation Indian woman felt that old-world gender roles were still rigidly being upheld for her. A study by Jain and Belsky (1997) on fathering roles among immigrant Indian fathers in America showed that some Indian fathers had adopted the fathering roles while others had not. They concluded that fathers who were least acculturated maintained their traditional attitudes at the personal and parenting levels. However, there has not been any research on the traditional attitudes of Indian men and women in Australia.

The 20th century has witnessed significant changes in the composition of population in western society due mainly to international migration and labor market transformation (Da, 2004). For example, contemporary Australian families comprise more than one hundred countries of origin (Hartley, 1995). Australia has a more culturally diverse immigrant population than most western societies (Collins, 1993), even though migration in Australia has been more restricted to higher income, higher education and higher skills than other countries like the USA. Many individual families and communities have distinct experiences which vary according to their ethnicity, age, gender, occupational or economic status, length of stay in Australia, location, English language proficiency and migration status (McDonald, 1991; Collins, 1993). It can thus be said that the population in Australia is not homogenous, rather it is a mixture of different cultures.

The changes in the composition of the population in the west imply that the existing theoretical frameworks in the studies of the family and gender relations, which are largely developed from a single cultural context, may not have relevance when applied to a population

with different cultural backgrounds (Baker, 2001; Coltrane, 1998; Connell, 2002). As discussed earlier in the chapter, a lot of research on men's housework involvement among a population with multicultural background still believes in employed women contributing more to housework than employed men. Cross-cultural research highlights that a majority of women take on "second shift" duties after they come home from work (Baker, 2001; Haddad & Lam, 1988; Hochschild & Machung, 1989).

To conclude it can be said that there are mixed opinions about how much time men spend in household tasks. However, in almost all countries and cultures, women still bear majority of the household burden with men only contributing in some spheres like childcare.

Differences and similarities in gender and culture are not only evident in the division of household labour, but also in work related factors like job satisfaction and job stress. Most researchers agree that organisations exist within cultural contexts (Neelankavil et al., 2000) and therefore management and employee assumptions and behavioural, organisational structures and functions are influenced by national culture (Hofstede, 1983). Moreover, work related out comes such as job satisfaction and work strain as perceived and felt by individual workers may vary among cultures since these out comes are manifestations of the cognitive, emotional, and motivational processes developed through the socialization process in the unique culture of the individual worker (Chiu & Kosinski, 1995; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997).

The next section will discuss the gender and cultural differences and similarities in these work related factors.

4.4 Gender and cultural differences in job satisfaction

Job satisfaction among women is often considered as a paradox. This is because most previous research into job satisfaction in the labour market has shown that women consistently express themselves as more satisfied with their jobs than men (Clark, 1997; Sloane & Williams, 2000). This is in spite of women's jobs often being considered as inferior to men's jobs in terms of pay, promotion, etc. The explanation given by Clark (1997) about this paradox is that since women's jobs have been so much worse in the past that they thus have lower expectations than men. Although there have been many suggestions for resolving this paradox, no clear solution has been found (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2007). However, parallel studies do show that females report higher than or equal happiness levels as males. This is known as the "paradox of the contented female worker" (Crosby, 1982).

Job satisfaction among men and women may not be uniform across all occupations. For example, Chiu (1998) found that young women lawyers were not as satisfied with their jobs as young male lawyers. The reason she states is due to lack of influence and promotional ability. Further, Chiu says that professional women tend to have high job expectations, similar to those of men, and the presence of inequality would produce lower job satisfaction for female professionals. A study of job satisfaction among university teachers in Britain revealed that there was no difference between overall job satisfaction between men and women; however, at the senior ranks (professor, reader, etc.) women seemed to be more satisfied than their male counterparts (Oshagbemi, 2000). The reason Oshagbemi cited was due to the relatively low numbers of female academics at higher ranks within UK universities. There is evidence that even in Australia, very few women occupy senior level positions in academia, even though most universities have equal opportunity practices (White, 2003). DeVaney and

Chen (2003) also found that gender was a significant determinant of job satisfaction with females being more satisfied than men. Their sample consisted of young financial graduates. However, Greenhaus (1990) found no significant gender differences in job satisfaction even though males tended to have the higher professional level positions and better salaries, while women were more concentrated in lower-paid clerical jobs. This could be because males and females have different values, and different concepts of equity (Witt & Nye, 1992). Therefore, women may not complain of lesser rewards. Kahn, Nelson, and Gaeddert (1980) argued that gender differences most likely occur when situational demands are ambiguous or weak. When this happens, men and women try to modify the situation according to their interpersonal orientations (Witt & Nye, 1992).

Past studies have also found that younger and more educated females have comparable rates of job satisfaction as their male counterparts. But higher educated females compare only with their rate of pay compared to the males; they are however dissatisfied with hours of work and job flexibility (Kifle & Kler, 2007).

The Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia² (HILDA, 2004) study has identified six measures of job satisfaction. They are overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with job security, satisfaction with hours of work, satisfaction with (type of) work and satisfaction with the flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments.

²*HILDA is a household-based panel study that collects information pertaining to economic, family labour market dynamics. It had four waves from 2001-2004 and was designed to be consistent with the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS).*

Kifle and Kler (2007) used data from the HILDA study to identify gender based differences the measures of job satisfaction. Their results show that females enjoy higher levels of workplace satisfaction compared to males with the exception of satisfaction with job flexibility. They reason that it may be due to lower expectations. But they cannot say that with surety, as the dataset does not allow them to study the matter further.

Many theories of differences in cultural values have also been found to be related to job satisfaction. Generally, these theories are based on Hofstede's (1980) seminal work on the consequences of culture for organizational functioning in different nations. "Dimensions of Culture" was the term Hofstede used to define the four values which differentiated one culture from another. These values were "power distance", "individualism", "masculinity" and "uncertainty avoidance". Using the dimensions of individualism-collectivism, Hofstede found that Australia was the second most individualistic country in the world.

Hui, Yee, and Eastman (1995) found a positive relationship between collectivism and job satisfaction. Their findings were based on Maslow's (1970) "hierarchy of needs" theory which states that higher needs depend on outside conditions such as "familial, economic, political, education, etc." (p. 99) to make them possible.

Because people in poorer nations often suffer from a lack of financial security and adequate housing, physiological and safety needs are more salient in these nations than in wealthy nations (Oishi, Diener, Lucas, & Suh, 1999). Further, Oishi et al. (1999) state that since these basic needs are met in wealthy nations, love and esteem needs become more important for people from such nations. Thus, employees from collectivist cultures have been found to value fulfillment of lower order needs like economic and social security more than their individual goals (Kanungo, 1990). On the other hand, employees from individualistic

cultures seek freedom and control (Kanungo, 1990). Brown (2002) found indirect support for his proposition that for people from individualistic cultures, job satisfaction will be the congruence between values reinforced on the job and the individuals' work values; while for people from collectivist cultures when the work role is approved by the spouse, parents and friends, it would result in job satisfaction. Therefore, when faced with a difficult situation, people from collectivist cultures believe that other more powerful factors like family demands do not allow them to succeed and so they remain dissatisfied compared to their individualistic counterparts (Chiu & Kosinski Jr., 1999). Chiu and Kosinski Jr. (1999) came to this conclusion through their study on registered nurses from Hong Kong and Singapore (collectivist cultures) and from Australia and the USA (individualistic cultures). They found that Chinese nurses scored lower on job satisfaction than the Australian and American nurses. Similarly, McCormick and Cooper (1988) found that Western nations like New Zealand, Sweden and the USA had higher job satisfaction than Asian nations like Japan and Singapore.

Skilled immigrants generally score over other immigrants in terms of employment. For example, a study conducted by Cunliffe (2007) for the New Zealand Government showed that 94 per cent of the principal migrants surveyed were working and contributing to the labour market. Of those, the majority of principal applicants said they were 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' with their jobs. One reason for this could be that since immigrants get a chance to use their qualifications and work in occupations of their choice in a foreign land, they are generally satisfied with their jobs.

Although there have been mixed opinions about job satisfaction and gender, most past research has shown that women seemed to be more satisfied with their work whether it was part time or full time, blue collar or white collar. Cross-cultural differences in collectivist and

individualistic cultures have also not been clearly evident. This could be due to the kinds of jobs that men and women from both individualistic and collectivist cultures perform. Studies of immigrant job satisfaction also reveal that job satisfaction of immigrants depends upon what the host nation has to offer them.

4.4.1 Cross-cultural differences in work-family conflict and job satisfaction (spillover)

There is a strong correlation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction. More recent research has explored the effects of each component of work-family conflict and gender on job satisfaction (Grandey, Cordeiro & Crouter, 2005). While this research found that work to family conflict predicted women's job satisfaction but not men's, there was no evidence of a relationship between family to work conflict and job satisfaction suggesting that one dimension of work-family conflict may have a stronger relationship with job satisfaction than the other.

The majority of studies have found that as WFC increases, job satisfaction decreases. However, results across individual studies have been inconsistent. For example, just as in North America and Western European nations (Kinnunen, Geurts, & Mauno, 2004), in India too work-family conflict was found to correlate significantly with job satisfaction (Aryee et al., 2005). But in other Asian countries like Hong Kong, Aryee and Luk (1996) failed to find any relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction. These findings may suggest that cultural differences are important in identifying factors that lead to work family conflict. A study conducted on managers by Spector et al. (2007) found that there was a more significant relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction in western

(individualist) cultures than in Asian (collectivist) cultures. Spector et al. (2007) argue that this may happen due to the greater individualism of western individuals, who tend to respond to adverse job conditions with dissatisfaction and thoughts of turnover. People in more collectivistic society might be more likely to remain loyal to the employer and respond to adverse conditions with greater affiliation with coworkers (Spector et al., 2007).

4.4.2 Cross-cultural differences in job stress

Women's experiences of job stress have already been discussed in Chapter 2 of the thesis.

Job stress is common to almost all jobs and all cultures. Culture performs an essential role in every component of the stress process, including the occurrence and appraisal of events, coping options, coping strategies, and the adaptation outcomes (Goh, 2003; Scherer et al., 2000; Slavin et al., 1991). Therefore, many researchers try to study stress from the cross-cultural point of view. Due to economic globalization, cross-cultural research on stress has been growing in importance (Liu & Spector, 2005). For example, the variables considered as job stressors in one culture may not be the same in another (Narayanan, Menon & Spector, 1999). They found that for their American (individualistic) sample, lack of control/autonomy appeared to be a major source of work stress. In contrast, for their Indian sample (collectivist), lack of structure and clarity was a great source of stress. In a study of 21 nations conducted by Peterson et al. (1995), individualism was associated with high levels of role ambiguity. However, people from western culture felt that their responsibilities were manageable, but were not sure of how to do it (Peterson et al., 1995); whereas collectivist people felt that they knew more about their jobs but felt that they had too much to do as well.

Sawang, Oei and Goh (2006) also argue that while the effect of work related stress on employees from different cultures may be similar, the form of stressors may be different, and these stressors may be influenced by cultural and social variables such as values, attitudes and perceptions. Accordingly, people from western (individualistic cultures) will handle work stress differently from eastern (collectivist) cultures. In their study of cultural values on occupational stress, Sawang et al. (2006) found that Australians (individualistic culture) perceived a greater tendency to appraise work demands as more stressful (high primary appraisal) than Sri Lankans (collectivist culture).

From the above discussion it could be reasonable to conclude that people from different cultures respond differently to stressors involving job satisfaction and work-family conflict, and to job stress.

4.4.3 Cross-cultural differences in work-family conflict and job stress (spillover)

Work-family conflict and job stress are interrelated and cannot be separated. For example, due to technological inventions like mobile phones and the internet, employers nowadays can be in touch with employees even when employees are at home. This may distract employees' attention from family matters, and it can be expected that the more time a person spends on the job, the more conflict there is likely to be between work and family (Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002).

Past research has revealed differences between individualistic and collectivist cultures on the relationship between work-family conflict and job stress. Individualists emphasize personal accomplishment and achievement through work. Thus, the individualist will tend to

view the needs of the self and the family as distinct, and will experience conflict when there are demands made by both (Spector et al., 2004). Therefore, work and family demands compete with one another rather than working together. However, in collectivist cultures, work is seen not as a means of enhancing the self, but as a means of supporting the family (Spector et al., 2004). Therefore, work and family demands complement each other.

Research has demonstrated Indian men are perceived to be primary providers for the family. They also hold more traditional attitudes. Australian men on the other hand, hold more egalitarian attitudes with regard to employment and household work. Australian men may not always be the major earners in the house. For example, study one of this thesis has shown that three Australian women had husbands who were in part-time and blue collar professions. They may at times, hold lesser positions or earn less than their wives. Yet, even in such households, women are still considered to be responsible for the majority of housework. It has been argued (see Hood, 1983) that these men still consider their wives to be co-providers as the men do not want to do the domestic work.

Although there have not been many studies comparing work related stress among Indians and Australians, there is evidence from a study conducted by Thanacoody, Bartram, Barker and Jacobs (2006) on female academics in an Australian university and Indian academics in a Mauritius university that regardless of cultural context, women of all hierarchical groups found it challenging to balance self, work and family. Although the Mauritian academics had domestic help, the women still had to balance work and perform tasks like picking up children from school and attending school functions (Thanacoody et al., 2006). In Australia too women also have to perform the same tasks, but mostly without the services of paid domestic help.

4.5 Aims and hypotheses of the present study

Most of the past literature suggests that there are differences in household work for men and women. Despite their employment or marital status, women still spend more time in household work than men do. They tend to perform majority of the housework and childcare. However, some researchers agree that women's entry into the work force has increased men's contribution to housework (e.g. see Bianchi et al., 2000). Yet, these findings are blurred and complex (Booth & Crouter, 1998; Hochschild & Machung, 1989). This is because men still consider their provider roles to be more important than their family roles. Cross cultural research regarding division of labour has also suggested that men have not increased their time in domestic household work; but they have increased their time in some areas like childcare. In Australia too, research has found that division of household labour in families is still traditional. In fact, men's time spent in housework declines when children are born (Baxter et al., 2008). Similar findings have been found among Indian men and women living in India. The traditional nature of Indian society suggests that women are solely responsible for housework and childcare related activities. Researches by Bharat (1995) and Ramu (1986) have found that working couples in India are bound by traditional values with women responsible for all domestic household work. Even study one of this research has found that Indian women are responsible for most of the domestic household labour. Yet, other research has shown that due to the nature of families which are changing, western society has become more egalitarian (Murray, 2002). For example, dual earner couples share the responsibility of performing household tasks.

Gender differences have also been evident on factors of job satisfaction, job stress and work-family conflict. Past research has shown that in general, women are more satisfied or

equally satisfied with their jobs as compared to men doing similar jobs (Crosby, 1982; Clark, 1997). However, cross-cultural differences in job satisfaction have not been very evident. This could be because job satisfaction among immigrants depends upon what the host country has to offer to them. Similar findings have also been observed among people from western individualistic cultures and people from collectivist cultures in terms of job stress and work-family conflict.

The present study was therefore designed to investigate differences in job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict among Australian white collar employees and Indian immigrant white collar employees in Australia as *representative cultures* of the west (individualism) and the east (collectivism) respectively.

The previous study investigated and compared differences in job satisfaction, job stress, work family conflict, and family-work conflict between Indian migrant women and their Australian counterparts. There were no apparent differences between the women of both cultures, although the women differed in their perception of job stress. It is possible that gender has a more important effect than does culture on women's work attitudes and culture has more effect than gender on men's work attitudes. It is also possible that rather than culture, gender itself may be an important determinant of job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. The present study wanted to investigate cultural and gender differences between Australian men and women and Indian immigrant men and women using the variables of job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict.

There were four main aims of this study. First, the present study wanted to investigate the role of culture in identifying job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict, and family-work conflict among employed Australian and Indian men and women, both working in the

Australian work-force. Second, the study wanted to investigate the role of gender on the same measures. Third, the study wanted to find out the interaction of culture and gender in identifying job satisfaction, job stress and work-family conflict. Fourth, the study wanted to find out if Indian immigrant men still held the traditional Indian beliefs about performing household work despite their entry into an individualistic and western culture.

4.5.1 Hypotheses of the study

From the above literature and discussion the following hypotheses can be formulated.

Hypotheses 1a and 1b

Most past research has shown that people from collectivist cultures will be more satisfied with their jobs than people from individualistic cultures. Although Indian men and women belong to a collectivist culture, they will experience less job satisfaction due to their immigrant status and adjustment to an individualistic society.

1a. There will be a cultural difference in job satisfaction, with Indian men and women being less satisfied with their jobs than Australian men and women, despite belonging to collectivist cultures.

In keeping with Clark's (1997) finding that women are more satisfied with their jobs, this study also assumes that Australian and Indian women will be more satisfied with their jobs compared to Australian and Indian men.

1b. Australian and Indian women will be more satisfied with their jobs compared to Australian and Indian men doing similar types of jobs.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b

Study one has already suggested differences in job stress between Australian and Indian women, with Australian women having a higher mean score on job stress than Indian women. Past research has also suggested that people from collectivist cultures may experience more job stress than people from individualistic cultures. However, Indian immigrants will also experience job stress due to their immigrant status and also due to adjusting to a new work culture. Therefore this hypothesis states that

2a. Men and women of both cultures will experience similar job stress.

Since men have the double responsibility of being good workers and primary earners, as well as being good fathers/husbands at home, they will experience more job stress than women.

2b. Men from both nationalities will experience more job stress than women from both nationalities.

Hypotheses 3a and 3b

For people from individualistic culture work and family demands conflict with one another, while for people from collectivist cultures work and family demands work with (compliment) one another. Therefore, Australian men and women will experience more work-family conflict than their Indian counterparts.

3a. Although men and women from both cultures will give priority to their family lives over their work lives, Australian men and women due to their individualistic nature will experience more work-family conflict than their Indian counterparts.

Since the predictors of work-family conflict like job demands, work overload etc. are work related variables men would experience more work-family conflict than women.

3b. Men of both nationalities will experience more work-family conflict than women of both nationalities.

Hypotheses 4a and 4b

For people from collectivist cultures centrality of family life is very important. Therefore, if work interferes with family, they will experience work-family conflict.

4a. Indian men and women will experience more family-work conflict than Australian men and women.

The predictors of FWC like number of children living at home, elderly people to be taken care of, etc. are family domain variables, women will experience more family-work conflict than men.

4b. Australian and Indian women will experience more family-work conflict than their Australian and Indian male counterparts.

Hypothesis 5

It has been demonstrated by many researchers (see Rao & Rao, 1985) that in western societies gendered division of labour is not strictly enforced, but in eastern societies beliefs about division of labour are quite traditional. This study hypothesises that Indian men would still be traditional in their outlook of household division of labour, despite their entry into a western or individualistic society.

5. Traditional beliefs of Indian immigrant men regarding household division of labour will not change despite immigrating to a more egalitarian and a western country like Australia.

The next chapter will analyse and discuss these hypotheses.

CHAPTER 5

Methodology, Results and Discussion of Study 2

5. Overview

This section discusses the methodology, procedure, results and discussion of a study on work-family balance among Indian immigrant men in Australia. The conceptual framework of this study was designed to evaluate gender and cultural similarities and differences between job satisfaction, job stress and work-family conflict among Australian and Indian working men and women. The method of employing quantitative as well as qualitative data was chosen since it would provide comprehensive data on factors related to the job as well as contributions of men towards domestic household work.

5. 1 Method

5.1.1 Participants

Participants in this study were 19 Australian and 19 Indian born husbands/fathers and 10 Australian born and 10 Indian born wives/mothers, all employed in the Australian work force ($N = 58$). Data for women were collected during the first study. The men participants were not related to the women participants in any way, and were also recruited through the snowball technique. Each of the men and women had to meet the following criteria:

Indian migrant men and women who have settled in Australia and were part of the Australian work force.

Australian men and women who were brought up in Australia and were part of the Australian work force.

Men and women of both nationalities should be approximately of the same age and be working in the same organization.

They will either be married or living with a significant other with at least one child at home.

It is assumed that by having a child or a significant other living with the men, they may be able to answer questions relevant to family stress, family support and work-family conflict.

5.1.2 Measures

The survey questionnaires were designed to assess job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict for each participant. The scales used in this study were similar to the ones used in study 1 of this research in order to be able to compare men and women.

To measure job satisfaction the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) by Warr, Cook & Wall (1979) was used. This scale consists of 15 items which describe different aspects of the job. The scale has an internal consistency reliability score (Cronbach's Alpha) of .95 for Australian men and .94 for the Indian men. Overall reliability score for men of both nationalities was .95. The items used a 7-point response scale (from 1= extremely dissatisfied to 7= extremely satisfied) with higher scores showing more satisfaction. Representative items of job satisfaction scale are-

How satisfied are you with (please tick)-

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Your immediate boss

Your rate of pay

Your job security

To measure job stress, the 12 item Job Stress Index (JSI) by Bernas & Major (2000) was used. Cronbach's Alpha for Australian men on this scale was .94, showing high reliability. Cronbach's Alpha for Indian men was .88, and overall reliability score for men of both nationalities was .93. The items used a 5-point Likert response scale (from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) with higher scores indicating higher stress. Examples of job stress items include-

I feel "burned-out" after a full day of work. ___

The tension I feel at work makes me unhappy. ___

My job is stressful. ___

To assess work-family conflict, the 22 item Work-Family Conflict Scale developed by Kelloway, Gottlieb and Barham (1999) was used. This scale consisted of items which integrated the work and family balance on one scale. The items used a 5-point Likert response scale (from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating higher conflict.

The Work Family Conflict Scale was divided into work-family conflict (W→F Conflict) and family-work conflict (F→W Conflict). The first 11 items of the scale measured W→F interface, while the last 11 items measured F→W interface. Sample items of W→F scale are:

1. To meet the demands of my job, I have to limit the number of things I do with my family members. ___

2. *My job prevents me from attending appointments and special events for family members.*

—

3. *After work, I have little energy left for the things I need to do at home.* ____

Representative samples of F→W item are -

I would put in a longer workday if I had fewer family demands.

My family demands interrupt my work day.

When I am at work, I am distracted by family members.

Alpha score on the W→F Conflict for the Australian population was 0.90, whereas it was 0.85 for the Indian population.

Sample items of the last 11 items of the work-family scale representing family-work conflict are:

1. *I would put in a longer workday if I had fewer family demands.* ____

2. *My family demands interrupt my work day.* ____

3. *Family demands make it difficult for me to take on additional job responsibilities.* ____

Cronbach's alpha for family-work conflict for the Australian men was 0.80 while it was 0.92 for the Indian men.

5.1.3 Procedure

After the study had been granted ethics approval, participants were contacted using the 'snowball' technique. Ethics included the following terms –

There will be no risk of pain, anxiety or discomfort. Interviews will be conducted in a place suitable to the participant.

Signed consent forms will be obtained from the participants.

Participants will be free to withdraw from the study whenever they feel like.

Participants will be assured of confidentiality of their information. No individual will be identifiable in any reports

Each Indian participant was asked to recruit his Australian counterpart. The “matched pair” of Australian and Indian participants were from the same work place, holding the same amount of responsibility. Consent forms were obtained from the participants. All the participants preferred the measures be given to them electronically. E-mail addresses of the participants were obtained when the consent form was given to them. Unlike in study 1, it was not possible to interview each participant personally (mainly due to their busy schedules), so the survey questionnaire was e-mailed to them. However, interview responses could be obtained personally from three Indian men. All the other questionnaires were e-mailed to the participants and the responses too were obtained electronically.

5.2 Research questions for the study

Research questions and hypotheses for this study were based on examining cultural and gender differences between Australian men and women and Indian immigrant men and women, as well as between men and women of both cultures. Since the previous study did not reveal any significant cultural differences between women of both cultures, the present study was undertaken to investigate the effects of culture and gender on the measures of job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. This study was also undertaken to find out differences between Australian men (individualistic culture) and Indian immigrant men (collectivist) culture on the performance of household labour.

5.3 Data Analyses

First, the reliability of each measure was calculated using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for each scale. To investigate the effects and interaction of culture and gender, 2 x 2 ANOVA was used. Chi-square (X^2) was used to determine differences in housework performed by Australian and Indian men. All data was analysed using SPSS 14.0 for windows.

5.4 Results

Participants were 38 men aged between 27-59 years ($M = 42.42$, $SD = 7.16$). Mean age of the 19 Australian participants was 43.10 ($SD = 8.33$) and mean age of the 19 Indian participants was 41.73 ($SD = 5.93$). All the male participants were occupied full time as health professionals, managers and in the field of information technology. Total numbers of children for the 19 Australian men were 42, while for the Indian immigrant men it was 35. Thus total number of children for the Australian and Indian men was 77 ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .70$). Total number of children for the Australian and Indian women participants was 40 ($M = 2$, $SD = 0.73$). All Indian men participants had immigrated to Australia between 1992-2002 through the General Skilled Migration visa category while the women participants had immigrated between 1990-2002 through the same visa category. All the men were full-time employees working for more than 48 hours a week.

Table 5.1 summarises the demographic characteristics of all the participants in the current study.

Table 5.1

Demographic Characteristics of all Men and Women Participants (N = 58)

Demographic characteristics	Men (N=38)	Women (N=20)	Total (N=58)
Employment status			
Full-time	38	15	53
Part-time	0	5	5
Full-time/casual	0	0	0
Part-time/casual	0	0	0
Spouse employment status			
Full-time	24	17	41
Part-time	12	3	15
Full-time/casual	2	0	2
Level of education			
Secondary school*	0	0	0
Diploma	0	0	0
University graduate	34	19	53
Post graduate/higher	4	1	5
Spouse level of education			
Secondary school*	0	0	0
Diploma	5	3	8

University graduate	30	14	44
Post graduate/higher	3	3	6
Total number of children	77	40	117

**Note:* All participants and their spouses had passed secondary school to get diplomas and degrees

In order to investigate differences in the division of household labour among Indian and Australian men, the household survey, similar to the one given to the women in study 1, was e-mailed to the male participants of the current study. Table 5.2 summarises cultural and gender responses of the household and work survey. Results of the survey from the women participants of the first study were added to the table. It must be noted that all participants could give multiple answers to some questions. For example, “What are the reasons for taking leave from work?” or “How do you spend your weekends?” Similarly, questions regarding spousal support in helping with household work and cooking could also generate multiple responses.

Table 5.2

Responses to Household and Work Survey

Responses to Survey	No. of cases with the experiences			
	Culture (<i>N</i> = 58)		Gender (<i>N</i> = 58)	
	Aus (<i>N</i> =29)	Ind (<i>N</i> =29)	Men (<i>N</i> =38)	Women (<i>N</i> =20)
Questions regarding work				
Money is main motivator for work	11	10	17	4
Job satisfaction is main motivator	18	19	21	16
To keep oneself occupied	0	0	0	0
Very happy with their jobs	16	14	22	8
Fairly happy with their jobs	9	10	12	7
Not happy with their jobs	4	5	4	5
Almost always bring home work from office	11	13	19	5
Sometimes bring home work from office	8	9	13	4
Never bring home work from office	10	7	6	11

Have taken stress leave from work	6	0	4	2
Never taken stress leave from work	23	29	34	18
Sick children is main reason for leave	13	11	4	20
Sick spouse is main reason for leave	0	0	0	0
School holidays are the main reason for leave	7	8	3	12

Questions regarding family and personal life

I am the major decision maker in the house	0	0	0	0
Spouse is the major decision maker	0	0	0	0
Decisions are made by both	29	29	29	29
How do you spend your weekends?				
Weekends are spent shopping for groceries/fruits, etc.	18	16	14	20
Weekends are spent looking after children	6	3	5	4
Weekends are spent cleaning	13	12	8	20
Weekends are spent entertaining	7	15	10	12
Weekends are spent just relaxing	5	4	9	0

Go on a holiday every 6 months	1	0	1	0
Go on a holiday once a year	28	29	37	20
Never go on a holiday	0	0	0	0

Questions regarding work-family balance

Do you-

Always get family support	29	29	38	20
Sometimes get family support	0	0	0	0
Never get family support	0	0	0	0

Whose job is more stressful?

My partner's job is more stressful	10	10	7	13
My job is more stressful	15	14	26	3
Both our jobs are equally stressful	4	5	5	4

How often do you help with household work?

(cleaning, laundry, etc.)

Help everyday	17	12	9	20
Sometimes help	8	8	16	0*
Help only on weekends	3	6	9	0*
Never help	1	3	4	0

How often do you cook for the family?

Almost always	16	12	8	20
Sometimes	7	4	11	0
Cook only on weekends	6	3	9	0
Never cook for the family	0	10	0	0

How often does your partner help with household work?

Help everyday	22	21	37	6
Sometimes help	4	4	1	7
Help only on weekends	3	2	0	5
Never help	1	3	0	4

How often does your partner cook for the family?

Almost always	21	19	38	2
Sometimes	5	2	0	7
Cook only on weekends	4	2	0	6
Never cook for the family	1	6	0	7

**Note:* These tasks were performed everyday by the women; Aus = Australian, Ind = Indian

Results of the responses to work and house survey in Table 5.2 have revealed certain similarities between Australian men and women and Indian immigrant men and women. For example, all 58 participants had partners who were employed. Decisions regarding family and personal life were made jointly and not by any single member of the household. Another

similarity was that 10 participants from both cultures felt that their partner's job was more stressful. Participants from both cultures were also matched on their responses with respect to the question on partner's help with household work.

A series of chi-square tests (X^2) were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences between culture (Australian and Indian) and gender (men and women) among the participants. Tables 5.3 and 5.4 summarise the chi-square (X^2) test results for culture and gender respectively.

Table 5.3

Cultural Differences between Australian and Indian Participants on Job and Home Related Factors

Responses	X^2	df	p
Taken stress leave	36.48	1	$p < .001$
Help with housework	24.35	3	$p < .001$
Cooking everyday	16.89	3	$p < .001$

Major cultural differences were observed on three items. The first difference was regarding the question of having taken stress leave from work. Results of the chi-square tests (Table 5.3) revealed that Australian and Indian participants differed significantly on aspects of having taken stress leave, $X^2 (1, N = 58) = 36.48, p < .001$. Significantly more Australian men and women than Indian men and women answered in the affirmative.

Table 5.4

Gender Differences between Men and Women on Job and Home Related Factors

Responses	X^2	df	p
Money as main motivator for working	4.41	1	$p < .05$
Happy with the job	11.41	2	$p < .01$
Whose job more stressful	10.38	2	$p < .01$
Weekends spent cleaning house	4.41	1	$p < .05$
Weekends spent relaxing	27.59	1	$p < .001$

However, some major differences were observed in gender. For example, in questions regarding participants' job experiences, money was the main motivator for 17 (44.73%) men compared with only 4 (20%) women. 22 (57.89%) men were very satisfied with their jobs compared to only 8 women. Chi-square (X^2) tests performed on this factor revealed this difference. Significantly more Australian and Indian men were satisfied with their jobs than Australian and Indian women, $X^2 (1, N = 58) = 4.41, p < .05$. Another major difference was with respect to taking leave for sick children. Only 4 (10.52%) men almost always took time off to be with sick children compared to all the 20 (100%) women. Similarly, 26 (68.42%)

men reported their jobs as being more stressful than their partner's jobs, $X^2 (2, N = 58) = 10.38, p < .01$. Most men felt that their jobs were more stressful than their wife's jobs.

Questions regarding family and personal life also reveal that most women spent their weekends, shopping and cleaning. Another major difference was that none of the women spent their weekends relaxing compared to 9 (23.68%) men who did so. More men than women found time to relax on weekends, $X^2 (1, N = 58) = 27.59, p < .001$. Thirty seven (97.36%) men reported that their partners always helped with the daily household work, whereas only 6 (30%) women said that they almost always got help from their partners.

Indian men and women were asked some additional questions. Responses to these are summarised in table 5.5

Women participants were interviewed fact-to-face, and their interview responses have been summarised in chapter 3.

Table 5.5

Additional Questions for Indian Immigrant Men and Women

Additional questions	Men		Women	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Did you face any kind of racial discrimination at your work-place?	1	18	0	10
Did you have to get your skills/qualifications assessed to be able to work in Australia?	14	5	5	5

Was it difficult for you to find a job in your area of expertise when you first arrived in Australia?	13	6	4	6
Was it difficult for you initially to adjust to the Australian work culture? Why?	2	17	4	6

From the above table, one very surprising factor is that only one Indian immigrant felt racially discriminated against. None of the other immigrants reported discrimination at their work place. Similarly, only two Indian men and 4 Indian women had any difficulty in adjusting to the Australian work culture.

Two aspects of the household and work survey were tested using chi-square to find out any significant differences between the attitudes of Australian and Indian men on helping with household work and cooking for the family. Results of these are summarized in table 5.6.

Table 5.6

Results of Chi-Square Tests to Determine Significant Differences among Australian and Indian Men on aspects of Cooking and Doing Housework

Responses	X^2	df	p
Housework	15.52	3	$p < .01$
Cooking	9.71	3	$p < .05$

Results of the chi-square (X^2) test also revealed that men and women from both cultures differed on their help with household work. More Australian men and women helped each other with household work compared to Indian men and women $X^2(3, N = 58) = 24.35, p < .001$. This difference was with respect to the question on help with household work to which 17 (58.62%) Australian men and women said they helped everyday, while only 12 (41.37%) Indian men and women helped everyday. Similarly, differences were also observed on the question of cooking for the family with significantly more Australian men than Indian men saying that they helped with cooking almost everyday, $X^2(3, N = 58) = 16.89, p < .001$.

5.4.1 Results of the effects and interaction of culture and gender

In order to investigate the effects of culture and gender and also the effects of the interaction of culture and gender, a 2 X 2 ANOVA was performed with JSS, JSI, WFC and FWC as the dependent variables and culture and gender as the fixed factors.

Table 5.7 summarises the means and standard deviations of culture and gender on job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict.

Table 5.7

Means and Standard Deviations of Culture and Gender on all Study Variables

Variable	Culture		Gender	
	Aus	Ind	Men	Women
	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>
JS	83.14 (13.97)	76.24 (13.89)	81.36 (15.59)	76.50 (10.91)

Job Stress	39.03 (8.85)	32.66 (7.24)	37.74 (7.25)	32.25 (10.03)
WFC	28.03 (8.81)	28.07 (7.68)	29.29 (7.65)	25.70 (8.86)
FWC	26.10 (5.97)	24.52 (5.93)	23.97 (5.68)	27.85 (5.74)

Note: Aus = Australian; Ind = Indian; JS = job satisfaction; WFC = work-family conflict; FWC = family-work conflict

Job Satisfaction

The main effects of culture on job satisfaction were not significant ($F(1, 54) = 2.38, ns$). Neither were the main effects of gender on job satisfaction ($F(1, 54) = 1.61, ns$). Similarly the main effects of the interaction of culture and gender were also not significant ($F(1, 54) = .66, ns$).

