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ABSTRACT

Prior research has indicated that having work-life policies on the books may not be sufficient to address employee needs, as companies sometimes face an implementation gap. Given the need to go beyond policy adoption to understand specific challenges of implementation, the purpose of this study is to explore those factors that constitute an organizationally supportive context for the implementation of a specific work-life policy: reduced-load work arrangements. We draw on a sample of Human Resource managers from 46 North American companies that were early adopters of reduced-load work for professionals. We also identify two important organizational contextual factors that may contribute to the creation of a supportive environment for policy implementation. We found that organizational commitment to Human Resource management and, more specifically, to work-life management are related to the support for reduced-load work arrangements. Our findings demonstrate an interactive relationship between these two types of commitment, such that a dedication to effective human resource practices may help mitigate the impact of lower support for work-life issues. We discuss the implications for scholars, human resource managers, and organizational leaders.
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Beyond Policy Adoption:
Factors Influencing Organizational Support for Reduced-load Work Arrangements

Work-life policies (e.g., flextime, telework, reduced-load work) have become a commonplace feature in the portfolio of Human Resource offerings in the majority of organizations today (Matos & Galinsky, 2012). For instance, according to the 2012 National Study of Employers, 77% of U.S. companies allowed flextime options and 63% offered telework options for at least some of their employees (Matos & Galinsky, 2012). Several strategic reasons for the adoption of such policies have been noted including: compliance with legal regulations, enhanced employee commitment, ability to attract as well as retain a diverse workforce, being seen as an employer of choice, and fostering employee well-being (Kossek & Friede, 2006).

Despite the proliferation of these policies and their intended benefits, there is mounting evidence that having these policies on the books may not be sufficient to fully address employee and organizational needs. The organizational context in which these policies are offered may inhibit or enhance their effectiveness (Allen, 2001; Eaton, 2003; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness, 1999). Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to examine the relative and interactive effects of factors that may influence the supportiveness of an organizational context for implementing a work-life policy.

To explore this issue, we focus on a particular work-life policy: the reduced-load work arrangement (RLWA), which is important for advancing understanding of contextual influences on policy implementation (Kossek, Ollier-Malaterre, Lee, Pichler, & Hall, in press).
RLWAs are defined as a reduction in work load for a commensurate decrease in salary (Lee, MacDermid, Williams, Buck, & Leiba-O’Sullivan, 2002). In a sample of early-adopting organizations that all offer some form of RLWA, we investigate organizational support for policy usage. Thus, our sample can be viewed as employers who were trying to be innovative and rapidly respond to the changing labor market when the need to attract and retain women was becoming a major corporate issue in the past ten to fifteen years. We explore other features of the organizational environment that enhance or impede organizational support for use of RLWAs. The remainder of the chapter is organized as follows. First, we describe RLWAs in greater detail and discuss evidence regarding the effectiveness of RLWAs in meeting employee and organizational goals. In particular, we highlight several facets of organizational support for RLWAs. We then describe factors that are expected to influence organizational support for RLWAs. To support our arguments, we present an empirical study of 46 organizations that offer RLWAs and present our findings regarding those factors that contribute to support for RLWAs.

**Reduced-Load Work Arrangements**

Following Lee et al. (2002), we employ the term *reduced-load* to highlight the fact that not only are work hours reduced in this policy, but so are the total responsibilities assigned to that employee. However, terms such as *part-time* and *reduced-time* may also refer to instances when employees work less than full-time. RLWAs have been used by employees at all organizational-levels, including senior managers and high-level professionals (Lee et al., 2002). RLWAs may be negotiated on a short-term or long-term basis and users are often able to maintain full benefits for the
duration of their arrangement. According to the 2012 National Study of Employers, 41% of companies allow at least some employees to “move from full-time to part-time work and back again while remaining in the same position or level” (Matos & Galinsky, 2012; p. 14). Organizations vary in their approach to offering RLWAs. Some organizations reluctantly allow RLWAs under special circumstances to retain exceptional employees (i.e., an accommodation culture), whereas others embrace it as a new and valuable way of working (i.e., a transformation culture; Lee, MacDermid, & Buck, 2000).

