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OVERLOADED? EXAMINING PREDICTORS OF WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT THROUGH ROLE OVERLOAD

LISA J. BRASDOVICH

ABSTRACT

Work-life balance is becoming a popular topic within organizations as no employee wants to endure work-family conflict. Research has been trying to understand what can impact work-family conflict. To increase knowledge about work-family conflict this study examined how role overload can impact different groups of people depending upon work schedule, parental status, and activity during commute. The data were collected through two surveys posted on Amazon's Mechanical Turk. In total, there were 192 respondents. Results found that an interaction was present between an employee's work schedule and the child's status as a student to significantly predict the time the employee is able to spend with the child. Employees with a compressed work week are able to spend more time with children than employees without a compressed work week. Further, when an employee has a compressed work week they are able to spend more time with children when their children are not in school compared to when children are in school. Additionally it was found that level of depletion after the work day significantly predicts one's work-family conflict. The findings of this study can help future researchers improve their knowledge on what can impact one's work-family conflict. The findings will also help organizations understand work-family conflict better. Organizations may become more willing to consider offering employees alternative
work schedules and activities to allow employees to replenish resources before the start of the workweek and after their workday is over.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Work-life balance is becoming a popular topic addressed in many organizations, as it is a growing concern that employees need to have work-life balance. Today, employers and employees are trying to find the right mix between the work domain and the non-work domain. It is important that work-life balance is obtained as employees will experience better health benefits (Bohle, Willaby, Quinlan, & McNamara, 2011; Burke & Cooper, 2008; Sullivan, 2014). By ensuring that work-life balance is obtained employers will also have more productive employees (Scandura & Lankau, 1997).

Many different factors can impact one's work-life balance. Previous research completed on work-life balance has examined many of these factors. Studies have primarily focused on gender differences, those with flexible work hours, and employees who have children (Allard, Haas, & Hwang, 2007; Allen & Finkelstein, 2014; Baxter, 2011; Bohle et al., 2011; Dex & Bond, 2005; Dikkers, van Engan, & Vinkenburg, 2010; McMenamin, 2007; Peters, den Dulk, & van der Lippe, 2009; Valcour, 2007). Although a large amount of research has been completed, researchers have only touched the surface of what can impact one’s work-life balance. Researchers are still trying to find
out what can impact one's work-life balance. Our understanding of this phenomenon can be improved by looking at role overload. Role overload is when a person has many different roles to play but doesn't have the available resources to be able to play all of the roles the person has (Goode, 1960; Matthews, Winkel, & Wayne, 2013). This often causes the person to have depleted resources (Goode, 1960; Matthews et al., 2013). Depleted resources result in higher work-family conflict for employees (Burke & Cooper, 2008; Matthews et al., 2013). Research has never examined the interplay between role overload and factors such as: one's work schedule specifically having a compressed work week, if one has children, children's school status, spouse's employment status, and one's commute. These constructs need to be looked at because it is important to know what can decrease an employee's work-family conflict. Work-family conflict research has treated people the same, but there are different types of employees. Employees may or may not have children and it is not known whether work-family conflict works the same for everyone. Research needs to look at employees who have a compressed work week to see if a compressed work week impacts work-family conflict positively or negatively for different groups of people. Furthermore, research has also not examined the impact that one's commute can have on people depending upon if they replenish their resource on their commute or not. If we treat all groups of people the same it could cause more harm than good. Therefore, we truly need to understand what can impact work-family conflict and this could be explained by role overload.

This paper will first discuss what work-life balance is. Definitions will be provided of what work-family balance and work-family conflict are. The paper will then explain
the consequences that can occur from having work-family conflict. Second, the paper will explain role overload and the implications this theory has on work-life balance. Third, the paper will explain the influence role overload has on parents and non-parents. Fourth, role overload will be used to explain how different types of people will react to their commute time. Fifth, the paper will show how role overload can explain how different types of employees react to having a compressed work week.

**Work-Life Balance**

Work-life balance and work-family conflict are terms that measure the same thing, but are one opposite ends of the spectrum from one another (Greenblatt, 2002; Gregory & Milner, 2009). Work-life balance can be defined as attention and energy that are able to be spent on both one's work domain and one's personal domain (Gregory & Milner, 2009). Work-family conflict can be defined as when one cannot handle both their work and personal life (Burke & Cooper, 2008).

Much research has been completed on work-life balance. Work-life balance is gaining popularity among researchers. Work-life balance first gained attention in the 1960's, but became popular in 2005 when research interest on work-life balance expanded. There were double the amount of papers received at the conference of Gender, Work, and Organizations on work-life balance topics than the previous year (Gregory & Milner, 2009).

Work-life balance gained popularity because there was a change in the demographics of employees as more women were now entering the work force (Sullivan, 2014). Since women were now entering the work force there was a need for
them to balance both their family and their work (Sullivan, 2014). Women were commonly discriminated against in the work place because employers knew they may become pregnant and would be unable to work (Sullivan, 2014). For this reason, the Women's Liberation Movement began (Sullivan, 2014). This movement allowed women to be able to balance both their work and family lives by giving women certain employment rights (Sullivan, 2014). This movement allowed women to have more flexible work schedules and allowed them to have maternity leave (Sullivan, 2014). This movement then led to the Family and Medical Leave Act in 1993 (Sullivan, 2014). Overall this movement led the way for employers to see the benefits in ensuring that employees have work-life balance.

Previous research has looked at many different predictors that can influence one's work-family conflict. For example, research has shown that one's occupation can impact work-life balance, as the stress and the demands of the job are different for different occupations (Allard et al., 2007; Peters et al., 2009). Matthews, Bulger, and Barnes-Farrell (2010) found that work-life balance is also different for every age group. They found that those between 29-45 had the highest work-family conflict. Further, Allen and Finkelstein (2014) also found that work-family conflict varies with the age of the employees and their life stage. Many researchers have also looked at gender as a primary predictor of work-family conflict (Allen & Finkelstein, 2014; Baxter, 2011; Dex & Bond, 2005; Robinson, Magee, & Caputi, 2014; Valcour, 2007). Gender is commonly studied because women are still seen as the primary caregivers to children. Women were found to have more interactions with their children and fathers are less likely to
take paternity leave (Baxter, 2011; Klaff, 2003). Work-life balance literature is continuing to expand because work-family conflict can cause many negative consequences for workers. Below, some of these negative consequences will be outlined.

**Consequences of work-family conflict.** Research has outlined many negative effects of work-family conflict. Below, many of these topics will be discussed such as: parents having less time to spend with their children, the impact it can have on employees' psychological and physical well being, the higher turnover that is experienced, and decreased marital satisfaction for employees.

Baxter (2011) found that parents' interactions with children decreased as work hours increased. When parents had to work an extra hour at work, the time spent with their child decreased by 26 minutes for the mother and 18 minutes for the father for that day. Mothers who are the primary caregiver for their children who work extended work hours experienced significant decreases in time spent with their children. Increasing work hours often leads to increased work-family conflict. This is due to employees having less time to spend on their personal domains, such as being with their children (Gregory & Milner, 2009).

Employees who face increased work-family conflict often face psychological and physical well being problems (Bohle et al., 2010; Burke & Cooper, 2008). These problems arise because employees are spending more time at work, which means they have less time for their family and non-related work activities (Geurts, Beckers, Taris, Kompier, & Smulders, 2009). Not spending enough time with their families causes
employees to have increased distress which results in psychological problems (Burke & Cooper, 2008). Employees will also have less time to take care of their health resulting in physical well being problems (Burke & Cooper, 2008). Employees continue to spend more time at work which means these employees are working longer work hours. It was found that the more overtime hours one worked the higher the work-family conflict the employee experienced (Geurts et al., 2009). A study by Greenhaus, Collins, and Shaw (2002) examined 353 certified public accountants. Results found that employees who spent more time on family than work experienced less work-family conflict than employees who spent more time on work than family. The study also found that as the number of hours an employee spent at work increased, so did their work-family conflict.

Work-family conflict usually occurs because employees are spending less time with their families because they are spending more time at work (Geurts et al., 2009). Spending more time at work means these employees are working longer work hours. Therefore, this section will review the influence that increased work hours can have on employees. As previously discussed most employees are working increased work hours even though 40 hours is what is considered the average full time work week in America (Sturman & Walsh, 2014). Many full time employees have to work over 40 hours a week to complete all of their job responsibilities or so they don't fall behind. The number of employees working overtime is continuing to rise. In 2014, 24.9% of US workers worked 41 hours or more a week (United States Department of Labor, 2014). Of those 24.9%, 8.5% worked 41-48 hours a week, 9.7% worked 49-50 hours, and 6.8% worked 60 or over hours a week (United States Department of Labor, 2014). Many employees work
these overtime hours because they enjoy the rewards they are receiving, such as bonuses, pay raises, or they enjoy their job (Gregory & Milner, 2009). Some workers feel that they owe working longer hours to their boss and coworkers (Burke & Cooper, 2008). Overworking has many side effects as it has been found to cause high levels of stress, health risks, and can even cause death in extreme situations (Burke & Cooper, 2008; Sullivan, 2014). Long work hours have been associated with health risks which include: high blood pressure, high heart rate, fatigue, and more accidents at work (Burke & Cooper, 2008). Increased work hours were found to increase stress and cause job dissatisfaction to employees (Gottholmseder, Nowotny, Pruckner, & Theurl, 2009). Overworked employees can experience chronic fatigue and can even experience unsafe psychological symptoms (Bohle et al., 2010). When employees worked more or fewer hours than desired they were also found to have lower life satisfaction levels (Baslevent & Kirmanoglu, 2014).