Job Stress

There was a significant main effect of culture with Australian participants reporting more job stress. $M = 39.03, (F(1, 54) = 10.87, p < .01)$.

There was a significant main effect of gender with men reporting more job stress than women ($M = 37.74, (F(1, 54) = 6.64, p < .05)$).

However, the interaction effects of gender and culture on job stress were not significant ($F(1, 54) = .95, ns$).

Work-Family Conflict

The main effects of culture on work-family conflict were not significant ($F(1, 54) = .13, ns$).

However, the main effects of gender on work-family conflict were significant ($F(1, 54) =$

6.12, $p < .05$) with Australian men and Indian men having a higher mean ($M = 29.29$) than Australian women and Indian women ($M = 25.70$).

The interaction effect between culture and gender on work-family conflict was not significant ($F(1, 54) = 2.74, ns$).

Family-Work Conflict

The main effects of culture on family-work conflict were not significant ($F(1, 54) = .92, ns$).

There was a significant main effect of gender with women reporting more family-work conflict. ($M = 27.85$), ($F(1, 54) = 5.97, p < .05$).

The interaction effects between culture and gender on family-work conflict were not significant ($F(1, 54) = .20, ns$).

5.5 Discussion

Hypotheses 1a and 1b

According to hypothesis 1a, Indian immigrant men and women would be less satisfied with their jobs as compared to Australian men and women. This hypothesis was assumed due to past research on the experiences of immigrants. For example, they may not be able to get the jobs they want, or they may also not be satisfied due to their adjustment to a different work culture. But, the main effects of culture on job satisfaction were not significant. There is an explanation for this. Usually, when immigrants migrate to a new country, they have to first find jobs in their areas of skills and expertise and then settle down. The process of finding jobs in one's field of expertise may sometimes be a very difficult process. In this study 13 Indian immigrant men initially found it difficult to get jobs in their area of expertise and in study one,

5 Indian women found it difficult to get jobs in spite of being fully qualified. However, after finding jobs, the immigrants were satisfied with them.

I waited for quite some time before getting a job as an engineer. I never even thought that I would get a job as an engineer. But now I am happy with the job (Indian male, Civil Engineer).

Another Indian software engineer had the following to say about his job.

“For me it was very difficult. I came to Australia in the early 1990s, when IT was a very distant field here. It was already booming in India so I thought that I would easily get a job in Australia. Although I had a degree in computers (BE) I had to start as a programmer which is the most basic thing in IT. But I changed my job immediately when I got the chance and am very happy here for the past 13 years.”

Since, it could have been difficult for the immigrant men and women to find jobs they wanted upon arrival in Australia, they may have been satisfied that they have got the type of job they wanted.

I have a master’s degree in Chemistry from India. I did my PhD from London and worked in India for a few years before coming to Australia. I had to work as tutor in an Australian University for a couple of years, along with students just starting their PhD. But this teaching experience helped me to reach the position of Professor which I am holding today (Indian male, Professor)

Work and household survey results revealed that Indian men and women were similar to Australian men and women in their perceptions regarding their jobs. Nineteen (32.75%) Indian men and women said that they worked for job satisfaction, while 18 (31.03%) Australian men and women said the same. According to Clark (1997), those who expect less

from their jobs are more satisfied with it. After qualification assessment and initial difficulty in getting a job, perhaps Indian immigrants would not have expected to get jobs in their areas of expertise. But having obtained such jobs would have made them satisfied (Refer to quote by the Indian civil engineer).

It may well be argued that immigrants bring with them diversity in their ways of working due to a different organisational culture of their host country. This diversity can result in misunderstandings in the way of working in the host country. This could be especially so while interacting with co-workers and it can lead to lower job satisfaction and more stress. However, Indian participants of this study have adapted to the diverse Australian work culture. Seventeen Indian men and six Indian women replied “no” to the question regarding difficulty in adjustment to the Australian work culture. A reason for this could be that immigrants may view the event of immigration as an opportunity for occupational change. Moreover, since most jobs are becoming racio-ethnically more global, immigrants have become a sizeable part of the work force (Bhuan & Islam, 1995), especially in countries like Australia. Again, according to Locke (1973), “job satisfaction is an attitude resulting from the appraisal of one's own job” Also, employees usually also have an overall evaluation of their jobs, which can be defined as overall job satisfaction and can be measured precisely with a single-item measure (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983; Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997). This study too was interested in measuring the overall job satisfaction of Australian and Indian immigrant men in the Australian work force. The Indian immigrant participants of this study appraised their jobs as being ‘satisfying’ and thus there were no differences between the locals (Australian men and women) and the immigrants (Indian men and women). Researchers in the past (e.g. Yousef, 2001) have argued that individuals who support a strong work ethic are likely to be

more committed to the organisation and thus are likely to be more satisfied with their jobs. Perhaps, the Australian men and women and Indian men and women in this study were satisfied with overall aspects of their job and therefore, there were no apparent differences between them.

Findings of this research do not support previous research that people from collectivist cultures will be more satisfied with their jobs than people from individualistic cultures (e.g. Hofstede, 1980; Hui et al, 1995; Oshi et al 1999). Indian men and women compared with Australian men and women, were equally satisfied with their jobs. Immigrant experiences regarding job satisfaction may differ from one person to another and culture may have very little role to play in it.

Therefore, hypothesis 1a was not supported.

Hypothesis 1b states that there will be gender differences in the perception of job satisfaction between men and women, with Australian and Indian women experiencing more job satisfaction than their male counterparts. However, 2 x 2 ANOVA results did not reveal any statistical significance ($F(1, 54) = 1.61, ns$). This would mean that men and women of both cultures are equally satisfied with their jobs. This finding is consistent with Greenhaus (1990) who found no gender differences in job satisfaction in his study and also with Crossby's (1980) theory of "paradox of the contended worker" which states that if not more than, women will be equally satisfied with their jobs like men.

There are a couple of reasons for women to be as satisfied with their jobs as men. Firstly, women compare their jobs with other women and not with men and secondly, women are willing to accept lesser rewards (Phelan, 1994). For example, men value salary more highly than women do. Indeed, results of this study have revealed that only 2 (20%) Australian

and Indian immigrant women worked for money; while results have revealed that 9 (45%) Australian men and 8 (40%) Indian men worked for money. This is because in most societies men are considered to be the main breadwinners of the family.

Hypothesis 1b was not supported.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b

Hypothesis 2a states that men and women from both cultures will experience similar job stress. Australian men and women would experience job stress due to their individualistic culture, while Indian men and women would experience job stress due to the entry of immigrants into a new country and also due to their entry into a new work culture. Surprisingly, the results revealed that it were the Australian men and women who experienced more job stress. Research has shown that besides race and ethnicity, education and skills also interact in the employment process of immigrants in a new country. Some jobs provide the opportunity for upward mobility and a dignified standard of living; many others offer only poor pay and tedious, hard, unstable work (Ortiz, 1996). Jobs which provide an opportunity for upward mobility can be more satisfying and less stressful. Immigrants from Non English Speaking Backgrounds (NESB) face a lot of stress adjusting to their jobs. However, for the Indian immigrant participants of this study level of education, skills and English language was never a problem of adjustment. The Australian Immigration Policy ensures the immigration of only skilled immigrants from India into Australia. Moreover, although the official language of India is Hindi, yet for schools, colleges and for all official purposes the language of communication is English. All immigrants migrating to Australia under the “skilled category” have to pass the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) with a band of 6,

which means that the individual is a competent user of the language. Therefore communicating at the work place may have not been very difficult for the participants. Researchers have added English speaking ability as a measure of assimilation and found that English language ability, whether learned before or after immigration, represents a means to upward mobility (Kossoudji, 1988). This is very true of all the Indian immigrant participants of this study. Many studies (see Aycan & Berry, 1996) have found that there is underemployment among highly skilled immigrants. However, no such evidence was found in this study. Some Indian immigrants did have to get their qualifications re-assessed and many experienced initial hardships in finding jobs. However, none of the Indian men or women remained unemployed for a long time and they did not report any stress on their jobs.

Independent Samples t-test performed after 2 X 2 ANOVA on items of the job stress questionnaire revealed that Australian men and women differed most from Indian men and women on four items (4, 6, & 9). Item number 10 was just significant at the .05 level. These items were:

4. I feel that I cannot work long enough or hard enough.
6. I feel that I will never get all my work done.
9. I have unwanted stress as a result of my present job.
10. I feel “burned-out” after a full day of work.

Work stress is caused due to work overload (Sales, 1970), stressful environment, low autonomy (Jackson, 1989), etc. An important point to be noted is that the interview questionnaire result (Table 5.2) showed that four Australian men had taken stress leave from work whereas no Indian men had done so, and two Australian women had availed of stress leave, while no Indian woman had taken this leave (chapter 3, study 1). According to Sawang,

Oei and Goh (2006) forms of stressors may be different, and may be influenced by cultural and social variables such as values, attitudes and perceptions. The four Australian men perceived their jobs to be stressful and could not cope with it. This may have prompted them to take stress leave. For Indians on the other hand, stress leave is something that is unheard of. Indians are used to working in stressful environments as interview results of women in study 1 have revealed. This difference can also be attributed to the difference in cultures- Individualism and Collectivism. Australian culture being Individualistic would mean that the individuals have to cope with all stressful experiences themselves. In individualistic countries, employees show lower needs for dependence and high need for autonomy (Adler & Jelinek, 1986) and if such autonomy is not available, they will face higher degree of role ambiguity (Agarwal & Ramaswami, 1993) which in turn may lead to job stress. This finding of the present study is also consistent with Sawang et al's (2006) finding that people from individualistic culture perceived a greater tendency to appraise work demands as more stressful (high primary appraisal) than people from collectivist cultures.

Empirical evidence shows that employees tend to form social networks with colleagues from similar cultural backgrounds (Manev & Stevenson, 2001). For example, Manev and Stevenson (2001) found that, instead of networking with colleagues from other cultural backgrounds in the same subsidiary, an Indian manager is more likely to establish a personal support network with other Indian managers in other subsidiaries, even when the disadvantage of a long-distance interaction is necessitated. Strong support networks in Indian societies can be advantageous for their stress-buffering attributes as opposed to more individualised approach to managing stress in western societies (Jobanputra & Furnham, 2005). Since Australia has many Indian immigrants and most of them in high positions (chapter1;

figure 1.1), establishing support networks with other Indians would be quite easy. Once these networks are established immigrants can settle comfortably on their jobs fully well knowing that they have emotional and physical support when they need it. This networking was evident in this sample of participants as the “snowball” technique was used. Indian men and women participants not only suggested names of a matched Australian participant, but also suggested names of other Indian white collar employees in other organisations who were known to them. However, it is not very clear from this study as to why Australian men and women would experience more job stress than Indian immigrants.

Thus, hypothesis 2a was not supported.

According to hypothesis 2b gender would have a significant effect on job stress. Men from both cultures would experience more job stress compared to the women due to their double responsibility of being good employees, primary bread winners and good fathers/spouses. This hypothesis was supported.

T-test results to find differences on items of job stress revealed that men and women differed on two items (2 & 12). These items are-

2. I have too much work to do.

12. My job is stressful.

The men participants perceived their jobs to be overall stressful and also felt that they had too much work to do. Most previous research has shown that it is women who experience more work stress due to gender bias at the work-place or other factors like not being accepted into predominantly male professions. However, this study has shown that women do not experience more stress than men. One reason could be that five women in this study, although

professionals, worked part-time whereas all the men were full time white collar professionals. A second possibility could be that women are balancing more work-family demands, but they feel successful in doing so (Milkie & Petola, 1999), especially when they compare themselves with other similarly strained women they know. Furthermore, sacrifices made in the family affect women more than men (Milkie & Petola, 1999). For men on the other hand, sacrifices made at work affect them more (Milkie & Petola, 1999). Men typically work for more hours than women (Gellar and Hobfall, 1994). ABS (2008) statistics in Australia reveal that on average men spend 4.33 hours per day in paid employment while women spend 2.52 hours per day. Even in this study, men worked for more than 48 hours a week, while women working part-time worked between 25-30 hours a week. Full-time employed women in this study spent 40 hours a week in paid employment. Twenty six male participants of this study felt that their job was more stressful than their partner's job. Past research (example, see Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) has demonstrated that people with highest work pressure had most trouble combining work and family roles. Sometimes, the job itself may be quite stressful and thus men may experience more job stress than women. According to Kanter (1977) men may like to be placed on jobs that offer scope for promotion. These job ladders have a high ceiling (Kanter, 1977) and thus may be stressful for men. Similarly, men also value autonomy, promotion, salary (Clark, 1997) more than women do thereby making them more stressed. Since men spend more time in paid employment, most work stress research has focused on men and therefore, the work place becomes the major source of stress Baruch et al. (1987).

Hypotheses 3a and 3b

Hypothesis 3a assumes that Australian men and women will experience more work-family conflict than Indian men and women. However, this hypothesis was not supported. Culture does not have any effect on work-family conflict. Rather, work-family conflict is caused by other factors like job stress, family stress, job involvement and family involvement (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992). Work-family conflict is also caused by work demands interfering with family demands. These factors are not culture specific and may be experienced by all employees alike. Although most past research (example, see Yang et al., 2000) has demonstrated that there are cultural differences in the experience of work-family conflict, the present research has not shown any such differences.

One possible explanation for this could be that balancing the demands of paid work and home responsibilities has become a principal daily task for a steadily growing number of employed adults (Fallon, 1997). The number of dual earner families is increasing and women are also increasing their time in the paid work-force. Household tasks thus have to be shared between the couples. Household survey results of this study reveal that seven Australian men helped out with household tasks everyday, while six men almost always cooked for the family. However, all (19) the men said that their partners cooked everyday, while 18 men said that their partners did the household work everyday. Therefore, men helped the women rather than being solely responsible for the household tasks. By not being fully responsible for domestic work and paid work, men and women from individualistic cultures may not experience any more work-family conflict than men and women from collectivist cultures. According to Goodnow & Bowes (1994) men may gain a sense of fulfillment from reducing their partner's

burden by helping her out. But they do not want the burden of owning the responsibility for household tasks.

Thus hypothesis 3a was not supported.

The hypothesis that men would experience more work-family conflict than women (hypothesis 3b) has been supported. An explanation for this could be that the men of this study had adopted the traditional male gender role. They were the main providers of the family. Research by Simon (1995) has revealed that in dual earner families, men found it important to provide economic support for the family, whereas only few women found it important to be the main providers of their family. This hypothesis is consistent with various past findings (e.g. Pleck, 1977; Fu & Shaffer, 2000)) that for men, work has a greater influence on the family domain (WFC) than for women. Men traditionally have experienced stronger sanctions for non-compliance with work role demands than for non-compliance with family demands; women, on the other hand, traditionally may have been exposed to stronger sanctions for non-compliance with family demands (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). According to Pleck (1977) the boundaries between work roles and family roles are asymmetrical for men and women. Therefore, when men experience conflict between work and home, they are expected to be more committed to the job due to which they experience more work-family conflict.

Factors relating to work-family conflict are likely to be job related factors like long hours of work, supervision, autonomy, etc. A total of 26 men in this study sample felt that their jobs were more stressful than their partner's jobs. *T*-tests conducted after ANOVA on items of the work-conflict scale revealed that men and women significantly differed on three items of the scale (5, 7, & 8) with men having a higher mean score on the items. These items are-

5. My job prevents me from attending appointments and special events for family members.

7. I think about work when I am at home.

8. I do not listen to what people at home are saying because I am thinking about work.

A possible explanation for this is that all the 38 men in this study were professionals with high levels of responsibility in their jobs. The demands of their work roles may have spilled over on the demands of their home roles thereby increasing their work-family conflict.

However, some past research (e.g., Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998) has not found any evidence for men to experience more work-family conflict or for women to experience more family-work conflict.

Hypotheses 4a and 4b

Hypothesis 4a states that Indian men and women would experience more family-work conflict than Australian men and women. This difference was predicted because of the values of individualism and collectivism. This hypothesis was not supported. There were no significant cultural differences found in the experience of work-family conflict. This finding is consistent with research comparing Chinese (collectivist) and American (individualistic) managers conducted by Yang et al. (2000). They found that family demands did not have much impact on their Chinese sample. It is generally thought that people from individualistic countries are more work and career oriented, while people from collectivist countries would be more family oriented. However, Hofstede (1980) found that western individualist societies valued family and personal time more strongly than eastern collectivist societies. Other cross-cultural studies (e.g. Shenkar & Ronen, 1987) on employees have also revealed that people from eastern countries give more priority to work than people from western countries. Therefore, it could be said that when conflicts arise, individualists tend to put self-interests above collective

interests, and collectivists tend to put self interests above individualistic interests (Hofstede, 1980).

According to hypothesis 4b, women from both cultures will experience more family-work conflict than men from both cultures. This hypothesis was supported. Family-work conflict is caused by family demands interfering with work demands. These demands include taking time off from work to make arrangements for children, not being able to take on additional job responsibilities or being distracted by family members at work. It has been established that in spite of women being a part of the labour force, they are still primarily responsible for most of the unpaid household work. Although survey results of the study do show that the fathers sometimes did take time off to be with sick children, all women participants reported being fully responsible for caring of sick children. According to Duxbury and Higgins (1991) spillover of family roles into work roles is more evident for women than for men.

Gender differences were again clear in the division of household work with women taking up the traditional gender roles. Women in this study performed most of the household work like cooking and cleaning. Women also reported that their husbands/partners only helped occasionally. Similarly, the male participants of this study also reported that their wives/partners almost always did the domestic chores. An explanation for this could be that in dual earner couples women generally define themselves in terms of their family roles (Aryee & Luk, 1996); while for men, participation in paid work and being primary providers was important to their family role (Simon, 1995).

Findings of hypotheses 4a and 4b strengthen the findings by Pleck (1977) that work would have a greater influence on the family domain for men, while family would have a

greater influence on women's work domain.

Hypothesis 5

This hypothesis wanted to test whether traditional attitudes of Indian men regarding household work had changed after immigrating to a more western and egalitarian culture. Chi square results reveal significant differences between men of both nationalities on the division of domestic labour. Ten Indian men never did the cooking for the family, while all Australian men helped at least sometimes or on weekends. Six Australian men claimed to cook everyday as against two Indian men who claimed the same. This is again the traditional viewpoint of Indian culture, where men never cook and it is always the duty of the females of the house (mother/sister/wife) to do the cooking. This attitude of the Indian immigrant men has not changed even after migration to Australia. A study on Indian immigrants in Britain by Murcott (2000) also found that on weekdays and Saturdays, migrant and British-born South Asian women spend more time than the other groups preparing and cooking food. Past research on Indian dual earner families (e.g. Ramu, 1987) has established that the women in Indian dual-earner families seek employment mainly for economic reasons; they experience role conflict, role overload, and marital stress mainly because the husbands generally do not alter their domestic roles. The father still holds the "provider" position of the family. Even when wives are employed, men in middle class families are still perceived by both wives and husbands to have the duty of being the primary provider, and mothers are perceived to hold primary responsibility for the home and family (Bharat, 1997; Ramu, 1988; Seymour, 1999; Suppal, Roopnarine, Buesig & Bennet, 1996).

Except for the aspect of cooking for the family, Indian and Australian men seemed to be balanced on other factors relating to balancing work and family roles. For example, men from both cultures took leave only sometimes to be with sick children and that all the men helped with household chores like cleaning and doing the laundry at least sometimes. This strengthens previous research by Bittman (1998), Dempsey (2000) and Pocock (2003) which states that even in Australia women take a larger proportion than men of workload, especially the responsibilities related to domestic work and childcare. Again, researchers like Perry-Jenkins & Crouter (1990) have suggested that even in families in which both parents are employed, the father is still often viewed in his traditional role as the primary provider. This also supports the traditional gender theory in which women are responsible for all the household work despite being in the paid work force.

Therefore, in the Australian and Indian professionals studied here, men are regarded as “providers” of the family while women are regarded as “care takers” of the family. Hypothesis 5 is therefore, partially supported.

5.6 Conclusion

Overall, the present study has found that it is gender rather than culture that is influential on job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict among dual earner couples. However, culture affected work stress.

A finding of the present study is that Indian participants seemed to have adjusted and settled well not only into the Australian work culture, but also into the Australian way of life. Studies of Indian immigrants in other countries like USA and Britain have also shown that Indian immigrants are well settled and adjusted. According to Devi Lakshmi and Pillai (2001),

“as trans national immigrants, Indians not only assimilate successfully with the American life style, but carry back to India their good experiences in America.” Similar findings were also obtained from studies of Indian immigrants in Britain. Most Indians in the UK are highly educated and find jobs in the IT sector.

This study has also supported previous research that for men work roles interfere with their family roles while for women, their family roles interfere with their work roles. What is interesting in this study is that men (and also women) have taken for granted that taking time off to be with sick children and doing unpaid domestic work is naturally the work of women. This means that tasks continue to be “gendered” (Ferree, 1991) and women continue to perform typically female tasks like cooking, cleaning and looking after children. This is consistent with a gender perspective, which suggests that meeting perceived family demands is more critical to women's sense of well-being, and the provider role is more important for men (Milkie & Peltola, 1999).

A recent survey conducted by Assocham’s Social Development Foundation (India) on 3000 dual earner couples in India reported that gender bias still makes a strong statement. Most working fathers felt that a homemaker mother was the ideal situation (Times of India, 5 May, 2008, p 3). The survey also pointed out that ideally most mothers with young families would prefer to stay at home and be with their children. The couples in the survey also voted in favour of having flexible working hours and option to work from home as means to spend more time with their children. Similarly, The Age (22 Feb. 2008, p. 5) reported that in Australia although men and women spend similar amounts of time “working” (between 51 and 52 hours a week), men spend more time in paid employment and women spend substantially more time in unpaid work. Further, The Age also added that for those men who do their share

of domestic duties, these tended to be confined to stereotypical male pursuits – in the garden, fixing the house or caring for pets. Women meanwhile, largely spent time doing household chores such as cleaning, washing and cooking.

The major conclusion drawn from this study is that the dual earner participants of the current study balanced their work and family roles by conforming to the traditional gender role identities. Findings of this study and similar findings from other research suggest that future research into work and family must take into consideration job stress in men and women from individualistic cultures and also the personal role identity of men and women in order to reduce work-family conflict in men and family-work conflict in women.

5.7 Limitations and strengths of this study

This study had several limitations. The numbers of participants were low and thus generalizations cannot be made for all Australian and Indian men and women. Just like the female participants of study one, the male participants of this study too were white collar professionals. They had wives/partners who were either employed full time, part time or as casuals. Perhaps, results would be different if the spouses/partners were only employed full time or if the husbands were in blue collar professions or even worked as casuals. Thus generalizations cannot be made for men working in other kind of jobs. This is also a culture specific study in which comparisons were made between Australian men and women and Indian men and women. Therefore the findings cannot apply to other culturally diverse people settled in Australia. Another drawback was that all the male participants of the current study could not be interviewed personally since they were all very busy. Therefore, one had to rely only on the quantitative measures of the study. Personal face-to-face interviews would have

allowed for better qualitative responses to the quantitative measures. Although Indian participants were asked to answer an additional question regarding their adjustment to the Australian work culture, majority of the participants did not answer it making it difficult to qualitatively understand their difficulties in adjustment.

The strength of the present research is that unlike past research where women have reported whether their husbands helped with domestic chores, this research had reports from the husbands themselves. Also this is the first study of work-family balance in Indian professionals in Australia and also to demonstrate their rapid acculturation and high contentment in Australian society.

5.8 Future research

Gender is a potential moderator of the impact of one's stress on the spouse's strain, because of differences in the traditional role demands and expectations for men and women (Westman, 2005). The process of crossover and spillover would help identify how one spouse's work and family conflict affect the other spouse's work and family conflict and also how stress in one domain affects another domain. Such research might clarify the role of gender and was thus undertaken in the next study.

CHAPTER 6

Study 3

Crossover and Spillover among Dual Earner Couples in Australia

6. Overview

The present study was undertaken to investigate partner crossover effects. The previous two studies (studies 1 & 2) of this thesis found that gender had a more important role to play than culture in work and family related variables. In both the previous studies, gender was studied at the individual level of analysis. The present study wanted to explore “gender” further by analysing the couple as a unit, taking into consideration crossover of work and family related variables from one partner to another.

This chapter first introduces the terms “crossover” and “spillover” followed by a discussion on the role of gender in the crossover and spillover processes. Next the concept of partner crossover effect is introduced. A description of the dependent and independent variables used in this study is made. Lastly, gaps in crossover research are identified and hypotheses for this study are formulated.

6. Definition of crossover and spillover

One of the major changes of today’s family has been the restructuring of work responsibilities in the household (Ciscel, Sharp, & Heath, 2000). The work of husbands and wives is divided into two: paid work and house work. Working families have to face the challenges of adjusting

to their family as well as work life. Time demands from work confront employees as they strive to provide care for family members (Hochschild, 1997). Over recent decades, a body of research has accumulated to indicate that job stressors can have a negative impact on health (Crossfield, Kinman, & Jones, 2005). It is very difficult to separate work life from family life and the stressors arising from them. Juggling work and family responsibilities is a common experience for many employees (Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993; Lee & Duxbury, 1998). Although engaging in both work and family roles can have positive effects for individuals (e.g., Rothbard, 2001), if workers are unable to balance the responsibilities associated with both roles, the potential for conflict between roles increases (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992a; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus & Powell, 2003; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Work-family conflict may be exacerbated when individuals face pressures to have both a successful career and a successful home life (Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Lundberg & Frankenhaeuser, 1999).

Workforce demographics, family roles, and the relationships between work and family are changing. These changes include an increasing percentage of families supported by dual incomes, widespread gender integration in organizations, and the aging of the population (Hammer, Colton, Caubet, & Brockwood, 2002). While specific family structure may vary, some generalities emerge: families have fewer children, the hours of work of the whole family have increased, and the distribution of work (i.e., between men and women and between paid employment and unpaid household labour) has changed (Ciscel, Sharp, & Heath, 2000).

It is a fact that people have not succeeded in separating stress arising at work from its manifestations in the home domain. Work, family and the work-family systems are interrelated (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) and thus affect one another. We can thus expect that the

couples' experiences at work affect their life at home and vice versa. Because of their dual responsibilities, working couples are particularly vulnerable to the problems of work-family spillover, conflict, and crossover (Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003). Bolger et al. (1989) have made a distinction between two situations in which stress is carried over. They are crossover and spillover. In spillover, stress experienced in one domain of life results in stress in the other domain for the same individual (Bolger et al., 1989). Spillover effect is a relationship between independent and dependent variables which intersect at different domains (Takeuchi et al., 2002). In spillover, reactions experienced in the work domain are transferred to and interfere with the non work domain (Leiter & Durup, 1996). Work-family spillover, which can be negative or positive and is bidirectional, involves the transfer of mood and behaviour from one domain (home or workplace) to the other (Almeida, Wethington, & Chandler, 1999; Bromet, Dew, & Parkinson, 1990). Spillover therefore, is an *intra-individual* transmission of stress.

Crossover effects involve the transmission of stress, strain, and depression from one member of a dyad to another (e.g., Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1989; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Jones & Fletcher, 1993; Westman & Etzion, 1995; Westman & Vinokur, 1998; Westman, Vinokur, Hamilton, & Roziner, 2004). Research on the crossover effects of partners' work and family experiences is an important emerging trend in the work and family literature (e.g., Hammer et al., 2005). Early research on crossover involved stress of the male worker's job on the psychological strain of his wife/partner. On the basis of work by Bolger et al. (1989) and more recently by Westman (2002), researchers are recognizing the potential for crossover effects of an employee's work-family experiences on the work-family experiences of his or her spouse. Crossover is said to occur when one person's experiences in work or

family are brought into the second domain, where they then affect other individuals (Bolger et al., 1989; Pittman, Solheim, & Blanchard, 1996).

In crossover, stress experienced in the work place by the individual leads to stress being experienced by the individual's spouse at home. Westman (2001) has defined crossover as a process that occurs when a stressor or psychological strain experienced by one person affects the level of strain of another person. Crossover can also occur when one person's experiences in work or family are brought into the second domain, where they then affect other individuals (Bolger et al., 1989; Pittman, Solheim, & Blanchard, 1996). Crossover therefore is a dyadic, *inter-individual* transmission of stress.

According to Westman and Vinokur (1998) there are three primary mechanisms involved in the crossover process: direct crossover via empathetic reactions, common stressors experienced by both members of a dyad, and indirect crossover via interpersonal conflict. Direct crossover via empathetic reactions from one partner to the other might occur when a partner experiences work-to-family conflict due to limited perceived control at work and, thus, their spouse experiences depressive symptoms due to empathetic feelings for their partner's high level of work-family conflict and low level of perceived control at work. Similarly, a partner's experience of family-work positive spillover might be negatively related to their spouse's experience of depressive tendencies because their spouse feels good about their partner's high level of positive spillover (Westman & Vinokur, 1998).

An increasing number of contemporary women and men are finding themselves involved in work and family arrangements that were largely unknown to their parents' generation (Barnett & Rivers, 1996; Hochschild, 1997). Today, since working couples have dual responsibilities, they are more troubled by problems of stress, work-family conflict and

crossover. Among dual-earner couples, wives typically experience higher levels of work-family conflict than husbands, particularly when young children are in the home (Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee, 1994; Marshall & Barnett, 1993; Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003). Other factors associated with increased work-family conflict among dual-earner couples are high levels of job involvement, a heavy workload, conflict at work or at home, and low levels of supervisor support (Fox & Dwyer, 1999; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992; Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee, 1994).

Social support has also been considered as an important variable in crossover research. In their study, Jones and Fletcher (1993) found that women perceived more sources of social support amongst work colleagues, family and friends than men. As personal resources are finite, providing social support to the provider may play an important part in the mechanisms of crossover – especially if the donor is also experiencing pressure (Westman, 2001). However, in Crossfield, Kinman & Jones' (2005) study of 74 dual earner couples, social support failed to predict the crossover of stress for either male or female participants.

6.1 The role of gender in the crossover process

Work-family conflict is often portrayed as a professional women's issue. Yet recent research has shown that men experience work-family conflict as well and sometimes, more than women do (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2003, as in study 2).

A review of crossover research demonstrates that crossover may be unidirectional or bi-directional. The first stress crossover studies were unidirectional and examined and found effects of husbands' job stress on the well-being of their wives. These studies related to the wives as the passive recipients of stress and strain from their husbands, neither assessing nor

controlling wives' job and life stress, and in some cases, had mixed samples of working and non-working wives (Westman, 2005).

Gender is a potential moderator of the impact of one's stress on the spouse's strain, because of differences in the traditional role demands and expectations for men and women (Westman, 2005). There is some indication that women are more susceptible than men to the impact of stressors affecting their partners (Kessler, 1979). Kessler and McLeod (1984) suggested that because of their greater involvement in family affairs, women become more sensitive not only to the stressful events that they themselves experience but also to those that affect other family members. Also, research on social support has increasingly characterised support seeking, giving and utilization as a process that involves men and women differently (Etzion, 1984). Johnson and Jackson (1998) suggest that women may act as "shock absorbers", taking on the men's stress.

Deeply ingrained norms about the priority of women's motherhood and homemaker roles and men's breadwinner roles may produce internal feelings of discomfort when women and men deviate too far from their internalized norms. They may also produce external sanctions in the form of disapproval by important others when individuals deviate from social norms (Major, 1993). Moreover, according to Major (1993), schools, medical services, and most community activities continue to be organized with reference to the (female) homemaker model, with domestic life principally the province of women. Social and employment policies remain grounded in this gendered template of separate spheres, implicitly, if not explicitly (Blau, Ferber, & Winkler, 1998; Figart & Mutari, 1998; Mutari & Figart, 1997; Orloff, 1993; Vogel, 1993).

However, there are mixed opinions concerning gender differences in crossover. For example, studies by Barnett et al. (1995); Hammer et al. (1995) and Westman & Vinokur (1998) suggest that there are bi-directional crossover effects of similar magnitude from husbands to wives and vice versa. But, while investigating dual career couples, Parsuraman et al. (1992) found that men's work and family stressors and work-family conflict did not affect their wives' family satisfaction. On the other hand, women's family role stressors had a significant negative relationship with their husbands' family satisfaction. Among dual-earner couples, wives typically experience higher levels of work-family conflict than husbands, particularly when young children are in the home (Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee, 1994; Marshall & Barnett, 1993; Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003). Other factors associated with increased work-family conflict among dual-earner couples are high levels of job involvement, a heavy workload, conflict at work or at home, and low levels of supervisor support (Fox & Dwyer, 1999; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992; Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee, 1994).

6.2 Partner Crossover Effects

Crossover effects, also known as transmission effects, occur when an individual's personal experiences of stress, strain, and depression influence the other member of the relationship dyad (Bolger, De-Longis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1989; Westman, 2001; Westman & Vinokur, 1998). Research on partner crossover effects within the work-family interface is an important emerging trend (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003).

Many researchers have examined how work can interfere and have an effect on the relationships they maintain with their partners. For example, Crouter, Perry-Jenkins, Huston, and Crawford (1989) have shown that higher levels of work stress are associated with higher

levels of negative marital interactions. Similarly, Schulz, Cowan, Cowan and Brennan (2004) provide evidence that increased pace at work, as well as increased emotional arousal at the end of the work day, can result in a reduction of marital interactions. Furthermore, Swanson and Power (1999), using a qualitative approach, reported that work can serve as a source of conflict with one's partner. Participants in their study reported that not only did they feel like their work negatively affected their relationship, but that when they felt like their partners' workloads were high, their partners' work also interfered with their relationships.

According to Robles and Kiecolt-Glaser (2003), marriage is a central part of life for most adults. As such, stable, happy marriages can have a profound effect on individuals' satisfaction and health (Robles & Kiecolt-Glaser, 2003). Marriage may fulfill basic and universal human needs including financial and emotional security (Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Henderson, 1977; Rook, 1984). Gove et al. (1990) propose that confiding in a spouse lessens the strains encountered in life and increases one's ability to cope with these strains. People in close relationships have the motivation, the opportunity, and the information to accurately perceive their partners (Kenny & Acitelli, 2001). Research by Jones and Fletcher (1993) has also shown that individuals have accurate perceptions of their partner's jobs.

Several studies have examined work–family conflict in terms of partner crossover effects. Research by Hammer, Allen, and Grigsby (1997) determined that an individual's experienced work–family conflict has a crossover effect on the experiences of work–family conflict for the other member of the dyad. In addition, work–family conflict has been shown to have a crossover effect on work-related withdrawal behaviours, lateness to work reported by women, number of interruptions reported by men at work, and the number of absences from work reported by men (Hammer et al., 2003).