RLWAs are unique from many other work-life policies because they actually change the amount of work completed, which is a critical form of preventing work-family conflict for professionals who often face rising workloads, work intensification, and overwork as their key challenges (Kossek, Valcour, & Lirio, 2014). This type of policy is distinct from other policies that only change when and where work is completed (e.g., telework, flextime), but maintain the same level of workload (Kossek et al., in press). As such, RLWAs are a particularly interesting policy to explore because they challenge the professional career cultures and talent management systems that are based on the hegemony of habitually placing career over personal life, where long hours are needed to advance the corporate ladder (Wharton & Blair-Loy, 2002). In essence, RLWAs are a key strategy for promoting a sustainable workforce as they allow employees to pursued career success while sustaining personal and family well-being (Hall, Lee, Kossek, & Las Heras, 2012).

Although it may seem counterintuitive for organizations to support RLWAs in times of global economic distress and increasing competition, such policies may help organizations recruit and retain top talent. In particular, the retention of older workers
and high talent women professionals (who might otherwise leave the workforce) may be enhanced through RLWAs (Kossek & Lee, 2008). RLWAs also can be an effective way to manage labor costs, use staff effectively, and motivate workers who want to not only have a career but devote time to other life interests from family life to volunteering, being involved in the community or church (Hall, Kossek, Briscoe, Pichler, & Lee, 2013).

Overall, additional research is warranted to improve our understanding of this relatively under-utilized career management practice.

**Effectiveness**

Research to empirically determine the effectiveness of work-life policies suffers from several shortcomings that make drawing conclusions about their effectiveness elusive (Kelly et al., 2008). For example, outcomes that scholars can use to define effectiveness can range from organizational-level return on investment (ROI) to individual-level work-family conflict or job satisfaction. Further, some studies explore the impact of policy availability, whereas others focus on policy usage (Kossek, 2005). Overall, research on the effectiveness of work-life policies is quite limited and, in the cases where evidence exists, the results are mixed (Ryan & Kossek, 2008).

With regard to RLWAs, more specifically, our ability to draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness of these policies is thwarted by the same limitations described above: varied definitions of effectiveness and variance in whether policy availability or use is the target of study. Further, researchers often study work-life policies in “bundles,” thus making it difficult to extract the unique effects of RLWAs (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000).
Evidence is growing that employees utilizing RLWAs are at least as effective as their full-load counterparts, particularly when managers and employees both benefit from the arrangement. For example, Kossek and colleagues (in press) have found that managers think employers benefit from RLWAs when used as a talent management tool with high performers, in conducive jobs and with employees who are flexible on using this form of flexibility, that is willing to give and take with the organization to ensure work gets done. Several other longitudinal studies of reduced-load employees, found that the majority experienced both personal and professional success as a result of their RLWA (Lee et al., 2006; Hall et al., 2013). The 2006 study showed that over one third of reduced-load participants had been promoted while working a reduced-load and another third of the sample was expected by their supervisors to be promoted within the year. Further, over 90% of the sample reported a positive impact of the RLWA on their children, felt more satisfied with their balance between work and life, and were happier (Lee et al. 2006). However, in a meta-analysis comparing full-time and part-time workers, Thorsteinson (2003) found no significant differences between these groups in terms of their job satisfaction, organizational commitment or intention to turn over. This lack of differences was true for both professional and non-professional employees (Thorsteinson, 2003).

**Supportive Context for RLWAs**

Despite these limited and mixed findings regarding the impact of work-life policies, there is ample evidence that they are more likely to be effective when implemented within a supportive organizational context (Allen, 2001; Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hansen, 2009; Kossek, Lewis,
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Hammer, 2010; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Thompson et al., 1999). In other words, when work-life policies are only offered to present a “family friendly” image of the organization, but are not offered in a context of support, they are less likely to be effective (Blair-loy & Wharton; 2002; Konrad & Linnehan, 1995). Effective implementation of RLWAs requires deep integration into the strategic and social fabric of organizational life.