Ryan, Ma, Hsiao, and Ku (2015) found that employee turnover intention can often be caused by work-family conflict. Their research entailed surveying 442 university food service mangers. Results found that work-family conflict was a significant predictor of why employees left the organization. Often these employees have to work weekends, late hours, and even holidays. These employees feel they are disengaging in their personal domain as they are constantly at their work domain. This lack of balance between the two domains has caused the industry to face a high turnover rate.

completed by Van Steenbergen et al. (2014) surveyed 215 couples with children. The study found that work-family conflict can decrease martial satisfaction. It was found that parents became easily irritated or angry at their partners when they arrived home. The spouse often had a negative outlook on the other's behaviors after a long work day. This often caused partners to withdraw from each other as they are still recovering from their work day.

One way employees try to reduce the consequences that can occur from increased work-family conflict is to separate or integrate their work and personal domain. Ashford, Kreiner, & Fugate (2000) explain that this thought process is often referred to as boundary theory. They further explain that boundary theory aims to explain how people are able to maintain the different domains of their life. The concept of integration and segmentation is often thought to be a spectrum. Segmentation can be defined as keeping different parts of one's life separate from one another. On the other hand, integration can be defined as being able to mix different aspects of one's life together. Some employees may be high on the segmentation side of the spectrum where they keep their work at their office and their home life at home. On the other end of the spectrum some employees prefer to integrate the two aspects and don't mind answering a personal call at work or a work call at home. Some employees prefer a mix of the two. For example, an employee may not work at home, but will answer a personal call at work. Bugler, Matthews, and Hoffman (2007) examined 332 workers from 24 different organizations by giving them a survey to determine where they fall on the segmentation and integration continuum. Results found that people who had less
flexible boundaries between work and personal lives had more conflict. People who allowed more flexible boundaries had more enhancement in their lives. They also found that the only significant predictor for enhancing one's personal life was one's willingness to be flexible in incorporating the two domains together.

**Role overload**

Many researchers have studied role overload. It was first explained by Goode (1960) as a concept called role theory. He explained that role theory was how society is made up of multiple roles that each person holds. Everyone has many different roles in one's lifetime such as being an employee, a husband or wife, a mother or father, and a son or daughter. He further explained that having so many roles can result in role strain or role overload. He explains that role overload occurs when a person only has limited resources available and has many different roles to fulfill. The person doesn't have available resources to be able to play all of the different roles that the person has, which causes the person to experience role overload. Role overload is often associated with ego depletion (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). Ego depletion is when a person has used up available resources causing the person to no longer have full control over the decisions, actions, and choices that the person makes (Baumeister et al., 1998). Often this results in a loss of self control (Baumeister et al., 1998). Role overload often occurs because a specific role one endures becomes too much (Matthews et al., 2013). Employees may often experience role overload because they have depleted resources available. In summary, role overload and resource depletion are overlapping constructs, and role overload measures have been used as operationalizations of depletion.
(Matthews et al., 2013). For this reason, both constructs will be discussed jointly here.

Muraven and Baumeister (2000) compared self control to a muscle in their research. This was demonstrated by both a muscle and self control needing to be rested when they have been overworked. Overworking causes resources to be depleted. To be able to use the resources to their full capacity they must be replenished. This can be observed by how a muscle needs to fully be rested before it is at full strength again. Further, Muraven and Baumeister (2000) explained that this is why people cannot always control their addictions. Relapses may occur when people have depleted resources in any aspect of their life, such as having a long day at work. Their resources are so low that they have no ability to use their self control to stop the addiction.

Baumeister et al. (1998) performed four different studies to explain how depleting one's self control can deplete one's energy level. The first study gave hungry participants only radishes to eat while chocolate was presented in front of them, causing them to use their self control. The other groups involved participants who were given chocolate to eat and a group given no snack. This study found that participants who used their self control gave up faster on a puzzle compared to those who didn't use their self control. The second study had participants give either a counter attitudinal speech or a pro attitudinal speech. The speech they had to make was either for or against raising tuition prices. Participants who had to make a counter-attitudinal speech for raising tuition prices were found to give up quicker on the subsequent task of completing a puzzle. These participants used up more of their resources on the speech task. Those in the pro-attitudinal group or those who did not make a speech had more
resources available to complete the puzzle and took longer to give up than those in the counter-attitudinal group. Experiment 3 showed participants either a funny or sad film and then had them solve a puzzle. This study found that having participants suppress their emotions about the film led to worse performance on the anagram task. The fourth experiment involved giving participants an ego depletion task that was difficult. The task involved crossing out the letter e with strict rules for when it could be crossed out. After the task was completed participants then had to watch a boring movie until they believed they could answer the questions about the film. Results found that participants were more passive and continued to watch the boring movie longer if they were in the ego depletion group.

Role overload has been found to increase employees' work-family conflict for employees as their resources are depleted (Burke & Cooper, 2008; Matthews et al., 2013). Employees who experience role overload often use their resources to fulfill their work domain and have no resources left for their personal domain (Matthews et al., 2013). This often results in work-family conflict as they have no resources left for their personal domain when they arrive home (Matthews et al., 2013).

Role overload commonly occurs when employees work too many hours and are therefore overworked (Valcour, 2007). Similarly, Fagnani and Letablier (2004) found that overworked employees arrive home tired and stressed because they have such low resources. These employees need to replenish their energy levels before they can engage in another role (Matthews et al., 2013). Nasurdin and O'Driscol (2012) found similar results as they surveyed academic staff at two Universities, one in New Zealand
and one in Malaysia. Both samples found similar results. Results found that work overload was found to be associated with higher work-family conflict.

Employees must replenish their resources to be able to engage in their personal role after their work role is complete (Matthews et al., 2013). If employees do not replenish their resources it will result in less attention to be spent on their family or personal life (Matthews et al., 2013). Employees who are not properly replenishing their resources are not able to balance their work and personal domains (Burke & Cooper, 2008). If employees are not overworked they will not need to replenish their resources as these employees will be able to come home and dedicate more time and energy to their families (Fagnani & Letablier, 2004).

The current study

Today many researchers have been trying to find what can reduce work-family conflict, as no employee wants to endure work-family conflict. Research hasn't examined how role overload may impact different employees' levels of work-family conflict. Role overload can be used to explain how constructs that have been understudied in literature relate to one another. First, role overload can show the impact that parental status can have on work-family conflict. Second, role overload can explain the impact that commuting can have on work-family conflict. Third, role overload can explain the impact that having a compressed work week can have on work-family conflict. For these reasons these constructs will come together to form the hypotheses for this study (Figure 1).

Parental status
It is important to understand family structure in regards to work-life balance. All individuals cope with their work-life balance differently, but certain trends can be found within individuals with similar family structures. For example, distinct differences between one's parental status can be found. Employees who are non-parents may prioritize work and engage in extra work hours whenever possible because their job is their life. They do not have to constantly worry about ensuring their children are safe, causing more time to be spent and focused on work. These employees can go home and replenish resources after work as they don't have any parental responsibilities to worry about. Employees with three young children will have different priorities. Throughout the workday, employees may be anxious to get home to spend time with their children. They would dread having to stay late, which would cause work-family conflict (Van Steenbergen et al., 2014). These employees may arrive home from work with depleted resources and have no time to replenish their resources as they have parental responsibilities to fulfill. These employees will experience greater work-family conflict because they are unable to replenish depleted resources (Matthews et al., 2013). All of this information has formed the following hypothesis:

_Hypothesis 1: Employees’ depletion after work will interact with one’s parental status when relating to work-family conflict (Figure 2). Having post-work depletion will cause more work-family conflict for parents than non-parents._

**Commute time**

Employees must get to and from work. The time it takes them to get to and from work is their commute time. Some employees may have a short commute time and only
have to travel a few minutes to and from work each day. Other employees have a much
greater commute time and must travel longer to get to and from work each day. While
some employees are lucky enough to skip morning traffic jams by living close to work,
others experience daily bumper to bumper traffic.

Commuting is perceived as stressful because commuters cannot control the time
it takes them to get to work because they don't know if there will be traffic or
construction (Koslowsky & Krausz, 1993). Commuting has largely been found to increase
stress, increase the risk of stress related health risks, and affect employees’ attitudes
before and after work which can carry over to the workday or their family
(Gottholmseder et al., 2009; Koslowsky & Krausz, 1993). Having to commute one minute
to work compared to no commute decreased employees’ relaxed state by 0.1%, where
having to commute for 19 minutes decreased their relaxed state by 2.2%
(Gottholmseder et al., 2009). The longer the commute, the more stress the employees
endured, which caused their relaxed state to decrease. This shows that the commute
may make the day more stressful to the employee.

Employees with shorter commutes or those who do not have to commute will
save money. They won't have to spend as much money on gas and are able to engage in
more leisure activities. Parents may reap additional financial benefits with reduced
commuting time. Employees with young children will have to pay childcare services
fees, which can add up with increased commute time. There are often expensive
overtime fees if parents are late which often happens to commuting parents (StGeorge
& Fletcher, 2012). StGeorge and Fletcher (2012) found that many parents explained how
expensive day care was and how they had to often rush home before the childcare center closed. They also found that this affected their child emotionally because the child was often angry to be the last child picked up. Parents were also found to be more distracted at work by constantly watching the clock because they did not want to be late picking up their child (StGeorge & Fletcher, 2012). Less commute time will allow employees with and without children to save money and have increased work-life balance.

Commute time could be argued to both increase and decrease work-life balance. StGeorge and Fletcher (2012) found that parents had one of two thoughts about commuting. The first was that some parents found commuting to be a waste of their time because they were being unproductive with their limited time. Less commute time allows employees to be more rested by being able to wake up and have extra time to get ready for their workday. Parents won't have to rush their morning activities such as getting dressed for work, making breakfast, and getting the kids ready. They can start their workday on their own terms, which means they have more autonomy to reduce stressful situations in the morning (McMenamin, 2007).

StGeorge and Fletcher (2012) also found that some parents found commuting as a relaxing journey where they could take time for themselves. Likewise, Gottholmseder et al. (2009) found that commute time did not affect work-family conflict because commuters enjoyed their time to recover from their work day. Work can cause an employee’s resources to be depleted, resulting in separation from family. Self-regulatory depletion will remain low until the employee's resources are replenished,
which can occur on the commute home (Matthews et al., 2013). Taking the commute time away from employees may lessen the transition from work to home, resulting in decreased work-life balance and heightened stress.