Other studies have examined in more detail partner crossover effects in terms of work and personal relationships. Chan and Margolin (1994) for example, found that for dual-earner couples a woman's work and work fatigue had a crossover effect on her partner's reactions at home. It was also determined that the woman's home affect had a direct crossover effect on her partner's work mood (Chan & Margolin, 1994). A study by Stevens, Kiger and Riley (2006) showed that the influence of crossover for male respondents most likely reflects the cultural expectation that women are primarily responsible for family cohesion. Their research also suggests that the processes that influence perceptions of family cohesion may vary for men and women. For female respondents, work and job characteristics influence their perceptions of family cohesion (Stevens et al., 2006). According to Jones and Fletcher (1993), when men reported experiencing work-to-relationship conflict, their partners accurately reported higher perceptions of partner's work-to-relationship conflict.

6.3 The present study

The present study was undertaken to investigate the effect of crossover of variables related to work and family between members of a couple. The first two studies were undertaken to investigate the effect of culture as well as gender on variables related to work-family conflict. The studies were independently conducted on women and men respectively; that is, the individual was the unit of analysis. The first study suggested some difference in job stress among Australian and Indian women participants. However, there were no other significant differences. The second study did not reveal any significant cultural differences, except on the job stress scale. Both studies revealed gender differences in the experience of job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict, and also in the division of household labour. Women

seemed to be doing more of domestic unpaid work despite being in the paid work-force and earning as much (and in some cases even more) than their husbands. They experienced more family-work conflict than men. But, husbands seemed to experience more job stress and work-family conflict than women. The effect of gender was clear in both the previous studies. Therefore, the present study was designed to see whether this effect of gender had a “crossover” relationship within married couples; that is, analyzing the couple as a unit, rather than analyzing each gender independently. Studying the couple as the unit of analysis allows the examination of crossover effects of the stress of one spouse affecting the stress of the other spouse (Greenhaus et al., 1989; Westman & Etzion, 1995). This study wanted to investigate if variables related to work and family in one partner produced the same effect in the other partner and vice versa.

Variables like fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress were the dependent variables used in this study. These variables were chosen as they represent the interconnectedness between work and home and are experienced by men and women alike. Almost all working couples with children experience fatigue either at work, at home or at both places. In western societies fatigue has been found to be a common health problem in the population and generally, women complain more about fatigue than men (Fuhrer & Wessely, 1995). Both the previous studies of this thesis have evidence that women who have entered the paid work-force are still mainly responsible for almost all the unpaid domestic work and thus they experience more family-work conflict than men. Similarly, results of the previous study have also shown that men experience more work-family conflict than women. This could understandably lead to fatigue or tiredness in both men and women. However, it is not clear whether the predictors of fatigue experienced by women will have the same effect on the

partner and vice-versa. Furthermore, although there has been a lot of past research on “burnout” (e.g., Westman & Etzion, 1995; Bakker, Demerouti, & Scahufeli, 2005), but there is very little research on fatigue. Therefore, fatigue was chosen as one of the dependent variables for the present study. In their sample of 101 military officers and their wives, Westman and Etzion (1995) found that burnout had significant crossover effects from one spouse to the other. Burnout and fatigue differ in some ways. Employees who are burned-out lack the energy to work adequately and poorly identify with their work and they experience feelings of exhaustion. (Bakker, Demerouti, & Scahufeli, 2005). Burnout is a mental state which can be regarded as an extreme expression of long term fatigue (Scahufeli, Leiter & Kalimo, 1995). Burnout is also generally associated with specific occupations, like doctors and nurses. Participants of this study did not belong to any specific occupation, thus fatigue was considered as a more appropriate variable for study.

For a family to function as a unit, it is important that both husbands and wives make adjustments. Most families have their own ways of adjustment. For example, husbands provide for the family while wives become caretakers of the family, or wives work part-time so that they can take care of the domestic aspects of the house. The present study is designed to investigate whether making adjustments has any effect on the marital relationship of the couple and what would be the predictors of dyadic adjustment. Therefore, dyadic adjustment was chosen as one of the dependent variables.

Study one suggested a significant difference in culture in job stress among the Australian and Indian women participants. Similarly, study two also showed gender and cultural differences on job stress. The present study was also designed to investigate the predictors of job stress among husbands and wives and any reciprocal effects of job stress

from one partner to another. Thus, job stress was chosen as a variable to study crossover effects.

Some researchers (e.g. Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair & Shafiro, 2005) have investigated job stress as an outcome variable. Others like Frone (2003) and Frone, Yardley, & Markel (1997) argue that rather than job stress be considered as an outcome of work-family conflict, it should be considered as a predictor of work-family conflict. When this argument was tested by Frone et al. (1997), it was found that indeed work-family conflict was correlated with job stress for both husbands and wives. The present study is interested in considering work-family conflict as a predictor of job stress but it could be argued that both job stress and work-family conflict could have a reciprocal effect on one another. Findings also indicate that women's own work-family conflict is also a predictor of their job stress. Since they have to devote equal time to house work as well as paid work, the effect of the stress would be more evident on their paid work rather than on their house work.

6.4.1 Dependent variables used in the present study

Fatigue

The experience of fatigue at work is normally very common among employees. Community and primary care studies have shown that some degree of fatigue is found in nearly all the population (Loge et al., 1998). Severe fatigue may affect the person's performance in the occupational as well as the home setting (Beurskens et al., 2000). According to Lewis and Wessely (1992) fatigue is a subjective sensation with emotional, behavioural and cognitive components. Although everyone is able to tell whether he or she is experiencing fatigue, it seems to be a diagnostic riddle for patients and doctors (Lewis & Wessely, 1992). Fatigue in

healthy people is usually temporary and is conceptualised as a consequence of physical or mental exertion (Ream & Richardson, 1996).

Fatigue can be divided into long term fatigue and acute fatigue. Acute fatigue is a normal phenomenon that disappears after a period of rest, when tasks are switched, or when particular strategies are used – for example, working at a slower pace (Beurskens et al., 2000). Long term fatigue on the other hand, is more difficult to reverse, not task specific, and the compensation mechanisms that were useful in reducing acute fatigue are no longer available (Beurskens et al., 2000).

According to Hardy, Shapiro and Borrill (1997) work demands and role conflicts are causes of fatigue. According to Pawlikowska et al. (1994) psychosocial factors like work, family and lifestyle factors can also cause fatigue in men and women. Living with children under the age of 6 years is often related to fatigue in the female population, whereas this relationship could not be found among men (Bensing, Hulsman, & Schreurs, 1999). Similar results have been found in other studies, making it clear that despite a more even distribution of employment between men and women (more women are employed than before), taking care of young children is still more burdensome for women than for men (Valdini, et al., 1988; Morrison, 1980).

Dyadic Adjustment

While studying family relationships, it is very important to study marital or dyadic adjustment. According to Spanier (1976) marital or dyadic adjustment may be viewed in two distinct ways-as a process, or as a qualitative evaluation of a state. Defining dyadic adjustment as a process rather than a state has several implications for measuring the concept, the most

important of which is that a process can best be studied over time (Spanier, 1976). Many researchers have indicated that marital distress and dissatisfaction are caused due to adherence to unrealistic beliefs by one or both spouses (Ellis & Harper, 1975; Epstein & Eidelson, 1981). It has also been argued that marital dysfunction and disappointment occurs when spouses hold unrealistic expectations about their relationship and then evaluate each other's behaviour against each others standards (Ellis & Greiger, 1977). Conflicts between work and family demands for a husband may affect the level of hostile interactions in his marriage either through his own psychological distress or through his wife's distress (Matthews, Conger & Wickrama, 1996). There is also considerable evidence that job stress can disrupt marital relationships by increasing hostile or withdrawn behavior in either spouse (Barling & Rosenbaum 1986; Crouter et al., 1989; Repetti, Matthews, & Waldron, 1989). Prior studies have also demonstrated that marital relationships suffer when the demands of work interfere with family life. Clark and Grote (1998b) studied married couples crossing the transition to parenthood and observed that marital distress (i.e., marital conflict and marital dissatisfaction) was concurrently associated with communal violations by an individual or that individual's spouse in the relationship in general and, for wives, in the division of housework. Communal violations include not attending to the other's needs and not demonstrating a general concern for the other's welfare (Clark & Grote, 1998b).

Job stress (work related stress)

Research suggests that people are more likely to attribute the stress or strain that they experience to the work environment than other life domains (McCormick, 1997; Warr & Payne, 1983). Employees are likely to draw on a number of sources when forming their

opinions about work stress, including organizational policies and practices, the trade union movement and the media (Kinman & Jones, 2005). There can be various causes of job stress like work overload, conflict with the boss or co workers, not taking a vacation, etc. According to Blewett et al. (2006), job stress is a widespread concern across all employment sectors and occupational levels, and is a commonly reported cause of occupational illness and associated organisational outcomes (e.g., lost work days, turnover, and workers' compensation claims).

6.4.2 Independent variables used in the study

Based on the results of the previous two studies of the thesis, family/social support, work-family conflict, family-work conflict, family cohesiveness and children were the independent variables or predictors used in this study. These variables were considered as potential predictors of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress among dual earner couples.

Family/Social support

The quality of family life depends a lot on the kind of support that families get. Family support is especially important in dual earner families with children. In the work-family conflict literature there is no single accepted definition of social support. But, there is a growing consensus that social support can come from both work and non-work sources (Beehr & McGrath, 1992; McIntosh, 1991). The most important non-work source of support is the support obtained from family members. As a primary source of support family members have a unique opportunity to provide both emotional support and instrumental support to the worker outside of the work environment (Caplan, G., 1976). Social and family support is also needed to cope with the demands of raising a child. The spouse, teachers, parent groups, etc. play a

major role in providing support to the family. In the organizational sciences, social support from family has received less research attention than work-related sources of social support (Adams, King, & King, 1996). Family support has been known to reduce work-family conflict. Similarly, supportive social networks have also been known to be associated with lower levels of stress (Cobb, 1976). Family support in the form of spousal support has been known to reduce marital stress and thereby reduce work-family and family-work conflict. Research suggests that fathers are important childcare providers when mothers work outside the home (Casper & O'Connell, 1998). Men are also more likely than women to provide financial assistance and are as likely as women to provide transportation to the children when needed (Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990). Therefore, the role of the father is as important as the mother to raise young children in the house.

Family cohesion

Family cohesion is defined as shared affection, support, helpfulness, and caring among family members (Barbarin, 1984; Moos, 1974). From Moos' perspective, cohesion ranges from low to high cohesiveness, with high levels indicating healthy functioning. Family cohesion is defined as the extent to which family members feel emotionally close or bonded to one another (Olson, 1993). It is characterized by shared affection, support, helpfulness, cooperation, interdependence and caring (Barber & Buehler, 1996; Stewart, 2001). The more cohesive the family is, the better is the communication and the greater the consensus between spouses (Farrell & Barnes, 1993). However, research has also indicated that high as well as low family cohesion can lead to family dysfunctions (Fisiloglu & Lorenzetti, 1994). For example, in highly enmeshed families, a lot of time and energy goes into seeking love and approval so that

there can be some harmony in the relationship (Bowen, 1976). But such relationships can be suffocating and end up in conflicts in the family functioning. Low cohesiveness also known as disengagement, on the other hand, leads to an apparent lack of capacity for establishing and maintaining positive relation with others (Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1983). Members of a low cohesion family may function autonomously but they lack a feeling of loyalty, and belonging, the capacity for interdependence and for sharing and support when needed (Fisiloglu & Lorenzetti, 1994). In between these two extremes of enmeshment and disengagement lies the balanced family. In such families individual family members have the freedom to be alone or connected to each other as they wish (Fisiloglu & Lorenzetti, 1994). Such families therefore function well.

Family cohesion in contemporary working families is influenced by how well an adult worker can integrate demands of work and family life (Stevens, Kiger, & Riley, 2006). Family cohesion is also shaped by how one family member's experiences at work can affect his or her partner. In dual earner families, family cohesion becomes a question of how well the working adults negotiate the demands of work and family life as individuals and as a couple (Stevens et al., 2006). These researchers have also contended that family cohesion is a dimension of family life that provides a more comprehensive view of family functioning than the marital relationship alone. Most working families have to face the challenges of the interaction of work life and family life. Time demands from work confront employees as they strive to provide care for family members (Hochschild, 1997). Many times employees bring home work related stressors which can affect family life and can also have a direct crossover effect on the partner's work or family life. Job factors can also affect the perceptions of family cohesiveness. When there is less stress on the job, there is more cohesiveness within the

family. Crouter, Perry-Jenkins, Huston, and Crawford (1989) have shown that higher levels of work stress are associated with higher levels of negative marital interactions.

Children

The number of children and the age of children are directly related to work-family conflict among couples, especially in women. Both large numbers of children and young children in the home may be associated with physical unavailability for work, preoccupation with childrearing activities, and overload (Voydanoff, 1988). According to Greenhaus and Kopelman (1981), and Katz and Piotrkowski (1983) having preschool children at home is consistently related to measures of work family strain and conflict. Research by Pocock (2000) on Australian women has suggested that the unpredicted sick child emerged as the greatest stressor in working women's lives. She further states that many women make use of their own sick leave to manage sick children.

Finding adequate and satisfactory childcare arrangements can also be a source of conflict for many working couples and it can also interfere with employment. As the number of dual-earner couples with children increases, responsibility for child care arrangements becomes an increasingly important aspect of household labour (Peterson & Gerson, 1992).

Work-family conflict and family-work conflict

These terms have already been discussed in detail in chapter two of the thesis. Analysis of the results of study two showed that there were gender differences in work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Men experienced more work-family conflict, while women experienced more family-work conflict. Therefore these two variables were selected for this study.

Family-friendly working arrangements

The term “work and family” or the “family friendly workplace” is one which recognises the non-workplace family responsibilities of its employees and develops and implements policies that allow employees to simultaneously fulfil work and family responsibilities (Strachan & Burgess, 1998). According to Hartin (1994) family friendly policies as those designed to minimise the impact of work on family life and these “family friendly” policies could be varieties of leave for maternity or paternity, sickness, emergencies and compassionate reasons; career breaks and extended leave; flexitime, part-time work and rostered days off.

In Australia, work place surveys have shown that balancing work and family roles is a concern for a sizeable number of people in the work force (DeCieri et al., 2003). Table 6.1 summarises the factors which can be considered as being “family-friendly” in Australia.

Table 6.1
Family-Friendly Working Arrangements in Australia

NOTE:
This figure is included on pages
194 - 195 of the print copy of the
thesis held in the University of
Adelaide Library.

Source: Strachan, G. & Burgess, J. (1998). The “family friendly” workplace. Origins, meaning and application at Australian workplaces. *International Journal of Manpower*, 19, 4-16.

In Australia, some organizations like the ANZ, Commonwealth and Westpac banks have introduced family-friendly policies and they have also reaped the results of such policies by having an increased staff retention rate (ACTU, 1993). It is important to study family-friendly policies for a number of reasons. For example, due to the entry of women in the work-force there is a need to address particular issues which are of importance to working women. These include maternity leave, child-care, leave to take care of sick children, etc. These factors

are considered important to balance work and family life. They are considered to interfere with concentration at work and increase absenteeism, lateness and leaving early and influence the ability of workers to take on additional work tasks, travel or relocate (Wolcott, 1990). Moreover, for parents living in dual earner families the tasks of balancing work and family roles is more challenging as both parents have to complete family work, paid work and also maintain social relationships with family and friends (Piotrkowski & Hughes, 1993).

6.5 Previous research and gaps in crossover research

Crossover studies have focused on different variables and factors of crossover between partners. As early as 1977, Booth studied the crossover of wife's occupational status on husband's marital satisfaction. Some studies have examined the crossover of job stressors of partner A to job stressors of partner B (e.g., Burke, Weir, & Duwors, 1980), while others like Bolger et al. (1989) studied the crossover of job stress to home stress from husbands to wives. Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli (2005) concentrated on crossover of burnout and work engagement among working couples, while Demerouti, Bakker and Schaufeli (2004) studied spillover and crossover of exhaustion and life satisfaction among dual earner couples. Others like Stevens and Riley (2006) have studied work to family spillover, crossover and family cohesion. Researchers like Riley and Eckenrode (1986) have studied crossover from husband's life events like falling ill, to wife's distress while Barnett et al. (1995), have researched crossover of distress between husbands and wives.

Crossover of depression from husbands to wives and vice versa has also been an important topic of research (e.g. see Vinokur et al., 1996; Westman & Vinokur, 1998). More recently, Dikkers, et al., (2007) studied the crossover effects of work and home in dyadic

partner relationships. But this study focused on the unidirectional effect of crossover, i.e. only from husbands to wives and not from wives to husbands.

It must be noted that in all these studies, role stressors were the main causes of crossover. Another important observation is that almost all the studies conducted before 1990 concentrated on crossover from one spouse to another, i.e. either from husband to wife or from wife to husband only (unidirectional). These studies were also more from homogeneous samples like military officers (Westman & Etzion, 1995), police officers, etc. However, even after 1990, very few studies have actually studied crossover at the dyadic level. While conceptually logical, studies of crossover effects of one spouse's work experience affecting the other spouse or family members in the home environment are not as common as spillover studies (Stevens et al., 2006). In order to enhance our understanding of the complex roles that husbands and wives perform in different domains, it is necessary to examine the crossover effects at the dyadic level. Therefore although there is a lot of research on *within* individual effects, there is little research on *within-couple* effects.

Although increasing number of women are a part of the labour force, very few studies have examined the bidirectional effects of husband's and wives job stress. Still fewer studies have considered fatigue as an outcome variable. Although it has been established that family and family cohesion are important factors in reducing work-family conflict, very few researchers (see Stevens et al., 2006), have considered family cohesion as a predictor of job stress, fatigue and dyadic adjustment. Family cohesion is a dimension of family life that has been neglected in the work-family literature (Stevens et al., 2006). This research therefore tries to redress this gap by examining family cohesion as a predictor of fatigue, job stress and dyadic adjustment.

Another important gap in research on crossover is that there are no studies of crossover effects among Australian dual earner couples. Australia is a “western” country with more and more women entering the work force. Thus many Australian families are now dual earner families with children. Although there is a lot of research on work family conflict in Australia (e.g., Fallon, 1997; Pocock, 2000), there is none on the ‘crossover’ effects of work-family conflict. This research thus tries to address this gap. The present study is also one of the few studies which take into account crossover and spillover effects together.

Finally, according to Crossfield, Kinman and Jones (2005) the crossover process should be further investigated in couples where male and female partners have working roles of equivalent status, where they are likely to experience workplace stressors that are similar in nature and degree. Moreover, many researchers (e.g. Swanson, 1992) have called for more research with intact paired or matched couples to understand “within” dual earner/dual career effects. This research tries to fill in these gaps as well as strengthen previous research on crossover between members of dual earner couples.

6.6 Aims and hypotheses of this study

The first two studies of this thesis investigated whether cultural or gender differences accounted for differences in job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and perception of division of house hold labour and family-work conflict. The first study included Australian and immigrant Indian women participants while the second study had Australian and immigrant Indian men as well as Australian and Indian immigrant women participants. The studies independently investigated culture and gender with regard to job satisfaction, job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. However both the studies showed no

significant cultural differences between the men and women of different nationalities in the study. But, gender differences in job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict were evident. Therefore, the present study was undertaken to investigate the role of gender further, but with the couple as the unit of analysis. The central aim of the present study was to identify the predictors of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress and examine the crossover and spillover effects from husbands to wives and vice versa. The couples of this study were quite evenly matched in terms of occupation as both worked as professionals or in white collar jobs. Thus it is assumed that work stress levels, work-family conflict, family-work conflict and fatigue experienced by them would be more or less similar for both.

A crossover effect involves a particular variable that influences and involves both partners. It refers to a dyadic inter individual transmission within the same domain (Demerouti, Bakker, & Scahufeli, 2005). Crossover can be bidirectional or unidirectional. According to past research, work-family conflict can be divided into a work domain and a family domain. Previous research has shown that a person's own job stress, their partner's job stress, work related policies/arrangements and fatigue are strong predictors of work-family conflict. Past research has also shown that number of young children living at home, lack of social support and spouse's work to family conflict has a significant effect on work-family conflict (family domain).

Unlike past research, this research does not consider work-family conflict as an outcome variable but rather as a predictor variable. Work-family conflict and family-work conflicts are considered as predictors of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress. This study assumes that conflicts from work and family in a partner can have a crossover effect on the

other partner's work and family conflicts and it can also interfere with the adjustment in couples.

This study assumes that the process of crossover is bidirectional. This is in line with previous research conducted by Matthews et al. (1996); Westman and Etzion, (1995); Zedeck et al. (1989). For example, it assumes that the crossover of fatigue is bidirectional, i.e. fatigue experienced by one partner influences the fatigue experienced by the other partner. Like Kenny and Acitelli (2001) and Jones and Fletcher (1993), this research also suggests that individuals are able to perceive how much their partners' work interferes with their relationships. This is called as a direct crossover effect where one partners' work and home related factors are positively related to the other partner's work and home related factors.

In keeping with past research, this study also suggests that individuals are able to perceive whether their partner's work and family relationship interferes with their own work and family relationship. This can also be called as a direct crossover effect. The present study has considered three outcome variables: fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress. The three variables together suggest the importance of interconnectedness between the worlds of work and family.

There have not been many work related studies that have studied fatigue as an outcome. Chan and Margolin (1994) for example, found that for dual-earner couples the woman's work and work fatigue had a crossover effect on her partner's reactions at home. McDonald (2003) has found that work load can cause fatigue, whereas general satisfaction can reduce fatigue. Rosa (2001) suggests that one of the primary sources of fatigue for most adults is the job they perform for their livelihood. Lack of social support and other socio-demographics (gender, marital status, occupation, etc.) can also cause fatigue. Since not much

has been researched on fatigue as an outcome, this research tries to see the bidirectional effect of fatigue of an individual as well as the predictors of fatigue which can have a crossover effect on another variable of the partner. In their study of burnout, Bakker et al. (2005) found that there was hardly any difference between the crossover of burnout from husbands to wives and vice versa. However, Chan & Margolin (1994) did find crossover effects of fatigue from one partner to another.

Dijkers et al. (2007) found a crossover effect of fatigue of husbands on their wives' home work load. They found that when husbands reported higher levels of depression and fatigue, the wives had to work harder at home. However, their study was unidirectional, and thus the same cannot be concluded for the wives. Fatigue can be considered as a factor of general adjustment. It can be an outcome of work, home or even a combination of work and home.

As noted earlier, in order for couples to be well adjusted, dyadic adjustment between husbands and wives is very necessary. If demands of work interfere with family life, the marital dyad can suffer. This research assumes that when one partner feels that the marital dyad is suffering, the feeling will cross over to the other partner as well.

Lastly, this research assumes that the predictors for fatigue, job stress and dyadic adjustment for men and women would be different. Therefore due to these different gender expectations, separate regression analyses were conducted for men and women with the couple as the unit of analysis.

Based on the above discussion, the following hypotheses were formulated.

Hypotheses concerned with the effects of children on the couple

1. There will be a significant positive relationship between the number of children living at home and fatigue experienced by the husband and wife.

Hypotheses concerned with effects of crossover

2. There will be a significant positive crossover relationship between family/social support of an individual and own dyadic adjustment as well as dyadic adjustment of the partner.

3. There will be a significant positive crossover relationship between perceived work-family conflict and job stress.

4. Own family cohesiveness is a positive predictor of dyadic adjustment in the partner

5. An individual's perceived lack of family/social support will have a significant negative crossover correlation with fatigue. This effect will be more evident in women.

6. Family/social support will be a negative predictor of job stress in both partners.

Hypotheses concerned with direct empathetic effects or bi-directional crossover

7. An individual's perceived level of fatigue is positively related to the partner's perceived level of fatigue.

8. There will be a bidirectional crossover effect of own dyadic adjustment with partner's dyadic adjustment.

9. An individual's perceived level of job stress is positively related to the perceived level of job stress in the partner.

The next chapter will test these hypotheses and this will be followed by a discussion of the results.

CHAPTER 7

Methodology, Results and Discussion of Study 3

7. Overview

This chapter discusses the methodology, results and discussion of the results of study three. The first part of the methodology section includes selection criteria for participants. This is followed by a description of the measures and tests used which are divided into measures of dependent variables and measures of independent variables. Procedure for the study undertaken is discussed next. In the next section results of the present study are analysed followed by a discussion of the results. The last part of the chapter discusses the conclusion, limitations and implication for future research.

7.1 Methodology

7.1.1 Participants

As in the previous two studies, participants were obtained from Adelaide and Melbourne in Australia. Participants in this study were 84 dual earner couples ($N = 168$). The participants were partly recruited through the “snowball” technique and partly through friends. Participants of this study were different from the participants of the first two studies; that is, none of the participants from the first two studies participated in the current study. The same participants were not recruited since they had already given me their valuable time in spite of being busy white collar professionals. So, it was not considered necessary to ask them to spare some more time for the research. New participants were therefore recruited. Some participants may have been immigrants to Australia. However, since this study was

designed to investigate crossover between dual earner couples (gender), and not culture, ethnicity of the participants was not noted.

All participants had to meet the following criteria:

All couples had to be a part of the Australian work-force.

All couples had to be married or living with a significant other.

Couples had to have at least one child living at home with them. This was necessary to answer questions regarding family support, work-family conflict, family-work conflict, etc.

Participants were employed in a range of different white collar professions like doctors, managers, teachers, IT engineers, etc. in government as well as in private organisations. Three doctor participants had their own clinical practice while four doctors were affiliated to some hospital. Male participants of this study were full time permanent employees and worked for an average of 46 hours a week. Twenty-six women (30.95%) participants worked part-time and the average hours they worked were 22 hours a week while women who worked full time worked for an average of 40 hours a week. Average age of the participants could not be identified as many of the participants had preferred not to state their age on the consent form. The selection criteria were similar to most studies conducted on work-family conflict in dual earner couples (e.g., Hammer, Allen & Grigsby, 1997).

Although it was not a condition, in fact all female participants too were employed in white collar professions and in higher levels of management. Thus, the study sample consisted of husbands and wives all employed as professionals or at higher levels of responsibility in organisations.

7.1.2 Measures

The survey questionnaires were designed to assess fatigue, dyadic adjustment, job stress, work-family conflict, family-work conflict, family cohesion and family support for each participant. The job stress items scale and the work-family conflict scale were also used in study 1 and study 2. Besides these questionnaires, a “Family Friendly Policy Questionnaire” was formulated by the researcher. This questionnaire was used to analyse certain policies of organisations and the employees’ knowledge and use of these policies. Already existing standardized questionnaires for investigating family-friendly policies were not used since they were quite long.

7.1.3 Measures of dependent variables

Although in the previous study (study 2) gender differences were found on job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict measures, only job stress was selected as an independent variable. Most past research has investigated WFC/FWC as outcome variables. However, the current study wanted to investigate whether WFC and FWC would be predictors of job stress and other outcomes among couples. Therefore, they were selected as independent variables. Along with job stress, fatigue and dyadic adjustment were selected as the dependent variables. A description of these variables is given below. All the measures were subjective and respondents reported their own perceptions about them.

Fatigue

To measure fatigue, the CIS 20R questionnaire developed by Beurskens, Bultmann, Kant, Vercoulin, Bleijenberg, & Swaen (2000) was used. This scale consists of 20 items and uses a 7-point scale for responses from all participants (1 = yes that is true, 7 = no that is not

true). The statements of this questionnaire refer to aspects of fatigue experienced during the previous two weeks. Item numbers 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 & 19 were reverse scored. All the scores were then added up with higher scores denoting more fatigue.

Sample statements of the fatigue questionnaire are-

I feel tired (reverse scored)

I feel very active

Thinking requires effort (reverse scored)

Physically I feel exhausted (reverse scored)

Participants had to tick their responses on a scale of seven. For example,

I feel tired: yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true (reverse scored).

The CIS 20R by Beurskens et al. (2000) was used in this study as it measured several aspects of fatigue like fatigue severity, concentration, amount of physical activity, etc. on the same scale and it therefore could identify fatigued and non-fatigued individuals. The CIS 20R has been used successfully by many researchers to study fatigue. Beurskens et al. (2000) used this measure to differentiate between fatigued and non-fatigued employees in a sample of healthy blue and white collar employees, patients, pregnant women and company and insurance doctors. The total Chronbach's α for their scale was .90, suggesting a very high reliability. Recently, this scale was used by Rook and Zijelstra (2006) to study occupational fatigue in a working population in the UK. Cronbach's α for their sample was .83. For this sample Chronbach's α for husbands was 0.90, while for the wives it was 0.85.

Dyadic adjustment

Dyadic adjustment in couples was measured using the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) by Spanier (1976). This scale measures the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between partners. Scores ranged from 0 = always disagree to 5 = always agree. The total score is the sum of all items, ranging from 0 to 151. Higher scores reflect a perception of higher quality of the relationship. The original DAS had a coefficient alpha of .96 for the total instrument and the various sub-scales range from .73 to .94, for the same sample. The scale has been found to have good content and construct validity (Spanier, 1976). This particular scale was used for this study as it can be completed quite quickly and allows researchers with more limited needs to use one of the subscales alone without losing confidence in the reliability or validity of the measure (Spanier, 1976). For example, researchers interested specifically in dyadic satisfaction may use the 10-item subscale for this purpose.

Some items of this scale are-

Handling family finances

Matters of recreation

Religious matters

Although the original scale consisted of 32 items, sub scales measuring dyadic consensus, dyadic satisfaction and dyadic cohesion were used in this study since some of the items were too personal to ask and not relevant to the study. For this study, Chronbach's α for husbands was 0.87 and for the wives it was 0.88.

Job Stress

To measure this factor, the 12 item Job Stress Index by Bernas and Major (2000) was used. The items used a 5-point Likert response scale (from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly

Agree) with higher scores indicating higher stress. Chronbach's α for participant husbands was 0.85, while for the participating wives it was 0.84. An example of job stress item is-

*I work under a great deal of tension.*__

*I have too much work to do.*__

*I feel "burned-out" after a full day of work.*__

Since in the first two studies job stress showed statistically significant gender differences the same scale was used in this study.

7.1.4 Measures of independent variables

Family Support (FSS)

The Family Support Scale (FSS) developed by Dunst, Jenkins and Trivette (1993) was used to measure the amount of family support each participant received especially to raise a young child. Scoring of the responses was based on a Likert type scale with 1 = not helpful at all to 5 = extremely helpful. If a source of help was not available to the participant, they had to score NA (not available). The more support participants had, the higher they scored on the scale. Chronbach's α for husbands and wives participating in the present study was 0.80 and 0.79 respectively.

The original survey questionnaire was developed to measure parents' satisfaction with the perceived helpfulness of support. This scale had 18 items and the alpha coefficient for the original scale was .77.

Sample items of the FSS are-

Tick the following sources of support that are helpful to you.

NA 1 2 3 4 5

My parents

My partner/spouse's parents

My partner/spouse

Work-family conflict (W→F) and family-work conflict (F→W)

To assess work-family conflict, the 22 item Work-Family Conflict Scale developed by Kelloway, Gottlieb and Barham (1999) was used. This scale consisted of items which integrated the work and family balance. The items used a 5-point Likert response scale (from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating higher conflict. The Alpha score for this scale was 0.93. Since the last study (study 2) did show some statistically significant results for gender on this scale, it was used again for this study.

The Work Family Conflict Scale was divided into work-family (W→F) conflict and family-work (F→W) conflict. The first 11 items of the scale measured W→F interface, while the last 11 items measured F→W interface. A sample W→F item is-

I have to change plans with family members because of the demands of my job. ___

Job demands keep me from spending the amount of time I would like with my family. ___

To meet the demands of my job, I have to limit the number of things I do with my family members. ___

A sample of F→W item is-

I would put in a longer workday if I had fewer family demands.

My family demands interrupt my work day.

When I am at work, I am distracted by family members.

Family cohesiveness

To measure family cohesiveness the Family Organized Cohesiveness Scale developed by Fischer (1992) was used. This is a 13 item instrument which measures the respondent's perception of how cohesiveness is organized in his or her family (Fischer, 1992).

Originally, this instrument was designed as a part of the California Family Health Project and it evaluated family life and the health of husbands and wives in a sample of 225 families. Opinions range from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree. Item numbers 2, 4 and 9 were reverse scored. The sum of the scores ranged from 13-78, with higher scores indicating higher cohesiveness.

Sample items of this instrument are-

Family members spend much of their free time together

*It is hard to know what the rules are in our family because they are always changing
(reverse scored)*

It is clear about what is best for family members

Cronbach's alpha for the husbands in the current study was .80, while for the wives it was .82.

Children

The number of children the participants had was analysed by asking the question, "Number of children?" Participants had to provide the number of children they had in each category. The responses were then summed up in order to determine the total number of children participants had.

Organizational policies

To find out how family friendly organizations are, the Family Friendly Working Arrangements questionnaire was developed by the researcher. It consists of 13 questions which have to be answered as 'Yes' (scored as 1), 'No' (scored as 0) or 'Not sure' (scored as 0). The questionnaire was developed by the researcher and it had an alpha of 0.54 for husbands and 0.45 for wives. Higher scores indicated higher family-friendly policies and higher awareness of them. Due to its low internal reliability it was not included in the final regression analysis, but it was analysed separately and the results discussed accordingly. Although various other measures could have been used, many of them were too long. The purpose of this study was to investigate the crossover effects between partners on measures of fatigue, job stress and dyadic adjustment, so family friendly measures were potentially relevant. Some questions asked in this questionnaire are-

Is there a provision for parental leave at your work-place?

Have you ever taken parental leave?

Is there an opportunity for you at your work-place to work only during school terms?

7.1.5 Procedure

The snowball technique was used to collect data. This method allows for an introduction to participants from a known individual which facilitates trust (Streefkerk, 1985). Friends were also contacted. To ensure that both partners were employed, participants were asked to fill in their occupation and position in the consent form. The questionnaires were coded to match the partners afterwards (for e.g. H1 = husband1, W1 = wife1, etc.). Participation was voluntary and participants were explained that all their data would remain confidential. Each partner was requested to fill in the questionnaires separately. Although questionnaires were given to 200 participants (100 couples), only 168 participants (84

couples) returned them fully completed, making the response rate as 84 per cent. All the measures used in the study were based on subjective responses: participants themselves reported their perceptions using the study scales.

7.2 Results

For data management and analysis of results the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 14.0 for windows was used. First, demographic characteristics of the sample were analysed. Then, analyses of the scales were carried out. To examine differences between husband and wife participants, t-tests were used. Pearson's Correlation was used to examine the relationship between the study variables. Finally, stepwise regression was conducted to identify the predictors and crossover effects of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress among husbands and wives. Three regression models each for men and women were computed for the three outcomes of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress. With $N = 168$ and using $p = 0.01$ as the accepted minimum level of statistical significance, this study had a statistical power of 0.80 for a moderate effect size.