Scholars have identified several factors that constitute a supportive context for the implementation of work-life policies (Allen, 2001; Kossek et al., 2010; Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011. First and foremost, a supportive organizational environment is inclusive and fair in its communication of work-life policies, access to policies, and negotiation of policies (Ryan & Kossek, 2008). Additionally, when organizations support the use of work-life policies, employees will not fear a career backlash for utilizing such policies (Eaton, 2003). In other words, when organizations support their work-life policies, employees can experience career development and promotion while utilizing them (Anderson et al., 2002; Eaton, 2003; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Thompson et al., 1999). Further, in a supportive context, leadership, Human Resource managers, and supervisors are all informed and aligned to support the use of work-life policies in the ways described above (Anderson et al., 2002; Kossek et al., 2011; Hammer et al., 2009; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999).

With regard to RLWAs, there is reason to expect that those factors that constitute a supportive context for work-life policies in general are important for the success of RLWAs. Note that Friede, Kossek, Lee, and MacDermid (2008) analyzed the HR manager perspective on the factors that are critical for the success of RLWAs. The HR
managers in the Friede et al. (2008) study cited the importance of several of the factors described above, including organizational communication, support from top leadership, and fairness in the negotiation and evaluation of the arrangement (Friede et al., 2008). Lirio, Lee, Williams, Haugen, & Kossek (2008) analyzed the managerial perspective on the factors impacting the success of RLWAs (using data from the same larger study as Friede et al., 2008). Their results highlight the importance of managers in the creation and maintenance of an inclusive and supportive organizational context for reduced-load workers. In some cases, managers played the role of “defending” employees against a broader, unsupportive organizational environment. A more recent study on RLWAs, Kossek and colleagues (in press) found that RLWAs were seen as more effective when the organizational context included strategic support from senior managers, low career penalties for utilizing arrangements, adaptive HR structures and systems to support policy usage, and relatively few organizational silos for access.

In sum, research does suggest that the effectiveness of work-life policies, and of RLWA specifically, is affected by the supportiveness of the organizational context. If organizations implement a work-life policy such as RLWA, they certainly would do so with the goal of having it as an effective practice. Thus, one may wonder why they might not have a supportive organizational environment for policy implementation. In the next section, we discuss what influences whether the organizational context is supportive.

Predictors of a Supportive Context for RLWAs

One of the main purposes of this chapter is to identify aspects of the organization that influence whether employers provide a supportive context for the implementation of RLWAs. Below, we discuss two critical organizational factors that are expected to
influence the degree of support for RLWAs: organizational commitment to human resource management (HRM), in general, and organizational commitment to work-life management (WLM), more specifically. These macro HR factors have had relatively limited empirical investigation, despite their obvious importance for implementation of new ways of working.

Organizational Commitment to HRM.

When organizations view their employees as a rare and valuable source of competitive advantage, they are more likely to be committed to the adoption of human resource management (HRM) practices that treat them as such (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). These high performance work practices include performance-based pay, team-based work design, training, and employee participation (Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Combs, Liu, Hall, & Ketchen, 2006; Huselid, Jackson, & Schuler, 1997). Such practices have been shown to have a positive impact on overall organizational performance, particularly when bundled together (Combs et al., 2006; Subramony, 2009). It is important to note that we define commitment to HRM as a strategically embedded commitment to the implementation of impactful human resource practices, as opposed to simply having the policies on the books for appearance or legal reasons.

Less is known about the relationship between an organization’s commitment to HRM and its approach to work-life policies (Batt & Valcour, 2003). A study by Berg, Kalleberg, and Appelbaum (2003) found that a commitment to HRM increased perceptions of work-family support among a pooled sample of workers in the steel, apparel, and medical electronics industries. Using national survey data collected in Britain, White, Hill, McGovern, Mills, and Smeaton (2003) found decreased negative
work-family spillover in organizations committed to HRM. In a sample of white-collar, dual-earner couples, Batt and Valcour (2003) found that autonomy in decision making (a “high performance” HRM practice) was significantly related to perceptions of work-family support. Given the strategic perspective underlying “high performance” HRM practices, we expect that organizations that place a high value on their employees would be more likely to provide a supportive environment for the use of RLWAs. Therefore, we propose that:

*Hypothesis 1.* Organizations that are more committed to human resource management will provide a more supportive context for reduced-load work arrangements.