Employees often experience role overload when they leave work. Employees who use their commute home to replenish their depleted resources will not need time to replenish their resources when they arrive home, as for some employees commute time is thought of as a transition between one's work and personal domain (Nippert-Eng, 2010). These employees see commuting as a boundary that forms a transition between their different domains. Employees are often exhausted from their work domain and making the transfer to their personal domain is demanding if their self-regulatory resources are depleted (Nippert-Eng, 2010).

It is believed that parents who use their commute home to replenish their depleted resources during their commute will be more recharged and have less work-family conflict. These employees will be ready for their next role when they arrive home. Parents who do not replenish during their commute will experience the opposite. They will arrive home and still need to replenish their depleted resources as their commute home only added additional stress. These employees will need to separate themselves from their families when they do arrive home to get their resources back (Matthews et al., 2013). It will not matter for employees who are non-parents as they do not have children related responsibilities when they arrive home. From this information the following hypothesis was formed:
Hypothesis 2: There will be a three-way interaction between depletion after work, one's parental status, and one's use of replenishing during the commute to predict one's work-family conflict. For parents, there will be a two-way interaction between depletion after work and type of commute, such that when depletion after work is high parents who don't replenish on their commute will have more work-family conflict than parents who replenish on their commute. There will be no differences seen for parents with low depletion after work. For individuals who are non-parents a main effect will be seen for depletion after the workweek, such that when depletion after work is high no difference on level of work-family conflict will be found. There will be no effect found on work-family conflict for non-parents regardless of whether they replenish their resources during their commute or not.

Compressed workweek

One way some employers try to help employees balance their family and work life is by allowing a compressed work week. A compressed work week is defined as working fewer days a week, but more hours on the days one works (Christensen & Schneider, 2010). Typically during a compressed work week an employee would work four, 10 hour days, instead of five, eight hour days. This gives employees an extended weekend or a day off during the week. Most nurses have a compressed work week because they work three, 12 hour shifts (Bae & Yoon, 2014).

The National Study of Changing Workforce found in 2005 that 10% of employers allowed employees to have compressed work week schedules throughout the year, but
many more employees have the ability to have such a schedule when needed (Christensen & Schneider, 2010). Small companies are more likely than large companies to give employees compressed workweeks (Christensen & Schneider, 2010). Small companies have limited employees and a greater capability to better fit each employee’s needs.

Compressed workweeks may relate to employee outcomes as Amendola, Weisburd, Hamilton, Jones, and Slipka (2011) found that police officers who worked 10 or 12 hour shifts had no performance or health concerns compared to those who worked 8 hour shifts. They did find that police officers who worked a 10 or 12 hour shift received about a half hour more of sleep a night and had a higher quality of life than those working an 8 hour shift. It was also found that those who worked 10 hour shifts worked less overtime than those who worked 8 and 12 hour shifts. Burke and Cooper (2008) also found that employees who have a compressed work week have increased productivity. This may allow employees to advance their career faster because they are getting more work done.

Employees who have a compressed work week may be more productive in their career because they have more time to recharge their depleted resources before their next shift. Employees who work a compressed work week have an extra day off to recharge and replenish their energy levels (Burke & Cooper, 2008). During that extra day employees can engage in more leisure and family activities (Burke & Cooper, 2008). By having a compressed work week employees will have additional time to recharge which will allow employees to experience heightened work-life balance.
Some employees may dislike the abnormal work schedule because they will get to see their family less on days they do work. These employees would have to go into work earlier and stay later than a traditional nine to five to make up the hours for a compressed work week. Parents or spouses who have to work 35 to 40 hours in three to four days will endure role overload when they return home because their energy level will be depleted from working long hours, causing them to neglect family (Matthews et al., 2013). This could cause employees to ignore their family when they do finally arrive home because they are so tired and overworked. Employees will then only want to relax and ignore their family, causing work-family conflict (Burke & Cooper, 2008).

Employees who have a compressed work week may prefer this schedule because they do get an extended weekend. This means these employees get at least three days off of work in a row. The extra day off of work could increase the time employees spend with their families compared to those who have a traditional two day weekend. A study in Australia found that by implementing a compressed work week it allowed workers to have more days off which allowed workers to have increased work life balance (Lingard, Townsend, Bradley, & Brown, 2008). They found that workers were able to engage in more leisure activities and were more recharged before returning to work (Lingard et al., 2008).

It is unknown whether spending time with one’s family is replenishing or depleting for employees, but arguments can be made for both directions. Spending time with one's children and spouse might be replenishing because work-family conflict arises when employees are unable to spend enough time with their family (Burke &
Cooper, 2008; Greenblatt, 2002; Gregory & Milner, 2009). When employees are away from their family they may experience increased guilt and negative thoughts which has a spillover effect onto their workday (Wayne, Butts, Casper, Allen & 2016). These negative and guiltily thoughts may be depleting for employees. On the other hand, spending time with one's family may be depleting. Employees may need a break from all of their responsibilities to have alone time for themselves. These employees may have depleted resources from constantly spending time with others. Based on the above arguments, it appears that a stronger case can be made for a replenishing effect, so Hypothesis 3 is posed in that direction (empirical investigation can also show whether the opposite direction is more likely). Furthermore, the amount of time employees are able to spend with their family does depend on the family's schedule. Parents may have additional time with their children depending on their child's school status. Parents will have more time with their children if their children are not in school. They will be able to spend the whole day with their children not in school on their extended weekend off of work. If the child is in school the parent will be unable to spend the full day with the child as on the parent's extra day off the child will be in school. The parent will have to spend time with the child when they arrive home from school. The more time spent with one's children will lead to less depletion before the work week begins as spending time with children is believed to be replenishing. The relationship depends on the child's school status because this will determine how much time is able to be spent with the child. The level of depletion the parent has before the work week relates to their level of work-family conflict (Matthews et al., 2013). Further, the relationship between time
spent with children and work-family conflict is impacted by the level of depletion before the work week the parent experiences. Employees with a compressed work week may also have additional time to spend with their spouse depending on their employment status. If the spouse is unemployed the employee will be able to spend more time with them. This would allow the couple to spend an extra full day together when the employee didn't work. If the spouse does work then the employee would only spend time with the spouse when they are home from work. By having more time to spend with the spouse it will allow the employee to have less depletion before the work week begins. The employee will be able to recharge one's resources before the start of the work week as spending time with one's spouse is replenishing (Burke & Cooper, 2008). This relationship depends on the spouse's employment status because this will determine how much time is able to be spent with the spouse. The effect of time spent with spouse on work-family conflict is mediated by the level of depletion before the work week the employee experiences. All of these factors contribute to the belief that the more time an employee is able to spend with family the less work-family conflict they will have as spending time with family is replenishing for employees. For these reasons it is hypothesized that:

_Hypothesis 3: Among parents, having a compressed work week will lead to increased time spent with children. This will be moderated by the child's status as a student (Figure 4). The relationship will be stronger for parents who have children not in school. A weaker relationship will be seen for parents who have children in school._
Hypothesis 4: Increased time spent with children will lead to less depletion before the workweek.

Hypothesis 5: The effect of having a compressed work week on depletion before the work week is mediated by the time spent with children. This relationship is moderated by the child’s status as a student.

Hypothesis 6: The level of depletion before the work week is related to one's work-family conflict.

Hypothesis 7: The effect of time spent with kids on work-family conflict is mediated by the level of depletion before the work week.

Hypothesis 8: Having a compressed work week will lead to increased time spent with one's spouse. This will be moderated by the spouse's employment status (Figure 5). The relationship will be stronger for employees who have an unemployed spouse. A weaker relationship will be seen for spouses who work.

Hypothesis 9: Increased time spent with one's spouse will lead to less depletion before the work week.

Hypothesis 10: The effect of having a compressed work week on depletion before the work week is mediated by the time spent with the spouse. This relationship is moderated by the spouse's employment status.

Hypothesis 11: The effect of time spent with spouse on work-family conflict is mediated by the level of depletion before the workweek.

Hypothesis 12: Increased time spent with one's family will lead to decreased work-family conflict.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

The sample used for this study included 351 participants. Participants were found by using Amazon's Mechanical Turk. Mechanical Turk is a system created by Amazon which was originally built for human computation tasks that computers were unable to do (Mason & Suri, 2012). Quickly, Mechanical Turk turned into a platform that researchers could perform experiments and offer surveys on (Mason & Suri, 2012). Mechanical Turk allows people to be requesters. These are the people who create the task they need workers to complete (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Workers then can select which tasks they want to complete and are given compensation to use on their Amazon account based on the task selected (Buhrmester et al., 2011).

Researchers are now beginning to use Mechanical Turk because it offers many advantages such as an ease of access to willing participants (Mason & Suri, 2012). The samples found on Mechanical Turk are commonly found to be more diverse than samples found among college students and Internet samples (Buhrmester et al., 2011).
All participants used in this study elected to participate in this study by selecting the HIT. To ensure participants qualified to take the survey, screener questions were asked. These questions ensured all participants were married, were United States citizens, commute to work, and worked full time (which was defined as working 35 or more hours a week). Depending on the survey taken participants were also required to work either a traditional work schedule where they work eight five hour days or else a compressed work schedule where they work fewer days a week, such as three twelve hour shifts or four ten hour shifts. Participants who worked a compressed work week were further required to have a schedule that has allowed them to have an extended weekend. If participants answered any of these questions incorrectly they were disqualified from the rest of the survey. Throughout the survey there were three attention check question that told participants how they needed to answer that question. For example, "If you are still paying attention, please strongly disagree with this statement." Participants were eliminated if they answered an attention check question incorrectly. This was to ensure that participants were actually paying attention and reading the survey.