7.2.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 7.1 shows the demographic characteristics of the participants of the current study. Descriptive statistics were reported separately for men and women. Results of paired samples t-tests carried out to find gender differences in variable means are also reported in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1

Employment Status and Level of Education of Participants of the Study

Demographic Characteristics	Fathers (N=84)	Mothers (N=84)	Total (N=168)
Employment status			
Full-time	84	58	142
Part-time	0	26	26
FT/casual	0	0	0
PT/casual	0	0	0
Educational level			
Only secondary school	0	0	0
Diploma	15	22	37
University degree	50	45	95
Post graduate/higher	19	17	36

FT = full-time, PT = part-time

Male participants of this study were full time permanent employees and worked for an average of 46 hours a week. Twenty-six women (30.95%) participants worked part-time and the average hours they worked were 22 hours a week while women who worked full time worked for an average of 39 hours a week. Average age of the participants could not

be identified as most of the participants had preferred not to state their age on the consent form.

Table 7.2 shows the number of children couples in this study had.

Table 7.2

Number of children for the couples of this study

Number of children	Number of Couples
1	19
2	62
3	3

Table 7.3 presents means and standard deviations for the variables included in the analysis.

Table 7.3

Means and SD for all Study Variables for all Couples (N = 168; Husbands = 84 and Wives = 84)

Variable	Husbands (N = 84)		Wives (N = 84)		t (df = 83)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Fatigue	84.95	6.32	83.86	7.04	1.47
2. Dyad Adj	57.63	5.90	56.84	7.48	1.27

3. Job stress	34.51	9.07	28.37	8.85	5.10***
4. FS	9.13	2.69	9.98	2.43	-3.69***
5. WFC	29.25	8.22	25.64	7.68	3.28**
6. FWC	22.64	6.69	25.02	7.75	-2.48*
7. FC	62.10	8.47	62.08	8.54	.03

Note: Dyad Adj = dyadic adjustment; FS = family support; WFC = work-family conflict, FWC = family-work conflict, FC = family cohesiveness, *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

As can be seen from the table there are significant differences in the perception of job stress, family support, WFC and FWC between husbands and wives. Like in study 2, significant differences were found on job stress in this study with husbands reporting more job stress than wives.

Wives reported having greater family support from schools, other support groups, etc. than men did, for raising children. However all husbands and wives reported family support from each other to raise their young children. Women also reported that they got some support from their own parents (38.09%) and from other parents (17.85%). None of the husbands reported getting any support from other parents. Consistent with past research (e.g., Pleck, 1977; Jacobs & Gerson, 2000), men reported higher work-family conflict than women, whereas women reported higher family-work conflict than men (Noor, 2004; Duxbury, Higgins & Lee, 1994). Similarly, study two has also suggested that men reported more WFC while women reported more FWC.

Table 7.4 summarizes the results of the analysis of spillover correlation between husbands on the dependent and independent variables.

Table 7.4

Within-Individual (Spillover) Correlation Coefficients for Husbands (N = 84)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Fatigue	—							
2. Dyad adj	.23*	—						
3. Job stress	-.07	.11	—					
4. Family support	.21	.00	-.19	—				
5. WFC	.01	.15	.37**	.05	—			
6. FWC	.03	-.12	.28**	.12	.26*	—		
7. FC	.42**	.49**	-.09	.11	.08	-.04	—	
8. Children	-.20	-.08	.10	.03	.09	.07	-.13	—

Note: Dyad adj = dyadic adjustment, WFC = work-family conflict, FWC = family-work conflict, FC = family cohesiveness, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 7.4 shows the spillover correlations between the husband participants of this study. There was a positive spillover between dyadic adjustment and fatigue ($r = .23$, $p < .05$) in husbands. This would mean that when their perception of dyadic adjustment increases, their fatigue also increases. Similarly, work-family conflict was positively correlated with job stress ($r = .37$, $p < .01$) implying that as job stress increases, work-

family conflict will increase in men. Positive significant correlations were also found between family-work conflict and job stress and also between family-work conflict and work-family conflict. Family cohesiveness was significantly positively correlated with fatigue ($r = .42, p < .01$) and dyadic adjustment ($r = .49, p < .01$).

Table 7.5 summarises the spillover coefficients between wives.

Table 7.5

Within-Individual (Spillover) Correlation Coefficients for Wives (N = 84)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Fatigue	—							
2. Dyad adj	.16	—						
3. Job stress	.29**	.24*	—					
4. Family support	.31**	.11	-.35**	—				
5. WFC	-.19	-.11	.57**	-.23*	—			
6. FWC	-.07	-.05	.26*	.00	-.23*	—		
7. FC	.34**	.48**	-.34*	.28*	-.00	-.23*	—	
8. Children	-.11	-.16	-.03	.06	-.09	.09	-.09	—

Note: Dyad adj = dyadic adjustment, WFC = work-family conflict, FWC = family-work conflict, FC = family cohesiveness, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 7.5 reveals positive spillover correlations among women between job stress and fatigue ($r = .29, p < .01$) and also between job stress and dyadic adjustment ($r = .24, p < .05$). This means that as job stress increases, fatigue will increase and so will dyadic adjustment. Family support has been found to be positively correlated with fatigue ($r = .31, p < .01$), but negatively correlated with job stress ($r = -.35, p < .01$). Family-work conflict is positively correlated with family support ($r = .26, p < .05$), but negatively correlated with work-family conflict ($r = -.23, p < .05$). A positive spillover correlation was found between family cohesiveness, fatigue and family support. However, family cohesiveness was negatively correlated with job stress ($r = -.34, p < .05$) and family-work conflict ($r = -.23, p < .05$). This would imply that as family cohesiveness increased, job stress and family-work conflict would decrease.

Table 7.6 summarises the crossover coefficients between husbands and wives.

Table 7.6

Crossover Correlation Coefficients for all Study Variables for Husbands (N = 84) and Wives (N = 84)

Variables	Wives							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Husbands								
1. Fatigue	.48**	.10	-.13	.20	.04	-.21	.40**	-.19
2. Dyad adj	.13	.66**	-.10	-.29**	.05	-.02	.45**	-.10
3. Job stress	-.10	.09	.24*	-.23**	.19	.07	-.10	.06
4. Family support	.37**	.15	-.12	.70**	-.04	-.06	.10	.05
5. WFC	-.05	.13	.21	-.01	-.08	.20	-.09	.11
6. FWC	.15	-.06	.03	.08	.26*	.16	.12	.12
7. FC	.30**	.46**	-.32**	.17	-.02	-.20	.89**	-.09
8. Children	-.12	-.17	.01	.03	-.09	.12	-.10	—

Note: Dyad adj = dyadic adjustment, WFC = work-family conflict, FWC = family-work conflict, FC = family cohesiveness, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

As Table 7.6 shows, there is a positive bi-directional crossover between fatigue in husbands and wives ($r = .48, p < .01$). A high positive bidirectional correlation was found between perceived dyadic adjustment in both partners showing that when one partner perceives an increase the other partner does too ($r = .66, p = .01$). Similarly, a significant positive correlation was observed between dyadic adjustment and family cohesiveness. The third dependent variable of job stress also had a bidirectional significant crossover correlation between both partners ($r = .24, p < .01$). This means that when job stress

increases in one partner, it will increase in the other partner too. But, it had a significant negative correlation with family support ($r = -.23, p < .01$), meaning that when perceived family support decreased, job stress in the partner increased.

Table 7.7 summarizes the results of predictors of fatigue in husbands while Table 7.8 shows the results of the predictors of fatigue in wives. Stepwise multiple regressions were used to find the predictors of fatigue in husbands and in wives.

To find out the predictors of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress, stepwise regression was used. Since this was an exploratory study stepwise regression was considered as the method for the analysis of results. To test the hypotheses on crossover effects for each couple, husband's predictor variables were regressed onto the wives' predictor variables and vice versa. Spillover hypotheses were tested by entering predictor variables of husband and wife individually along with the regressed crossover variables. Only variables that were significant predictors of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress in men and women are presented in the regression tables.

Table 7.7

Predictors of Fatigue in Husbands (N = 84)

Variables	B ^a	SE ^a	Beta ^b (β)	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change
Fatigue W	.35	.09	.39***	.22	.30	24.35***
FC H	.23	.07	.30**	.30	.08	9.91**
<i>F</i> value for overall model					18.46***	

Note: Fatigue W = wife's fatigue, FC H = own (husband) family organized cohesiveness, ^aUnstandardised coefficient, ^bstandardised regression coefficient, *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$

Two variables entered into the regression equation were significant predictors of fatigue in men: Their partner's fatigue ($\beta = .39, p < .001$) and their own perceived family cohesiveness ($\beta = .30, p < .01$) accounting for 30% and 8% of the variance respectively. Increased levels of fatigue in their partners led to an increase level of fatigue in the men. Again, fatigue in husbands increased when their own perception of family cohesiveness increased. Together these two variables accounted for 30% of the total variance.

Table 7.8

Predictors of Fatigue in Wives (N = 84)

Variables	B ^a	SE ^a	Beta ^b (β)	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change
Fatigue H	.46	.11	.42***	.22	.30	24.35***
Family Support H	.72	.25	.28**	.28	.07	8.40**
<i>F</i> value for overall model					35.45***	

Note: Fatigue H= husband's fatigue, Family Support H = husband's family support

^aUnstandardised coefficient, ^bstandardised regression coefficient, *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$

Similar results were found for the wives as for the husbands. That is, partner's fatigue ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) and partner's family support ($\beta = .28, p < .01$) were the two significant predictor variables of fatigue in women. Partner's fatigue accounted for 30% of the variance, while partner's family support accounted for 7% of the variance. Together the two variables accounted for 28% of the total variance. Results show that there is a bi-

directional crossover of fatigue in both partners. As fatigue increased in husbands, the feeling crossed over increasing fatigue in the wives. When perceived family support in helping children in men increased, wives experienced an increase in fatigue.

Tables 7.9 and 7.10 depict the predictors of dyadic adjustment in husbands and wives respectively. Stepwise regression was used to find out the predictors of dyadic adjustment in husbands and wives.

Table 7.9

Predictors of Dyadic Adjustment for Husbands (N = 84)

Variables	B ^a	SE ^a	Beta ^b (β)	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change
Dyadic Adj W	.45	.07	.57***	.43	.44	64.45***
FC H	.18	.06	.30**	.47	.04	6.45*
FS W	-.47	.19	-.20*	.50	.04	6.10*
<i>F</i> value for overall model					28.68***	

Note: Dyadic Adj W = wife's dyadic adjustment, FC H = Own (husband) family cohesiveness, FS W = wife's family support

^aUnstandardised coefficient, ^bstandardised regression coefficient, *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Analysis of results in Table 7.9 reveal that wife's perceived dyadic adjustment, the husband's family cohesiveness and wife's report of family support for help with children together accounted for 50% of the total variance in the model for husbands. The wife's dyadic adjustment ($\beta = .57, p < .001$) accounted for 44% of variance. Own family cohesiveness ($\beta = .30, p < .01$) accounted for another 4% of the variance while wife's family support ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$) added another 4% to the variance. Although not expected, results revealed that wives' perceived family support to raise children had a negative crossover correlation which meant that dyadic adjustment in husbands would increase when family support to wives decreased.

Table 7.10

Predictors of Dyadic Adjustment for Wives (N = 84)

Variables	B ^a	SE ^a	Beta ^b (β)	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change
Dyadic Adj H	.71	.11	.60***	.44	.44	64.45***
FC W	.20	.08	.23*	.48	.04	6.61*
<i>F</i> value for overall model					37.74***	

Note: Dyadic Adj H = husband's dyadic adjustment, Family Cohesiveness W = own (wife) family cohesiveness

^aUnstandardised coefficient, ^bstandardised regression coefficient, *** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$

As the results in Table 7.10 show, husband's dyadic adjustment ($\beta = .60, p < .001$) had a bi-directional crossover effect accounting for 44% of the variance. The wife's own

perceived family cohesiveness ($\beta = .23, p < .05$) added another 4% to the variance. Together these two variables accounted for a total of 48% of the total variance. Wives' dyadic adjustment increased when their own perceived family cohesiveness increased. Tables 7.11 and 7.12 show the predictors of job stress in husbands and wives respectively.

Table 7.11

Predictors of Job Stress for Husbands (N = 84)

Variables	B ^a	SE ^a	Beta ^b (β)	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change
WFC H	.43	.11	.39***	.13	.14	12.98**
FWC W	.26	.12	.22*	.17	.05	4.93*
FS W	-.83	.37	-.22*	.21	.05	5.19*
<i>F</i> value for overall model				8.23***		

Note: WFC H = own (husband) work-family conflict, FWC W = wife's family-work conflict, FS W = wife's family support

^aUnstandardised coefficient, ^bstandardised regression coefficient, *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Three variables entered into the regression were significant predictors of job stress in husbands. His own work-family conflict ($\beta = .39, p < .001$) accounted for 14% of the variance while his wife's family-work conflict ($\beta = .22, p < .05$) accounted for 5% of the variance. A negative crossover relationship was observed between job stress and partner's

perceived family support ($\beta = -.22, p < .05$) adding another 4% to the variance. This means job stress increases in husbands when perceived family support for helping with children to their partner decreases. The three predictor variables together accounted for 21% of the total variance.

Table 7.12

Predictors of Job Stress for Wives (N = 84)

Variables	B ^a	SE ^a	Beta ^b (β)	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change
WFC W	.56	.10	.48***	.31	.32	39.02***
FS W	-.73	.33	-.20*	.36	.05	6.30*
FC H	-.20	.09	-.20*	.39	.04	4.87*
<i>F</i> value for overall model				18.33***		

Note: WFC W = own (wife) work-family conflict, FS W = own (wife) family support, FC H = husband's family cohesiveness

^aUnstandardised coefficient, ^bstandardised regression coefficient, *** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$

For women, their own work-family conflict ($\beta = .48, p < .001$) was a significant positive predictor of their own job stress. This means that job stress increased in women when their own work-family conflict increased. Work-family conflict accounted for 32% of the variance. Own perceived family support to bring up children was a negative predictor of

job stress in women ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$) which meant that women's job stress increased when they received more family support in bringing up their children. This variable added another 5% to the variance. Partner's family cohesiveness ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$) was also a negative predictor of job stress in women adding 4% to the variance. Together the three predictors accounted for 39% of the total variance.

Table 7.13 summarises the results of the family-friendly working arrangements policy for husbands and wives.

Table 7.13

Results of Family Friendly Policy Questionnaire for Husbands and Wives (Total N = 168; Men = 84, Women = 84)

Statement	<u>Husbands</u>			<u>Wives</u>		
	Yes	No	Not sure	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Provision for parental leave	51.3%	30%	17.5%	65%	20%	13.8%
2. Availed parental leave?	18.8%	78.5%	0%	38.8%	57.3%	0%
3. Availed full maternity leave?	NA	NA	NA	30%	70%	0%
4. Work only during school terms? (And be at home during school holidays?)	16.3%	78.5%	6.3%	17.5%	78.8%	4.8%
5. Can work from home?	30%	65%	5%	16.3%	8%	3.8%
6. Changed status from FT to PT?	5%	95%	0%	28.5%	72.5%	0%

7. Childcare facility at work place? 2%	90%	3.8%	3.8%	87.5%	7.5%
8. Ever used this facility?	0%	98%	0%	0%	0%
9. Get childcare costs from employer?	2%	98%	0%	0%	96.5%
10. Policy for paternity leave?	17.5%	61.3%	21.3%	15%	46.3%
11. Ever taken paternity leave?	10%	78%	2.5%	NA	NA
12. Get time off for family emergencies?	93.3%	1.5%	5.3%	97.5%	2%

Note: Items not scored by participants are not included in the table; NA = not applicable

Table 7.13 summarizes the responses of the family friendly questionnaire. As can be observed from the table, although 51.3% of men had the facility of availing parental leave, only 18.8% of them actually used it. However, out of 65% of women who had the facility, 38.8% of women took the advantage of parental leave that their organizations offered. Both men and women were quite well matched in their responses concerning being able to work only during school terms and not during school holidays, with 78.5% men and 78.8% women stating that they could not be at home during school holidays. Nearly all husbands (93.3%) and wives (97.5%) did get time off for family emergencies.

7.3 Analyses of results

Hypothesis concerned with the effects of children on the couple

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis states that there will be a significant effect of number of children living at home and fatigue experienced by husbands and wives. However, results did not reveal any significant association. Most past literature discusses the age of children being a cause of fatigue. However, this study was concerned with the number of children living at home with the couples. Perhaps, since each couple (husband and wife) had the same number of children and the total children for the couples was 152, with most couples having only one or two children, the effect of children on fatigue was not been visible.

Hypotheses concerned with effects of crossover

According to hypothesis 2, perceived family support to raise children is assumed to be a predictor of dyadic adjustment in couples. This hypothesis is partially supported. For men, their partner's/wife's perceived family support seemed to be a negative predictor of their dyadic adjustment ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$). This finding suggests that less support to bring up children lead to higher levels of dyadic adjustment in husbands. No crossover relationship was found between perceived dyadic adjustment and partner's perceived family support in women.

Hypothesis 3 suggests a crossover relationship between work-family conflict and job stress. However, this hypothesis was not supported. Surprisingly, the results showed a spillover effect rather than a crossover effect. Participants' own work-family conflict was positively related to their own job stress. For men work-family conflict had a positive spillover relationship with job stress ($\beta = .39, p < .001$) showing that when work-family

conflict increased for the men, their job stress increased too. Similar findings were found for the women ($\beta = .48, p < .001$).

Hypothesis 4 states that perceived family cohesiveness will be a predictor of dyadic adjustment among couples. However, results of step-wise regression reveal that there is a spillover effect of family cohesiveness on dyadic adjustment. This means that rather than the partner's perception of family cohesiveness affecting the marital dyad, it is one's own perception of family cohesiveness which is responsible for couples' dyadic adjustment. For both genders there was a positive correlation between family organized cohesiveness and dyadic adjustment which meant that when family cohesion was high, dyadic adjustment too was high.

Hypothesis 5 assumes that an individual's perceived lack of family/social support to raise children will have a significant negative crossover correlation with fatigue and that this effect will be more evident in women. However, there is in fact a positive correlation between social support and fatigue ($\beta = .28, p < .01$). This would mean that as women increase their family support to their husbands, their own fatigue also increases. Thus hypothesis 5 is not supported.

Hypothesis 6 states that perceived family support in bringing up children will be a negative predictor of job stress in both partners. This hypothesis is partially supported in husbands as their wives' perception of family/social support in raising young children is related to an increase in their job stress. In this study perceived family/social support of wives is a negative predictor of job stress in husbands ($\beta = -.22, p < .05$). This meant that job stress increased in men when they perceived that their wives had less family support in bringing up children. The crossover effect of husbands' family support on wives' job stress was not observed in this study. Therefore hypothesis 6 was partially supported.

However, the step-wise regression results do show a negative spillover effect of the wives' own perceived family support on their own job stress ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$). When wives perceived that they were not getting enough family support to help with children, their own job stress increased.

Although it was not assumed, family cohesiveness of husbands had a negative crossover effect on the job stress of their wives ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$). When husbands felt that family cohesiveness was low, job stress in wives increased. No such effect was found in husbands.

Hypotheses concerned with direct empathetic effects or bi-directional crossover

According to Hypothesis 7 increase or decrease of fatigue in one partner will crossover and have the same effect on the other partner. This hypothesis states that there will be a bi-directional crossover effect of fatigue of one partner on fatigue of the other partner. Results of this study show that the husbands' perceived level of fatigue had a significant effect on the wives' perceived level of fatigue ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) accounting for 22 per cent of the variance. Furthermore, wives' perceived fatigue too had a significant effect on the husbands' level of fatigue ($\beta = .39, p < .001$), accounting for 22 per cent of the variance, thereby supporting hypothesis two. This finding suggests that the effects of fatigue are reciprocal. When an individual perceives that his/her partner is experiencing high levels of fatigue, then the partner too experiences high fatigue. The same or other factors are causing fatigue in both.

Although it was not hypothesized, results of the predictors of fatigue for men revealed that their own perception of family cohesiveness was a predictor of their fatigue ($\beta = .30, p < .01$). This was more of a spillover effect than a crossover effect. However, this spillover effect was not observed in women.

Hypothesis 8 is the empathetic hypothesis of crossover which states that dyadic adjustment in one partner is a predictor of dyadic adjustment in the other partner. This hypothesis has been fully supported. For men $\beta = .57, p < .001$, accounting for 43 per cent of the variance, while for the women $\beta = .60, p < .001$, accounting for 44 percent of the variance.

Hypothesis 9 is the bi-directional crossover hypothesis of job stress. It assumes that when job stress increased in one partner, it would also increase in the other partner. Results did not reveal this effect and thus, this hypothesis is not supported.

7.4 Discussion of study 3

The first study of this thesis was designed to investigate cultural differences between Australian women and Indian immigrant women. The second study investigated cultural as well as gender differences among Australian and Indian men and women. Study one suggested cultural differences in job stress but no other statistically cultural differences were found in both the studies. However, study two revealed significant differences in gender on the variables of job stress, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Participants of both the previous studies were married with partners occupied in the Australian work-force, and had at least one child living at home with them. In both the previous studies the individual was the unit of analysis. In the previous studies it was not clear whether the experiences of the participants and their partners were similar on the study variables. Therefore, the present study was undertaken to see whether gender would make any difference and also to see if interaction between husbands and wives would be able to predict reasons for fatigue, adjustment and job stress. The central aim of the present study was to analyse gender effects with the couple as the unit of analysis.

Most previous research has mainly focused on the impact of the husband's job on the wife's job. They examined only *unidirectional* crossover. However, this research has tried to examine crossover effects among both couples (bidirectional). The main aim of this study was to predict factors related to work, family and adjustment and to see if they had the same effect on husbands and wives. The couples of this study were quite evenly matched in terms of occupation as both worked as professionals or in white collar jobs. Thus it is assumed that stress levels, work-family conflict, family-work conflict and fatigue experienced by them would be more or less similar for both.

Results of t-tests in Table 1 show that women perceive that they have more social support than men. This is because women participants of this study have reported that they get some support from their children's schools and their teachers, doctors and even from parent groups. Men have not reported these sources of support. This can be attributed to the fact that activities regarding children's schools, or even attending to sick children is predominantly the domain of the mother. Fathers have very little or no contribution in it. According to Glezer (1991) in Australia working women were more likely to take time off than men to look after sick children.

Significant gender differences were found in work-family conflict and job stress with men experiencing more of both. This finding is consistent with previous research (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) that individuals with highest work pressure and emotional demands had most trouble combining work and family life. This finding is also similar to the finding in study two of this research which found that men experienced more work-family conflict as well as job stress than women. The male participants of this study were professional full time employees. They were married or living with a significant other with at least one child living at home with them. All the wives/partners of this study too worked as professionals. Spitze (1988) suggested that

wives' employment does lead to greater participation of husbands in the household, thus increasing their husbands' relative contribution. Contrary to the findings by Spitze (1988), Greenhaus et al., (1989) have reported that people with high levels of psychological involvement in their work role may be more preoccupied with their work and, hence may devote an excessive amount of energy to their work role at the expense of their family role, resulting in work-family conflict. But there are contradicting reports of husbands' participation in house hold work. Hochschild (1989) demonstrated that husbands of working wives do not spend significantly more time in family work compared to husbands of nonworking wives. It can be argued that the amount of time one spends in a particular role and the amount of psychological commitment to a role are influenced by a number of factors including traditional gender role expectations (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991). Maybe the male participants of this study helped out with house hold chores, contrary to gender role expectations, since their partners too were employed as professionals.

Another reason for men to have high job stress could be attributed to the job itself and men's perception of it. Men generally value autonomy, promotion etc. in their jobs more than women do (Clark, 1997). Kanter (1977) explained that men are more likely to be located on job ladders which have a high ceiling and therefore provide greater opportunity for promotion. According to Van Yperen (2003) providing employees with autonomy allows them to make certain choices and decisions about their work; these may concern how they plan their work (timing control) or the methods they use to carry out their work (method control). If these are not satisfied, then they would experience more stress. However it cannot be ruled out that trying to balance the home and work domains could add more pressure on the husband's job, thereby making it more stressful. All the

male participants of this study worked for more hours (46 hours p/w) than their wives (some wives worked part-time) and thus could be assumed to have more work pressure.

A significant but expected result in table 1 is that women experience more family-work conflict than men. This result is consistent with the result in study two. This could be because most working women have to balance work and family together. Beutell and Greenhaus (1983), for example, found that employed women who held traditional gender role attitudes experienced considerable conflict when they employed the "super mom" strategy; that is, when they aimed to meet all role expectations. Not only are women expected to become super mums, but taking care of the elderly or any extended family is also expected from them even if they are in paid work.

Discussion of fatigue as an outcome variable

The first outcome variable that was studied to find out crossover effects was fatigue. Fatigue is a factor that can have negative effects both at work or at home. Previous research by Stewart, Abbey, Meana, & Boydell (1998) has shown that women attributed their fatigue to a combination of home and outside factors, for e.g. relationship problems, lack of social support, etc. This can not only have a negative effect on their work, home and general adjustment, but also on their health. Living with children under the age of 6 years is often related to fatigue in the female population, but this relationship could not be found among men (Bensing, Hulsman, & Schreurs, 1999). Similar results have been found in other studies, making it clear that despite a more even distribution of employment between men and women (more women are employed than before), taking care of young children is still more burdensome for women than for men (Valdini, Steinhardt, Valicenti, & Jaffe, 1988; Morrison, 1980).

Surprisingly, results of this study did not show any significance for number of children being predictors of fatigue in women. Neither was number of children a predictor of dyadic adjustment or job stress among the couples. There is a possibility that since all the couples had either one or two children, there was not enough variation to show any effects. Only three couples had three children. Moreover, since 26 women in this study (30.95%) were part time employees, having children living at home may not have been considered as a major issue as they would have more time on hand than men did to look after the children. So, although children could be a hidden cause of fatigue in women, it is not clearly apparent in the results. Having fewer children at home reduces a lot of work of the couples. Therefore the number of children may not have affected the marital dyad or predicted job stress for the husbands and wives.

An unexpected finding of this study was that when husbands reported higher perceived availability of social support in bringing up children, fatigue in their wives increased. One possible explanation for this finding could be that since many women in this sample were employed part-time, they could make adjustments in their work schedule to accommodate their family problems. Moreover, past research (see Goodnow & Bowes, 1994) has shown that men only “help out” but do not take any responsibility for house hold chores. Therefore women have to tell the men how to do things. Although they may help, men probably may do not do things in the way women want them to do be done. Past research has demonstrated that most women revolve their work hours according to their children’s timings. Therefore, men may not be of much help when it comes to school and childcare related activities. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, women in Australia spend 59 minutes per day in child care, whereas men only spend 22 minutes a day in the same activity. Another explanation that could be suggested is that regression results showed that there was collinearity between partner’s family support and women’s

fatigue. But since the result was significant, it was included in the final model. More research into this finding is necessary.

A unique finding of this study is the bidirectional crossover of fatigue, an area which so far has not been researched. This finding suggests that the effects of fatigue are reciprocal. When an individual perceives that his/her partner is experiencing high levels of fatigue, then the partner too experiences high fatigue. There are times when husbands are stressed by their own jobs, children have to be looked after and there is no family or social support the husband may feel tired and fatigued. During those times even the wives will feel the same due to the crossover effect. This can also happen vice versa. When one of the partners is fatigued, it may lead to neglect of the children, neglect of the partner, neglect of household chores, etc. This in turn might lead to fights thus affecting the marital dyad. One reasonable explanation that can be given for such a crossover is that families in close relationships are able to understand and perceive one another's problems thereby transmitting the effects of their problems to their partner.

Medical research has studied the effects of fatigue on individuals. Women generally experience more fatigue than men. There could be some serious consequences of fatigue. Accidents at work place can happen due to extremely fatigued workers. Psychologically, fatigue can lead to anxiety and depression. This can carry over to other areas of work or even have an effect on the children. Therefore it is necessary to control the factors that cause fatigue. Although this study has shown that fatigue can be bidirectional, further research is needed to strengthen this finding.

One important and very surprising observation regarding predictors of fatigue is that for men their own family cohesiveness is positively correlated with their own fatigue (spillover effect). Normally, one would assume that when men perceive less or no shared affection, support and helpfulness or bonding within the family, their level of fatigue

would increase, or that when the husbands were unable to integrate the demands of work and family life their fatigue would increase. However, the results reveal a different fact: More family cohesiveness leads to more fatigue in men. Greenhaus et al. (1989) have reported that people with high levels of psychological involvement in their work role may be more preoccupied with their work and, hence may devote an excessive amount of energy to their work role at the expense of their family role. Recent research by Stevens, Kiger, & Riley (2006) has shown that for male respondents work variables are less salient for family cohesion because culturally, men are expected to be more committed to work than to family. Perhaps, when husbands felt that the family was more cohesive, their contribution towards domestic tasks, children and spouse would increase and they would not be able to integrate demands of work and family. An increase in multiple demands increases the risk of suffering from fatigue. This would lead to an increase in fatigue. These findings are, however, speculative and more insight is needed into it.

Another interesting point regarding too much cohesiveness has been researched by Fisiloglu and Lorenzetti (1994). They say that this togetherness and closeness, also called enmeshment, results in an over identification with the family and limited autonomy which leads to marital and family problems.

Berger, Cook, DelCampo, Herrera, & Weigel (1994) contend that if a family functions in a manner that is comfortable for a person, that person may perceive less stress than one who wishes for a different mode of functioning. Results of this study are consistent with a study by Berger et al. (1994) comparing Mexican-American and Anglo male and female respondents on family cohesiveness. Considering their family to be a more cohesive unit is a predictor of lower perceived stress (fatigue) for Mexican-American respondents but not for Anglo respondents (Berger et al., 1994).

Discussion of dyadic adjustment as an outcome variable

As already discussed in the previous chapter, the quality of family life depends a lot on the kind of support that families get, especially support to bring up young children. Spousal support to help with children has been known to reduce marital distress and therefore when wives feel that they may not be receiving enough spousal support, the feeling crosses over and increases dyadic adjustment in husbands. Results of the present study have revealed that perceived dyadic adjustment in husbands increased when reported family support for bringing up children by wives decreased. Lower perceived family support in bringing up children to wives lead to higher dyadic adjustment in husbands. One reason for this finding could be that mothers often consider fathers to be an important source of family support. The increase in women's market work has facilitated the increase in men's involvement in child rearing, at least in marriage (Bianchi, 2000). Furthermore, since children are the responsibility of both husbands and wives, husbands may increase their marital support to provide the contribution that wives need to bring up the children.

Similar to family support, family cohesiveness was also assumed to be an important predictor of crossover of dyadic adjustment. Results of this study show that family cohesiveness in one partner does not crossover to affect the other partner's dyadic adjustment. Rather, each partner's own perception of family cohesiveness is responsible for his/her own dyadic adjustment. This is a spillover effect of family cohesion over own dyadic adjustment. This finding is consistent with findings of Fisiloglu and Lorenzetti's (1994) research on married graduate students. They found a linear relationship between perceived family cohesion and perceived dyadic (marital) adjustment due to the normative expectations that family life is important and family members are expected to do things together as a family.

Past research has demonstrated that marital relationships can suffer when couples are unable to manage the demands of their home and work. According to Ryan and Deci (2000) social affiliation is considered to be a basic psychological need and a primary way adults fulfill this need is to form an intimate relationship with another person. In a marriage or a co-habiting relationship, “another person” is usually the wife or partner. Therefore, if one partner experiences a major acute stressor, then the other partner will give support because the expectations in a close relationship are clear.

There is also empirical evidence (see Fisiloglu & Lorenzetti, 1994) that level of education is an important predictor of marital adjustment. They found that when spouses had a master's degree, perceived marital adjustment scores of the subjects were higher than when spouses had either high school or bachelor's degrees. It was also found that when spouses had a doctoral degree, the subjects had higher perceived marital adjustment scores than when spouses had a bachelor's degree. Therefore, higher education will be a predictor of high dyadic adjustment between the couples. This study sample had husbands and wives who were matched on their levels of education since they were all professionals. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that high dyadic adjustment in one partner had a crossover effect on the dyadic adjustment of the other partner.

Discussion regarding job stress as an outcome variable

Interestingly, both husbands and wives perceived their own work-family conflict to be a better predictor of their own job stress rather than their partner's job stress. Findings indicate that for each member of the couple their own work-family conflict has a positive correlation with their own job stress. Similar findings were found by Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro (2005) in their study of the relationship between the work-family interface and depressive symptoms. They found that men may experience more depressive

symptoms when additional family demands interfere with their work responsibilities. In a study of turnover intentions, Netemeyer, Brashear-Alejandro, & Boles (2004) found that effects of work-family conflict on job stress were greater than that of role conflict. Moreover, models of work-family conflict propose that this conflict can have an important effect on the quality of both work and family life (Burke, 1988; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983). According to Tan (2001) there is a greater prevalence of conflicts where work interferes with family than when family interferes with work. The findings of this research are also consistent with previous research by Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington (1989) who found that work overload at home contributed to job stress for both men and women.

As expected, there was a crossover effect of the wives' family-work conflict on the job stress of husbands. This finding implies that when the wives' family-work conflict increased, job stress of the husbands increased. This can happen when the demands of the house increase and interfere with the job. For example, sick children in the house, school holidays or even family events. All the participants ($N = 168$) of this study were married and had at least one child living at home. Although the presence of children per se had no significant effect on any of the outcome variables, it could be 'hidden' in some predictor variables like family-work conflict. For women, being married also brings in some family responsibilities not only towards one's own family but also towards extended family, if any. Again, despite being in the work-force, women are still responsible for most of the domestic work thereby potentially increasing the family-work conflict. According to Milkie and Peltola (1999) although most employed, married women have spouses who work full-time, a significant proportion of employed men have wives who work part-time or do no paid work. They further state that married men are more likely to have a partner who can and are willing to take care of many tasks everyday at home and make his life

more balanced. Therefore when wives reported an increase in their family-work conflict, job stress in husbands increased. Although some researchers (e.g., Tan, 2001) feel that work-family conflict may cause more job stress, family-work conflict can also contribute to job stress. However, this crossover effect was not found in wives. This is because research shows that men generally do not adjust their home time in response to their wives' employment (Shelton & John, 1996), so that wives' feelings of balance may be less affected by husbands' work life (Milkie & Peltola, 1999). Findings of this study are partially consistent with Bolger et al's (1989) study where they found that work overload contributed to stress at home for both men and women.

Another predictor of job stress in men was their wives' perception of family support for children. Husbands' job stress increased when family support for raising children reported by the wives decreased. This finding is consistent with research by Snarey (1993) who found that men who were fathers had a greater attachment to the labour force or greater commitment to their careers out of a sense of responsibility to provide for their children. Therefore, when wives reported less support, husbands would have increased their time and support to provide for the children, thereby increasing their job stress. Or the finding could also be attributed to the traditional gender role which states that women or wives are responsible for most domestic chores or unpaid work, especially children related activities, while men are responsible for paid work in the work-force. When family support reported by wives was less, men would have to spend more time at home in providing support for the children, thus reducing their time at work and increasing their job stress. Consistent to the traditional gender role expectations, Karambayya and Reilley (1992) found that women in dual earner families restructured their work activities around their family responsibilities more than men did. When husbands perceived that their wives' contribution towards domestic tasks decreased, their job stress increased.