**Organizational Commitment to Work-Life Management**

While most organizations claim a commitment to employee work-life balance, not all organizations are deeply committed to supporting the work-life needs of employees. Some organizations may simply have the policies *on the books* to provide an image of family friendliness, but there is no deeper strategic integration of work-life issues into the vision or culture of the organization. Therefore, we define organizational commitment to work-life management (WLM) as the extent to which the organization has a deep cultural and strategic commitment to meeting employee work-life needs. Similar to the previously discussed definition of commitment to HRM, this construct is differentiated from an organizational approach to WLM that offers work-life policies is name-only, but is not fully committed to their implementation. Implicit in our definition is the assumption that supporting employee work-life needs will benefit multiple constituencies, such as different employee groups as well as the organization (Kossek et al., in press; Kossek, 1989; Tsui & Milkovitch, 1987). In organizations with a high
commitment to WLM, work-life policies are treated as an important component of talent management and as a way to show that management places a high value on its workforce (cf. Lobel & Kossek, 1996; Kossek et al., 2010). We expect that such organizations will provide a more supportive context for the RLWAs that they offer.

_Hypothesis 2:_ Organizations that are more committed to work-life management will provide more supportive contexts for reduced-load work arrangements.

**Relationship between Factors Influencing Support for RLWAs**

Although we expect that when organizations are committed to HRM and, more specifically, to work-life management, they will offer a more supportive context for RLWAs, it is unclear whether commitment to HRM versus work-life management will differentially or interactively contribute to the creation of a supportive context for RLWAs. For example, a commitment to HRM may be more important for organizations without a strong record of commitment to work-life initiatives and practices in order to successfully implement any work-life policy. Alternatively, it is possible that a high commitment to WLM may be sufficient to create a supportive context for RLWAs, even in instances when the organization does not show a broader commitment to high performance HRM.

To investigate this issue in greater depth, we therefore propose the following two exploratory research questions.

*Research Question 1:* What is the relative impact of commitment to HRM and commitment to WLM on the extent to which organizations provide a supportive context for RLWAs?

*Research Question 2:* Is there an interaction between commitment to HRM and commitment to WLM in the extent to which organizations provide a supportive context for RLWAs?

**Method**
Procedure

Target organizations were identified by their representation in at least one of the following categories: previous participation in an Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Study on reduced-load work, recognition in the “2004 Working Mother” list, commendation by the National Association for Female Executives (NAFE), membership in the Boston College Work Family Roundtable, representation on the Michigan State University School of Labor & Industrial Relations Human Resources Advisory Board, or membership in the College and University and Work and Family Association group. A total of 108 organizations were contacted for participation in the study among which 56 (52%) attempted the survey. Some firms were not included in the final analyses if more than a third of their data were missing. All organizations with missing data were contacted several times by phone and e-mail to complete the survey. All participants were assured that the answers they provided would not be directly linked back to themselves or their organization.

Within each target organization, we identified a high-level HR manager to participate in our survey. HR managers were recruited by e-mail, phone, or post, often using multiple methods. We targeted upper-level HR managers for the survey, because they were expected to be more knowledgeable about their organization’s approach to WLM. They were invited to participate in a web-based survey about their organization’s employees, HRM practices, and work-life policies. The survey was administered via a secure web site. Survey instructions indicated that they should provide “an overall perspective of your company regarding how reduced-load (working less than full-time
and accordingly being paid less), and other related work-life policies are evolving and fit into your business and human resource environment.”

**Sample**

The final sample of organizations for this study consisted of 46 organizations from multiple sectors of the economy. About half (48%) of the organizations in our sample were professional service firms, but organizations from high-technology manufacturing (15%), consumer goods (13%), and durable manufacturing (13%), as well as government and non-profits (11%) were also represented. Organizations ranged in size from between 500-2,000 employees to more than 50,000 employees.

For each company, we contacted the individual who directly oversaw the work-life programs and practices or supervised these individuals and asked them to complete the survey. One HR manager from each company completed the survey. The vast majority of the respondents (75%) were at the HR manager level or higher. Approximately 40% of the respondents were managers, 22% were directors, 7% were vice presidents, and 7% were senior vice presidents or higher.