After screening out participants who answered an attention check question incorrectly or did not qualify for the survey the final sample used for data analysis were 192 participants. This means that 54.7% of participants were included. The most common reason that participants were disqualified was because they did not pass the screener questions (139 respondents). This caused them not to advance to the rest of
the survey. Another reason data were not included was because participants answered an attention check questions incorrectly (20 respondents).

The final sample of 192 participants varied in age; 7.65% of participants were between 20-24 years old, 47.4% of participants were 25-34, 25% of participants were between 35-44, 18.22% of participants were between 45-64, and 1.56% of participants were 65 and older. The sample included an even number of women (N=94) and men (N=98) participants. The sample had 104 participants who had children and 88 who did not have children. There were 105 participants who had a traditional workweek and 87 participants who had a compressed workweek. There were no demographic differences found between participants who were excluded versus those who were included.

Procedure

The surveys created were uploaded onto SurveyMonkey. There were two surveys one for those who have a compressed workweek and one for those who have a traditional workweek. The link to complete the survey was then added to Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. To obtain participants there was a 50 cents incentive offered. Participants answered the series of questions. After successful completion of the survey participants were thanked for completing the survey and their payment was transferred to their Amazon account. To receive payment participants must have successfully answered the manipulation check questions entered into the questionnaire and be a qualified respondent.

Measures
Participants were given a short questionnaire that asked them general information and screener information such as: age, gender, if they are residents of the United States, if they commute to work, if they work full time, their current work schedule, if they are married, and if they have children under 18 living in their immediate household (Appendix A). This was to ensure that they were qualified to continue with the survey.

**Time with children.** If the participants answered that they have children in their immediate household they then answered a series of questions about their child or children. This measure was created to find out how much time participants spend with their child or children (Appendix B). Participants who worked a traditional work week were asked to answer for their typical work week/weekend, which was defined as working five eight hour days which allows them to have a two day weekend. Participants who worked a compressed work week were asked to answer for when their schedule allowed them to have an extended weekend, which was defined as having a three or four day weekend. The questions asked allowed for there to be multiple ways to operationalize time spent with children. Time spent with children can be calculated by taking the average of the following two questions, "For your children who don't attend school, how many hours in YOUR EXTENDED/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them?" and "For your children who do attend school, how many hours in YOUR EXTENDED WEEKEND/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them?" For this method to work the average was only taken for those who have both children in and out of school. A second way to look at time spent with children is
addition of the same questions. A third way is to look only at time spent with only the youngest child. The questionnaire had respondents answer a set of questions about each of their children one at a time. Respondents were to start with their youngest child and answer for every child they had. These questions allowed for better knowledge about that individual child. These questions asked questions such as that child's school schedule, how old the child is, how many days the child is in school for, and how much time is spent with this child. Time spent with the youngest child can easily be analyzed by looking at the question, "How many hours do you spend interacting with this child on YOUR WORK DAYS when you have an EXTENDED WEEKEND/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND?" This same method explained above could also be completed to find out the time spent with Child 2.

**Time with spouse.** To find out the time the participants are spending with their spouse they were asked five questions (Appendix C). Participants who worked a traditional work week were asked to answer for their typical work week/weekend, which was defined as working five eight hour days which allows them to have a two day weekend. Participants who worked a compressed work week were asked to answer for when their schedule allowed them to have an extended weekend, which was defined as having a three or four day weekend. Time spent with spouse was analyzed using, "On non-work days when YOU have an EXTENDED WEEKEND/ TRADITIONAL WEEKEND, how many total hours do you spend interacting with your spouse." Other questions asked in this section include: how many days the spouse is at work for and how many days the participants and their spouse are home during the work week together. The last
question asked how many hours on average in a week the participants spent with their family. Time spent with family was analyzed using the question, "How much time do you spend with your family on average in a week when YOU have an EXTENDED WEEKEND/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND?" For the purposes of this survey family was defined as their spouse and children if applicable.

**Depletion.** Level of depletion was measured by using ten questions from Reilly's (1982) role overload scale along with seven additional items that were created (Appendix D). Reilly's (1982) role overload scale was used because role overload and level of depletion were used interchangeably. The seven items that were created for this scale were questions that were positively scored items so that the scale did not only include negatively scored items. A factor analysis of these 17 items confirm that the newly 7 added items and the original items form a single factor. This scale contained 17 items that are measured with a 5-point Likert scale. Positive items were reverse coded before analysis so that higher scores indicate higher role overload and lower scores indicate less role overload. Participants were given this scale twice. First, they were asked to answer the questions for how they typically feel right when the workday is over. Second, they were asked to answer the questions for how they typically feel before the work week begins.

Participants who worked a traditional work week were asked to answer for their typical work week/weekend, which was defined as working five eight hour days which allows them to have a two day weekend. Participants who worked a compressed work week were asked to answer for when their schedule allowed them to have an extended
weekend, which was defined as having a three or four day weekend. Items were asked such as "There are too many demands on my time" and "I am full of energy." Two items from Reilly's (1982) scale were altered due to the wording of the question. Question 6 originally read "Sometimes I feel as if there are not enough hours in the day." For the purposes of this survey "sometimes" was deleted because the goal of this questionnaire was to know how the participants always feel. Question 8 originally read “I seem to have more commitments to overcome than some of the other wives I know." For the purposes of this survey wives was changed to wives/husbands, as both were included in this survey.

**Type of activity during commute.** To find if participants use their commute to replenish their resources or not, a scale was created (Appendix E). This scale contained 20 items that were measured with a 5-point Likert scale. The scale was recoded so that high scores indicate depleted resources and low scores indicate that resources are being replenished. Eight questions were designed to see if participants replenish their resources on their commute. Items are asked such as "On the commute home I let my mind wander" and "On the commute home I hardly even think about anything." Twelve items were designed to see if participants do not replenish their resources on their commute home. Items were asked such as “On the commute home I think about my work day" and "On the commute home I frequently make work calls."

**Work-family conflict.** To measure work-family conflict, a scale created by Stephens and Sommers (1996) was used (Appendix F). This scale contained 14 items that were measured with a 7-point Likert scale. Positive items were reverse coded
before analysis so that higher scores indicate more work-family conflict and lower scores indicate less work-family conflict. Participants who worked a traditional work week were asked to answer for their typical work week/weekend, which was defined as working five eight hour days which allows them to have a two day weekend. Participants who worked a compressed work week were asked to answer for when their schedule allowed them to have an extended weekend, which was defined as having a three or four day weekend. Items were asked such as "Because my work is so demanding, I am often irritable at home" and "My work keeps me from my family more than I would like." For the purposes of this survey any reference in the survey to children will be put in parentheses as some respondents will not have children.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alphas, and the correlation matrix for the variables used in this study can be seen in Table 1. All of the Cronbach's alphas can be seen in the diagonals. All of these values were high indicating that there was high internal consistency. The correlation matrix was examined to look for possible covariates that could affect the results in the study. Gender could be a covariate for the following variables: time spent with children on the weekend, \(r=0.37\) time spent with children not in school, \(r=0.34\) time spent with the youngest child, \(r=0.23\) and time spent with spouse \(r=0.16\).

Hypothesis tests

_Hypothesis 1:_ Employees' depletion after work will interact with one's parental status when relating to work-family conflict. Having post-work depletion will cause more work-family conflict for parents than non-parents.

Hypothesis 1 was analyzed using hierarchical regression. Variables included in the multiple regression were one's parental status (parent or non-parent), and one's depletion level after work. Together it was predicted that these variables will predict the
dependent variable, one's level of work-family conflict. For this hypothesis to be supported there must be a significant interaction between one's parental status and one's depletion level after work. This will cause parents to have greater work-family conflict than non-parents.

In Step 1 of the hierarchical regression both parental status and level of depletion after the workday were added into the model. The model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .49$, $p < .01$. It was found that parental status was non-significant, $p = .91$. Depletion after the workday was found to be significant, $p = < .01$. Level of depletion after the workday had a positive effect on work-family conflict as the Table 2 shows. By adding in the interaction term this did not significantly improve the model, $R^2 = .49$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $p = .76$. This means Hypothesis 1 is not supported. Table 2 shows the regression coefficients for the model.

**Hypothesis 2:** There will be a three way interaction between depletion after work, one's parental status, and one's use of replenishing during the commute to predict one's work-family conflict. For parents, there will be a two-way interaction between depletion after work and type of commute, such that when depletion after work is high parents who don't replenish on their commute will have more work-family conflict than parents who replenish on their commute. There will be no differences seen for parents with low depletion after work. For individuals who are non-parents a main effect will be seen for depletion after the workweek, such that when depletion after work is high no difference on level of work-family conflict will be found. There will be no effect found on work-family conflict for non-parents regardless of whether they replenish their resources during their commute or not.

Hypothesis 2 was analyzed similarly to Hypothesis 1. This analysis included use of recharging during the commute as an additional variable in the multiple regression. This analysis expected to find a three way interaction between depletion after work, one's parental status, and one's use of recharging during the commute to predict work-family
conflict. In Step 1 of the hierarchical regression parental status, type of activity during the commute, and level of depletion after the workday were added into the model. Model 1 was found to be significant, $R^2 = .50$, $p = < .01$. It was found that parental status, $p = .96$, and type of activity during the commute were non-significant, $p = .11$. Depletion after the workday was found to be significant, $p < .01$. Level of depletion after the workday had a positive effect on work-family conflict as Table 3 shows. Model 2 added in the three two-way interactions and this did not significantly improve the model, $R^2 = .51$, $p > .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $p = .25$. All three of the two-way interaction terms were found to be non-significant, $p > .05$, as Table 3 shows. Model 3 added in the three-way interaction between depletion after the work day, parental status, and activity during commute and this did not significantly improve the model, $R^2 = .51$, $p > .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $p = .50$. The three-way interaction term was found to be non-significant, $p = .50$. This means that Hypothesis 2 is not supported, as shown in Table 3 along with the regression coefficients for the model.