Women's perception of family support for rearing children was also found to be significantly correlated with their own job stress (spillover effect). For wives, family support was significantly negatively correlated with their job stress. When wives felt that they did not have enough family support to help with children, their job stress increased. Again, this finding contradicts previous findings of the current research where even when women got support from their husbands, their fatigue increased. One possible explanation for this could be that perhaps, women need more support from their work sources rather than their non-work sources to reduce job stress. For example, 78.8% women participants reported that they had no provision to work from home during school holidays and only 16.3% could work from home; 87.50% women said that they had no childcare facilities at work. Social support is assistance with job-related problems provided by co-workers, supervisors, and kinship, an individual's immediate family (Chu, Lee & Hsu, 2006).

According to Price (2001) an employee who is well-supported by a social support system appears to have less job-related stress. Having family-friendly working arrangements may possibly help in the reduction of job stress in women especially when they know that they can work around their children's timings. Thus if the women participants of this study felt that they were not getting enough family/social support especially from their work source, it spilled over to their work domain thereby increasing their job stress.

Finally, although not hypothesized, partner's perceived family cohesiveness seemed to be a significant predictor of job stress for the women. It was negatively correlated with job stress meaning that job stress in women increased when they perceived that their husbands experienced less cohesiveness. This is a crossover effect where the husband's lack of family cohesiveness crossed over to the job stress of the wife. When women perceive their family environment to be supportive, where family members can

express themselves and there is low interpersonal conflict, then they would face less job stress. Previous research by Netemeyer et al. (1996) suggests that family-work conflict is more apt to exert negative influences in the home domain, cause more internal conflict in the family unit, and contribute to less life and job satisfaction. Again, since the sex role theory posits that men and women experience different opportunities and constraints in their social roles, patterns of role involvement differ for women and men; for example, men spend more time in paid work than women do, whereas women spend longer hours in family work than men do (Voydanoff, 2004). Thus men are regarded as providers whereas women are expected to be involved in family roles although they may be employed full time in paid work just like their husbands. When women perceive these differences to interfere with their work life, their job stress may increase.

Discussion of the family-friendly policy questionnaire

Research suggests that family-friendly policies can reduce the stress associated with balancing multiple roles (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Yet, very few employees actually take advantage of them. For example, in the current study only 30% of the women took full benefit of maternity leave (paid leave for 14 weeks). There is evidence in the US that only 30% of female university employees had taken full maternity leave since 77% thought that taking maternity leave would hurt them professionally (Finkel, Olswang, & She, 1994).

Analysis of the family friendly policy questionnaire reveals that very few couples had the freedom to work from home. Although many of the men could work from home, maybe they may choose not to do so. A reasonable explanation for this could be the traditional sex role theory. Being providers, males are supposed to work “outside” of the homes and they may choose not to work from home except in times of emergencies. Furthermore, employees who take advantage of these options, and thus visibly demonstrate interest in

family and personal life, may face negative judgments regarding their lack of commitment to the organization (Allen & Russell, 1999).

Fewer women on the other hand had a choice of working from home. Not having a choice to work from home or only during school terms can contribute to the fatigue and job stress of the women. Very few of the participants ever received any childcare benefits from their employers nor did they have childcare facilities at the work place. However, one positive point for all employees was that nearly all of them got time off for family emergencies.

To sum up, this study contributed to the literature on crossover and spillover in white collar dual earner couples by investigating the predictors of variables relating to work, home and marital adjustment. The present study has also confirmed results of the first two studies of this thesis by showing that gender is indeed an important factor in balancing work-family conflict. Crossover effects of fatigue included the empathetic crossover of fatigue and the crossover of men's family support in women. The most interesting finding of this study was the bi-directional crossover of fatigue from one partner to another. Regarding dyadic adjustment, crossover effects were observed in wives' perceived family support in raising young children on men (negative crossover) and the empathetic crossover of dyadic adjustment. In men crossover effects of job stress were seen in wives' family-work conflict and family support (negative crossover). In women these crossover effects of job stress were observed in husband's perception of family cohesiveness (negative crossover).

There were two unexpected findings in the current study. The first was when husbands reported increased support towards raising the children, fatigue in wives increased. The second odd finding was that family cohesiveness was positively related to fatigue in men. As said earlier, these two findings need more investigation and research.

Another important finding was that higher family support with children leads to lower dyadic adjustment in husbands. Although it was hypothesized that there would be a crossover effect of work-family conflict on the job stress of both partners, both husbands and wives perceived their own work-family conflict to be a better predictor of their own job stress rather than their partner's job stress.

Children were not found to be predictors of the outcome variables in the current study. This could be due to the small numbers of children the participants had. However, social/family support regarding raising young children has been an important predictor of crossover and spillover among the couples in the current study.

7.5 Conclusion

Research concerning inter-relations between work-family conflict, family-work conflict and crossover is fairly limited. Although there is a lot of research on division of labour in households (see Baxter, 1997; 2002) and work-family conflict (see Fallon, 1997) there are no studies investigating crossover and spillover of work and family related variables among white collar dual earner couples in Australia. Again, there is not much research on bi-directional crossover, especially of fatigue and dyadic adjustment among couples. Therefore, this study attempts to extend the literature on the work-family interface and crossover by examining these relationships. This study can be considered one of the few to study the effect of crossover and spillover simultaneously.

As can be seen from the results, children did not pose problems or threats to the marital dyad. Therefore, number and age of children cannot be considered as predictors of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress. Yet the support that is needed to raise young children from either the home or outside does predict levels of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress among couples. This would imply that when parents do get support from any

source, it would surely reduce their fatigue and job stress, and increase their dyadic adjustment.

Most working families (especially women) today are trying to juggle home and work responsibilities. Very few households have the support of paid domestic help. Most households today are dual earner families with women holding equally responsible positions like men. Yet work remains structured in keeping with the traditional (male) breadwinner model, as if employees were without family responsibilities or other non-work personal involvements (Feldberg & Glenn, 1979). Moreover, schools, medical services, and most community activities continue to be organized with reference to the (female) homemaker model, with domestic life principally the province of women. Social and employment policies remain grounded in this gendered template of separate spheres, implicitly, if not explicitly (Blau, Ferber, and Winkler 1998; Figart and Mutari 1998; Moen 1992; Mutari and Figart 1997; Orloff 1993; Vogel 1993). Kessler and McLeod (1984) suggested that because of their greater involvement in family affairs, women become more sensitive not only to the stressful events that they themselves experience but also to those that affect other family members.

To balance work and family roles it is important that men take into consideration the help and support they receive from their spouses positively. A family can never function as a dyad with individualistic ideas. The fact that children do not contribute significantly to the outcome variables suggests that couples themselves are responsible for maintaining their work-life balance.

In terms of work-place policy this research suggests that factors responsible for fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress are different for men and women. Organisations must identify these factors and implement such policies that will benefit men and women differently. Participation of husbands in household work should not be looked down upon,

but rather be seen as an essential aspect to maintain a healthy work-life balance. Praising or rewarding employees who spend time to be with sick children or even giving some kind of incentives to male employees who perform typically “female” tasks (picking up children from school) could be a way of encouraging other employees to balance work and family roles. For example, allowing employees to start work late two days a week so that children can be dropped off, or encouraging men (wherever possible) to take part in 3 way conferences in schools. Employees especially men, must take advantage of the family-friendly policies that their organisations offer so that they can contribute to the welfare of the family.

Although culture (study one & study two) in the Indian immigrant groups may not have been an important identifier of work-family conflict, studies two and three have shown that gender is clearly an important identifier of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress. Therefore, it would be reasonable to conclude that many family and work variables are still quite gender specific.

7.6 Limitations and future research

Although the present study revealed important information on crossover and spillover, the major limitation was that all the participants-husbands and wives were white collar employees. Therefore generalisations cannot be made for all working couples, especially if one of the partners works in a blue collar profession. Additionally, couples of this study who worked full time worked for an average of 46 (men) and 40 (women) hours a week. Part time employed worked for an average of 22 hours a week. Perhaps, employees in blue collar jobs or unskilled jobs and who work for lesser amount of time have different stressors thus having different crossover effects. Even having husbands and wives in different or unequally matched professions could reveal significantly different results.

Another limitation of the study is that it is cross-sectional and therefore causal directions cannot be found. For example, the fatigue scale measured the feelings of tiredness among employees for the past one month. It could so happen that during the past month some employees may have felt more stressed or fatigued due to problems at home or at work. Results could vary if employees were tested at some other time. This is also an exploratory study and therefore it gives scope for further research.

One possibility of having unexpected results could also be due to having a relatively small and homogenous sample ($N = 168$). There was also a high inter correlation between some variables like family cohesiveness and family support. Husbands and wives appeared to perceive their sources of family support to be the same. Also, items that husbands found to be important for family cohesiveness may have also been perceived to be equally important by the wives increasing the collinearity between the variables.

There is also the limitation of depending upon self-report and subjective responses. The differences in subjective and objective measures are worth considering. For example, although the current study has reported that wives' family support in bringing up children and family cohesiveness negatively affects husbands' fatigue and dyadic adjustment, past research based on subjective reports has demonstrated that when wives supported their husbands, their dyadic adjustment increased.

Future research could take into account crossover effects among blue collar full time or even among unskilled workers. Perhaps, researchers could use longitudinal methods, especially to study effects of fatigue on work-family conflict. It would also be worthwhile to consider using objective as well as subjective measures to study the outcome variables like fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusion and Implications

8. Overview

The purpose of this research has been threefold: Firstly, it explored cultural differences in occupational stress and work-family conflict among Indian immigrant men and women in Australia and Australian-born men and women; secondly, it investigated gender differences among Australian men and women and Indian men and women, and finally it explored the crossover effects of work stress related variables on men and women (gender). These were exploratory studies in which a cross-sectional research design was used and qualitative (in study 1 & partly in study 2) as well as quantitative methods were employed. This research contributes to the work-family literature in four major ways:

1. First, it partially strengthens the traditional gender role and Conservation of Resources Theory. It strengthens the fact that as far as domestic work is concerned, there can be more similarities in gender roles than differences between certain cultures.
2. This research has lent support to past research findings that people from individualistic cultures would experience more job stress than people from collectivist cultures. It also strengthens past research that resources need not be lost while balancing work and family roles.
3. This research has also supported past research findings that job stress and work-family conflict is correlated and is common among dual earner families. An increase in work-family conflict increases job stress in individuals.
4. Although not explicitly, the research has also suggested that support in bringing up young children is the responsibility of both parents.

8.1 Similarities and differences between Individualistic and Collectivist cultures

Australia has become one of the most popular destinations for Indians to immigrate. This is because of the shortage of skilled workers in Australia and the “skilled immigration” policy of the Australian government. Many highly qualified Indians from India have taken advantage of this policy and have made Australia their home.

Generally, immigration is regarded as one of the most traumatic and stressful events of an individual’s life. This happens when immigrants do not have any social support, any kind of help and no jobs in the host country. However, there are other immigrants who are well adjusted, are happy with their jobs and have social support either from their own family or from their community networks. Indians belong to the latter group: They are well adjusted, educated, are professionals and hold high positions in organisations. Similar studies of Indian immigrants in other countries like USA and Britain have also shown that Indian immigrants are well settled and adjusted.

Indians in Australia have retained a strong ethnic identity and have also identified with the host society. Indian men and women were both comparable to the Australian-born participants in terms of job satisfaction, work-family conflict and family-work conflict since there were no significant differences between the matched pairs. However, in the first study significant cultural differences were found in job stress with Australian women being more stressed than Indian women. This difference could be attributed to the fact that in India and among Indians, both husbands and wives in dual earner families perceive men mainly in their provider roles. Indian men and women are still traditional with regard to their perceptions of ‘provider’ and ‘domestic’ roles. Although wives share the economic burden, they are still appreciated more in their domestic role rather than in their provider role. Therefore, their paid employment life can be “stress-free”. The husband is the

primary bread-winner and therefore more appreciated in his provider role. He is awarded the main provider status. Thus the husbands' unpaid domestic front is "stress free". This feeling among Indians has not changed despite immigration to a more "western" society with egalitarian views. Thus the suggested difference in job stress may be partly due to Indian women being satisfied with this tradition. Previous research on Korean immigrants (Collectivist culture) in America (Individualistic culture) by Lim (1997) has also demonstrated that although Korean men in America did not oppose their wife's working, the husbands regarded the wife as a secondary bread winner, working by choice not necessity, and whose main responsibility was to the children and family-related duties. Korean immigrant wives, just like the Indian immigrant wives in this study, also endorsed their husband's views. The Korean immigrant wives believed that the authority of men as family heads should remain unchallenged for the family order (Lim, 1997). A study on Indian immigrant women in the USA has revealed that immigration to the USA gave them a new found freedom. But by and large they adhered to the traditional Indian ideology about gender roles, being responsible for cooking, house work and looking after the children (Devi Lakshmi & Pillai, 2001).

Ramu (1989) has suggested that Indian men and women continue to be governed by the traditional beliefs and values which "encourage wives to acknowledge and defer to their husbands even though they share the provider roles". But for a western society Hardesty and Bokemier (1989) have contended that it is important for women themselves to hold egalitarian sex role attitudes when expecting similar attitudes from others and co-operation from husbands in household matters. Due to these egalitarian attitudes, men in western societies are not necessarily the sole providers of the family. It does not matter what kind of jobs they perform or that their wives may work for more hours than they do

and in some cases may even earn more than them. However, since the numbers of participants were too small, only suggestions regarding the results can be made.

Results of the second study of this research within the same area of investigation have revealed no cultural differences between Australian men and women and Indian immigrant men and women on job satisfaction, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. But there was a significant difference in job stress, with Australian men and women experiencing more job stress than their Indian counterparts. Similar results were obtained in study 1 where Australian women experienced more job stress than Indian women. This difference could be attributed to differences in cultures – individualism and collectivism - since research has demonstrated that people from individualistic culture perceived a greater tendency to appraise work demands as more stressful (high primary appraisal) than people from collectivist cultures (Sawang et al., 2006). People from individualistic cultures value job related factors like autonomy and would like to be in control of their environment. However, it is not clear from this research which job related factors were more stressful for the Australians.

8.2 Gender differences between Australian and Indian men and women

Study 2 did reveal some significant gender differences between men and women from both cultures. Australian and Indian men seemed to experience more job stress and more work-family conflict than their female counterparts. However, Australian and Indian women experienced more family-work conflict than the men.

These findings are not surprising as they conform to most past research. Irrespective of culture, men are still considered to be providers while women are considered as care takers. Research in Australia among dual earner couples has shown that men spend only 22 minutes per day on child care activities and 1.37 hours per day on

domestic duties. Women on the other hand, spend 59 minutes per day on childcare and 2.42 hours a day in domestic duties (ABS, 2008). Even in India, there is a strong gender bias among dual earner couples with men wanting their wives to be “homemakers”. Even working mothers reported that they would like to spend time with their young children (Times of India, May 5, 2008).

Results of the second study also revealed that men had more job stress than did women. Men perceived that they had too much work to do and felt that over all, their job was stressful. This can be due to men spending more time in paid employment than women and also due to the nature of men’s jobs. Some white collar jobs like doctors, IT specialists could be more stressful and demanding than other white collar jobs thereby increasing the over all stress levels of the participants of the study.

A significant difference in cooking for the family was also observed between men of both cultures. Very few Indian men cooked everyday for the family. Ten of the 19 Indian men reported that they never cooked at all. Again this is not surprising as most past research on Indian socialisation norms has shown that even when husbands and wives are employed, Indian women are still responsible for all the cooking for the family. Men are brought up with the traditional belief that the kitchen is the “female” domain and therefore, it is either the mother, the sister, and after marriage the wife who will be responsible for it. Another reason for Indian men not volunteering in the cooking is because preparing Indian meals is a long process. Pre-preparation of the meals is even more arduous than the actual meal. With men spending more time in paid employment, finding time to cook may be difficult for the men.

Participants from studies 1 and 2 balanced their work and family lives adhering to the traditional gender role. Therefore, when work interfered with family for the men, they experienced more work-family conflict, while when family interfered with work for the

women, there was an increase in their family-work conflict. Although husbands helped their wives, Benin and Agostinelli (1988) have pointed that women are relatively unaffected by increased household labour participation on the part of husbands unless the labour is specifically spent in those tasks traditionally defined as "feminine" chores, such as cooking or cleaning.

8.3 Gender differences in crossover research

Study three was undertaken to find out the effects of crossover between stress related variables on husbands and wives, taking the couple as the unit of analysis. The husband and wife participants of this study were all employed as professionals and therefore had high responsibility in their jobs. Professionals are generally perceived by the public as a distinguished class of workers who serve public needs, enjoy considerable prestige and job autonomy and are thus shielded from stressful work situations that are common to non-professional workers - such as excessive job pressure, task monotony and lack of job control (Chan, Lai, Ko & Boey, 2000). However, in spite of the status professionals enjoy, they too experience stress related to their jobs and home.

8.4 Crossover and Spillover correlations

Results revealed that for both men and women, crossover relationships were strong predictors of fatigue, dyadic adjustment and job stress. For fatigue in husbands, there was a crossover correlation with wives' fatigue. This effect was also observed in the wives. However, there was a negative crossover of husband's family support on wives' fatigue. For dyadic adjustment in husbands, dyadic adjustment of wives and negative crossover of family support for children were the predictors. In wives, husband's dyadic adjustment was the predictor of their own dyadic adjustment. Crossover of wives' family-work conflict and

wife's family support were the predictors of job stress among husbands; while for wives, their husband's family cohesion was the predictor of job stress.

Spillover of own family cohesiveness was a predictor of husband's fatigue and dyadic adjustment. No spillover effect was observed in women for fatigue. However, women's own family cohesion had a positive crossover effect with their dyadic adjustment. Own work-family conflict spilled over to increase job stress among husbands, while among women, their own work-family conflict and social support to raise young children was a predictor of their job stress.

The choice of dependent variables in this study was due to their interaction in the home and work contexts. Fatigue in this research was considered as a general variable affecting people at home and at work. Dyadic adjustment is needed by couples to manage their personal lives and marital relationships. Job stress determines the amount of stress a person has on the job and how it can affect the individual's family life.

Study three of this research suggests gender differences in crossover research, especially for job stress. Research suggests that women are still primarily responsible for the household (Pleck, 1985), suggesting more family role stress. Most previous research supports the idea that dual-career men experience greater work-family conflict due to conflicts within the family domain. The expectations that women will take care of the family may cause family demands to interfere with work more for women than for men (Higgins & Duxbury, 1992). This finding has been strengthened by this crossover research. When the women participants' work-family conflict increased, their own job stress also increased. The same effect was also found in men. When men perceived increase in their own work-family conflict, they also reported increase in their job stress. Similarly, job stress in men increased when family-work conflict in wives increased. Therefore, it can be assumed that reported high work-family conflict in men and women is directly responsible

for increase in their job stress. Past research has demonstrated that one reason for this could be the work-family policies of organizations. What most employers must realize is that is that even if their employees are not working additional hours when they are under heavy workloads, the strain or psychological distress caused by heavy workloads may still lead to higher work-family conflict (Ilies, Schwind, Johnson, & Wagner, 2007). Most employees desire flexible working hours. Extended work hours have been linked to work-family conflict (see Piotrkowski, 1987). Social support at the work place is another factor responsible for high work-family conflict especially among women. Galinsky (1994) revealed that workers in unsupportive work environments - those characterized by discrimination or favouritism - experienced more negative family consequences. Having childcare facilities in the work premises also have not shown any promising advantages. The clearest advantage of on-site child care is the increase in the availability of child care; but the quality, hours of operation, and cost of on-site child care may not be substantially different than for off-site care. Further, even slots in on-site child-care centers may be limited, meaning spaces may not be available for all employees seeking care (Glass & Estes, 1997). In study three of this research 90 per cent of men and 88 per cent of women did not have childcare facilities at their work place.

Dual-career men do not have mutually supportive work and family roles (i.e. they are parallel rather than complementary) (Lewis & Cooper, 1988; Googins & Burden, 1987; Ross, Mirowsky & Huber, 1983; Sekaran, 1986). Society expects men to give priority to the work ('breadwinner') role. When dual-career men are unable to follow these expectations, the extent to which they perceive work conflicting with the family is likely to increase. Empirical studies support this argument (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Sekaran, 1986; Lewis & Cooper, 1988; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). The experience of strain taxes an individual's resources and would therefore be expected to influence the energy with which

the individual seeks out social interaction and behavioral engagement. As individuals experience increasing levels of work-to-family conflict, they are likely to withdraw from social activities and interactions; therefore, their engagement in social behaviors in the family will be limited (Ilies et al., 2007). Further they state that employees who reported high amounts of work-to-family conflict on particular days were less likely to interact socially with their families, even when they controlled for the amount of time the employee spent at home. This suggests that employees withdraw from their families on days that they experience high levels of work–family conflict.

One important finding is that providing support for raising young children is the responsibility of both husbands and wives. When husbands perceived that their wives did not receive support for the children, their own job stress increased. A similar spillover effect was also found in wives, that is, when wives reported that they were not getting enough support for the children, their own job stress increased. This implies that the father's and mother's work revolves around their children and if they perceive that their children are not getting enough family/social support, it increases their job stress.

Another finding is that when both husbands and wives perform white collar jobs, or have similar amount of responsibility in their jobs, there is a spillover of work-family conflict on job stress. This happens because for both partners, work and family domains are equally important. Families today are becoming more egalitarian which means that men and women devote equal time to paid employment and to the family. Men's primary roles as being the sole bread winner are slowly eroding and couples are moving towards a "marriage of equally dependent spouses" (MEDS, Nock, 2001). Among egalitarian men, marital, family and occupational roles are of equal importance, and they view themselves as participants in all spheres of life (Stickney & Conrad, 2007).

However, in the context of this research, it could be said that families have become more equitable rather than egalitarian. This is because many women participants in this research worked part-time and thus spent lesser hours in paid work while spending more hours in unpaid domestic work. Men on the other hand, spent more time in paid work and less time in domestic work. This is how most families maintained equality and balance in paid and unpaid work.

In this context, what can be done to reduce job stress among men and women? Does it mean that women should give up their jobs altogether to look after the domestic front or that husbands should always take up full-time white collar employment so that they do not have to worry about daily household duties or that balancing the demands of work and family should be treated totally as a women's problem? Clearly none of these solutions are practical and are nearly impossible.

The fact is that dual-earners couples are becoming the norm today and not an exception. As already discussed in chapters one and two, when the husband and wife both work there are many psychological and monetary benefits for the family. However, women have already accommodated to the structural lag produced by the changing realities of the work/family interface (Moen & Yu, 2000). This they have done by choosing "mommy track" jobs which includes a lower status and fewer chances of advancement, moving in and out of the labour force, doing part-time work, not being willing to travel or relocate, and working lesser hours than men (see Becker & Moen, 1999). In Australia women still tend to undertake more of the household chores and domestic duties (Bittman, 1991) and therefore stress resulting from overload may be experienced more by women than by men (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971). Furthermore, Spencer and Podmore (1984) have suggested that the structure of a profession and cultural values regarding sex roles make women in male-dominated professions particularly susceptible to work-family conflicts. Therefore, in

order to be able to balance home and work domains, many women choose to take up part-time employment or work for shorter hours. Although there is no evidence from this research whether women have taken up part-time employment to accommodate family needs, there is evidence in this research that a total of 28% women did work part-time and 29% did change their status from full-time to part-time. There are many arguments as to why women take up part time jobs. One belief is that part time employment is forced upon women due to their domestic responsibilities. But Hakim (1995) claims that part-time employment is typically chosen voluntarily by the great majority of married women. Part-time workers are thus attracted to relatively undemanding jobs with ‘no worries or responsibilities’ due to their overriding commitment to the ‘marriage career’, notably their domestic activities and family life (Hakim, 1995). But this is not always true. Not all women voluntarily take up part time employment. Women may work part time due to the demands on their time and childcare costs (Ginn et al., 1996), or part-time employment may also enable individuals to more easily manage their family responsibilities, particularly dependent children, elderly parents and/or leisure activities (Walsh, 1999).

Overall, this research has found support for the success of the Australian immigrant policy, some support for the traditional gender role and also some support for egalitarian attitudes among dual earner couples. In addition to these findings, this research has also shown that balancing work and family lives and providing support for young children is important for both husbands and wives, regardless of culture. It is more of a gender issue rather than a cultural matter.

This research is not without its limitations. As mentioned in chapters three and five due to a relatively low number of participants, generalizations cannot be made for all Indian immigrants living in Australia. A couple of odd findings of the third study also need to be investigated more. For example, the finding that providing family support for

children from husbands increased fatigue in wives or that own family cohesiveness increased fatigue in husbands.

There is also the limitation of not knowing the ethnic cultural backgrounds of the Australian population. The Australian population in this study represented the diversity of the western population. However, this could have obscured the differences in the Australian culture.

Another limitation of the research is in the interview, household and work survey method employed. The interview questionnaire was very structured and close-ended thereby giving participants a limited choice of answers. Although participants could comment on any other aspect at the end of the questionnaire, not many participants did so. Though open-ended questions give participants freedom to respond, they are quite time consuming. All participants of this research were very busy since most of them worked in positions of responsibility hence close-ended questionnaires were considered as time saving for them. A possible participant sample bias may also exist in the “snowball” technique employed to recruit participants since this technique draws from a small circle with specific social and economic characteristics (Streefkirk, 1985).

8.5 Contribution of this research to the work-stress literature

One of the major contributions of this thesis is towards the investigation of job and work related variables on Indian immigrants in Australia. This is the first study in Australia which has tried to investigate job stress and work-family balance among skilled Indian immigrants in Australia.

The results of this thesis have supported findings that job stress and work-family conflict is common among dual earner families. At the same time, families have found their own ways and resources of adjusting to these stressors. In some families wives work

part-time or for shorter hours than their husbands; in other families women have taken up paid and unpaid work by being neo-traditional while others have become more egalitarian in their attitudes towards paid work and domestic household work. Therefore this study supports the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory as it has shown that it is possible for dual earner couples to experience job stress, fatigue and work-family conflict and yet adjust to it by not losing resources and personal conflict. The COR model assumes that job stress and work-family conflict are related to one another. Therefore, when employees experience high levels of conflict at work, they might use up all available resources and leave fewer resources for work-family demands (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). Research has shown that people who are comfortable with their combination of roles (work and family) have shown greater organizational commitment, positive organizational attitudes and increased levels of work and family satisfaction (Johnson, 1995; Lewis & Cooper, 1995). Personal coping strategies related to the traditional gender role theory were used by almost all the participants.

Another contribution of this research towards the area of work-stress is that it has taken into consideration husbands and wives working in the same area of responsibility. Crossfield et al. (2005) have demonstrated the need to investigate couples where male and female partners have working roles of equivalent status and where they are likely to experience workplace stressors that are similar in nature and degree. Similarly, researchers like Swanson (1992) have also called for intact paired or matched couples to study “within” dual earner effects. Australian and Indian participants of study one (women) were matched in terms of age, marital status and occupation. Similarly, all participants in study three were matched couples in white collar professions.

One major problem of the work-family literature is its focus on employed mothers resulting in less knowledge about employed fathers. Similarly, researchers like Perry-

Jenkins et al. (2000) feel that gender and ethnicity must also be considered when studying work-family conflict. The present research has tried to redress this gap by recruiting Indian and Australian participants as well as employed fathers and mothers.

In terms of organizational and work-place policy, this research has demonstrated that factors contributing to fatigue, job stress and work-family conflict are different for husbands and wives and that increase in work-family conflict does lead to an increase in job stress among men and women. Most organizations must recognize these factors and implement policies accordingly for men and women. For example, employing flexible working hours especially when children are small or during children's school holidays. Providing facilities like allowing employees to start work late two days a week can help employees, especially men, to drop children off to school. It must be understood that flexible work should be for everyone, and not just for women. The first two studies of the thesis have also demonstrated that when there is a person-job fit, even immigrants are satisfied with their jobs thereby assimilating them in the local work culture. Furthermore, when immigrants do not experience racial discrimination at the work-place, it increases their job satisfaction and reduces their job stress.

To sum up it can be said that the current research has demonstrated that participants of all the three studies ($N = 226$) balanced their work and family lives quite well by being neo-traditional and egalitarian (equitable). Therefore, it could be said that rather than experiencing work-family conflict or family-work conflict, participants experienced work-family balance.

8.6 Future research

The realm of work and family continues to be complex and research on it is still inconclusive. Some researchers like Loscocco (1997) have shown gender differences in

work-family conflict; while others like Hammer et al. (1996) have not found any such differences. The present research however, has found gender differences in study two and some gender differences in crossover and spillover of work and family related variables in study three.

But it is not clear from this research whether similar gender differences will be found among couples both of whom work in blue collar professions or even among unskilled couples. Similarly, even among lesser skilled immigrants in Australia, there may not be obvious gender differences. However, it is possible that different religious groups, for example, Muslims are more likely than others to be stereotyped and therefore results might have been different. Therefore research especially crossover research, needs to compare work-family experiences among dual earner couples in other occupations as well as in immigrants who may not hold highly skilled jobs. Future research also could take into consideration the time period of Indian immigrants living in Australia. Problems of first and second generation immigrants may be totally different. Another area of research that is recommended is job stress and work-family conflict among Indian immigrants who have arrived on a SIR (skilled independent regional) or the skilled independent regional (sponsored) visa in Australia. Condition of this visa is that skilled immigrants have to find work in specified 'regional' areas of Australia where there are skill shortages. Therefore, immigrants arriving on this visa cannot settle anywhere in Australia, except for the specified regional place mentioned in their visa. This may cause them difficulties in settling down and adjusting to the Australian culture.

Study three of this thesis had a heterogenous mixture of white collar professionals. Some research in the past (see Chan et al., 2000) has identified that different kinds of stress can affect people working in different professions. For example, interpersonal tension and lack of social support at the workplace were found to induce stress among nurses (Decker,

1985) and engineers (Keenan & Newton, 1987). It would be interesting to see the crossover and spillover effects among Australian husbands and wives both working in these professions.

According to Bellavia and Frone (2005), work-family conflict continues to be an increasing challenge for organizations and those they employ. However, the possibility exists that participation in both the work and home domain can enhance an individual's overall performance (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). A study by Balmforth and Gardner (2006) has confirmed that work and family life can be integrated and harmonious. Employees stand to gain when they perform numerous roles. Despite awareness that our current knowledge of the work-family interface is incomplete without an understanding of the benefits of participating in both work and family, research in this area is progressing slowly (Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006). Some research suggests that work-family facilitation (which is one manifestation of positive spillover) may be a crucial component of work-family balance (Frone, 2003) and this balance may be improved by increasing facilitation levels. This work-family facilitation would be valuable to study as the literature on the work-family interface develops.

APPENDIX A
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
FORMAT FOR APPLICATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT'S HUMAN ETHICS
SUBCOMMITTEE

TITLE: Occupational Stress among Australian Professionals: The Role of Culture, Gender and Work-Family Conflict

INVESTIGATORS, THEIR QUALIFICATIONS AND ROLES:

Principal Investigator: Dr. Helen Winefield, PhD, Department of Psychology, University of Adelaide.

Student Investigator: Shruti Mujumdar, PhD candidate, Department of Psychology, University of Adelaide.

AIM OF STUDY:

The aim of this study is to conduct a more thorough investigation of the work-family conflict faced by the Indian migrant men and women in Australia. It will also investigate and compare organizational stress and work-family conflict between Indian migrant men and women and their Australian counterparts. The study of comparison between immigrant Indian men and women and Australian men and women will give a more detailed idea of cultural differences between perceived home role expectations of both nationalities and the kind of support they give to their spouses who too are a part of the Australian work-force. We feel that husbands' attitudes towards involvement in domestic work could have some impact on work-family conflict faced by women.

PARTICIPANTS:

Participants in the study will include Indian and Australian working men and women who meet the following specifications:

- Indian migrant men and women who have settled in Australia and are part of the Australian work-force.
- Australian men and women who are born and brought up in Australia and are part of the Australian work-force.
- The Indian and Australian men and women should be approximately of the same age and hold the same position in the organization. Indians will nominate an Australian co-worker who occupies the same position as them.
- They will either be married, living with a significant other and living with at least one child at home. By having a child or significant other living with them, participants may be able to answer questions relevant to family stress, family support and work-family conflict.

Exclusion Criteria

Working men and women who are divorced or childless will not be included in this study. It is assumed that these men and women may not be able to answer questions related to family and work-family conflict. Moreover, they do not have to juggle between spouses, children and work.

PLAN AND DESIGN:

Methods and Procedures

Job Stress & Work-Family Conflict

To measure job stress and work-family conflict the following tests will be used.*

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Job Stress Test	Job Stress	Bernas & Major (2000)
Job Satisfaction Scale	Job Satisfaction	Warr, Cook & Wall (1979)
Work-Conflict Scale	Work-Family Conflict	Kelloway, Gottlieb & Barham (1999)

In addition, personal interviews will also be conducted. The interviews will be structured and will include questions such as:

How often do you help your wife/partner with domestic chores?

Do you have a more stressful job than your wife/partner?

Do you or have you taken leave from work due to sick children?

Are there any chores in the house which are solely your responsibility?

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

There will be no risk of pain, anxiety or discomfort. Interviews will be conducted in a place suitable to the participant.

Signed consent forms will be obtained from the participants (see attached Information Letter and Consent Form).

Participants will be free to withdraw from the study whenever they feel like.

Participants will be assured of confidentiality of their information. No individual will be identifiable in any reports

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING OF RESULTS:

Since the data is both qualitative and quantitative, it will be analysed accordingly. Statistical measures such as Correlation and t-tests and thematic analysis with inter-rater reliability checks will be used.

OTHER ETHICS COMMITTEES TO WHICH PROTOCOL HAS BEEN SUBMITTED:

N/A

DATE OF PROPOSED COMMENCEMENT:

Data collection will commence as soon as Ethics Approval is granted.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES AND PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCE:

The following expenditure will be incurred, and will be available through departmental funding.

Inter library loans:	\$130 pa
Chocolates for participants:	\$70 pa
Total:	\$200 pa

Appendix B
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

**Title of Project: Occupational Stress and Work-Family Conflict among Indian
Migrant Men in Australia**

You are invited to participate in a study examining the relationship between the levels of occupational stress and work-family conflict that Indian migrant men and Australian men face. This is a study conducted by Dr. Helen Winefield, Associate Professor, School of Psychology, University of Adelaide and Shruti Mujumdar, A PhD student with the School of Psychology, University of Adelaide.