**Measures**

**Supportive context for RLWAs.** In order to measure supportive practices related to RLWAs, we created a scale that contained items representing the facets of organizational support described above (e.g., access to training and development, pay and promotion opportunities). The items for this scale are shown in the Appendix. Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements using a scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). An exploratory factor analysis using principal axis factoring was conducted to determine the latent factor
structure of the items. An examination of the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) and the factor loadings indicated that a single factor best described the underlying covariance structure. After removing one poorly performing item, this factor explained 40% of the variance in the data. Factor loadings ranged from .417 to .816. The estimated reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .83$.

Organizational commitment to HRM. We used an adapted form of the Huselid et al. (1997) scale to measure commitment to HRM. Respondents indicated the extent to which each of seven items described their organization using a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). All seven items reflect practices designed to enhance HRM. Higher scores indicate a greater organizational commitment to HRM. The reliability estimate for the current study is $\alpha = .81$.

Organizational commitment to WLM. To assess the extent to which the organization was committed to WLM, we developed a measure of the extent to which organizations integrated work-life practices and values into their overall vision and strategy based on our review of the literature described above (See Appendix). These items were measured on a five-point scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). An exploratory factor analysis using principal axis factoring was conducted to determine the dimensionality of these four items. Only the first factor had an Eigenvalue above 1.0; this factor explained a 59% of the variance in the data. Factor loadings ranged from .641 to .824. The estimated reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .84$.

Control variables. In light of prior research, we controlled for both organizational size and sector. Because organizational size has consistently been found to predict the adoption of innovative human resource management programs (Kochan,
McKersie & Chalykoff, 1986; Osterman, 1994) as well as the adoption of work-family programs (Goodstein, 1994; Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Milliken, Martins, & Morgan, 1998), we controlled for the potential confounding effects of size. Organizational size was measured by asking respondents how many full-time employees worked for their organization, using a five-point scale ranging from under 200-500 to greater than 50,000.

Because industry has been found to predict the extent of workplace innovation in organizations (Kochan et al., 1986), and has also been related to extent of work-family benefit adoption (Milliken et al., 1997; Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000), we also controlled for industry effects by dummy coding organizations as either manufacturing (coded as 1) or non-manufacturing (coded as 0).

An additional control variable was the total number of work-life policies offered by the organization. Because we were interested in strategic and cultural factors that impact support for RLWAs, we decided to control for the total number of policies on the books of the organization. The policies that were included in the measure were as follows: job-sharing, flextime, flexiplace, modified/compressed work week, company-sponsored dependent care (on or near site), dependent care referral services, paid personal or family care leave, maternity leave, paternity leave, lactation program, company-sponsored health and wellness program (on or near site), health and wellness referral services, continuing education, phased retirement, and adoption aid. RLWAs were not included in this index because all organizations in the sample offered this policy. This index is similar to the indices used by Konrad and Mangel (2000) and Osterman (1995). The work-life policies index (WLPI) was created by summing yes/no responses for each
The reliability estimate for this index was $\alpha = .73$, which is consistent with the alpha estimate of Osterman’s (1995) index, which was .75.

**Analyses**

Hypotheses were tested using hierarchical and moderated multiple regression. Hierarchical regression was used to explore the impact of commitment to HRM and WLM above and beyond the control variables. To facilitate understanding of the unique implications of these two variables, two hierarchical regressions were conducted in which the order of their entry into the regression was reversed. To investigate the interaction between commitment to HRM and WLM, we conducted a third hierarchical regression in which the two types of commitment were entered in Step 2 and the cross-product of the two variables was entered in Step 3. The interaction term was calculated as the cross-product of mean-centered variables (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Significant interactions are interpreted according to procedures described by Cohen and Cohen (1983).