Hypothesis 3: Among parents, having a compressed workweek will lead to increased time spent with children. This will be moderated by the child’s status as a student (Figure 4). The relationship will be stronger for parents who have children not in school. A weaker relationship will be seen for parents who have children in school.

Before analysis all of the different ways variables could be measured were analyzed. There were multiple ways to operationalize time spent with children as previously discussed. This could be completed through addition or multiplication of the questions, "For your children who don't/do attend school, how many hours in YOUR EXTENDED/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them?" Another way
to look at time spent with children is to look only at the youngest child or the second youngest child.

To analyze child's status as a student this could be done multiple ways as well. The first way is to look at the number of kids each parent has in school. This was done by looking at the question, "How many children do you have who are in a school program (Preschool to high school)." The second method is by taking the percent of kids each parent has in school. This variable was calculated by taking the number of children in a school program divided by the total number of children that respondent had. A third way to analyze the data was to dummy code (0=not in school, 1=in school) and create a variable for whether the respondent’s children were in school or not. A fourth way was to look at only the youngest child's school schedule. For this method the youngest child's school status was dummy coded. If the child was in school the child was coded as 1 if the child was not in school the child was coded as 0.

All of these different combinations were analyzed. Only one of these ways will be explained for ease of explanation. Of the available options the way that was chosen was to look only at the youngest child. For this analysis child's school status was used as the predictor variable. This was done by dummy coding whether the youngest child was in school or not (0= not in school, 1 in school). The dependent variable of time spent with children was used by looking only at the time spent with the youngest child.

Step 1 of the hierarchical regression included gender as it could be a possible covariate. Gender was found to be significant, $R^2 = .05, p = .01$. Women were found to spend more time with children than men. Step 2 of the hierarchical regression included
work schedule and the youngest child's school schedule. This model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .15, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .10, p = .004$. The youngest child's school status was found to be non-significant, $p = .67$. Work schedule was found to be significant, $p < .01$. Work schedule had a positive effect on time spent with the youngest child as Table 4 shows. Greater time was spent with the child when the parent had a compressed workweek. Model 3 looked at the interaction between work schedule and child's school status and the interaction was found to be nearly significant, $R^2 = .19, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .04, p = .052$. Table 4 shows the regression coefficients for the model. Figure 6 shows that when parents have a compressed workweek they spend more time with their children if their children are not in school compared to when their children are in school. When parents have a traditional workweek they only spend a little more time with children in school compared to children not in school. Next, simple slopes were analyzed. The effect of work schedule was analyzed separately for children who were in school and those who were not in school. For children who were in school, work schedule had a non-significant positive effect, $R^2 = .02, p = .22$. For children who are not in school, work schedule had a significant positive effect, $R^2 = .19, p = .03$. This shows that when children are not in school parents with a compressed workweek spent significantly more time with their children. Additionally, the effect of child status was analyzed separately for individuals who had traditional versus compressed workweeks. For parents who had traditional workweeks, a non-significant positive effect was found, $R^2 = .01, p = .54$. In contrast, for parents who had compressed workweeks a significant negative effect was found, $R^2 = .08, p = .048$. This shows that parents with a compressed workweek spend
significantly more time with children who are not in school compared to children in school. This means that Hypothesis 3 is supported.

Hypothesis 4: *Increased time spent with children will lead to less depletion before the workweek.*

Hypothesis 4 was analyzed using a regression. The dependent variable entered into the regression is the level of depletion before the workweek. The predictor variable entered into the regression is the time spent with the children. The analysis also controlled for number of children the respondent had in Model 1, which was found to be non-significant, \( R^2 = .03, p = .15 \). The predictor variable entered into the regression is the time spent with the children. There were multiple ways to look at time spent with children. It could be analyzed by using addition, multiplication, or by looking only at the time spent with the youngest child. All three of these methods were analyzed and the results were all non-significant. For example, looking at the youngest child resulted in non-significant results, \( R^2 = .03, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .01, p = .25 \). This caused Hypothesis 4 to not be supported as Table 5 shows.

Hypothesis 5: *The effect of having a compressed workweek on depletion before the workweek is mediated by the time spent with children. This relationship is moderated by the child's status as a student.*

An analysis was completed for whether time spent with children mediates the relationship between work-schedule and depletion before the workweek by using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013). Through PROCESS it was also tested whether this relationship is moderated by the child’s status as a student. This method was analyzed using all of different methods that time spent with children and child school status can be analyzed. For example, when looking only at the youngest child it was found that the indirect
The effect found for this analysis was -.04. The 95% confidence interval ranged from -.33 to .41. PROCESS looked at the indirect effect at two levels of the moderator (child's status as student). The indirect effects found were .08 and .02. The confidence intervals for both of these indirect effects included 0. This indicates that there was not a significant indirect effect. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 6: The level of depletion before the workweek is related to one's work-family conflict.**

Hypothesis 6 was analyzed using a regression. The predictor variable included in the regression was the level of depletion before the workweek. The dependent variable entered into the regression was work-family conflict. The analysis was found to be significant, $R^2 = .49, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .00, p = .76$. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was supported. Level of depletion before the workday had a positive effect on work-family conflict which can be seen in Table 6.

**Hypothesis 7: The effect of time spent with kids on work-family conflict is mediated by the level of depletion before the workweek.**

An analysis was completed for whether the level of depletion before the workweek mediates the relationship between the effect of time spent with kids on work-family conflict by using PROCESS. This method was analyzed using all of different methods that time spent with children can be analyzed. For example, when looking at the youngest child it was found that the indirect effect found for this analysis was 0. The 95% confidence interval ranged from -.01 to .01. The confidence interval also included 0, indicating that there was not a significant indirect effect. This means that Hypothesis 7 was not supported.
Hypothesis 8: Having a compressed workweek will lead to increased time spent with one’s spouse. This will be moderated by the spouse’s employment status (Figure 5). The relationship will be stronger for employees who have an unemployed spouse. A weaker relationship will be seen for spouses who work.

Hypothesis 8 was tested by using a hierarchical regression. Predictor variables put into the analysis were the respondent’s work schedule (traditional or compressed workweek) and a dummy coded variable for whether the spouse were employed or not (0=unemployed 1=employed). The product term of these variables were also created. In this analysis how many days the spouse works was a control variable. The dependent variable being measured was the time spent with the spouse. Model 1 included the control variables gender and the number of days the spouse works (analyses performed without this covariate yielded similar results). Model 1 was found to be non-significant, $R^2 = .03$, $p = .10$. The number of days the spouse works was found to be non-significant, $p = .12$. Gender was found to be significant, $p = .01$. Women were found to send more time with their spouse than men. Model 2 includes both work schedule and spouse’s employment status. Model 2 was found to be non-significant, $R^2 = .04$, $p > .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p = .07$. Model 3 had a non-significant interaction between work schedule and spouse’s employment status, $R^2 = .04$, $p > .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $p = .43$. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. All regression coefficients can be found in Table 7.

Hypothesis 9: Increased time spent with one’s spouse will lead to less depletion before the work week.

Hypothesis 9 was tested by using a regression. The predictor variable put into the analysis was time spent with spouse. The dependent variable being measured was the level of depletion before the workweek. In this analysis how many days the spouse
works was a control variable and was put into Model 1. How many days the spouse works was found to be non-significant, $R^2 = .01 \ p = .46$. Model 2 included time spent with spouse and was found to be non-significant, $R^2 = .02, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .01, p = .24$. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was not supported. All regression coefficients can be found in Table 8.

Hypothesis 10: The effect of having a compressed workweek on depletion before the workweek is mediated by the time spent with the spouse. This relationship is moderated by the spouse’s employment status.

An analysis was completed for whether time spent with spouses mediates the relationship between work-schedule and level of depletion before the workweek by using PROCESS. Through PROCESS it was also tested whether this relationship is moderated by spouse's employment status. The indirect effect found for this analysis was -.05. The 95% confidence interval ranged from -.31 to .21. PROCESS looked at the indirect effect at two levels of the moderator (spouse's employment status). The indirect effects found were 0 and -.01. The confidence intervals for both of these indirect effects included 0. This indicates that there was not a significant indirect effect. Therefore, Hypothesis 10 was not supported.

Hypothesis 11: The effect of time spent with spouse on work-family conflict is mediated by the level of depletion before the workweek.

Hypothesis 11 was tested to see if the level of depletion before the workweek mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and time spent with spouse using PROCESS. The indirect effect found for this analysis was 0. The 95% confidence interval ranged from 0 to .01. The confidence interval also included 0, indicating that
there was not a significant indirect effect. This means that Hypothesis 11 was not supported.

_Hypothesis 12: Increased time spent with one's family will lead to decreased work-family conflict._

Hypothesis 12 was tested by using a regression. The predictor variable put into the analysis was time spent with family. Time spent with family was analyzed using the question," How much time do you spend with your family on average in a week when YOU have an EXTENDED WEEKEND/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND? The dependent variable being measured was work-family conflict. The analysis was found to be non-significant, $R^2 = .01, p = .19$. This means that Hypothesis 12 was not supported. All regression coefficients can be found in Table 9.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study helps contribute to the growing work-life balance literature (Gregory & Milner, 2009). This study examined the impact that role overload can have on different types of people which literature has overlooked. This study looked at many different factors such as: one's work schedule, the child's school status, the spouse's employment status, if the participant is a parent or a non parent, and activity during the commute. This study also looked at the participant's level of depletion before the work week and after the work day. Research before this study has treated people the same and has not looked at individual family differences. People were treated the same regardless of the different levels of depletion that they had throughout their day and their family's school and work schedule. Figure 7 shows the significant findings that were found in this study.