Before agreeing to participate in the study, it is important to read and understand the explanation, procedures and methods of the study. You will then be asked to sign a form indicating your consent to participate in the study.

Purpose of the study

We would like to examine the relationship between occupational stress and work-family conflict levels in both, Indian immigrant men and Australian men. Our previous study on immigrant Indian women and Australian women showed that culture is not an important factor in determining work-family conflict. We feel that it may be the couple's (or even the family?) work-home balance which needs to be investigated. We would like to see whether cultural differences in work attitudes are clearer in men than in women.

We hope that our study would have relevance both to theories of occupational stress and to policies seeking to optimize the emotional well being of immigrant Indian men and women working in Australia.

Who can participate?

Participants will include Indian and Australian working men who meet the following specifications:

- Indian migrant men who have settled in Australia and are a part of the Australian work-force.
- Australian men who are brought up in Australia and are part of the Australian work-force.
- The Indian and Australian men should be approximately of the same age and hold the same position in the organization. The Indian man will nominate an Australian co-worker who occupies the same position as him.
- The men will either be married or living with a significant other with at least one child living at home with them. By having a child and living with a wife or partner, participants may be able to answer questions relevant to family stress, family support and work-family conflict.
- The Indian and Australian men will have spouses/partners who are also part of the Australian work-force. The spouses or partners need not hold very responsible positions in the work-force.

Around 20 matched pairs of men will be required to participate in this study.

Exclusion criteria

Men who are unmarried, divorced or childless will not be included in this study. It is assumed that these men may not be able to answer questions relating to family and work-family conflict.

Procedures involved

The procedure will involve the use of three questionnaires. These questionnaires will measure job stress, job satisfaction and also work-family conflict that working women face.

Interviews will also be conducted. The interview will not take more than 25 minutes and will be conducted at a place and time best suited to the participant.

Voluntary Participation and Confidentiality

Participation is voluntary and the participant is free to withdraw whenever he feels like. Full care will be taken to ensure that the data remains private and confidential. There will be no sensitive questions asked. None of the participants will be identifiable in any way.

If you have any questions or doubts regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact the following researchers.

SHRUTI MUJUMDAR

shruti.mujudar@student.adelaide.edu.au

DR. HELEN WINEFIELD

h-winefi@complex.psych.adelaide.edu.au

Human Research Ethics Committee Contact

If you have any ethical concerns regarding this study, please contact the Chair of the Departmental Ethics Committee:

DR. PAUL DELFABBRO

Phone No: (03) 8303 5744

Email: paul.delfabbro@adelaide.edu.au

APPENDIX C

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

1. I, _____ (please print name)
consent to take part in the research project entitled, **“Occupational Stress among Australian Professionals: The Role of Culture, Gender and Work-Family Conflict.”**
2. I acknowledge that I have read the attached Information Sheet and my consent is given freely.
3. I have been informed that the information I provide will be kept confidential.

Signature

Date

E-mail address: _____

APPENDIX D

JOB SATISFACTION SCALE

Following items deal with various aspects of your job. Please show how satisfied or dissatisfied you feel with each of these features of your present job, by ticking the appropriate box.

1 = extremely dissatisfied; 2 = very dissatisfied; 3 = moderately dissatisfied; 4 = not sure; 5 = moderately satisfied; 6 = very satisfied; 7 = extremely satisfied

Aspect of Job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. The physical work conditions							
2. The freedom to choose your own method of working							
3. Your fellow workers							
4. The recognition you get for good work							
5. Your immediate boss							
6. The amount of responsibility you are given							
7. Your rate of pay							
8. The opportunity to use your abilities							
9. Industrial relations between management and staff							
10. Your chance of promotion/reclassification							
11. The way the organisation is managed							
12. The attention to suggestions you make							
13. Your hours of work							
14. The amount of variety in your job							
15. Your job security							
16. Now, taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about your job as a whole?							

APPENDIX E
JOB STRESS ITEMS

1. I work under a great deal of tension. _____
2. I have too much work to do. _____
3. My working environment is very stressful. _____
4. I feel I cannot work long enough or hard enough. _____
5. I feel stressed by my job. _____
6. I feel as if I will never get all my work done. _____
7. It makes me tense to think about my job. _____
8. While at work, I feel there is too much pressure to get things done. _____
9. I have unwanted stress as a result of my present job. _____
10. I feel “burned-out” after a full day of work. _____
11. The tension I feel at work makes me unhappy. _____
12. My job is stressful. _____

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Not Sure

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

APPENDIX F

WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT SCALE

ITEMS

1. I have to change plans with family members because of the demands of my job.

2. Job demands keep me from spending the amount of time I would like with my family.

3. Job responsibilities make it difficult for me to get family chores/errands done. _____
4. To meet the demands of my job, I have to limit the number of things I do with family members. _____
5. My job prevents me from attending appointments and special events for family members. _____
6. After work, I have little energy left for the things I need to do at home. _____
7. I think about work when I am at home. _____
8. I do not listen to what people at home are saying because I am thinking about work.

9. After work, I just need to be left alone for a while. _____
10. My job puts me in a bad mood at home. _____
11. The demands of my job make it hard for me to enjoy the little time I spend with my family. _____
12. I would put in a longer workday if I had fewer family demands. _____
13. My family demands interrupt my work day. _____

14. Family demands make it difficult for me to take on additional job responsibilities.

15. I spend time at work making arrangements for family members. _____
16. Family demands make it difficult for me to have the work schedule I want. _____
17. When I am at work, I am distracted by family members. _____
18. Things going on in my family life make it hard for me to concentrate at work. _____
19. Events at home make me tense and irritable on the job. _____
20. Because of the demands I face at home, I am tired at work. _____
21. I spend time at work thinking about the things that I have to get done at home.

22. My family life puts me into a bad mood at work. _____

Note: The rating scale ranged from (1) *Strongly Disagree* to (5) *Strongly Agree*.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Can't Say
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

APPENDIX G
INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Information *(please fill in or tick)*

Age ____ years

Marital Status: Married ____ Living with partner ____

Number of Children ____

Year of migration to Australia *(for Indian participants only)* _____

Designation in organization _____

Questions Regarding Work *(please tick one or more)*

a. What is your main motivation for working?

Money ____

Job Satisfaction ____

To keep you occupied ____

Any other (please state) _____

b. How happy are you with the kind of job you are doing?

Very happy ____

Fairly happy ____

Not happy ____

c. What are the main reasons for which you take leave from your work?

Sick children ____

Sick spouse ____

School holidays ____

Any other (*please state*) _____

d. How often do you have to bring your work home from office?

Almost always ____

Sometimes ____

Never ____

e. Have you ever taken “*Stress Leave*” from your work?

Yes ____

No ____

Questions Regarding Family and Personal Life (*please tick one or more*)

a. Who is the major decision maker of the house?

You ____

Your spouse ____

Both of you ____

Anyone else ____

b. How do you spend your weekends?

Shopping ____

Cleaning the house ____

Looking after the children ____

Entertaining ____

Just relaxing ____

Any other way (*please state*) _____

c. How often do you go on holidays?

Once in 6 months ____

Once a year ____

Never ____

Any other ____

d. Whom do you holiday with?

Family ____

Friends ____

By yourself ____

e. Do you take time off from work to be with sick children?

Always ____

Sometimes ____

Never ____

Questions Relating to the Work-Family Balance *(please tick one)*

a. Does your partner/wife also work?

Yes ____

No ____

b. Does your partner/wife work?

Full time ____

Part time ____

Casual ____

c. Is your job more stressful and demanding than your partner/wife's job?

Yes ____

No ____

Equal ____

d. How often do you help with the household chores?

Almost everyday ____

Sometimes ____ (*please specify*) _____

Only on weekends ____

Never help ____

e. How often do you cook for your family?

Almost everyday ____

Sometimes ____ (*please specify*) _____

Only on weekends ____

Never cook ____

f. If there was a conflict between your work and family, which one would you give priority to?

Work ____

Family ____

Can't say ____

g. Overall, how well do you think you are you managing the work home balance?

Very well ____

Fairly well ____

Not very well ____

Additional questions for Indian immigrant women

Yes

No

Did you face any kind of racial discrimination at the work place?

Did you have to get your skills/qualifications assessed to be able to work in Australia?

Was it difficult for you to find a job in your area of expertise when you first arrived in Australia?

The following questions were recorded on tape.

Have your family roles changed after coming to Australia? And has it affected the level of fatigue you experience?

Did you find any cultural differences between working in India and in Australia? Which country do you think has a more flexible work culture?

How have you organized your life in relation to the bi-cultural experience? Were you readily accepted in the Australian culture?

Additional questions for Australian women (recorded on tape)

Do you mix around with Indian immigrants in your office?

Do you think that you are at an advantage in terms of employment over immigrants?

APPENDIX H

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

FORMAT FOR APPLICATIONS TO THE SCHOOL'S HUMAN ETHICS

SUBCOMMITTEE

TITLE: Crossover and Work-Family Conflict among Indian Immigrant Couples in Australia

INVESTIGATORS, THEIR QUALIFICATIONS AND ROLES:

Principal Investigator: Dr. Helen Winefield, Professor, School of Psychology, University of Adelaide.

Student Investigator: Shruti Mujumdar, PhD student, School of Psychology, University of Adelaide.

AIM OF STUDY:

Aim of the study is conduct a detailed investigation into-

Crossover effects between immigrant husbands' and wives' general adjustment

Crossover effects between immigrant husbands' and wives' work adjustment

Role of social support as a factor contributing towards job satisfaction and marital adjustment.

To find out whether one spouse's job stress can help to explain variance in the other spouse.

PARTICIPANTS:

Participants in the study will include Indian and Australian working couples (husbands and wives) who meet the following specifications:

- Indian migrant couples who have settled in Australia and are part of the Australian work-force.

- Australian couples who are born and brought up in Australia and are part of the Australian work-force.
- They will either be married, living with a significant other and living with at least one child at home. By having a child and a significant other living with them, participants may be able to answer questions relevant to family stress, family support and work-family conflict.
- The male participants will be employed as professionals or at higher levels of responsibility in organisations (e.g., managers, IT specialists, etc.). Female participants should be employed, but not at any particular level of responsibility.

This will help to understand if the stressful job of the male partner has a crossover effect on the job of the female partner.

Around 50 Indian and 50 Australian couples will be required to participate in the study.

Exclusion Criteria

Working couples who are childless will not be included in this study. It is assumed that these couples may not be able to answer questions related to family, work-family conflict and crossover. Moreover, they do not have to juggle between their family and work.

Couples where one of the partners is unemployed will also be excluded from the study. We assume that crossover effects will not be salient in such couples.

PLAN & DESIGN:

Methods and Procedures

To study the effects of crossover, fatigue, family support and marital adjustment, the following scales will be used:

Instrument	Reference
Fatigue questionnaire	Beurskens, Bultmann, Kant, Vercoulin Bleijenberg, & Swaen (2000)
The Family Support Scale (FSS)	Dunst, Jenkins, & Trivette (1984)
Family Organized Cohesiveness Scale	
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	Spanier (1976)
Job Stress Index	Bernas & Major (2000)
Family-Friendly Working Arrangements	Self Developed

The “snowballing” technique will be used. Indian men and women who I know will be able to recommend their Australian counterparts as well as other Indians from their work place. Through e-mails or telephone calls I will be able to ask them for their as well as their partner’s/wife’s consent to participate. I will then e-mail the questionnaires or hand it over personally to them, if they wish. Similarly, these Australian men and women would be able to recommend other participants with whom they are acquainted.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

There will be no risk of pain, anxiety or discomfort.

Participants will be free to withdraw from the study whenever they feel like.

Participants will be assured of confidentiality of their information. No individual will be identifiable in any reports.

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING OF RESULTS: (In brief)

Data will be analysed using statistical measures like multiple regressions, t-tests and correlations.

Inter-rater reliability checks will also be used.

APPENDIX I
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Title of project: Crossover and work-family conflict among Australian and Indian immigrant couples in Australia.

You are invited to participate in a study examining the effects of work-family conflict, family support, fatigue and family friendly working arrangements over crossover among Indian migrant couples in Australia and Australian couples. This is a study conducted by Dr. Helen Winefield, Professor, School of Psychology, University of Adelaide and Shruti Mujumdar, A PhD student with the School of Psychology, University of Adelaide.

Before agreeing to participate in the study, it is important to read and understand the explanation, procedures and methods of the study. You will then be asked to sign a form indicating your consent to participate in the study. However, you have the right to withdraw whenever you like.

Purpose of the study

We would like to investigate how one spouse's home or work stress can affect the other spouse's adjustment to his/her home or work. Most of the previous studies have studied individuals and their adjustment to work or home. We feel that by studying couples, we could get a better insight into their stress and work-family conflict levels. We expect that the couples' experiences at work do affect their lives at home and vice-versa.

We hope that our study would have relevance both to theories of occupational stress and to policies seeking to optimize the emotional well being of immigrant Indian men and women working in Australia.

Who can participate?

Participants will include Indian and Australian couples who meet the following criteria:

- Indian migrant couples who have settled in Australia and are a part of the Australian work-force.
- Australian couples who are brought up in Australia and are a part of the Australian work-force.
- They could be married, living with a significant other and living with at least one child at home. By having a child and a partner, participants may be able to answer questions relevant to family stress, family support and work-family conflict.
- The male participants will be employed as professionals or at higher levels of responsibility in organisations (e.g., as managers, IT specialists, etc.). Female participants could be white collared or blue collared employees, working part-time or full-time.

This will help to understand if the stressful job of the male partner has an effect on the job of the female partner.

Procedures involved

You will need to complete several measures. These questionnaires will measure fatigue, family support, marital adjustment and family friendly working arrangements. Each measure will not take more than 5 minutes to complete.

Voluntary Participation and Confidentiality

Participation is voluntary and the participant is free to withdraw whenever he/she feels like. Full care will be taken to ensure that the data remains private and confidential. There will be no sensitive questions asked. None of the participants will be identifiable in any way as the participants need not disclose their names on the questionnaires.

If you have any questions or doubts regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact the following researchers.

SHRUTI MUJUMDAR

shruti.mujumdar@student.adelaide.edu.au

DR. HELEN WINEFIELD

h-winefi@complex.psych.adelaide.edu.au

Human Research Ethics Committee Contact

If you have any ethical concerns regarding this study, please contact the Chair of the Departmental Ethics Committee:

DR. PAUL DELFABBRO

Phone No: (03) 8303 5744

Email: paul.delfabbro@adelaide.edu.au

APPENDIX J

FATIGUE QUESTIONNAIRE

On this page you will find 20 statements. With these statements we wish to get an impression of how you have felt during the **past two weeks**. For example:

I feel relaxed

If you feel that this statement is not true at all, place a tick (✓) in the right space; like this:

I feel relaxed yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7✓ no, that is not true

If you feel that you are not sure, please place a tick in the middle; like this:

I feel relaxed yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4✓ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

Do not skip any statement and place only one tick for each statement.

1. I feel tired yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

2. I feel very active yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

3. Thinking requires effort yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

4. Physically I feel exhausted

yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

true

5. I feel like doing all kinds of nice things

yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

6. I feel fit

yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

7. I do quite a lot within a day

yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

8. When I am doing something, I can concentrate quite well
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
9. I feel weak
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
10. I don't do much during the day
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
11. I can concentrate well
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
12. I feel rested
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
13. I have trouble concentrating
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
14. Physically I feel I am in a bad condition
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
15. I am full of plans
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
16. I get tired very quickly
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
17. I have a low output
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
18. I feel no desire to do anything
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
19. My thoughts easily wander
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true
20. Physically I feel in a good shape
yes, that is true 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ no, that is not true

APPENDIX K
DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

Scale-

1 Always Disagree

2 Disagree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 Agree

5 Always Agree

1. Handling family finances _____
2. Matters of recreation _____
3. Religious matters _____
4. Friends _____
5. Philosophy of life _____
6. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws _____
7. Aims, goals and things believed important _____
8. Amount of time spent together _____
9. Making major decisions _____

10. Household tasks _____

11. Leisure time interests and activities _____

12. Career Decisions _____

Scale-

0 All the time

1 Most of the time

2 More often than not

3 Occasionally

4 Rarely

5 Never

1. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation or terminating your relationship? _____
2. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well? _____
3. Do you ever regret that you ever married? (or lived together) _____
4. Do you confide in your mate? _____
5. How often do you and your partner quarrel?
6. How often do you and your partner “get on each other’s nerves?”

APPENDIX L

FAMILY ORGANIZED COHESIVENESS SCALE (FOC)

The following items will tell us about your family's attitudes and beliefs. Record in the space the number that best corresponds to your family's current attitude about each item. Please answer the items about your current family (you, your spouse/partner & your children).

1. **Strongly disagree**
2. **Disagree**
3. **Mildly disagree**
4. **Mildly agree**
5. **Agree**
6. **Strongly agree**

1. Family members spend much of their free time together. _____
2. It is hard to know what the rules are in our family because they are always changing.

3. It is easy to know who the leader is in our family. _____
4. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in our family. _____
5. It is clear about what is best for family members. _____
6. Family togetherness is important. _____
7. In our family everybody knows what is expected of them. _____
8. It is clear who makes the decisions. _____
9. Members of our family are not very involved with each other. _____

10. In our family, we are alike in how we think and feel. _____
11. Family members share the same friends. _____
12. Family members feel very close to each other. _____
13. When our family gets together for activities, everybody is present. _____

APPENDIX M
FAMILY SUPPORT SCALE (FSS)

Listed below are sources of support that are often helpful to members of families raising a young child. This questionnaire asks you to indicate how helpful each source is to *your family*.

Please tick (✓) the response that best describes how helpful the sources have been to your family during the past 3-6 months. If a source of help has not been available to your family, tick (✓) the NA (not available) response.

NA- not available. **1-** not helpful at all **2-** sometimes helpful **3-** generally helpful **4-** very helpful **5-** extremely helpful

Sources of support	NA	1	2	3	4	5
1. My parents						
2. My partner/spouse's parents						
3. My relatives/kin						
5. Partner/spouse						
6. My friends						
7. My partner/spouse's friends						
8. My own friends						
9. Other parents						
10. Co-workers						
11. Parent groups						
12. Social groups/clubs						

13. Place of worship/Religious organizations						
14. My family or child's doctor						
15. Professional helpers (social workers, teachers, therapists, etc.)						
16. Professional agencies (public health, mental health, social services, etc.)						
17. School/day-care centres						
18. Early intervention programmes						

APPENDIX N

FAMILY-FRIENDLY WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

Here are a few questions regarding flexible working arrangements. Please tick (✓) your option.

1a. Is there a provision for parental leave at your work-place?

YES___

NO___

NOT SURE___

1b. Have you ever availed of this facility?

YES___

NO___

1c. Have you availed of your full maternity leave?

YES___

NO___

2. Is there an opportunity for you at your work-place to work only during school terms and be at home during school holidays?

YES___

NO___

NOT SURE___

3. Is there a possibility for you to work from home during normal working hours?

YES___

NO___

NOT SURE___

If yes, on what occasions have you worked from home?

4. Have you ever changed your status from full-time to part-time?

YES___

NO___

If YES, why?

5a. Does/did your work-place have child-care facilities on its premises?

YES___

NO___

NOT SURE___

5b. Have you ever used this facility?

YES___

NO___

6. Do/did you get help with costs of child-care from your employer?

YES___

NO___

7a. Is there a policy for 'Paternal Leave' for all male employees at your work-place?

YES___

NO___

NOT SURE___

7b. Have you ever taken Paternity Leave?

YES___

NO___

8. Do all employees get time off for family emergencies?

YES___

NO___

NOT SURE___

REFERENCES

- ACTU (1993). *Work and Family Issues: Guidelines for Enterprise Bargaining*. ACTU, Melbourne.
- Adams, A. G., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work– family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 411–420.
- Adler, N., & Jelinek, M. (1986). Is “organization culture” culture bound? *Human Resource Management, 25*, 73-90.
- Agarwal, P. (1991). *Passage from India: Post 1965 Indian immigrants and their children; conflicts, concerns, and solutions*. Palos Verdes, CA: Yuvati Publications.
- Agarwal, S., & Ramaswami, S. N. (1993). Affective organizational commitment among sales people: an expanded model. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 13*, 49-70.
- Agho, A., Price, J., & Mueller, C. (1992). Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity, *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology, 65*, 185-96.
- Akerstedt, T., Kecklund, G., & Johansson, S.-E. (2004). Shift work and mortality. *Chronobiology International, 21*(6), 1055–1061.
- Allan, C., Loudoun, R., & Peetz, D. (2005). Influences on work/non-work conflict, in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference of the Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand (AIRAANZ), 9-11th February*

- 2005, eds. M Baird, R Cooper & M Westcott, University of Sydney, Sydney, pp. 13-22, AIRAANZ.
- Alexander, M. & Baxter, J. (2005). Impacts of work on family life among partnered parents of young children, *Family Matters*, 72, 18-25.
- Allen, T. D., & Russell, J. E. A. (1999). Parental leave of absence: Some not so family friendly implications. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 166–191.
- Allen, T.D., Herst, D. E., Burck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work to family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278–308.
- Allerton, H. E. (2001). Building communication spans cultures. *Training and Development*, 55(5), 84-97.
- Alimo-Metcalf, B. (1998). 360 degree feedback and leadership development. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 6(1), 35-44.
- Anderson, M. L. (1993). *Thinking About Women. Sociological Perspectives on Sex and Gender*. Macmillan Publishing Company, USA.
- Anderson, E. A., & Leslie, L. A. (1991). Coping with employment and family stress: Employment arrangement and gender differences. *Sex Roles*, 24, 223–231.
- Argyle, M., & Furnham, A. (1983). Sources of satisfaction and conflict in long-term relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45(3), 481–493.
- Aryee, S. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work–family conflict among married professional women: Evidence from Singapore. *Human Relations*, 45, 813–837.
- Aryee, S., & Luk, V. (1996). Work and non work influences on the career satisfaction of dual earner couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 38–52.

- Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., & Lo, S. (1999). Role stressors, inter-role conflict, and well-being: The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 259–278.
- Assocham Social Development Foundation (ASDF), India (2008). *Working parents spend less than 30 min/day with kids*. On line article reported by The Times of India, 5 May, 2008, p 3.
- Asis, M. M., Domingo, L., Knodel, J., & Mehta, K. (1995). Living arrangements in four Asian countries: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology, 10*, 145-162.
- Atkinson, J., & Huston, T. L. (1984). Sex role orientation and division of labor in early marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 330-345.
- Atkinson, M., & Boles, J. (1984). WASP (Wives as Senior Partners). *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46*, 861-870.
- Aycan, Z., & Kanungo, R.N. (1998). Impact of acculturation on socialization beliefs and behavioral occurrences among Indo-Canadian immigrants. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 29*, 451–467.
- Aziz, M. (2004). Role stress among women in the Indian IT sector. *Women in Management Review, 19*, 356-363.
- Bacharach, S., Bamberger, P., & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(1), 39-53.
- Babbie, E. R. (1992). *The Practice of Social Research, (6th ed)*, Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.

- Baker, M. (2001). The future of family life. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Families: Changing trends in Canada* (4th ed., pp. 285-302). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). The crossover of burnout and work engagement among working couples. *Human Relations*, 58, 661-689.
- Ballard, B. (1981). Some considerations of culture shock as a crisis in personal Identity. *Goulcae Journal of Education*, 2(1), 3-10.
- Balmforth, K., & Gardner, D. (2006). Conflict and facilitation between work and family: Realizing the outcomes for organizations. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 69-77.
- Banta, W., & Tennant, F. (1989). *Combatting substance abuse in the work place*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Barbarin, O. A. (1981). *Measuring basic family processes: Validity and reliability of family process scale*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Barber, B., & Buehler, C. (1996). Family cohesion and enmeshment: Different constructs, different effects. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 433-441.
- Barling, J. (1990). *Employment, stress, and family functioning*. Cchester: Wiley.
- Barling, J., & Rosenbaum, A. (1986). Work Stressors and Wife Abuse. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 346-48.
- Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K. (1985). Women's involvement in multiple roles and psychological distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(1), 135-145.
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Singer, J. D. (1992). Job experiences over time, multiple roles, and women's mental health: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 634-644.

- Barnett, R. C., Raudenbush, S. W., Brennan, R. T., Pleck, J. H., & Marshall, N. L. (1995). Changes in job and marital experience and change in psychological distress: A longitudinal study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 839-850.
- Barnett, R. C., & Rivers, C. (1996). *She works, he works: How two-income families are happy, healthy, and thriving*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baruch, G. K., & Barnett, R. C. (1986). Cited in Aston, J., & Lavery, J., (1993). The health of women in paid employment effects of quality of work role, social support and cynicism on psychological and physical well being. *Women & Health, 20*, 2.
- Baruch, G. K., Biener, L., & Barnett, R. C. (1987). Women and gender in research on work and family stress. *American Psychologist, 42*(2), 130-136.
- Bauder, H. (2003). Brain Abuse, or the devaluation of immigrant labour in Canada. *Antipode, 35*(4), 699-717.
- Baxter, J. (1997). Gender equality and participation in domestic labour: A cross national perspective. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 28*(3), 220-247.
- Baxter, J. (2002). Patterns of Change and Stability in the Gender Division of Household Labour in Australia, 1986-1997. *Journal of Sociology, 38*(4): 399-424.
- Baxter, J., Hewitt, B., & Western, M. (2005). Post-familial families and the domestic division of labour: A view from Australia. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 36*, 583-600.

- Baxter, J., Hewitt, B., & Haynes, M. (2008). Life course transitions and housework: Marriage, parenthood, and time on housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 259–272.
- Beach, B. (1989). *Integrating work and family life*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Beauregard, T.A. (2006). Are organizations shooting themselves in the foot? : Workplace contributors to family-to-work conflict [online]. London: LSE Research Online.
- Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Reinventing the Family. In Search of New Lifestyles*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beehr, T. A. (1985). The role of social support in coping with organizational stress. In: Beehr, T. A. & Bhagat, R. S. (Eds), *Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations: An Integrated Perspective*, Wiley Interscience, New York.
- Beehr, T. A., & McGrath, J. E. (1992). Social support, occupational stress and anxiety. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 5, 1-19.
- Behrman, D., & Perreault, W. D., Jr. (1984). A role stress model of the performance and satisfaction of industrial salespersons. *Journal of Marketing*, 48, 9-21.
- Bellavia, G., & Frone, M. R. (2005). *Work-family conflict*. In Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & Frone, M. R. (Eds), *Handbook of Work Stress*, (pp. 113-139), Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bender, K. A., Donahue, S. M., & Heywood, J. S. (2005). Job Satisfaction and gender segregation. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57, 479–96.

- Bender, K. A., Heywood, J. S. (2006). Job satisfaction of the highly educated: The role of gender, academic tenure, and earnings. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 53(2), 253-279.
- Benin, M. H., & Agostinelli, J. (1988). Husbands' and wives' satisfaction with the division of labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 349-361.
- Bensing, J. M., Hulsman, R. L., & Schreurs, K. M. G. (1999). Gender differences in fatigue: Bio-psychosocial factors relating to fatigue in men and women. *Medical Care*, 37(10), 1078-1083.
- Berger, P., Cook, A., DelCampo, R., Herrera, R., & Weigel, R. (1994). Family/Work Roles' Relation to Perceived Stress: Do Gender and Ethnicity Matter? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 15(3), 223-242.
- Berk, S. (1985). *The gender factory: The apportionment of work in American households*. New York, Plenum.
- Bernas, K. H., & Major, D. A. (2000). Contributors to Stress Resistance. Testing a Model of Women's Work-Family Conflict. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 178.
- Berry, J. W., & Annis, R. C. (1974). Acculturative stress: The role of ecology, culture, and differentiation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 5, 328-406.
- Berry, J. W. & Kim, U. (1988). Acculturation and mental health. In P. R. Dasen, J. W. Berry, J. W. & N. Sartorius (Eds.), *Health and cross-cultural psychology: Towards applications* (pp. 207–236). London: Sage.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H. & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology: research and applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Berry, J. W. (1994). Acculturation and psychological adaptation: An overview. In A. Bouvy, R.R. Van de Vijver, P. Boski, & P. Schmitz (Eds.), *Journeys into International Conference of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 129-141). Liege: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Berry, J. W. (1998). Acculturative stress. In P. B. Organista & K. M. Chun (Eds.), *Readings in ethnic psychology*. New York: Routledge.
- Beurskens, A. et al. (2000). Fatigue among working people: validity of a questionnaire measure. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 57, 353-357.
- Beutell, N. J., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1983). Integration of home and non home roles: Women's conflict and coping behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 43-48.
- Bharat, S. (1995). Attitudes and Sex - Role Perceptions among Working Couples in India. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 26(3), 371-388.
- Bharat, S. (1997). Family socialisation of the Indian child. *Trends in Social Science Research*, 4, 201-216.
- Bhopal, K. (1997). *Gender, race and patriarchy. A study of South Asian women*. Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Bhuiyan, S. M., Islam, M. S. (1996). Continuance commitment and extrinsic job satisfaction among a novel multicultural expatriate workforce. *Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*, 32(1), 35-46.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Maternal Employment and time with children: dramatic change or surprising continuity? *Demography*, 37(4), 401-414.
- Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor. *Social Forces*,

79(1), 191-228.

Bianchi, S., Robinson, J. and Milkie, M. (2006). *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*,
New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1989). Family ties: Balancing commitments to work and
family in dual earner households. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 776-789.

Bittman, M. (1991) *Juggling Time: How Australian Families Use Time*. Canberra:
Australian Government Publishing Service.

Bittman, M. (1995). Changes at the heart of family households. Family responsibilities in
Australia 1974-1992. *Family Matters*, 40, 10-15.

Bittman, M. & Lovejoy, F. (1993). Domestic power: Negotiating an unequal division of
labour within a framework of equality. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of
Sociology*, 29, 302-321.

Bittman, M., England, P., Folbre, N., Sayer, L., & Matheson, G. (2003). When does
gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of
Sociology*, 109(1), 186-214.

Bittman, M., & Wajcman, J. (2004). The rush hour. The quality of leisure time and
gender equity. In N. Folbre, & M. Bittman (Eds), *Family Time: The Social
Organization of Care*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bittman, M., Rice, J., & Wajcman, J. (2004). Appliances and their impact: the ownership of
domestic technology and time spent on household work. *The British Journal of
Sociology*, 55(3), 401-423.

Black, S. J. (1990). Locus of control, social support, stress and adjustment in
international transfers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 7, 1-29.

- Blair, S. L., & Lichter, D. T. (1991). Measuring the division of household labor: gender segregation of housework among American couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 12*, 91–113.
- Blanchard-Fields, E., Chen, Y., & Hebert, C. E. (1997). Inter-role conflict as a function of life stage, gender, and gender-related personality attributes. *Sex Roles, 37*, 155–174.
- Blau, F. D., Ferber, M. A., & Winkler, A. E. (1998). *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Blood, R. O., & Wolf, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living*. New York: Free Press.
- Bodenmann, G. (1997). Dyadic coping: A systemic transactional view of stress and coping among couples: Theory and empirical findings. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 47*, 137 – 141.
- Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R., & Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 175–183.
- Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2003). *Highlights of the National Study of the Changing Work Force*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., & Swanberg, J. E. (1998). *The 1997 national study of the changing workplace*. New York: Family and Work Institute.
- Bonn, D., & Bonn, J. (2000). Work related stress: Can it be a thing of the past? *The Lancet, 355*, 124.
- Booth, A. (1977). Wife's employment and husband's stress: A replication and refutation. *Journal of marriage and family, 39*(4), 645.

- Booth, A., & Crouter, A. C. (1998). *Men in families: When do they get involved? What difference does it make?* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Borgas, G. J. (1987). Assimilation, changes in cohort quality, and the earnings of immigrants. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3, 463-489.
- Bose, C. E., Bereano, P. L., & Malloy, M. (1984). Household technology and the social construction of housework. *Technology and Culture*, 25(1), 53–82.
- Boss, P. (1987). Family stress. In M. B. Sussman, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp. 695-723). New York: Plenum Press.
- Bowen, M. (1976). Theory and practice of psychotherapy. In P. J. Guerin (Ed). *Family and Therapy: Theory and Practice* (pp. 42-90). New York: Gardner Press.
- Boyar, S. L., Maertz, C. P., Jr., Pearson, A. W., & Keough, S. (2003). Work–family conflict: A model of linkages between work and family domain variables and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15, 175–190.
- Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of diaspora. Contesting identities*. Routledge, London.
- Brayfield, A. A. (1992). Employment resources and housework in Canada. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 19–30.
- Brewster, K. L., & Rindfuss, R. R. (2000). Fertility and women’s employment in industrialized nations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 271-296.
- Brickson, S. (2000). The impact of identity orientation on individual and organizational outcomes in demographically diverse settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 82-101.
- Brief, A. P., & Aldag, R. J. (1976). Correlates of role indices. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 468-472.

- Brines, J. (1993). The exchange value of housework. *Rationality and Society*, 5, 302–340.
- Brines, J. (1994). Economic Dependency. Gender and the Division of Labor at Home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(3), 652-688.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32, 513–531.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological systems theory. *Annals of Child Development*, 6, 187-249.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. (1994). Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review* 101(4), 568-586.
- Brown, D. (2002). The role of work and cultural values in occupational choice, satisfaction, and success: A theoretical statement. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80, 48-56.
- Bruck, C. S., Allen, T. D., & Spector, P. E. (2002). The relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A finer-grained analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60, 336-353.
- Bryson, L., Warner-Smith, P., Brown, P., & Fray, L. (2007). Managing the work–life roller-coaster: Private stress or public health issue? *Social Science & Medicine*, 65, 1142–1153.
- Buriel, R. (1993). Childrearing orientations in Mexican American families: The influence of generation and sociocultural factors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 987-1000.

- Burke, R. J. (1988). Some antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3*, 287-302.
- Buunk, B. P., Kluwer, E. S., Schuurman, M. K., & Siero, F. W. (2000). The Division of Labor among Egalitarian and Traditional Women: Differences in Discontent, Social Comparison and False Consensus. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 759-779.
- Cabrera N. J., West, J., Shannon, J. D., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Parental interactions with Latino infants: Variation by country of origin and English proficiency. *Child Development, 77*, 1190–1207.
- Caplan, G. (1976). The family as support system. In G. Caplan & M. Killilea (Eds.), *Support systems and mutual help: Multidisciplinary explorations* (pp. 19-36). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Carlsen, S., & Elm Larsen, J. (1993). (Eds.). *The equality dilemma: Reconciling working life and family life, viewed in an equality perspective. The Danish example*, Copenhagen, Danish Equal Status Council.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of multi dimensional measure of work family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*, 249–276.
- Chan, C. J., & Margolin, G. (1994). The relationship between dual-earner couples' daily work mood and home affect. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11*, 573–586.
- Chan, K. B., Lai, G., Ko, Y. C., & Boey, K. B. (2000). Work stress among six professional groups: the Singapore experience. *Social Science & Medicine, 50*, 1415-1432.