**Results**

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of all variables are reported in Table 1. The zero-order correlation between commitment to HRM and commitment to WLM, while positive and significant, clearly indicates that separate constructs were being assessed ($r = .37$, $p < .05$). Relationships at the bivariate level indicate that the control variables had nonsignificant effects on the outcome variables. At the bivariate level, both commitment to HRM and commitment to WLM were significantly related to the supportive context for RLWAs ($p < .01$ for both). These results provide initial support for Hypothesis 1 and 2. Multiple regressions were used to further explore Hypotheses 1
and 2. As can be seen in Table 2 (Step 2), commitment to HRM explains an additional 16.5% of the variance ($p < .01$) in the supportive context for RLWAs above and beyond the effects of the control variables. This finding provides further evidence in support of Hypothesis 1. Similarly, in Table 3 (Step 2), commitment to WLM explains an additional 23.8% of the variance ($p < .01$) in supportive context for RLWAs above and beyond the control variables. These findings support Hypothesis 2.

**INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE**

To investigate the incremental and interactive influence of the two types of commitment (for HRM and WLM), we conducted additional analyses. To address Research Question 1, we included a third step in our hierarchical regressions (Tables 2 and 3). As can be seen in Step 3 of Table 2, commitment to WLM explains an incremental 14.6% of variance in the supportive context for RLWAs (above and beyond commitment to HRM; $p < .01$). In Table 3 (Step 3), we can see that commitment to HRM does not explain a significant amount of incremental variance above and beyond commitment to WLM.

**INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE**

**INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE**

In the analysis of Research Question 2, we explore the interactive effects of these two types of commitment. In Table 4 (Step 3), we add the interaction term of these two variables above and beyond their main effects. The interaction between commitment to HRM and WLM is significant in the prediction of a supportive context for RLWAs. The addition of the interaction term explains an additional 11.2% of the variance in this outcome ($p < .01$). Figure 1 displays the plot of the interaction term. The figure indicates
that when commitment to WLM is high, level of commitment to HRM does not impact the supportive context for RLWAs. It is only when commitment to WLM is low that the regression slope is noticeably positive. These findings indicate that a high commitment to HRM, in general, can essentially overcome a lower commitment to WLM in creating a supportive context for RLWAs. The least supportive context, not surprisingly, occurs when the organization has low commitment to both HRM and WLM.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the macro HR factors of commitment to human resource management and work-life strategy that impact the supportiveness of an organizational context for implementing a specific work-life policy that challenges work-life norms for professionals. This investigation is important because, while many organizations may offer work life flexibility policies such as RLWAs, organizations vary in the degree to which they support the use of the policy without penalty (Eaton, 2003; Lee et al., 2003). Existing research has shown that the context in which such policies are offered has a profound impact on their effectiveness both generally (Kelly et al., 2008) and specifically for RWLAs (Kossek et al., in press). Indeed, in our study, organizations offering a greater number of work-life policies were no more supportive of RLWAs than those that offer fewer such policies. This suggests that merely having lots of work-life policies on the books is a necessary but insufficient condition for organizational support of work life. Having policies on the books can be a sign of awareness of the recruitment and public relations value of work-life policies but not does not necessarily suggest that
working in alternative and diverse ways have gained acceptance “moving from the margins to the mainstream” of organizational life (Kossek et al., 2010).

We found that the overall organizational approach to HRM does impact the context for RLWAs. When organizations are committed to HRM as a valued organizational strategy, they are more likely to provide support for RLWAs. Perhaps this finding suggests that such firms are more likely to see talent as a resource in which to invest and take a longer term view to retaining and developing people. Those organizations that are dedicated to investing in human capital will be more likely to support their reduced-load workers. When organizations are committed to overall human resource management in their implementation of HR practices they are building a culture of commitment to supporting human capital that extends to their approach to alternative work arrangements.

We also found that a higher commitment to effectively managing employee work-life needs is related to a greater context of support for RLWAs. Again, our findings reinforce the important concept that offering work-life policies on the books is simply not enough to meet employee needs. When organizations are more deeply committed to work-life issues as part of their vision and strategic approach to managing the organization, they will be more likely to support their reduced-load employees.