One of the significant findings this study found was that an employee's work schedule and the child's status as a student significantly predicts the time the employee is able to spend with the child. This study found that when parents have a compressed work week they are able to spend more time with their children who are not in school
compared to when their children are in school. Parents with a traditional work week spend similar time with their children no matter the child's school status. Previous research suggested that employees may experience role overload when they arrive home from work when they had a compressed work week due to depleted resources (Burke & Cooper, 2008; Matthews et al., 2013). This would cause employees to ignore family until they were able to replenish their resources (Burke & Cooper, 2008). Employees with a compressed workweek get at least an extra full day to replenish their resources. This allows them to have additional time to spend with their children as the study found. Parents are able to spend more time with children on their extended weekend because they can direct their full attention to their children. On their extended weekend they will be more relaxed and will not be preoccupied with work for an extra day like those with a traditional work week may be. Parents who have a compressed work week will spend less time commuting during the week, allowing them to have more time to be at home. Further, parents who work a compressed work week are able to spend more time with their children when their children are not in school compared to when their children are in school. As predicted this occurs because children who are not in school are more likely to be at home spending time with their parents. When children are in school they are unable to spend their extended weekend with them.

Another significant finding is that level of depletion after the work day significantly predicts one's work-family conflict. Similarly, this study also found that depletion before the workweek significantly predicts one's work-family conflict. Research has found that employees have lower resources available to engage in their
next role when their previous role causes strain (Fagnani & Letablier, 2004; Matthews et al., 2013). Previous research has also found that having depleted resources often results in work-family conflict (Matthews et al., 2013). This study clearly supported previous research by showing how level of depletion can predict work-family conflict.

A reason that the majority of the hypotheses may not have been supported is because it is unknown whether spending time with one's family is replenishing or depleting. It may vary case by case. Some parents do look forward to the moment that they get to drop off their children at day care or leave them with a babysitter. These employees may have depleted resources from spending time with their children and find having time away from their children as replenishing. Other parents may dread the moment they have to leave their children. These parents may have depleted resources from having to leave their children and find spending time with their children as a replenishing activity. From one's own experience it was assumed that increased time spent with family would result in less work-family conflict, but the opposite could be true. If employees have an extra day of off work that is spent completely to their self it may be even more replenishing. Lingard et al. (2008) found that workers who had a compressed work week were able to engage in more leisure activities. The leisure activities the employee engages in could be activities done by oneself instead of with one's family. Employees may be better able to replenish their resources by having alone time to recharge instead of spending time with their family. Having alone time will allow employees to not have to worry about their children or spouse. Employees will get to do whatever they choose and not have to consider what their spouse or children enjoy.
doing. This means that future researchers should examine what activities are replenishing for employees as increased time with one's family may not be replenishing as believed.

**Practical implications**

Employees have a stronger connection with an organization if they value their work-life balance. Previous research found that when a company had a strong commitment to work-life balance it allowed the employee to form a personal relationship with the organization (Sturman & Walsh, 2014). This can cause employees to have lower turnover intentions (Ryan et al., 2015). This could end up saving the company valuable money by not having to train new employees because an employee quit. This will allow companies to keep their employees satisfied within the organization and create a positive culture for their employees. An employer may be able to lower work-family conflict for their employees if they offer a replenishing resources activity before the start of their workweek and after the end of their workday. If employers allowed employees to engage in this type of activity employees would be able to start and end their workday with their resources replenished. They would then be able to be more productive on the job (Scandura & Lankau, 1997). A company could simply allow employees to stand up and stretch, sit in relaxation, or listen to music before and at the end of their shift for five minutes to unwind from their family life. This will allow for a separation of work and family time before they even begin their shift or their commute home.
Organizations need to talk to employees and understand how the company can improve their work-life balance. They can discuss possible nontraditional work schedules with the employees. They need to discuss what options are available such as working a compressed work week. This study found that employees who have a compressed work week are able to spend more time with their children when their children are not in school. Parents who have young children who are not yet in school may like the opportunity to try a compressed work week to see how it works for their lifestyle. Parents may see increased time spent with children which they have been trying to find. Employees would also value the company’s efforts in allowing them to pick a work schedule which is best for their own specific life (Burke & Cooper, 2008; Sullivan, 2014).

Limitations

Although this study tried to reduce any limitations that could have occurred, they still may be present. Limitations of this study could be that respondents could have seen no value in taking the survey seriously. The respondents may have rushed through the questions to finish the survey in a short amount of time. This could have caused the results to be non-significant when significant results should have been found. Participants may have underestimated or overestimated the time they spent with their spouse and children as they did not want to recall the information. To reduce this likelihood there were several attention check questions throughout the survey. Respondents who answered incorrectly to an answer check question did not earn
compensation and their results were not included in the data. A fair compensation of $.50 was also given to participants to try and reduce this limitation.

One possible limitation might be the fact that men and women reported spending different amounts of time with their spouses. Although this may indicate the possibility of over or underreporting on the basis of gender, it’s important to note that it is not necessarily a problem that the averages are not equal. That is, although one would expect an individual’s report to match that of the individual’s spouse, the participants in this study did not necessarily include members of the same couple. Therefore, it is possible that men who are employed spend different amounts of time with their spouses than women who are employed do. Another possible issue could be that there were 20 participants’ data that were excluded from the study due to failing an attention check question. Employees who have high levels of depletion may have been more likely to fail an attention check question. A main focus of this study was to see how depletion influenced work-family conflict. This means that depleted participants may have been excluded from the data. These employees may have been less motivated to follow the directions and pay attention to the questions. Further, employees with depleted resources would be less inclined to complete information for each individual child in the time spent with children questionnaire. Respondents with depleted resources may have skipped responding for more than one child as they saw it required them to complete additional questions. This issue could not be avoided as there was no way to identify whether the participants truly had depleted resources at the time of the survey or if they were simply not paying attention.
Having respondents think back to a time when they had a compressed work week that allowed them to have an extended weekend could have limitations on the results. Some participants may not have had an extended weekend for months. This may have caused them to make up their answers. This could allow for the result and the data to be incorrect. These employees may have overestimated or underestimated the time they spent with their children when they have a compressed workweek which allows them to have an extended weekend. To reduce this limitation participants were offered $.50 compensation. Offering compensation to participants allows participants to have an incentive and motivation to answer the questions as truthfully as possible.

Future research should look at those with a compressed work week for weeks at a time. By having a longitudinal study it would allow the researcher to see the changes week to week with their schedule and how it impacts their work-family conflict. This study only asked participants to answer when they had a schedule that allowed them to have an extended weekend. It did not ask when this schedule was. It also did not take into consideration that they could have this schedule months ago. Future researchers should request that participants have recently had an extended weekend. This would allow for the data to directly show their attitudes about the recent week of work they experienced.

Data were also collected all in one sitting from the participants. This required participants to recall parts of their day or week. Participants may have recalled this information incorrectly or were influenced by previous survey measures. Participants may have underestimated or overestimated their level of work-family conflict and the
depletion they feel at the end of their workday as they could have been fully replenished when they were taking the survey. To try and reduce this affect the work-family conflict scale was presented first. This was given before the role overload scale after their work day and before their work week begins scale to ensure that their feelings on these scales did not impact one another. Data should also be collected throughout the participant's work day. The data would be more reliable if it were collected directly before or after what it is measuring. For example, the participants would have to answer the survey right after the work day is over, directly following their shift. This would require participants in the study to agree to take the survey every day concurrent with their work schedule. This would allow research to truly know how the participants felt at each part of their work day. This would also reduce the likelihood that a previous survey measure influenced their results.

The timing of this study could have impacted the results. This study was completed right after the holiday season. This is a time when many employees may have had prolonged time off of work. These employees may just be getting back to their normal routine. The holiday season is also a stressful season for some employees as they have increased family obligations. This could have increased respondents’ work-family conflict. Also, some work activities could have been altered due to the holiday season. Some employees may experience increased workloads because other employees are out of the office. On the other hand, some employees may get to engage in non-normal work activities, like holiday parties. All of these reasons could have caused participants to answer differently than they would have at a different time of the
year. To try and reduce this effect the data were not collected during the holiday season and instead collected two weeks after the holiday season. This allowed participants to get back into their normal routines for a week before given the survey. Future researchers should replicate the survey during a non-holiday season. This will allow participants to be in their normal work routine. They would not be distracted by the holiday season. They would not have extended periods off of work disrupting their normal work schedule and routine. This will allow the researchers to find out if employees experienced increased work-family conflict during the holiday season.

Another limitation is that participants may have interpreted their time with their children and spouse differently than other participants. Some respondents with multiple children may have interpreted their time with their children as concurrent. These participants could have counted time being spent with both children at once. Other respondents may have only counted only individual time with each child. This same issue could have occurred for respondents who are married and have children. Some respondents may have counted concurrent time spent with their children and spouse, while others could have counted only individual time with each. Future researchers need to look at direct time employees are spending with their children. This survey lacked a proper question that asked parents how much time do they spend with all of their children. Instead, the survey had two separate questions asking for time spent with children in school and time spent with children not in school. Future researchers need to look at one variable addressing both of these questions together. This will allow for more accurate results.
Respondents were also not given any directions to what time spent with their spouse or children counted as. Respondents may have interpreted this differently. Some respondents may have counted any time that they around their child as interacting with them. Others may have only counted direct one on one time with their child. For example, some respondents may have counted attending an after school activity for their child as time spent interacting with them, where other respondents didn't. This could have caused respondents to underestimate or overestimate the amount of time they spend with their children and spouse. Future researchers need to have clear directions for participants on what counts as time spent with children and spouse.

Time spent with children had to be calculated using an average or addition of the following two questions, "For your children who don't attend school, how many hours in YOUR EXTENDED/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them?" and "For your children who do attend school, how many hours in YOUR EXTENDED WEEKEND/TRADITIONAL WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them?" This caused there to be two separation questions analyzed together instead of analyzing one direct question. This could have caused time spent with children to be calculated incorrectly as people may have answered differently to these two questions. Respondents may have overestimated or underestimated the time spent with their children who were not in school compared to their children in school. In the future researchers could have participants record time spent with each family member throughout the week to get a more reliable number. People may have responded differently if they were asked one direct question, such as "How many hours in YOUR EXTENDED WEEKEND/TRADITIONAL
WEEKEND do you spend interacting with your children?" To try and reduce this uncertainty time spent with children was also analyzed using the time spent with the youngest child. This method allowed for there to be no uncertainty in the question asked. This question also possesses limitations as it only asks about the youngest child and does not address other children.