- Chitnis, S. (1988). Feminism: Indian Ethos and Indian Convictions. In R. Ghadially (Ed.), *Women in Indian Society: A Reader*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Chiu, L.H. (1993). Self-esteem in American and Chinese (Taiwanese) children. *Current Psychology: Research and Reviews*, 11, 309–313.
- Chiu, R., & Kosinski, F. Jr. (1995). Chinese cultural collectivism and work-related stress: Implications for employment counselors. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 32(3), 98-110.
- Chiu, R. K., & Kosinki, F. Jr. (1999). The role of affective dispositions in job satisfaction and work strain: Comparing collectivist and individualist societies. *International Journal of Psychology*, 34(1), 19-28.
- Ciabattari, T. (2001). Changes in men's conservative gender ideologies: Cohort and period influences. *Gender & Society*, 15, 574–591.
- Ciscel, D. H., Sharp, D. C., & Heath, J. A. (2000). Family Work Trends and Practices: 1971-1991. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 21(1), 23-36.
- Clarke, J. (1988). Stress in management. *Business Credit*, 46-48.
- Clark, A. E. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, 4, 341-372.
- Clark, M. S., & Grote, N. K. (1998b). Why aren't indices of relationship costs always negatively related to indices of relationship quality? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 2-17.
- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 38, 300-314.

- Collins, J. (1993). Immigrant Families in Australia. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 24(3), 291-309.
- Coltrane, S. (1989). Household labor and routine production of gender. *Social Problems*, 36, 473-490.
- Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family man: Fatherhood, housework, and gender equity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coltrane, S. (1998). Gender, power, and emotional expression: Social and historical contexts for a process model of men in marriages and families. In A. Booth & A.C. Crouter (Eds.), *Men in families: When do they get involved? What difference does it make?* (pp. 193-211). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Coltrane, S. (2000). Research on household labor: Modelling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 1208-1233.
- Coltrane, S., & Ishii-Kuntz, M. (1992). Men's housework: A life course perspective. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54(1), 43-57.
- Connell, R.W. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Cooper, C. L., & Davidson, M. J. (1982). *High Pressure: Working Lives of Women Managers*, Fontana, London.
- Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. (1992). Stress-management interventions in the workplace: stress counseling and stress audits. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 994, 65-73.
- Coverman, S. (1985). Explaining husbands' participation on domestic labor. *Sociological Quarterly*, 26, 81-97.

- Cowan, R. S. (1983). *More work for mother: The ironies of household technology from the open hearth to the microwave*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cox, Eva. (1976). *We Cannot Talk Our Rights: Migrant Women 1975*. Sydney: NSW Council of Social Services.
- Cox, T. H., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(4), 827-847.
- Cox, T. H. (1993), *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Craig, L. (2007). Is there really a second shift, and if so, who does it? A time-diary investigation. *Feminist Review*, 86, 149-170.
- Crampton, & Mishra (1999). Women in management. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(1), 87-106.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992), *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs and How it Affects Their Performance*, Lexington Books, New York, NY.
- Crosby, F. (1982). *Relative Deprivation and Working Women*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crossfield, S., Kinman, G. & Jones, F. (2005). Crossover of occupational stress in dual career couples. *Community, Work and Family*, 8(2), 211-232.
- Crouter, A. C., Perry-Jenkins, M., Huston, T. L., & Crawford, D. W. (1989). The influence of work-induced psychological states on behavior at home. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(3), 273-292.

- Cunliffe, D. (1997). *90pc of skilled migrants enjoying life in NZ*. Online article retrieved on 28-07-08, www.beehive.govt.nz
- Danna, K., & Griffin, R.W. (1999), Health and well being in the workplace: a review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25, 357.
- Davidson, M. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1983). *Stress and the Women Manager*, Robertson, Oxford.
- Day, T. (1992). Capital-labor substitutions in the home. *Technology and Culture*, 33, 302–27.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1968). *The second sex*. New York: Modern Library.
- Decker, F. H. (1985). Socialization and interpersonal environment in nurses' affective reaction to work. *Social Science and Medicine*, 20, 499-509.
- DeLepervanche, M. (1984). *Indians in a White Australia*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- De Lepervanche, M. (1991). The Family: In the National Interest? In Gill Bottemley et al. (Eds.), *Intersexions Gender/Class/Culture/Ethnicity*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- DeLongis, A., Capreol, M., Holtzman, S., O'Brien, T., & Campbell, J. (2004). Social support and social strain among husbands and wives: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(3), 470-479.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., & Scahufeli, W. (2005). Spillover and crossover of exhaustion and life satisfaction among dual-earner parents. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 2, 266-289.
- Dempsey, K. (2000b). Men's share of childcare: a rural and urban comparison *Journal of Family Studies* 6, 245–266.

- Department for International Development (DFID), (2000). *Achieving Sustainability, poverty elimination and the environment*. Stairway Communications, UK.
- Derne, S. (1995). *Culture in action: Family life, emotion, and male dominance in Banaras, India*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Desai, M. (1993). Marital dynamics and developmental programmes. *Indian Journal of Social Work, LIV*, 71-84.
- Desai, N., & Krishnaraj, M. (1987). *Women and Society in India*. Delhi: Ajanta Publications.
- DeVaney, S. A., & Chen, Z. (2003). Job satisfaction of recent graduates in financial services, retrieved 9 March 2006, www.bls.gov/opub/cwc/cm20030522ar01p1.htm
- DeVault, M. L. (1987). Doing housework; Feeding and family life. In G. Gerstel & H. E. Gross (Eds.), *Families and work* (pp. 178-191). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- DeVault, M. L. (1991). *Feeding the family: The social organization of caring as gendered work*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- DeVoretz, D. (2006). Immigration Policy: Methods of Economic Assessment. *International Migration Review, 40*(2), 390-418.
- Dex, S., Clark, A. & Taylor, M. (1995). *Household Labour Supply*, Sheffield: DfEE.
- DIAC. Online article. www.immi.gov.au/skilled/general-skilled/migration/index.htm
- Dijkers, J. S. E., et al. (2007). Crossover between work and home in dyadic partner relationships. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 48*, 529–538.
- Dion, K. K., & Dion, K. L. (2001). Gender and cultural adaptation in immigrant families. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), 511-521.

- Dodd-McCue, D., & Wright, G. (1996). Men, women, and attitudinal commitment: the effects of workplace experiences and socialization. *Human Relations, 49*, 1065-1091.
- Dormann, C., & Zapf, D. (2001). Job satisfaction: A meta analysis of stabilities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 483-497.
- Drago, R. W., Black, D., & Wooden, M. "Gender and Work Hours Transitions in Australia: Drop Ceilings and Trap-Door Floors" (July 2004). IZA Discussion Paper No.1210. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=569185>
- Dunst, C., Trivette, C., & Jenkins, V. (1986). The family support scale: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Individual, Family and Community wellness, 1*, 45-52.
- Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 60-74.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict: A comparison by gender, family type, and perceived control. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 449-466.
- Dwyer, D. J., Schwartz, R. H., & Fox, M. L. (1992). Decision-making autonomy in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 22*(2), 17-23.
- Dyck, D. (2001). The toxic workplace. *Benefits Canada, 25*(3), 52.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(4), 569-91.
- Editorial Team (2003). Why neo-disciplinary? Why now? *Organization, 10*(3), 403-20.
- Edwards, J. R., & Cooper, C. L. (1988). The impacts of positive psychological states on physical health: a review and theoretical framework, *Social Science and Medicine,*

27, 1447-1459.

- Edwards, J., & Rothbard, N. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review* 25(1), 178– 200.
- Ellis, A. & Harper, R. (1975). *A new guide to rational living*. Englewood Cliffs; NJ Prentice Hall.
- Ellis, A. & Greiger, R. (1977). *RET: Handbook of rational emotive therapy*. New York Springer.
- Elloy, D. (2001). A predictive study of stress among Australian dual earner couples. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(1), 122-123.
- Elloy, B. F., & Mackie, B. (2002). Overload and Conflict among Australian Dual Career Families: Moderating Effects of Support. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 907-913.
- Elloy, D. F., & Smith, C. R. (2003). Patterns of stress, work-family conflict, role conflict, role ambiguity and overload among dual-career and single-career couples: An Australian study. *Cross Cultural Management*, 10, 55-66.
- Engle, P. L., & Breaux, C. (1998). Fathers' involvement with children: Perspectives from developing countries. *Social Policy Report: Society for Research in Child Development*, 12(1).
- Epstein, N., & Eidelson, R. J. (1981). Unrealistic beliefs of clinical people: Their expectations, goals and satisfaction. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 9, 13- 22.
- Erdwins, C., Buffardi, L., Casper, W., & O'Brien, A. (2001). The relationship of women's role strain to social support, role satisfaction and self efficacy. *Family Relations*, 52(3), 230-238.

- Erler, M. (1996). Die Dynamik der Modernen Familie. Empirische Untersuchung Zum Wandel der Familienformen in Deutschland, Juventa, Weinheim.
- Espiritu, Y.-L. (1999). Gender and labor in Asian immigrant families. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(4), 628-647.
- Etzion, D. (1984). The moderating effect of social support on the relationship of stress and burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 615-622.
- Evans, G. W., Palsane, M. N., & D'Souza, R. (1983). Life stress & health in India. *Indian Psychologist*, 2, 62-78.
- Exter, T. (1989). Job applicants (hiring new workers). *American Demographics*, 11(11), 67-68.
- Fallon, B. J. (1997). The Balance between Paid Work & Home Responsibilities: Personal Problem or Corporate Concern? *Australian Psychologist*, 32(1), 1-9.
- Fan, P. L., & Marini, M. M. (2000). Influences on gender-role attitudes during the transition to adulthood. *Social Science Research*, 29, 258-283.
- Farrell, M. P., & Barnes, G. M. (1993). Family systems and social support: A test of the effects of cohesion and adaptability on the functioning of parents and adolescents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 119-132.
- Feather, N. T. (1990). Economic deprivation and the psychological impact of employment. *American Psychologist*, 32(1), 37-45.
- Ferree, M. (1990). Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52(4), 866-884.

- Field, S., & Bramwell, R. (1998). An investigation into the relationship between caring responsibilities and the levels of perceived pressure reported by female employees. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 71*, 165- 170.
- Figart, D. M., & Mutari, E. (1998). Degendering work time in comparative perspective: Alternative policy frameworks. *Review of Social Economy, 56*, 460-480.
- Finkel, S. K., Olswang, S., & She, N. (1994). Childbirth, tenure and promotion for women faculty. *Review of Higher Education, 17*, 259-270.
- Fischer, L., Ransom, D. C., Terry, H. E., & Burge, S. (1992). The California Family Health Project: IV. Family structure/organization and adult health. *Family Process, 31*, 399-419.
- Fitinger, L. & Schwarz, E. (1981). *Strangers in the world*. Bern: Hans Huber. Cited in Wang, X., & Sangalang, P. (2005). Work Adjustment and Job Satisfaction of Filipino Immigrant Employees in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 22*(3), 243-254.
- Fletcher, B., & Jones, F. (1993). A refutation of Karasek's demand -discretion model of occupational stress with a range of dependent measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 319-330.
- Forgays, D. K., & Forgays, D. G. (1993). Personal and environmental factors contributing to parenting stress among employed and non employed women. *European Journal of Personality, 7*, 107–118.
- Forman, J. W., & Myers, D. *The Personal Stress Reduction Program*. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey. 1987.

- Fox, G. L., & Chancey, D. (1998). Sources of economic distress: Individual and family outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*(6), 725–749.
- Fox, M. L., & Dwyer, D. J. (1999). An investigation of the effects of time and involvement in the relationship between stressors and work-family conflict. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 164-174.
- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior 66*, 438–456.
- French, J., Rogers, W., & Cobb, S. (1974). A model of person-environment fit. In Coelho, G., Hamburg, D., & Adams, J. (Eds), *Coping and Adaptation, Basic books*, New York, N.Y.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. V. (1982). *The mechanisms of job stress & strain*. London: Wiley.
- French, M., (1992). *The war against women*. Penguin Group: Australia.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). *Work-family balance*. In J. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 143–162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M. R., & Rice, R.W. (1987). Work family conflict: The effects of job and family involvement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 8*, 45–53.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992a). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 65-78.

- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work–family interface [Special issue: On work–family balance]. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 145–167.
- Fu, C. K., & Shaffer, M. A. (2001). The tug of work and family: Direct and indirect domain-specific determinants of work-family conflict. *Personnel Review, 30*(5), 502-522.
- Fuhrer, R., & Wessely, S. (1995). The epidemiology of fatigue and depression: A French primary-care study. *Psychological Medicine, 25*, 895-905.
- Galinsky, E. (1989). Labor force participation of dual-earner couples and single parents. In *Investing in People, Background Papers* (Vol. II). Commission on Workforce Quality and Labor Market Efficiency, U.S. Department of Labor, 1259-1312.
- Galinsky E. (1994). Families and work: the importance of the quality of the work environment. In S. L. Kagan, & B. Weissbound (Eds.), *Putting Families First* (pp.112–136). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, T., & Friedman, D. E. (1993). *National study of the changing workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Ganster, D. C., & Schaubroeck, J. (1991). Work stress and employee health. *Journal of Management, 17*(2), 235-271.
- Gavron, H. (1966). *The Captive Wife*. London. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gershuny, J. (1995a). Change in the division of domestic work: Micro-sociological evidence. *Discussion paper no. 107*, Deutsches Institut fur Wirtschaftsforschung, Berlin.

- Gershuny, J. (2000). *Changing Times: Work and Leisure in Post-industrial Societies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gershuny, J., & Robinson, J. (1988). Historical changes in the household division of labour. *Demography*, 52, 537-552.
- Gerson, J. M. (1985). Women returning to school: The consequences of multiple roles. *Sex Roles*, 13, 77-92.
- Geurts, S. A. E., Kompier, M. A. J., Roxburgh, S., & Houtman, I. L. D. (2003). Does work-home interference mediate the relationship between work load and well-being? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 532-559.
- Giga, S., Noblet, A., Faragher, B., & Cooper, C. (2003). Organisational stress management interventions: a review of UK-based research. *The Australian Psychologist*, 38, 158-164.
- Ginn, J., et al. (1996). Feminist fallacies: A reply to Hakim on women's employment. *British Journal of Sociology*, 47(1), 167-173.
- Glass, J., & Fujimoto, T. (1994). Housework, paid work, and depression among husbands and wives. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 35, 179-191.
- Glenn, N. D., & Weaver, C. N. (1979). A note on family situation and global happiness. *Social Forces*, 57(3), 960-967.
- Glezer, H. (1991). Juggling work and family commitments. *Family Matters*, 28, 6-10.
- Glezer, H., & Wolcott, I. (1997). Work and family values, preferences and practice. Australian Family Briefing: *Australian Institute of Family Studies*, 4, 1-4.
- Glezer, H., & Wolcott, I. (1999). Work and family life. *Family Matters*, 52, 69-75.

- Goh, Y. W. (2003). The Aetiology of Occupational Stress and Coping. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Queensland, Brisbane.
- Goldsmith, E. (2007). Stress, fatigue, and social support in the work and family context. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 12*(2), 155-169.
- Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain, *American Sociological Review, 25*(4), 483–496.
- Gore, S. (1987). Perspectives on social support and research on stress moderating processes. In J. M. Ivancevich & D. C. Ganster (Eds), *Job Stress: From Theory to Suggestion*. The Haworth Press, New York.
- Gornick, J. (1999). Gender equality in the labour market. In D. Sainsbury (Ed.) *Gender and welfare state regimes* (pp. 210-242). Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Gove, W., Style, C., & Hughes, M. (1990). The Effect of Marriage on the Well-Being of Adults: A Theoretical Analysis. *Journal of Family Issues, 11*(1), 4-28.
- Grahame, K. M. (2003). “For the family:” Asian immigrant women’s triple day. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 1*, 65-89.
- Grandey, A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The Conservation of resources model applied to work–family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 350–370.
- Grandey, A., Cordeiro, B. L., & Crouter, A. C. (2005). A longitudinal and multi-source test of the work–family conflict and job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*, 305–323.
- Gray, E. (2000). Negotiating the Life Course Discussion Paper Series Discussion Paper DP-006. Australian Sociological Association conference in Adelaide December 2000.
- Gray, M., & Sanson, A. (2005). Growing up in Australia: the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, *Family Matters, 72*, 4-9.

- Grbich, C. (1995). Male primary caregivers and domestic labour: involvement or avoidance? *Journal of Family Studies, 1*, 114–129.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Kopelman, R. E. (1981). Conflict between work and nonwork roles: Implications for the career planning process. *Human Resource Planning, 4*(1), 1-10.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1986). A work-nonwork interactive perspective of stress and its consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 8*(2), 37-60.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasurman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future direction. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender in organizations* (pp. 228–235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., Granrose, C. S., Rabinowitz, S., & Beutell, N. J. (1989). Sources of work-family conflict among two career couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 34*, 133-153.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2003). When work and family collide: Deciding between competing role demands. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90*(2), 291–303.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Collins, K. M. (2001). Career involvement and family involvement as moderators of relationships between work-family conflict and withdrawal from a profession, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(2), 91-100.

- Greenstein, T. N. (1996). Husbands' participation in domestic labor: Interactive effects of wives' and husbands' gender ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 585–595.
- Greenstein, T. N. (2000). Economic dependence, gender, and the division of labor in the home: A replication and extension. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 322–335.
- Gronlund, A. (2007). More control, less conflict? Job demand–control, gender and work–family conflict. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 14, 476–497.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: an ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111–26.
- Grzywacz, J. G., Arcury, T. A., Marin, A., Carrillo, L., Burke, B., Coates, M. L., & Quandt, S. A. (2007). Work-family stress studied among immigrant Latinos. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1119–1130.
- Guglielmi, S., & Tatrow, K. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A methodological and theoretical analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 8(1), 61–99.
- Gupta, N., & Jenkins, G. D. (1985). Dual-career couples: Stress, stressors, strains and strategies, in T. A. Beehr & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations: An Integrated Perspective* (pp.141-175). Wiley, New York.
- Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 560–568.
- Haas, L. (1986). Wives' orientation towards breadwinning: Sweden and the United States. *Journal of Family Issues*, 7, 358–381.

- Haddad, T., & Lam, L. (1988). Canadian families - Men's involvement in family work: A case study of immigrant men in Toronto. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 29, 269-281.
- Hakim, C. (1995). Five feminist myths about women's employment', *British Journal of Sociology*, 46(3), 429-455.
- Hall, E. M. (1994). Women, work and health: employment as a risk factor for coronary heart disease. *Journal of Preventive Cardiology*, 4, 365-84.
- Halpern, D. F. (2005). How time-flexible work policies can reduce stress, improve health, and save money. *Stress and Health*, 21, 157-168.
- Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual-earner couples: Within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 185-203.
- Hammer, L. B., Colton, C. L., Caubet, S. L., & Brockwood, K. J. (2002). The unbalanced life: Work and family conflict. In J. C. Thomas & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of mental health in the workplace* (pp. 83-101). London: Sage.
- Hammer, L. B., Bauer, T. N., & Grandey, A. A. (2003). Work-family conflict and work-related withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17, 419-436.
- Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R., & Shafiro, M. (2005). The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on experiences of depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(2), 138-154.

- Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L., & Colton, C. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work–family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11* (3), 249–265.
- Hardesty, C., & Bokemeier, J. (1989). Finding time and making do: The distribution of household labor in nonmetropolitan marriages. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*(1): 253-267.
- Hardy, G. E, Shapiro, D. A., & Borrill, C. S. (1997) Fatigue in the workforce of National Health Service Trusts: Levels of symptomatology and links with minor psychiatric disorder, demographic, occupational and work role factors. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 43*, 83–92
- Hartley, R. (1995). Families, values and change: Setting the scene. In R. Hartley (Ed.), *Families and cultural diversity in Australia* (pp. 1-24). Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Haw, M. A. (1982). Women, work and stress: A review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 23*(2), 132-144.43
- Herlth, A., Brunner, E., Tyrell, H. & Kriz, J. (1994), Abschied von der Normalfamilie. Partnerschaft Contra Elternschaft, Springer, Berlin.
- Henderson, S. (1977). The social network, support and neurosis. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 131*, 185-191.
- Hermans, J. M., & Kempen, H. J. G. (1998). Moving cultures: The perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist, 53*, 1111–1120. Cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist, 53*, 1111–1120.

- Heymann, J. (2000). *The widening gap: Why America's working families are in jeopardy, and what can be done about it*. New York: Basic Books.
- Higgins, C. A., Duxbury, L. E., & Irving, R. H. (1992). Work-family conflict in the dual-career family. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 51, 51- 75.
- Higgins, C. A. Duxbury, L. E., Lee, C., & Mills S. (1994). An examination of work-time and work-location flexibility. *Optimum: The Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23, 29-37.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Lee, C. (1994). Impact of life-cycle stage and gender on the ability to balance work and family responsibilities. *Family Relations*, 43, 144-150.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Johnson, K. (2000). Part-time work for women: does it really help balance work and family? *Human Resource Management*, 39(1), 17-32.
- Hill, E. J., & Henderson, P. (2004). *Working families around the world: Implications for child care, elder care and corporate programs*. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the Alliance for Work/ Life Progress, Phoenix, AZ.
- Ho, D. Y. F., & Chiu, C. Y. (1994). Component ideas of individualism, collectivism, and social organization: An application in the study of Chinese culture. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 137–156). New Park, CA: Sage.
- Hobfall, S. (1986). Civil adjustment to war related stress. In N. Milgram (Ed.), *Stress and coping in time of war: Generalizations from the Israeli experience* (pp. 294-315). New York: Brunner/ Mazel.
- Hobson, C. J., Delunas, L., & Kesic, D. (2001). Compelling evidence of the need for corporate work/life balance initiatives: Results from a national survey of stressful life-events. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 38(1): 38-44.

- Hochschild, A. R. (1997). *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (1989). *The second shift*, New York: Viking.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. Berkshire, U.K.: McGraw-Hill.
- Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 11, 213-18.
- Hood, J. C. (1983). *Becoming a two-job family*. New York: Praeger.
- Hood, J. C. (1986). The provider role: Its meaning and measurement. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 349-359.
- Hopkins, K. (1993). Supervisor Intervention with Troubled Workers. Doctoral dissertation, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, 1993.
- Horin, A. (1995). Jobs and Families: How Mums Cope. Sydney Morning Herald, 24/8/95, p.1 & p.8.
- Horenczyk, G. (1996). Migrant identities in conflict: Acculturation attitudes and perceived acculturation ideologies. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities. Social psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 241–250). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann. Cited in Kotic, A. (2002). Acculturation Attitudes, Need for Cognitive Closure, and Adaptation of Immigrants. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 2002, 142(2), 179–201.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work Stress and Social Support*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA

- Hovey, J. D. & Magana, C. (2000). Acculturative Stress, Anxiety, and Depression among Mexican Immigrant Farm workers in the Midwest United States. *Journal of Immigrant Health, 2*(3), 119-131.
- HSE, UK (2007). An analysis of the prevalence and distribution of stress in the construction industry. Online article Prepared by the Health and Safety Laboratory for the Health and Safety Executive.
- Hu, C. Y., & Kamo, Y. (2007). The division of household labor in Taiwan. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 38*, 105-124.
- Huang, Y.-H., Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., & Perrin, N. A. (2004). The relationship between work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 25*, 79–100.
- Huber, J., & Spitze, G. (1983). *Sex Stratification: Children, Housework, and Jobs*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hughes, D. L., & Galinsky, E. (1994). Gender, job and family conditions, and psychological symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 251-270.
- Hui, C. H., Yee, C., & Eastman, K. L. (1995). The relationship between individualism-collectivism in job satisfaction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 44*, 276-282.
- Hurrell, J. Jr., Nelson, D. L., & Simmons, B. L. (1998). Measuring job stressors and strains: Where we have been, where we are, and where we need to go. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3*(4), 368-389.
- Hutnik, N. (1998). *Ethnic minority identity: A social psychological perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Hyde, J. S., Essex, M. J., Clark, R., Klein, M. H., & Janis, E. B. (1996). Parental leave: Policy and research. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*.
- ILO (1993). *World Labour Report*. New York: ILO. International Labour Organization
- (2002). *Safework, what is workplace stress?* 1-8.
- Ivancevich, J. M., Matteson, M. T., & Preston, C. (1982). Occupational stress, Type A behavior, and physical well being. *Academy of Management Journal, 25*, 373- 391.
- Jackson, S. (1989). Does job control control job stress? In S. L. Sauter, J. J. Hurrell Jr. & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Job Control and Worker Health* (pp. 25-53). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Jackson, S. (1992). Towards a historical sociology of housework: a materialist feminist analysis. *Women's Studies International Forum, 15*, 153-72.
- Jackson, S., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36*, 16-78.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2000). Do Americans feel overworked? Comparing ideal and actual working time. In T. L. Parcel, and D. B. Cornfield (Eds.), *Work and family: Research informing policy*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 71-96.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families? Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and Occupations, 28*(1), 40-63.
- Jain, A., & Belsky, J. (1997). Fathering and acculturation: Immigrant Indian families with young children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59*(4), 873-883.
- Jayaram, N. (1998). *The Study of Indian Diaspora A Multidisciplinary Agenda*, Department of Sociology, Bangalore University, India.

- Jick, T. D., & Payne, R. (1980). Stress at work. *Exchange*, 5, 50-56.
- Jick, T. D., & Mitz, L. (1985). Sex differences in work stress. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 408-420.
- Jobanputra, R., & Furnham, A. (2005). British Gujarati Indian immigrants and British caucasians' beliefs about health and illness. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 51, 350-
- Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). Another look at sex differences in preferred mate characteristics: The effects of endorsing the traditional female gender role. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 322-328.
- Jones, F., & Fletcher, B. C. (1993). An empirical study of occupational stress transmission in working couples. *Human Relations*, 46, 881-903.
- Joplin, J. R. W., Shaffer, M. A., Francesco, A. M., & Lau, T. (2003). The macro-environment and work-family conflict: Development of a cross cultural comparative framework. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3, 305-328.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Kakar, S. (1978). *The inner world: A psycho-analytic study of child hood society in India*.
- Kaldenberg, D., Becker, B., & Zvonkovic, A. (1995), "Work and commitment among young professionals: a study of male and female dentists", *Human Relations*, 48(11), 1355-77.
- Kamal, P., Phil, M. A., & Jain, U. (1988). Perceived stress as a function of family support. *Indian Psychological Review*, 33, 4-10.

- Kan, M. Y., (2008). Does gender trump money? Housework hours of husbands and wives in Britain. *Work, Employment and Society*, 22(45), 45-66.
- Kang, C. (1996). *Acculturative stress, family environment, and psychological adjustment of Korean American adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1990). Work alienation in developing countries: Western models and Eastern realities. In A. M. Jaeger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Management in developing countries* (pp. 193-208). London & New York: Routledge.
- Karasek, R. A. Jr. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-308.
- Karasek, R., & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy Work: Stress Productivity and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 3 – 34.
- Katz, M., & Piotrkowski, C. (1983). Correlates of family role strain among employed black women. *Family Relations*, 32(3), 331-339.
- Kaufmann, F. X. (1997). *Family life and family policies in Europe*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Keenan, A., & Newton, T. J. (1987). Work difficulties and stress in young professional engineers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 133-145.

- Keinan, G., & Perlberg, A. (1987). Stress in academe: a cross-cultural comparison between Israeli and American academicians. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *18*, 193–207.
- Kelly, J. R., & Kelly, J. R. (1994). Multiple dimensions of meaning in the domains of work, family and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *26*, 250–274.
- Kelloway, K. E., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The Source, Nature and Direction of Work and Family Conflict. A Longitudinal Investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *4*(4), 337-346.
- Kenny, D. A., & Acitelli, L. K. (2001). Accuracy and bias in the perception of the partner in a close relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*, 439-448.
- Kerr, J., & Slocum, W., Jr. (2005). Managing corporate culture through reward systems. *Academy of Management Executive*, *19*(4), 130-139.
- Kessler, R. C. (1979). A strategy for studying differential vulnerability to the psychological consequences of stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *20*, 100-108.
- Kessler, R. C., & McLeod, J. D. (1984). Sex differences in vulnerability to undesirable life events. *American Sociological Review*, *49*(5), 620-631.
- Kessler, R. C., Price, R. H., & Wortman, C. B. (1985). Social factors in psychopathology: Stress, social support and coping processes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *36*, 531-572.
- Kessler-Harris, A., & Sacks, K. B. (1987). The demise of domesticity in America. In L. Beneria & C. R. Stimpson (Eds.), *Women, households and the economy* (pp. 65- 84). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Khairullah, D. Z., & Khairullah, Z. Y. (1999). Behavioural acculturation and demographic characteristics of Asian-Indian immigrants in the United States of America. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *19*, 57-80.
- Khoo, S-E., & Mak, A. (2000). *Permanent settlement or return migration: the role of Career and family factors*. Paper delivered at the 10th Biennial Conference of the Australian Population Association. POPULATION AND GLOBALISATION: AUSTRALIA IN THE 21ST CENTURY Melbourne 28th November to 1st December 2000.
- Kielhofner, G. (1995). *A model of human occupation-Theory and application*. Chicago: Williams and Wilkins.
- Kim, Y. (1988). *Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Kinman, G., & Jones, F. (2005). Lay representations of workplace stress: What do people really mean when they say they are stressed? *Work & Stress*, *19*, 101-120.
- Kinnunen, U., & Mauno, S. (1998). Antecedents and outcomes of work family conflict among employed women and men in Finland. *Human Relations*, *51*(2), 157-177.
- Kinnunen, U., Geurts, S., & Mauno, S. (2004). Work-to-family conflict and its relationship with satisfaction and well-being: A one-year longitudinal study on gender differences. *Work & Stress*, *18*, 1-22.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 1245-1267.

- Kluwer, E. S., Heesink, A. M., & van de Vliert, E. (1996). Marital conflict about the division of household labor and paid work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 958-969.
- Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: A construct validation study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32, 198-215.
- Korabik, K., Lero, D. S., & Ayman, R. (2003). A multi-level approach to cross-cultural work-family research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3, 289–303.
- Kosic, A. (2004). Acculturation strategies, coping process and acculturative stress. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 45, 269-278.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work–family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for future organizational behavior–human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139–149.
- Kossoudji, Sherrie. (1988). English Language Ability and the Labor Market Opportunities of Hispanic and East Asian Immigrant Men. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 6, 205-228.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (1992). *Organizational Behaviour*. Homewood, IL: Irwin
- Krishnan, A., & Berry, J. W. (1992). Acculturative stress and acculturation attitudes among Indian immigrants to the United States. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 4(2), 187-212.
- Kuo, W. H., & Tsai, Y. M. (1986). Social networking, hardiness and immigrant's mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 27, 133-149.

- Kurman, J. (2001). Self-Enhancement: Is it restricted to Individualistic Cultures? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1705-1718.
- Lakha, S., & Stevenson, M. (2001). Indian identity in a multi-cultural Melbourne. Some preliminary observations. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22(3), 245-262.
- Lambert, S. (1991). The combined effects of job and family characteristics on the job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation of men and women workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 341-63.
- Lambert, S., & Hopkins, K. (1995). Occupational conditions and workers' sense of community: Variations by gender and race. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 151-179.
- Langan-Fox, J., & Poole, M. E. (1995). Occupational stress in Australian business and professional women. *Stress Medicine*, 11, 113-122.
- Languani, P. (1992). Cultural differences in stress and its management. *Stress Medicine*, 9(1), 37-43.
- Laroche, M., Kim, C., Hui, M. K., & Joy, A. (1996). An empirical study of multidimensional ethnic change: The case of French Canadians in Quebec. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 27, 114-131.
- Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (1994). Divergent worlds: The daily emotional experience of mothers and fathers in the domestic and public spheres. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 1034-1046.
- Lavee, Y. (2004). Couples under stress: Studying change in dyadic closeness-distance. In V. Bengtson, A. Acock, K. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods* (pp. 281 – 283). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Lay, C., & Nguyen, T. (1998). The role of acculturation-related and acculturation non-specific hassles: Vietnamese-Canadian students and psychological distress, *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 30, 172-181.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1990). Theory based stress management. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1(1), 3-13.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46(8), 819-834.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991c). 'Psychological stress in the workplace', In: Perrewé, P. L. (Ed.), *Handbook on Job Stress [Special Issue], Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 6, 1-13
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 123-133.
- Lee, C. M., & Duxbury, L. (1998). Employed parents' support from partners, employers, and friends. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(3), 303-322.
- Lee, C., & Powers, J. R. (2002). Number of social roles, health and well being in three generations of Australian women. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 9, 195-215.
- Le Fevre, M., Matheny, J., & Kolt, G. S. (2003). Eustress, distress, and interpretation in occupational stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18, 726-744.
- Lefkowitz, J. (1994). Sex-related differences in job attitudes and dispositional variables: now you see them. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 323-349.
- Lehrer, E. L., & Nerlove, M. L. (1986). Female labor force behavior and fertility in the US. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12, 181-204.

- Lennon, M. C., & Rosenfield, S. (1994). Relative fairness and the division of housework: The importance of options. *American Journal of Sociology*, *100*, 506–531.
- Lewin, K. (1952). Group decision and social change. In R. Winston (Ed.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, 459-473. New York: PAC
- Lewis, S. N. C., & Cooper, C. L. (1988). Stress in Dual Earner Families. In B.A. Gutek, A.H. Stromberg & L. Larwood (eds.) *Women and Work: An Annual Review*, *3*, (pp.139-168).
- Lewis, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1999). The work–family research agenda in changing contexts. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *4*, 382–393.
- Lewis, G., & Wessely, S. (1992). The epidemiology of fatigue: More questions than answers. *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health*, *46*, 92-97.
- Lim, I.-S. (1997). Korean immigrant women’s challenge to gender inequality at home: The interplay of economic resources, gender, and family. *Gender and Society*, *11*, 31-51.
- Lin, N., & Lai, G. (1995). Urban stress in China. *Social Science and Medicine*, *41*, 1131-1145.
- Lindgren, B., & Laurila, A. (2005). Proximate causes of adaptive growth rates: growth efficiency variation among latitudinal populations of *Rana temporaria*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *18*, 820–828.
- Liu, C., & Spector, P. (2005). International and Cross Cultural Issues. J. L. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds), *Handbook of Work Stress*. California: Sage Publications.
- Loge, J. H., Ekeberg, O., & Kaasa, S. (1998). Fatigue in the general Norwegian population: normative data and associations. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *45*, 53–65.