We also explored the incremental and interactive impact of commitment to HRM and WLM. We found that being committed to WLM does explain incremental variance in supportive context for RLWAs above and beyond commitment to HRM. However, the reverse of this finding is not true. Commitment to HRM did not explain incremental variance above commitment to WLM. These differential findings suggest that an
organization’s approach to work-life issues may be more central to its support for RLWAs than the broader HRM approach is. In our moderation analyses, we found that when commitment to WLM was high, the organization’s commitment to HRM was not important in predicting support for RLWAs. However, when commitment to WLM was low, a broader commitment to HRM was valuable in creating a context of support. These findings suggest that a strategic commitment to employees as a key organizational resource is an important factor in supporting RWLAs. Although commitment to work-life issues is important, a broader culture that values employees may be just as impactful when it is absent.

There are some potential limitations to this study that deserve mention. First, the recruiting strategy was targeted at organizations that are known for offering RLWAs. Thus, the findings are constrained to organizations that already offer some degree of work-life support for employees. Within these organizations, we interviewed one manager per organization, who may have a unique perspective on the commitment of the organization to HRM or WLM. They may also be biased towards reporting greater levels of support for RLWAs, based on their role within the organization. Common method variance could also potentially inflate correlations between measures (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). However, our results do not indicate a pattern of extremely high inter-correlations among self-reported variables, relative to the reliability of the scales. This study was also conducted within North America and prior research has demonstrated cross-national differences with regard to work-life issues and the context of support for employees (Kossek & Ollier-Malaterre, 2013; Lyness & Judiesch,
Future research should explore whether our findings generalize in other cultures outside of North America.

**Implications for Future Research and Practice**

Despite these limitations, this research has important implications for both research and practice. For researchers, we want to highlight the importance of treating global organizational *support* for work-life policies as an important dependent variable in its own right. There have already been calls for researchers to differentiate between policy availability and use (Kossek, Baltes & Mathews, 2011), but these two outcomes still do not paint the full picture of policy implementation. It is important for scholars to further investigate the organizational factors such as the impact of commitment to HR and work-life policies that constitute a supportive context for the effective implementation of specific work-life practices such as RWLAs and cultures and structures that facilitate the creation of that context.

In the current study, we focus on an organization’s commitment to both HRM and WLM as predictors of this supportive context. Our findings highlight the importance of both of these variables and suggest that the underlying vision, values, and culture of an organization may play an important role in influencing the degree of support for work-life policies. We hope that other researchers continue to investigate the underlying strategic and cultural goals and values of organizations as predictors of policy support. Further, we hope that researchers move beyond the main effects of these variables to understand the complex interplay between vision, values, strategy, and culture in impacting support for work-life policies.
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It is also important to emphasize that our focus on RLWAs, a unique type of work-life policy is very important for advancing professionals careers and well-being, as RWLAs are unique in their reduction in actual workload, as opposed to just a change in the time or place of work completion. Utilization of RLWAs challenges traditional notions of what is considered a “good” or “valuable” worker. Thus, we believe that support for such arrangements may be more closely linked to the values of the organization regarding the fostering of a sustainable work force and the reduction of work-family conflict and promotion of employee well-being than other types of policies (Kossek et al., 2014) We suggest that future research include multiple types of work-life policies and investigates linkages to commitment to human resource management and investment in a work–life strategy. Additionally, a comparative study that explores factors influencing support and implementation for different types of policies across cross-national contexts would be valuable for advancing knowledge of how to address the work-family policy and practice implementation gap.

We believe that the results of this study will also be valuable to Human Resource Managers. By using support for RLWAs as our outcome (in lieu of policy availability), we hope to turn the attention of practitioners to the context in which work-life policies are offered and implemented. In essence, we hope practitioners will understand the importance of supporting reduced-load workers (or employees using other types of work-life policies). HR managers may also play an important role in educating both managers and employees about the importance of support for RLWAs. Overall, support for work-life policies does not begin or end when employees negotiate their policy usage. Instead,
all HR systems (e.g., promotion, training, recruiting) must adapt to the needs of employees using alternative work arrangements.