Further the sample size used for this study was small. This could have caused non-significant findings. If the study was completed with a larger sample significant results may have been found. To ensure similar results are found this study should be duplicated with a larger sample size. In this data set the sample size was small when looking at different groups of parents who had children in school or not. This will ensure that there is high statistical power.

Another limitation includes the lack of causality in this study. This study does not make strong causal conclusions as no experiment was completed. The results obtained from this study were found from a self report survey. This could have caused participants to underestimate or overestimate the amount of depletion and work-family conflict they experience. Further, participants may have underestimated or overestimated the actual amount of time they spend with their children as they were not recording the actual time day to day. In the future researchers could have participants record time spent with each family member throughout the week and have respondents answer the surveys directly after the time period it relates to.

As another limitation, an argument could be made that the results are a statistical artifact. For instance, it may be possible that every employee may have the
same level of work-family conflict, but merely responded differently to the survey. Some employees may be motivated to suppress their awareness of their level of work-family conflict. Other employees may have no resources available to suppress their awareness of their level of work-family conflict. Future researchers should examine this possibility by completing an experiment that temporarily depletes resources. Further, this study did lack any social desirability scale. Social desirability responding could be relevant to the ability to exert self-regulatory resources. Participants who don't have depleted resources while taking the survey could have had the ability to regulate their responses according to social standards. Likewise, participants whose resources are depleted may not have had the resources to complete the survey honestly and instead answered for what they believed was socially desirable.

A final limitation is monomethod bias. The constructs measured in this study were only measured by surveys. This could have caused the constructs to not be measured correctly. Further, collecting data in the same method tends to inflate relations among variables. This could have caused participants to be susceptible to response sets. This could have caused a correlation to be seen between depletion after the workday and work-family conflict when one may not have existed. Depletion before the workweek and work-family conflict could have also been vulnerable to this effect. Future researchers should use a variety of different methods to measure the constructs. This will ensure that the constructs are measuring what they are intended to measure and relations among variables are not inflated.

Directions for future research
Researchers should continue to expand upon results found from this study. There are many things future researchers could do to further support the current findings. For example, researchers should ask participants about the length of their commute. Length of commute may be an important covariate that was not measured. The length of the commute may impact the ability of employees to recharge on their commute home. Employees who have longer commutes may be more likely to recharge on their commute. Employees with a shorter commute may not have enough time to recharge causing them to have more work-family conflict. This effect may have influenced participants differently as researchers have found that women have shorter commute times compared to men (Axiza, Scott, & Newbold, 2012; Plaut, 2006). Further, income of participants should be asked in future research. Income of participants can impact the length of one's commute. Researchers found that employees with higher incomes and those between the ages of 30 and 44 have the longest commute time (Axiza et al., 2012). This can be explained because parents want to raise their children in suburban areas, opposed to cities (Axiza et al., 2012).

Researchers in the future should also ask participants what their job title is. Research has shown that one's occupation can impact work-life balance (Allard et al., 2007). The stress and demands of the job are different for different occupations. For example, managerial jobs produce more stress on the employee and often cause the employee to spend extra time at work and less time at home, which increased work-family conflict (Allard et al., 2007; Peters et al., 2009). Participants in the study may have been from very different work environments that had different stress levels. For
example, commonly nurses, firefighters, and police work compressed work weeks. As a nurse, firefighter, or police officer there is no room for errors in their job as it can result in death. This causes their job to be very high stress. A participant who is a salesperson can mess up a sales opportunity and it is not a life and death situation. The person will have added stress from the situation, but not the same impact as causing a death to a patient by giving the patient the wrong drug dosage.

Researchers should also look at effect of other work schedules such as: flexible work hours and working from home. Flexible hours are continuing to increase and have grown in popularity between employers and employees (Beers, 2000). Flexible work schedules are when employees must work a certain amount of hours a pay period, but it doesn't matter how many hours they work a day (Beers, 2000). Peters et al. (2009) found that allowing employees to engage in flex time increased employees’ work-life balance. Another popular work schedule that should be looked at is telecommuting, also known as working from home. Working from home allows employees to have the flexibility and control of their work hours while also allowing them to balance their home life better (Peters et al., 2009). Future researchers should look at flexible work schedules and telecommuting in addition to traditional workweeks and compressed workweeks to understand what work schedule better allows employees to replenish depleted resources. Employees who work a flexible work schedule may be better able to replenish their resources than any other work schedule. This is because employees who work a flexible work schedule can work the hours that are best for their social life. These employees would be able to coordinate their work schedule around their family. For
example, these employees would be able to attend events for their child more easily than parents who have a set work schedule. It would be important to see which work schedule allows employees to have the highest work-life balance.

Future studies should also see the impact that being married has on level of depletion. This study only looked at employees who were married and therefore missed an important subgroup, single parents. Being a single parent is becoming more common in today's times (Robinson et al., 2014). As the number of single parent mothers who are trying to provide for their family continues to rise, understanding this group will become increasingly important. Employees who are not married and do have children may have the highest work-family conflict. These employees may never get the needed time to replenish their resources. These employees may have the most depletion as they are constantly worried about their child's needs. They would also not have a spouse to help them with household activities and caring for their children causing them to have even higher depleted resources.

Future researchers should find out what type of activities replenish participants’ resources. People may have different activities they like to do to replenish their resources. Some people may use exercise, where others may enjoy quiet alone time watching television, and some people may like engaging in activities with their family. This study did not find out what kind of activities allowed employees to replenish their resources. Some participants in this study may have replenished resources by spending increased time with their family where for others it may have caused even more depleted resources.
Conclusion

Although work-life balance has become a growing topic of interest, there is still much research to be done. There are many other factors that future research should consider when studying work-family conflict as demonstrated in this paper. It is hoped this paper will allow for future research on understanding work-family conflict to expand by including role overload as an overarching theory.
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### Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Family Conflict</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Depletion Before Workweek</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Type of Activity During Commute</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of Depletion After Work Day</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time with Family</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time with Spouse On Weekend</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time with Children in School On Weekend</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Time with Children Not in School On Weekend</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Time with Youngest Child</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Days Spouse Works</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Number of Children</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Spouse's Employment Status</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Child 1's School Status</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Work Schedule</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Parental Status</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gender</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Age</td>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level, p<.05

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level, p<.01

Note: Parental Status was coded as 0=Nonparents and 1=Parents
Work schedule was coded as 0=traditional workweek 1= compressed workweek
Youngest Child's school status was coded as 0=not in school and 1=in school
Spouse's employment status was coded as 0=unemployed and 1=employed
Gender was coded as 0=men and 1=women
Cronbach's alphas are found in the diagonals
Some values are blank when looking at parental status because these variables were only looking at participants who have children
Table 2 Results of Hierarchical Regression Predicting Work-Family Conflict (Hypothesis 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Depletion After The Workday</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Depletion After The Workday ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01.
Note: Parental Status was coded as 0=Nonparents and 1= Parents

Table 3 Results of Hierarchical Regression Predicting Work-Family Conflict (Hypothesis 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Activity During Commute</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Depletion After The Workday</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Depletion After The Workday ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Depletion After The Workday ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status × Type of Activity During Commute</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Depletion After The Workday ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status × Type of Activity During Commute</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01.
Note: Parental Status was coded as 0=Nonparents and 1= Parents

Table 4 Results of Hierarchical Regression Predicting Time Spent with Youngest Child (Hypothesis 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Schedule</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child's School Status</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Schedule × Youngest Child's School Status</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-12.86</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01.
Note: Gender was coded as 0=men and 1=women
Work schedule was coded as 0=traditional workweek 1= compressed workweek
Youngest child’s school status was coded as 0=not in school and 1=in school
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Table 5 Results of Regression Predicting Level of Depletion Before Workweek (Hypothesis 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent with Youngest Child</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 6 Results of Regression Predicting Work-Family Conflict (Hypothesis 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Depletion Before Workweek</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 7 Results of Hierarchical Regression Predicting Time Spent with Spouse (Hypothesis 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Spouse Works</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse’s Employment Status</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Schedule × Spouse’s Employment Status</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Note: Gender was coded as 0=men and 1=women
Work schedule was coded as 0=traditional workweek 1= compressed workweek
Spouse's employment status was coded as 0=unemployed and 1=employed

Table 8 Results of Regression Predicting Level of Depletion Before Workweek (Hypothesis 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Many Days the Spouse Works</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent with Spouse</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 9 Results of Regression Predicting Work-Family Conflict (Hypothesis 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent With Family</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
Figure 1

- Level of Depletion the After Work Day
- Parental Status
- Type of Activity During Commute
- Child's Status as a Student
- Time Spent With Children
- Compressed Workweek
- Spouse's Work Schedule
- Level of Depletion Before Workweek
- Time Spent With Spouse
- Work-Family Conflict
- Time Spent With Family
Figure 2 (Hypothesis 1)
Figure 3 (Hypothesis 2)
Figure 4 (Hypothesis 3)

Hypothesis 3

Time Spent With Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Work Week</th>
<th>Compressed Work Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children Not in School</td>
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</tr>
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Results for Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Spent With Youngest Child</th>
<th>Children Not in School</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Work Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A

General Information

Traditional Work Week Survey
This survey is restricted to individuals who are 18 and older, are a United States citizen, married, work full time, commute to work, and work a traditional work week (5, 8 hour days). You will only receive compensation if you meet these requirements. Please exit the survey by closing the browser now if you do not qualify. Thank you for your time.