- Loo, R., & Thorpe, K. (1998). Attitudes toward women's roles in society: A replication after 20 years. *Sex Roles, 39*, 903–912.
- Loscocco, K. A. (1997). Work–family linkages among self employed women and men. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 204–226.
- Luk, D. M., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Work and family domain stressors and support: Within – and cross domain influences on work-family conflict. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*, 489-508.
- Lundberg, U., Mardberg, B., & Frankenhaeuser, M. (1991). The total workload of male and female white collar workers as related to age, occupational level, and number of children. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 35*(4), 315-327.
- Lundberg, U., & Frankenhaeuser, M. (1999). Stress and workload of men and women in high ranking positions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 142–151.
- MacKay, C. J., Cousins, R., Kelly, P. J., Lee, S., & McCaig, R. H. (2004). “Management Standards” and work related stress in the UK: Policy background and science. *Work & Stress, 18*, 91-112.
- Madhavappallil, T., & Choi, J-B. (2006). Acculturative stress and social support among Korean and Indian immigrant adolescents in the United States. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 32*(2), 123-143.
- Major, B. (1993). Gender, entitlement, and the distribution of family labor. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*, 141-159.
- Mandelbaum, D. (1970). *Society in India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mane, P. N. (1991). Socialization of Hindu women in their childhood: An analysis of literature. *Indian Journal of Social Work, LII*, 81-95.

- Manev, I. M., & Stevenson, W. B. (2001). Nationality, Cultural distance and expatriate status: Effects on the managerial network in a multinational enterprise. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(2), 285-303
- Manning, M. R., Ismael, A. H., & Sherwood, J. J. (1981). Effects of role conflict on selected physiological, affective, and performance variables. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16, 125-141.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–253.
- Marshall, N. L., Barnett, R. C. (1993). Work-family strains and gains among two-earner couples. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 21, 64-78.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S., & Leiter, M. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research. (June 1, 2006). Work-life balance: Ways to restore harmony and reduce stress. On line article.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Matthews, L. S., Conger, R. D., & Wickrama, K. A. S. (1996). Work-family conflict and marital quality: mediating processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59, 62-79.
- MayoClinic.com (2006). Work-life balance: Ways to restore harmony and reduce stress. www.mayoclinic.com/health/work-life-balance/WL00056. Online article retrieved on 20-2-2009.

- McCloskey, J. C. (1990). Two requirements for job contentment: Autonomy and social integration. *Image: Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 22*, 140-143.
- McCormick, J. (1997). An attribution model of teachers' occupational stress and job satisfaction in a large educational system. *Work and Stress, 11*, 17-32.
- McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1982). *Family adaptation to crisis*. In H. McCubbin, A. Cauble, & J. Patterson (Eds.), *Family Stress, Coping and Social Support* (pp. 26-47). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- McDonough, P., & Walters, V. (2000). Gender and health: reassessing patterns and explanations. *Social Science and Medicine, 52*, 547-559.
- McGowan, J. (2005). Learning not to think: schooling in India. *Commonweal, 132*(3), 8.
- McIntosh, N. J. (1991). Identification and investigation of properties of social support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 72*, 201-217.
- McVicar, A. (2003). Workplace stress in nursing: a literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 44*(6), 633-642.
- Mead, M. (1967). *Cooperation and competition among primitive people*. Boston: Beacon.
- Mederer, H. J. (1993). Division of labor in two-earner homes: Tasks accomplishment versus household management as critical variables in perceptions about family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55*, 133-145.
- Menaghan, E., & Parcel, T. (1990). Parental employment and family life: Research in the 1980s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*(4), 1079-1098.
- Mueller, K. A., & Yoder, J. D. (1997). Gendered norms for family size, employment, and occupation: Are there personal costs for violating them? *Sex Roles, 36*, 207-220.

- Michie, S. (2002). Causes and management of stress at work. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 59, 67-72.
- Milkie, M. A., & Peltola, P. (1999). Playing all gender roles: gender and the work-family balancing act. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(2), 476-491.
- Miller, P. W. (1987). The wage effect of the occupational segregation of women in Britain. *The Economic Journal*, 97, 885-896.
- Miller, S. M., & Kirsch, N. (1987). Sex differences in cognitive coping with stress. In R. C. Barnett, L. Beiner & G. K. Baruch (Eds.), *Gender & Stress* (pp. 278-307). New York: The Free Press.
- Miranda, A.O., Estrada, D., & Firpo-Jimenez, M. (2000). Differences in family cohesion, adaptability, and environment among Latino Families in dissimilar stages of acculturation. *Family Journal*, 8, 341-351.
- Moen, P., & Yu, Y. (2000). Effective work/life strategies: Working couples, work conditions, gender and life quality. *Social Problems*, 47, 291-326.
- Moen, P., & Sweet, S. (2003). Time clocks: Couples' work hour strategies. In P. Moen (Ed.), *It's about time: Career strains, strategies, and successes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moos, R. (1974). *The social climate scales: An overview* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Morrison, J. D. (1980). Fatigue as a presenting complaint in family practice. *Journal of Family Practice*, 10, 795-801.
- Mulhall, A. (1996). Cultural discourse and the myth of stress in nursing and medicine. *International Journal Nursing Studies*, 33(5), 455-468.

- Murcott, A. (2000). Invited presentation: Is it still a pleasure to cook for him? Social changes in the household and the family. *Journal of Consumer Studies & Home Economics*, 24(2), 78–84.
- Murphy, L. (1988) Workplace interventions for stress reduction and prevention. In C. L. Cooper, C. L. & R. Payne (Eds.) *Causes, Coping and Consequences of Stress at Work* (pp. 310–339). John Wiley and Sons: Chichester.
- Murphy, G., & Murphy, L. (1968). *Asian Psychology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Murphy, L. (1995). Occupational stress management: Current status and future direction. *Trends in Organizational Behavior*, 2, 1-14.
- Murray, D. (2002). The relationship of patriarchal culture, heterosexual intimate relationships, divorce, and identity: A qualitative study. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 63, 1090.
- Museum Victoria. *Origins, immigrant communities in Australia*.
- Mutari, E., & Figart, D. M. (1997). Markets, flexibility, and family: Evaluating the gendered discourse against pay equity. *Journal of Economics issues*, 31, 687-705.
- Myers, D. (1985). *Employee problem prevention and counseling*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books, 1985.
- Nakazato, H. (2007). Overview of Research on Work–Life Balance in Australia. *Japanese Journal of Family Sociology*, 19, 62-69.
- Nangle, S., Kelley, M., Fals-Stewart, W., & Levant, R. (2003). Work and family variables as related to paternal engagement, responsibility, and accessibility in dual-earner couples with young children. *Fathering*, 1(1), 71-90.

- Narasimhan, R. L., & Pandey, R. N. (2000). Some main results of the pilot time use survey in India and their main policy implications. Online article. www.unescap.org/stat/meet/timeuse/Programme.htm>.
- Narayanan, L., Menon, S., & Spector, P. (1999). A cross-cultural comparison of job stressors and reactions among employees holding comparable jobs in two countries. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 6(3), 197-212.
- National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) (1991). *What to Do When an Employee Is Depressed: A Guide for Supervisors*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Publication No. 91-1792.
- Neelankavil, J. P., Mathur, J. P., & Zhang, Y. (2000). Determinants of managerial performance: a cross-cultural comparison of the perceptions of middle-level managers in four countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(1) 121-140.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and work–family conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 400–410.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Brashear-Alejandro, T., & Boles, J. S. (2004). A 38 cross-national model of job-related outcomes of work role 39 and family role variables: A retail sales context. *Journal of 40 the Academy of Marketing Science*. 32, 49-60.
- Newton, T. J. (1989). Occupational stress and coping with stress: A critique. *Human Relations*, 42, 441-461.
- Nock, S. L. (2001). The marriages of equally dependent spouses. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(6), 755–775.

- Nolen-Hoeksema, Larson, & Grayson. (1999). Gender Differences in Stress & Coping Styles. *In Personality & Individual Differences, 37*, 1402.
- Noordin, F., Williams, T., & Zimmer, C. (2002). Career commitment in collectivist and individualist cultures: a comparative study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*, 35–54.
- Noor, N. M. (2004). Work-family conflict, work- and family- role salience, and women's well-being. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(4), 389-405.
- Nordenmark, M. (2002). Multiple social roles-a resource or a burden: Is it possible for men and women.... *Gender, Work and Organizations, 9*(2),
- Nordstrom, K. A. (1991). *The internationalization process of the firm. Searching for new patterns and explanations*. Institute of International Business, Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm.
- Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: adjustment to a new cultural environment. *Practical Anthropology, 177*.
- OECD. (2002). *Babies and bosses: Reconciling work and family life*. Paris: OECD.
- Oishi, S., Diener, E., Lucas, R., & Suh, E. (1999). Cross-cultural variations in predictors of life satisfaction: Perspectives from needs and values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(8), 980-990.
- Olson, D. H. (1993). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: Assessing family systems. In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal family processes* (pp. 104–137). New York: Guilford Press.

- Olson, D. H., Russell, C. R., & Sprenkle, H. D. (1983). Circumplex model of marital family systems: cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. *Family Process, 18*, 3-35.
- Oman, R. F., & King, A. C. (2000). The effect of life events & exercise programme format on the adoption and maintenance of exercise behaviour. *Health Psychology, 19*, 605-612.
- Orloff, A. S. (1993). Gender and the social rights of citizenship: The comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *American Sociological Review, 58*, 303-328.
- Ortiz, V. (1996). The Mexican-origin population, permanent working class or emergent middle class? In R. Waldinger and M. Bozoghmer (Eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles*, Russell Sage, New York.
- Park, J. (2000). The effect of multiple roles of South Korean married women professors: Role changes and the factors which influence potential role gratification and strain. *Sex roles: A journal of research, 43*(7/8), 571-591.
- Park, J., & Liao, T. F. (2000). The effect of multiple roles of South Korean married women professors: Role changes and the factors that influence potential role gratification and strain. *Sex Roles, 43*, 571-591.
- Parker, D. F., & De Cotiis, T.A. (1983). Organisational determinants of job stress. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance, 32*, 160-177.
- Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y. S., Godshalk, V. M., & Beutell, N. J. (1996). Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*, 275-300.

- Parsuraman, S., & Purohit, Y. (2000). Distress and boredom among orchestra musicians: The two faces of stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 74-83.
- Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J. (2002). Toward reducing some critical gaps in work-family research. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*, 299-312.
- Parnell, J. A., & Hatem, T. (1997). The cultural specificity of management constructs: An empirical examination. *International Journal of Value-Based Management 10*(3), 247-271.
- Patterson, J. (1993). The role of family meanings in adaptation to chronic illness and disability. In A. Turnbull, J. Patterson, S. Behr, et al. (Eds.), *Cognitive coping research and developmental disabilities* (pp.221-238). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Patterson, M., Warr, P., & West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*, 193-216.
- Pawlikowska, T., Chalder, T., Hirsch, S. R., Wallace, P., Wright, D. J., & Wessely, S. C. (1994). Population based study of fatigue and psychological distress. *British Medical Journal, 308*, 763-766.
- Peirce, R. S., Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1996). Financial stress, social support, and alcohol involvement: A longitudinal test of the buffering hypothesis in a general population survey. *Health Psychology, 15*(1), 38-47.
- Pendakur, K., & Pendakur, R. (1998). The colour of money: Wage differentials across ethnic groups. *Canadian Journal of Economics, 31*(3), 518-548.
- Perrucci, C. C., Pottes, H. R., & Rhoads, D. C. (1978). Determinants of male family-role performance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3*, 53-66.

- Perry-Jenkins, M., & Crouter, A. C. (1990). Men's provider-role attitudes: Implications for household work and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues, 11*, 136-156.
- Peterson, R., & Gerson, K. (1992). Determinants of responsibility for child care arrangements among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54*(3), 527-536.
- Peterson, M. F. (1995). Role conflict, ambiguity and overload: a 21 nation study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 429-452.
- Peuckert, R. (1996). (1996). *Forms of families in social change*. Wiesbaden: Opladen.
- Phelan, J. (1994). The paradox of the contended female worker: an assessment of alternative explanations. *Social Psychology Quarterly 57*(2), 95-107.
- Pittman, J. F., Solheim, C. A., & Blanchard, D. (1996). Stress as a driver of the allocation of housework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*, 456-468.
- Pituc, S. T., & Lee, S. J. (2007). Asian women and work-family issues. *A Sloan Work and Family Encyclopaedia Entry*.
- Pleck, J. H. (1977). The work family role system. *Social Problems, 24*, 417-427.
- Pleck, J. H. (1985). *Working wives/Working husbands*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pocock, B. (2000). *Having a life: Work, family, fairness and community*. Centre for Labour Research, University of Adelaide, SA.
- Pocock, B., Skinner, N., & Williams, P. (2007). *Work-life in Australia: Outcomes from the Australian Work and Life Index (AWALI) 2007*.
- Pollock, K. (1988). On the nature of social stress: Production of a modern mythology. *Social Science & Medicine, 26*(3), 381-392.

- Pope, D., & Withers, G. (1993). Do migrants rob jobs? Lessons of Australian history, 1861-1991. *The Journal of Economic History*, 53, 719-742.
- Presland, P., & Antill, J. K. (1987). Household division of labor: The impact of hours worked in paid employment. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 39, 273-291.
- Price, J. L. (2001). Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22(7), 600-624.
- Probert, B. (1998). Working in Australian Universities: Pay Equity for Men and Women? *Australian Universities' Review*, 41(2), 33-42.
- Ptacek, J. T., Smith, R. E., & Zanas, J. (1992). Gender, Appraisal, and Coping: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 747-770.
- Quick, J. C., & Quick, J. D. (1984). *Organisational stress and preventive management*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Quick, J. C., Quick, J. D., Nelson, D. L., & Hurrell, J. J. (1997). *Preventative Stress Management in Organisations*. Washington, D.C. American Psychological Association.
- Raley, S. B., Mattingly, M. J., & Bianchi, S. M. (2006). How dual are dual-income couples? Documenting change from 1970 to 2001. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68, 11-28.
- Rana, B., Kagan, C., Lewis, S., & Rout, U. (1998). British South Asian women managers and professionals. *Women in Management Review*, 13(6), 221-232.
- Ralston, H. (1997). *The lived experience of South Asian immigrant women in Atlantic Canada: The interconnections of race, class, and gender*. Ewadin Mellen Press.

- Ralston, D. A., Yu, K. C., Wang, X., Terpstra, R. H., & He, W. (1996). The cosmopolitan Chinese manager: Findings of a study on managerial values across the six regions of China. *Journal of International Management*, 2, 79–109.
- Ralston, D. A., Holt, D. H., Terpstra, R. H., & Kai-Cheng, Y. (1997). The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial work values: A study of the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(1), 177–207.
- Ramu, G. N. (1988). *Family structure and fertility*. New Delhi, India: Sage.
- Ramu, G. N. (1989). *Women, Work and Marriage in Urban India. A Study of Dual and Single Career Couples*. New Delhi, India: Sage.
- Randall, D. M. (1993). Cross-cultural research on organizational commitment: A review and application of Hofstede's Value Survey Module, *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 91-110.
- Rao, P.V.V., & Rao, N. V. (1985). Sex-role attitudes across two cultures: United States and India. *Sex Roles*, 13, 1-18.
- Rao, V. V. P., & Rao, V. N. (1988). Sex Role Attitudes of College Students in India. In R. Ghadially (Ed.), *Women in Indian Society: A Reader*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Rao, M. H. (1990). Employment of wife and husband's participation in housework. *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, 51, 447-456.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1971). *Dual Career Families*, London: Penguin.
- Rapoport, R., & Bailyn, L. (1996). *Relinking Life and Work: Toward a Better Future*. A Report to the Ford Foundation, New York.

- Rapp, C., & Poertner, J. (1992). *Social administration: A client-centered approach*.
White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.
- Redding, S. G. (1993). *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Ream, E., & Richardson, A. (1996). Fatigue: a concept analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 33, 519–29.
- Reifman, A., Biernat, M., & Lang, E. L. (1991). Stress, social support, and health in married professional women with small children. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 431–445.
- Reitzes, D. C., & Mutran, E. J. (1994). Multiple roles and identities: Factors influencing self-esteem among middle aged working men and women. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57, 313-325.
- Repetti, L., Matthews, A., & Waldron, I. (1989). Effects of Paid Employment on Women's Mental and Physical Health. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1394-1401.
- Riley, D., & Eckenrode, J. (1986). Social ties: Costs and benefits within differing subgroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51, 770-778.
- Robbins, S., Millet, B., Cacioppe, R., & Waters-Marsh, T. (1998). *Organizational Behaviour*. Prentice Hall, Australia. P/L, Sydney.
- Robinson, J. P., & Godbey, G. (1997). Time for Life. *The Surprising Ways Americans Use their Time*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Robinson, J., & Godbey, G. (1997). *Time for life*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Robles, T. F., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (2003). The physiology of marriage: Pathways to health. *Physiology and Behavior*, 79, 409–416.

- Rodgers, F., & Rodgers, C. (1989). Business and the facts of family life. *Harvard Business Review*, November/December, 320-327.
- Roedel, R. R., & Nystrom, P. C. (1988). Nursing jobs and satisfaction. *Nursing Management*, 19(2), 34-38.
- Roehling, P. V., Moen, P. & Batt, R. (2003). When work spills over into the home and home spills over into work. In P. Moen (Ed.) *It's about time: Couples and careers*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Rook, K. S. (1984). Research on social support, loneliness and social integration: Toward an integration. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 239-264.
- Rook, J. W., & Zijlstra, F. (2006). The contributions of various types of activities to recovery. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(2), 218-240.
- Rosa, R. R. (2001). Examining work schedules for fatigue: It's not just hours of work. In P. A. Hancock & P. A. Desmond (Eds), *Stress, workload, and fatigue* (pp 513-528). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rosaldo, M. Z. (1974). Women, culture, & society: A theoretical overview. In M. Z. Rosaldo & L. Lamphere (Eds.), *Woman culture, and society* (pp. 17-42). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ross, C., & Mirowski, J. (1988). Child care and emotional adjustment to wives employment. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 29, 127-38.
- Rosse, J., & Rosse, P. H. (1981). Role conflict and ambiguity: An empirical investigation of nursing personnel. *Evaluation and the Health Professions*, 4, 385-405.

- Rosse, J., Crown, D., & Feldman, H. (1990). Alternative solutions to the workplace drug problem: Results of a survey of personnel managers. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 27*, 60-75.
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 655–684.
- Rubin, L. B. (1976). *Worlds of Pain. Life in the Working-class Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Russ, F., & McNeilly, K. (1995). Links among satisfaction, commitment and turnover intentions: the moderating effect of experience, gender and performance. *Journal of Business Research, 34*, 57-65.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68–78.
- Sales, S. M. (1970). Some effects of role overload and role underload. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5*, 592-608.
- Saplosky, R. M. (1992). Neuroendocrinology of the stress response. In J. B. Becker et al., (Eds.), *In Behavioural Endocrinology* (pp. 287–324), Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sawang, S., Oei, T. P. S., & Goh, Y. W. (2006). Are country and culture values interchangeable? A case example using occupational stress and coping. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 6*(2), 205-219.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M.P., & Kalimo, R. (1995). The general burnout inventory: a self report questionnaire to assess burnout at the workplace. In: MP Leiter, ed. *Extending*

- the burnout construct: reflecting changing career paths.* Symposium, APA/NIOSH conference. Work Stress and Health.
- Schein, E. H. (1984). Culture as an environmental context for careers. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 5, 71-81.
- Scherer, R.F., Hwang, C.E., Yan, W. & Li, J. (2000). The Dimensionality of Coping among Chinese Health Care Workers. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 317–27.
- Schulz, M. S., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., & Brennan, R. T. (2004). Coming home Upset: Gender, marital satisfaction, and the daily spillover of workday experience into couple interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(1), 250–263.
- Schwartzberg, N. S., & Dytell, R. S. (1996). Dual-earner families: The importance of work stress and family stress for psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 211–23.
- Selye, H. (1964). *From Dream to Discovery*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Selye, H. (1978). *The stress of life*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Seybolt, J. W. (1986). Dealing with premature employee turnover, *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 16(2), 26-32.
- Seymour, S. C. (1999). *Women, family, and child care in India*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University press.
- Shafiro, M., & Hammar, L. (2004). *Work and Family: A Cross-Cultural Psychological Perspective*. The Sloan Research and Family network.
- Sharf, R. S. (1996). *Theories of Psychotherapy and Counseling: Concepts and Cases*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brookscole.

- Shelton, B. A., & John, D. (1996). The Division of Household Labor. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 299-322.
- Shenkar, O., & Ronen, S. 1987. Structure and importance of work goals among managers in the People's Republic of China. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30: 564-576.
- Siahpush, M., & Karlin, J. B. (2005). Financial stress, smoking cessation and relapse: results from a prospective study of an Australian national sample. *Research report, Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer, the Cancer Council Victoria, Carlton, Victoria, Australia.*
- Sieber, S. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation, *American Sociological Review*, 39(4), 567-78.
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 27-41.
- Siegrist, J., Peter, R., Junge, A., Cremer, P., & Seidel, D. (1990). Low status control, high effort at work and ischemic heart disease: Prospective evidence from blue-collar men. *Social Science and Medicine*, 31, 1127-1 134.
- Siguaw, J., & Honeycutt, E. (1995). An examination of gender differences in selling behaviors and job attitudes. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 24, 45-52.
- Simon, C. R. (1995). Gender, multiple roles, role meanings, and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36, 182-194.
- Sinha, J. B. P., & Verma, J. (1987). Structure of collectivism. In C. Kagiteibasi (Ed). *Growth and progress in Cross-Cultural Psychology*. (pp. 123-129). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zetlinger.

- Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R.C. (1994). Individualism in a collective culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp.123-136). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Siu, O., Liu, L., & Cooper, C. (1999). Managerial stress in Hong Kong and Taiwan: A comparative study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 1-9.
- Slavin, L. A., Rainer, K. L., McCreary, M. L., & Gowda, K.K. (1991). Towards a Multicultural Model of the Stress Process. *Journal of Counseling and Development* 70, 156–63.
- Sloane, P., & Williams, H. (2000). Job satisfaction, comparison earnings and gender. *Labour*, 14, 473-501.
- Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, IL.
- Smith, P., Smits, S., & Hoy, F. (1998). Employee work attitudes: the subtle influence of gender. *Human Relations*, 51, 649-66.
- Sørensen, J.G., Norry, F.M., Scannapieco, A.C. & Loeschcke, V. (2005). Altitudinal variation for stress resistance traits and thermal adaptation in adult *Drosophila buzzatii* from the New World. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 18, 829–837.
- Sourabh, N. C. (2007). The culture of women’s housework: A case study from Bihar, India. Academic dissertation, University of Helsinki, Department of Sociology.
- Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2000). Well-being at work: a cross-sectional study of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29, 517–538.

- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Dyadic Adjustment Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38(1), 15-28.
- Spector, P. et al. (2007). Cross national differences in relationships of work demands, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions with work family conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 805-835.
- Spencer, A., & Podmore, D. (1984). Women in a male-dominated profession in English: Pressure and strain in family and domestic life. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 14, 47-66.
- Spielberger, C. D., & Vagg, P. R. (1999). *The Job Stress Survey: JSS professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Spurlock, J. (1995). Multiple roles of women and role strains. *Health Care for Women International*, 16, 501-508.
- Srinivasan, R. (1994). The Hindu work ethic. *Hinduism Today*, 16(6), 3-4.
- Sriram, R., & Krishna, A. (2000, July 11-14). *Demystifying fatherhood in Indian context: A study of Gujarati Hindu families at Baroda*. Paper presented at the XVI Biennial Meetings of the International Society for the Study of Behavioural Development, Beijing, China.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 46-56.
- Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (1981). Employee turnover and post decisional accommodation processes. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 235-281). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Steil, J. M. (2000). Contemporary marriage: Still an unequal partnership. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 125–152). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stein, F. (2001). Occupational stress, relaxation therapies, exercise and biofeedback. *Journal of Prevention, Assessment & Rehabilitation, 17*(3), 235-246.
- Stevens, D. P., Kiger, G., & Riley, P. J. (2006). His, hers, or ours? Work-to-family spillover, crossover, and family cohesion. *The Social Science Journal, 43*, 425-436.
- Stewart, D., Abbey, S., Meana, M., & Boydell, K. (1998). What makes women tired? A community sample. *Journal of Womens' Health, 7*(1), 69-75.
- Stickney, L. T., & Konrad, A. M. (2007). Gender-role attitudes and earnings: A multinational study of married women and men. *Sex Roles, 57*, 801–811.
- Storer, D., et al. (1976). *But I Wouldn't Want My Wife to Work Here*. Fitzroy: CURA.
- Streefkerk, H. (1985). *Industrial Transition in Rural India*. Popular Prakashan.
- Suedfeld, P. (1997). Reactions to societal trauma: Distress and /or useless. *Political Psychology, 18*, 849-861.
- Sullivan, O. (2000). The Division of Domestic Labour: Twenty Years of Change? *Sociology, 34*, 437-456.
- Suppal, P. G., Roopnarine, J. L., Buesig, T., & Bennett, A. (1996). Ideological beliefs about family practices: Contemporary perspectives among North Indian families. *International Journal of Psychology, 31*, 29-37.
- Swanson, V., Power, K. G., & Simpson, R. J. (1998). Occupational stress and family life: A comparison of male and female doctors. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 71*, 237-260.

- Swanson, V., & Power, K. G. (1999). Stress, satisfaction and role conflict in dual-doctor partnerships. *Community, Work and Family*, 2(1), 67–88.
- Szalai, A. (1972). *The Use of Time. Daily Activities of Urban and Suburban Populations in Twelve Countries*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Szymanski, E. M., Ryan, C., Merz, M. A., Trevino, B., & Johnson-Rodriguez, S. (1996). Psychosocial and economic aspects of work: Implications for people with disabilities. In E. M. Szymanski & R. M. Parker (Eds.). *Work and Disability: Issues and Strategies in Career Development and Job Placement* (pp. 9-38), Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Tait, M., Padgett, M., & Baldwin, T. (1989). Job and life satisfaction: a re evaluation of the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of the date of the study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 502-507.
- Takeuchi, R., Yun, S., & Tesluk, P. (2002). An examination of crossover and spillover effects of spousal and expatriate cross-cultural adjustment on expatriate outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 655-666.
- Talbot, S. (2005). From here to paternity: family biographies in the making. *Family Matters*, 72, 58–63.
- Talmud, I., & Izraeli, D. N. (1999). The relationship between gender & performance issues of concern to directors: correlates or institution? *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 20, 459-474.
- Tata, J. (2000). Autonomous work teams: an examination of cultural and structural constraints. *Work Study*, 49, 187-193.

- Tausig, M., & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding time: Alternate work schedules and work-life balance. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 101-119.
- Taylor, S. E. et al. (2004). Culture and social support: Who seeks it and why? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 354–362.
- Thanacoody, R., Bartram, T., Barker, T., & Jacobs, K. (2006). Career progression among female academics: A comparative study of Australia and Mauritius. *Women in Management Review*, 21(7), 536-553.
- Thomas, L., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work–family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6–15.
- Thoits, P. (1983). Multiple identities and psychological well-being: a reformulation and test of the social isolation hypothesis, *American Sociological Review*, 48, 2, 174–87.
- Thompson, L. (1991). Family work: Women’s sense of fairness. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 181-196.
- Tichenor, V. J. (1999). Status and income as gendered resources: The case of marital power. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(3), 638-680.
- Tilly, L., & Scott, J. (1978). *Women, work and family*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506–520.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Turner, J., Wheaton, B., & Lloyd, D. (1995). The epidemiology of social stress. *American Sociological Review* 60(1), 104-125.

- Vagg, P. R., & Spielberger, C. D. (1998). Occupational stress: Measuring job pressure and organisational support in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 294-305.
- Valdini, A., Steinhardt, S., Valicenti, J., & Jaffe, A. (1988) A one-year follow-up of fatigued patients. *Journal of Family Practice*, 26, 33-38.
- Valentine, S., & Mosley, G. (2000). Acculturation and sex-role attitudes among Mexican Americans: A longitudinal analysis. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, 22, 104–113.
- Van Yperen, N. W. (2003). Do high job demands increase intrinsic motivation or fatigue or both? The role of job control and job social support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 339-348.
- Vegchel, H., de Jonge, J., Bosma, H., & Schaufeli, W. (2005). Reviewing the effort–reward imbalance model: Drawing up the balance of 45 empirical studies. *Social Science and Medicine*, 60, 1117–1131.
- Verbrugge, (1982) cited in Hibbard, J. H., & Pope, Dr P. H., (1987). Employment characteristics and health status among men & women. *Women & Health*, 12, 88.
- Verma, J. (1999). Collectivism in the cultural perspective: The Indian scene. In J. C. Larsy, J. Adair, & K. Dion (Eds). *Latest Contributions to Cross-Cultural Psychology*. (pp. 228-241). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zetlinger.
- Verma, J., & Triandis, H. C. (1998). *The measurement of collectivism in India*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Association of Cross Cultural Psychology, Bellingham, WA, August.

- Vinokur, A. D., Price, R., & Caplan, R. (1996). Hard times and hurtful partners: How financial strain affects depression and relationship satisfaction of unemployed persons and their spouses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 166-179.
- Vogel, L. (1993). *Mothers on the Job: Maternity Policy in the U.S. Workplace*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Voigt Graf, C. (2004). Towards a geography of transnational spaces. Indian transnational communities in Australia. *Global Networks*, 4(1), 25-49.
- Voydonoff, P. (1988). Work role characteristics, family structure demands, and work/family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(3), 749-761.
- Waldron, I., Weiss, C. C., & Hughes, M. E. (1998). Interacting effects of multiple roles on women's health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 39, 216-236.
- Walker, A. (1985). Reconceptualizing family stress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47(4), 827-837.
- Wallace, J. E. (1997). It's about time: A study of hours worked and work spillover among law firm lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 227-248.
- Walsh, J. (1999). Myths and counter-myths: An analysis of part-time female employees and their orientations to work and working hours. *Work, Employment & Society*, 13(2), 179-203.
- Walton, R. (1992). From control to commitment in the workplace. In J. Gabarro (Ed.), *Managing people and organizations* (pp. 487-498). Boston: Harvard Business School Publications.

- Warr, P.B., Cook, J., & Wall, T. D. (1979). Scales for the Measurement of Some Work Attitudes and Aspects of Psychological Well- Being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52, 129-148.
- Warr, P., & Payne, R. (1983). Affective outcomes of paid employment in a random sample of British workers. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 4, 91-104.
- Weatherall, R., Joshi, H., & Macran, S. (1994). Double burden or double blessing? Employment, motherhood and mortality in the longitudinal study of England and Wales. *Social Science and Medicine*, 38, 285–297.
- Weiss, R. S. (1987). Men and their wives' work. In Faye J. Crosby (Ed.), *Spouse, Parent, Worker: On Gender and Multiple Roles*. (pp. 109-121). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, 1, 125-151.
- Western, M., & Baxter, J. (2001). *The Links between Paid and Unpaid Work: Australia and Sweden in the 1980s and 1990s*. In J. Baxter and M. Western (Eds). *Reconfigurations of Class and Gender* (pp. 81-104). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Westman, M. (2001). Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations*, 54, 717.
- Westman, M. (2002). Gender asymmetry in crossover research. In D. L. Nelson & R. J. Burke (Eds.), *Gender, work, stress and health* (pp. 129–149). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (1995). Crossover of stress, strain and resources from one spouse to another. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 169-181.

- Westman, M., & Vinokur, A. D. (1998). Unraveling the relationship of distress levels within couples: Common stressors, empathic reactions, or crossover via social interaction? *Human Relations, 51*, 137–156.
- Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (1999). The crossover of strain from school principals to teachers and vice versa. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 269–278.
- Westman, M., & Piotrkowski, C. S. (1999). Introduction to the special issue: Work-family research in Occupational Health Psychology. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 301-306.
- Westman, M., Vinokur, A. D., Hamilton, L. V., & Roziner, I. (2004). Crossover of marital dissatisfaction during downsizing among Russian army officers and their spouses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 769–779.
- Westman, M. (2005). Crossover of Stress and Strain between Spouses. A Sloan Work and Family Encyclopaedia Entry.
- White, L. K., Booth, A., & Edwards, J. N. (1986). Children and marital happiness: Why the negative correlation? *Journal of Family Issues, 7*, 131-148.
- White, K. (2003). Women and leadership in higher education in Australia. *Tertiary Education and Management, 9*(1), 45-60.
- Whyte, W.W. (1956). *The Organization Man*. Simon and Schuster, New York, NY.
- Williams, K. J., & Alliger, G. M. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *Academy of Management Journal 37*(4), 837 868
- Williams, F. L., Haldeman, V., & Cramer, S. (1996). Financial concerns and productivity. *Financial Counseling and Planning, 7*, 147-156.

- Williamson, R. C. (1996). Decision making and adjustment among Soviet-Jewish emigres in a middle-sized urban area. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 9, 383-397.
- Winefield, A. H., Winefield, H. R., Tiggeman, M., & Goldney, R. D. (1993). *Growing up with Unemployment. A Longitudinal study of its Psychological impact*. Routledge, London.
- Winefield, A. H. et al. (2002). The psychology of work and unemployment in Australia today: An Australian psychological society discussion paper. *Australian Psychologist*, 37(1), 1-9.
- Wingfield, J.C. et al. (1997). Corticosterone and behavioural responses to unpredictable events. In S. Harvey, & R. J. Etches (Eds.). *Perspectives in Avian Endocrinology* (pp. 267–278). Sinauer.
- Wolcott, I. (1990). The structure of work and work of families. *Family Matters*, 26, 32-38.
- Wolcott, I., & Glezer, H. (1995) *Work and Family Life: Achieving Integration*, AIFS, Melbourne.
- Wong, P. (1993). Effective management of life stress: The resource congruence model. *Stress Medicine*, 9, 51-60.
- Wooden, M. (1994). The labour market experience of immigrants, in M. Wooden, R. Holten, G. Hugo & J. Sloan, *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues* (2nd edn), AGPS, Canberra.
- Wu, Z., & Baer, D. E. (1996). Attitudes toward family and gender roles: A comparison of English and French Canadian women. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 27, 437–452.

- Yinger, J. M. (1981). Toward a theory of assimilation and dissimilation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4, 249-264.
- Yogev, S. (1981). Do professional women have egalitarian marital relationships? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43, 865-872.
- Yousef, D. A. (2001). Islamic work ethic: a moderator between organizational commitment and job satisfaction in cross-cultural context. *Personnel Review*, 30, 152–169.
- Zastrow, C. (1984). Understanding and preventing burn-out. *British Journal of Social Work*, 14, 141–155.
- Zedeck, S. (1992). *Work, families, and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Zedeck, S., Maslach, C., Mosier, K., & Skitka, L. (1989). Affective response to work and quality of family life: employee and spouse perspectives. In E. B. Goldsmith (Ed.), *Work and Family: Theory, Research, and Application* (pp. 135-157). Sage, California.