This study also has relevance for organizational leaders, those who play an important role in shaping the vision, values, and culture of their organization. Leaders will benefit from understanding how these “bigger picture” issues play out in the daily lives of employees. By creating an environment that is committed to HRM and WLM, they may increase the likelihood that employees will be supported when they utilize work-life policies. In order to truly support employee work-life needs, organizational leaders must “walk the talk.” Although many organizations pay lip service to work-life balance and employees as a valuable resource, not all organizations have such values deeply embedded in the way that they operate. Our results demonstrate the importance of moving beyond such “lip service” to a deeper cultural integration of valuing employees and their work-life needs.
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Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations and Inter-correlations for all Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Potential Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Industry</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. # of Employees</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. # of Work-Life Policies</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commit. to HRM</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commit. to WLM</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support for RLWAs</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. * p < .05 ** P < .01. Scale reliabilities in parentheses; SD = Standard Deviation; Commit. to HRM = Commitment to Human Resource Management; Commit. to WLM= Commitment to Work-Life Management; RLWA = Reduced-load Work Arrangement. For industry, 0 = non-manufacturing, 1 = manufacturing.
Table 2

*Incremental Impact of Commitment to Work-Life Management in Predicting Supportive Context for Reduced-load Work Arrangements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.411**</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Employees</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Work-Life Policies</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to HRM</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to WLM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th></th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th></th>
<th>F for ΔR²</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.143</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td></td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td>.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td></td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.583**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.509*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.977**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* *p < .05. **p < .01. HRM = Human Resource Management. WLM = Work-Life Management.
Table 3

**Incremental Impact of Commitment to Human Resource Management in Predicting Supportive Context for Reduced-load Work Arrangements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.411**</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>2.136**</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Employees</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Work-Life Policies</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to WLM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.144*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.509*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td></td>
<td>.170</td>
<td></td>
<td>.230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for ΔR²</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.027*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

*Interaction between Commitment to Human Resource and Work-Life Management in Predicting Supportive Context for Reduced-load Work Arrangements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.411**</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>-.8029*</td>
<td>3.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Employees</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Work-Life Policies</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to WLM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>2.784**</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>2.469**</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLM x HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.569*</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F                             | .143     |       | 3.509*   |       | 4.604**  |       |
| Adjusted R²                   | -.605    |       | .230     |       | .340     |       |
| ΔR²                           | .011     |       | .311**   |       | .112**   |       |
| F for ΔR²                     | .143     |       | 8.476**  |       | 7.157**  |       |

*Notes.* *p < .05. **p < .01. HRM = Human Resource Management. WLM = Work-Life Management. WLM x HRM = Interaction between commitment to WLM and commitment to HRM.
**Figure 1**

*Interaction between Commitment to HRM and WLM in Supportive Context for Reduced-Load Work Arrangements*

APPENDIX

New Measures Developed or Adapted for This Study

Organizational Commitment to Work-Life Management (WLM)

1. This organization is one of the best employers for people concerned about balancing work and life because of the great policies and programs it offers.
2. This organization is one of the best employers for people concerned about balancing work and life, because of the top management philosophy.
3. The human resource strategy developed by this organization includes consideration of employees’ work and life demands.
4. The business strategy of this organization explicitly incorporates strategy based on the value of employees.

Organizational Commitment to Human Resource Management (HRM)
Adapted from Huselid, M., Jackson, S.E., & Schuler, R.S. (1997).

1. Working in teams is a core part of the work environment in this organization.
2. This organization engages in quality improvement practices
3. This organization works towards employee empowerment
4. This organization engages in frequent diagnosis of strategic needs
5. This organization engages in talent development in order to achieve its business objectives
6. The HR policies of this organization are designed by individuals with a clear understanding of the strategic business objectives of the company
7. HR serves a supporting role in the implementation of strategic business decisions

Supportive Context for Reduced-Load Work Arrangements

1. The performance review process for those working reduced-load adjusts the criteria for evaluation in a fair manner, given the lesser hours of the individual
2. Training opportunities are less for those working on a —reduced-load basis, compared to other employees (R)
3. Career development opportunities are better for those employees not working on a reduced-load basis (R)
4. There are some opportunities to be hired into the organization from the outside in a reduced-load arrangement
5. Reduced-load work arrangements result in one being less likely to be chosen for special developmental assignments (R)
6. Assuming good performance, advancement opportunities for those working on reduced-load are as good as opportunities for those working full-time
7. Individuals working a reduced-load generally have to return to a full work load in order to receive a promotion (R)

(R) = Reverse-scored