1. What is your age in years (Please write the number such as 1 instead of writing the word "one") _____
2. What is your sex? (Male, Female)
3. Are you a resident of the United States? (Yes, No)
4. Do you commute to work? (Yes, No)
5. Are you currently employed full time? (Wok 35 or more hours a week) (Yes, No)
6. What type of work schedule do you work? (A Traditional work week can be defined as working 5, 8 hour days a week.) (Traditional, Other)
7. Are you married? (Yes, No)
8. Do you have children under 18 living in your immediate household? (Yes, No)

Compressed Work Week Survey

This survey is restricted to individuals who are 18 and older, married, work full time, commute to work, and work a compressed work week that allows you to sometimes have an extended weekend (a 3 day or 4 day weekend). You will only receive compensation if you meet these requirements. Please exit the survey by closing the browser now if you do not qualify. Thank you for your time.

1. What is your age in years (Please write the number such as 1 instead of writing the word "one") _____
2. What is your sex? (Male, Female)
3. Are you a resident of the United States? (Yes, No)
4. Do you commute to work? (Yes, No)
5. Are you currently employed full time? (Wok 35 or more hours a week) (Yes, No)
6. What type of work schedule do you work? (A compressed work week can be defined as working fewer days a week, but more hours on the days you do work. For example, a person could work 4, 10 hour days.) (Compressed, Other)
7. Does your compressed work schedule ever allow you to have an extended weekend (having 3 or 4 days off in a row)? (Yes/No)
8. How many days is your typical extended weekend? _____
9. Are you married? (Yes, No)
10. Do you have children under 18 living in your immediate household? (Yes, No)
Appendix B

Time with Children

Traditional Work Week Survey
1. How many total children do you have who have graduated high school and no longer live in your immediate household?
2. How many total children do you have who have graduated high school and live in your immediate household?
3. How many total children do you have who are under 18 living in your immediate household?
4. How many children do you have who are in a school program (Preschool to high school)?
5. How many children do you have who aren't in a school program (Preschool to high school)?

Below, you will be asked questions about your TYPICAL WORK WEEK/WEEKEND. This means working 5, 8 hour days which allows you to have a 2 day weekend.

1. For your children who don’t attend school, how many hours in YOUR TYPICAL WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
2. For your children who do attend school, how many hours in YOUR TYPICAL WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)

Starting with your youngest child please answer the following questions. Once you have completed this information for all of your children you may skip to the next section. If you have more than 6 children answer for your 6 youngest children.

Child One
1. How old is this child? (Please indicate this response in years. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
2. During a 7 day week (Sunday-Saturday) how many days is this child in school (preschool-high school) for?
3. During YOUR TYPICAL WEEKEND how many days is this child in school (preschool-high school) for?
4. How many hours do you spend interacting with this child on YOUR TYPICAL WEEKEND? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
5. How many hours do you spend interacting with this child on YOUR TYPICAL WORK DAYS? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)

Note: This was repeated for up to six children
Compressed Work Week Survey
1. How many total children do you have who have graduated high school and no longer live in your immediate household?
2. How many total children do you have who have graduated high school and live in your immediate household?
3. How many total children do you have who are under 18 living in your immediate household?
4. How many children do you have who are in a school program (Preschool to high school)?
5. How many children do you have who aren't in a school program (Preschool to high school)?

Below, you will be asked questions about your EXTENDED WORK WEEK/WEEKEND. This means having a schedule which allows you to have a 3 or 4 day weekend.

1. For your children who don't attend school, how many hours in YOUR EXTENDED WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
2. For your children who do attend school, how many hours in YOUR EXTENDED WEEKEND do you spend interacting with them? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)

Starting with your youngest child please answer the following questions. Once you have completed this information for all of your children you may skip to the next section. If you have more than 6 children answer for your 6 youngest children.

Child One

1. How old is this child? (Please indicate this response in years. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
2. During a 7 day week (Sunday-Saturday) how many days is this child in school (preschool-high school) for?
3. During YOUR EXTENDED WEEKEND how many days is this child in school (preschool-high school) for?
4. How many hours do you spend interacting with this child during YOUR EXTENDED WEEKEND? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
5. How many hours do you spend interacting with this child on YOUR WORK DAYS when you have an EXTENDED WEEKEND? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)

Note: This was repeated for up to six children
Appendix C

Time with Spouse

**Traditional Work Week Survey**

1. During a 7 day week (Sunday-Saturday) how many days is your spouse at work?
2. During a 7 day week (Sunday-Saturday) how many days are BOTH you and your spouse not at work when YOU have a TYPICAL work week?
3. On work days when YOU have a TYPICAL work week, how many total hours do you spend interacting with your spouse? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
4. On non-work days when YOU have a TYPICAL work week, how many total hours do you spend interacting with your spouse? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
5. How much time do you spend with your family on average in a week when YOU have a TYPICAL work week? (For the purposes of this survey family can be defined as your spouse and children if applicable. Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)

**Compressed Work Week Survey**

1. During a 7 day week (Sunday-Saturday) how many days is your spouse at work?
2. During a 7 day week (Sunday-Saturday) how many days are BOTH you and your spouse not at work when YOU have an EXTENDED WEEKEND?
3. On work days when YOU have an EXTENDED WEEKEND, how many total hours do you spend interacting with your spouse? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
4. On non-work days when YOU have an EXTENDED WEEKEND, how many total hours do you spend interacting with your spouse? (Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
5. How much time do you spend with your family on average in a week when YOU have an EXTENDED WEEKEND? (For the purposes of this survey family can be defined as your spouse and children if applicable. Please indicate this response in hours. Please indicate a number such as 1 instead of writing the word “one”)
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Appendix D

Reilly's (1982) role overload scale along with seven additional items that were created

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements for how YOU TYPICALLY FEEL BEFORE THE WORK WEEK BEGINS (after the weekend) when YOU have a work week which allows you to have a TYPICAL WEEKEND (2 day weekend).

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements for how YOU TYPICALLY FEEL BEFORE THE WORK WEEK BEGINS (after the weekend) when YOU have a work week which allows you to have an EXTENDED WEEKEND (3 or 4 day weekend).

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements for how YOU TYPICALLY FEEL RIGHT WHEN THE WORKDAY IS OVER (before your commute home). Please answer for how you typically feel when you have a work week which allows YOU to have a TYPICAL WEEKEND (2 day weekend).

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements for how YOU TYPICALLY FEEL RIGHT WHEN THE WORKDAY IS OVER (before your commute home). Please answer for how you typically feel when you have a work week which allows YOU to have an EXTENDED WEEKEND (3 or 4 day weekend).

1=strongly disagree
2=disagree
3=neither agree or disagree
4=agree
5=strongly agree

1. I have to do things which I don't really have the time and energy for.
2. There are too many demands on my time.
3. I need more hours in the day to do all the things which are expected of me.
4. I can't ever seem to get caught up.
5. I don't ever seem to have any time for myself.
6. I feel as if there are not enough hours in the day.
7. I seem to have to overextend myself in order to be able to finish everything I have to do.
8. I seem to have more commitments to overcome than some of the other wives/husbands I know.
9. I feel I have to do things hastily and maybe less carefully in order to get everything done.
10. I just can't find the energy in me to do all the things expected of me.
11. I know I have plenty of time in the day to get everything needed done.*
12. I feel well rested.*
13. I am eager for the rest of my day.*
15. I am full of energy.*
16. I am ready for the next task ahead of me.*
17. I feel like I have enough personal time.*
*Asterisks indicate a reverse scored item
Appendix E

Twenty item type of activity during commute scale that was created

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements for what is true on your TYPICAL COMMUTE HOME FROM WORK.

1=strongly disagree
2=disagree
3=neither agree or disagree
4=agree
5=strongly agree

On the commute home, I...
1. let my mind wander.*
2. let myself go.*
3. don't think about my work day.*
4. hardly even think about anything.*
5. let myself relax.*
6. sing along with the radio.*
7. don't think about how long it takes me to get home.*
8. feel in control.*
9. think about my work day.
10. worry about what my spouse (and kids) are doing.
11. think about the red lights I will get stopped at.
12. think about all of the tasks I have to do when I get home.
13. frequently make work calls.
14. think about how much time I am wasting.
15. worry about traffic accidents.
16. think about what I need to get done tomorrow at work.
17. think about all of the house work that needs to be done.
18. worry about work responsibilities I didn't get to today.
19. think of all the errands I need to do.
20. worry about there not being enough time in the day.
*Asterisks indicate a reverse scored item
Appendix F

Stephens and Sommers (1996) 14 items work-family conflict scale

For the purposes of this survey family can be defined as your spouse and children if applicable. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements for how YOU TYPICALLY FEEL when you have a work week which allows YOU to have an TYPICAL WEEKEND (2 day weekend).

For the purposes of this survey family can be defined as your spouse and children if applicable. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements for how YOU TYPICALLY FEEL when you have a work week which allows YOU to have an EXTENDED WEEKEND (3 or 4 day weekend).

1=strongly disagree
2=disagree
3=somewhat disagree
4=neither agree or disagree
5=somewhat agree
6= agree
7=strongly agree

1. My work keeps me from my family more than I would like.
2. My work takes up time that I feel I should spend with my family.
3. The time I must devote to my job does not keep me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.*
4. I generally seem to have enough time to fulfill my potential both in my career and as a spouse (and parent).*
5. I often feel the strain of attempting to balance my responsibilities at work and home.
6. Because my work is so demanding, I am often irritable at home.
7. The demands of my job make it difficult for me to maintain the kind of relationship with my spouse (and children) that I would like.
8. The tension of balancing my responsibilities at home and work often causes me to feel emotionally drained.
9. The problem-solving approaches I use in my job are effective in resolving problems at home.*
10. The things I do that make me effective at work also help me to be a better (parent and) spouse.*
11. What works for me at home seems to be effective at work as well, and vice versa.*
12. I am not able to act the same way at home as at work.
13. I act differently in responding to interpersonal problems at work than I do at home.
14. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.

*Asterisks indicate a reverse scored item