Chapter 1
Introduction

The literature on the work-family interface is complex on several accounts, and not surprisingly, this interface has become a crucial area in organizational research. Family and work are the two most important domains of life for most of the working couples (Andrews and Withey, 1976). When conflict arises between these two domains, it has adverse consequences for both employees and organization. When conflict arises between these two domains, it has adverse consequences for both employees and organization. These juggling dual roles may prevent employees both married and unmarried to contribute optimally to the organization because of time pressure and increased levels of stress and emotional burnout. Inability to deal with the demands of the two domains, results in the form of higher attrition rates, reduced organization commitment and lower productivity. According to Herman and Gyllstrom (1977), married individuals experience more WFC than those who are unmarried. Single person tends to have more flexibility in the use of their time and energy, and they have lesser familial duties. Thus, they are less likely to face WFC. For those who are married, the employment status of their spouse is also a potentially important influence on FIW conflict. Greenhaus et al (1989) proposed that the number of hours worked per week by spouses was positively associated with conflict between work and family. Non-working spouses are usually the pillars of the family, and they assume most of the family responsibilities. This frees the employed partner to more fully concentrate on his/her work. In contrast, families with both partners working full-time (or part-time), employees face dual demands from work and family activities, resulting in increased levels of FIW conflict.

Definition of terms:

**Dual Career Couple (DCC):** DCC was originally discussed and the phrase coined by Rapport and Rapport (1969, 1971) they describe such a family as one where both heads of household pursue a professional career by choice and at the same time maintain a family together. Family was arbitrarily defined as involving at least a marital pair and one child living as a domestic unit (Cherpes, 1985). Consistent with the existence literature DCC will also be called as dual income couples regardless of organization type (Brett et al, 1992; Hall and Hall, 1979; Hammer et al, 1997).
Work Family Conflict (WFC): WFC occurs when demand of family and work are incompatible so that participation in either the family or work roles is more difficult because of participation in the other (Peralin 1989; Voydanoff, 1988). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) have offered the following definition of this conflict “Work-Family Conflict is a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible” (p.22).

Brief history of research on dual career couple’s work-life integration

An academic research paper linking work and family was published in 1965 by Rhona and Robert N. Rapport entitled work and family in contemporary society. Thereafter, in 1974 Robert Seidenberg made an observation that work could negatively impact family life in Corporate Wives- Corporate Causalities. In 1977 the first full scale review of work and family interactions titled Work and Family in the United States was published by Rosabeth Moss Kanter. Kanter argued that better balance would be achieved between people’s personal and professional lives if women became more active in work as well as at home (Kanter, 1977).

In 1997 a similar study entitled “Two Careers, One Marriage : Making it work in the workplace” was conducted by the Catalyst Career and Family Centre, addressing what workplace barriers dual career couple faces when they try to achieve professional as well as personal success and what employers can do to fulfil the needs of DCC. Furthermore, this study also tells what types of organisation support are required in the form of organisation family friendly programs and policies. In 1998 Business work-life study by the Families and Work Institute survey businesses on the work-life family friendly benefits being offered to DCC. It is one of the first and most comprehensive studies on DCC of how US organisation are replying to the Nation’s changing workforce, as more women has started entering the workforce. The findings gave an extensive exposure to the specific quality of work-life benefits offered by employers. It was also found that still many executives do not believe that these work-life benefits will help employees and their families while also found that still many executives do not believe that these work-life benefits will help employees and their families while also benefiting the company. Carter (1997) states “To function effectively in the workplace partners in the career couple must be able to negotiate a balance between the demands of work and family. So, family friendly policies make good business sense. Proactive Corporate Programs- including child and elder care, flexible benefits, job
sharing, part-time work, telecommuting, parental leave, personal time and employer assistance programs- all have reflected the change perspective of corporate interest and involvement” (p.22). Work and family emerges as a major reason for negative outcomes for work, family and individual to integrate their work and family in a more satisfying way. This integration results into bidirectional interference of WFC i.e. work to home and home to work. This bidirectional influence is mainly because of two careers i.e. of husband and wife in one family which results into more complex career development processes. However this complexity has increased particularly more in family with young children. Couples with young children are bounded with the responsibilities of raising the children, which leads to a greater need to coordinate work and family roles. Therefore, when DCC tries to raise their own career, they consult each other on issues such as relocations, promotions and transfers, sharing of household tasks and many more. Therefore this makes DCC to go for unique work-life arrangements style (O’Niel et al, 1987; Pixley Moen, 2003). DCC who experience conflict between work and family faces higher level of work exhaustion leading to tension between work and family domains. Furthermore, this exhaustion leads to emotional drainage and depletion of physical energy level. We contend that this blurring boundary between work and family should become more tangible in the eyes of today’s HR professional and corporate houses.

Researchers has also begun to recognize the bidirectional nature of WFC i.e. work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with family (FIW) (Duxbury, Higgins & Mills, 1992; Frone et al 1992; Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991). Consistent with the above findings, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) gave three forms of WFC (a) time-base conflict (b) strain-based conflict, and (c) behaviour based conflict. Time based conflict occurs when time devoted to one role makes it difficult to participate in another role. Strain-based conflict suggests that strain experienced in one role intrudes into and interferes with participation in another role. In 1991, Gutek et al also mentioned two directions of WFC with each of these three forms. When two directions WIF and FIW are combined with three forms i.e. time based conflict, strain-based conflict and behaviour based conflict resulting into six dimensions (1) time-based WIF (2) time-based FIW (3) strain based WIF (4) strain based FIW (5) behaviour based WIF (6) behaviour based FIW. Multiple threads of evidence consistently indicate that work-family spill over appears to be in every DCC daily routine.
Current theories of WFC

There are several theories associated with WFC interplay: rational view, spillover, compensation, instrumental, segmentation and conflict.

Rational view

According to the rational view, WFC increase as the number of hours spent working in either domain increases. Due to long working hours, extensive time commitments in either domain detracts from time spent in the other domain. This causes WFC. Therefore, according to rational view, the work and family domains are always unbalanced and are more likely to be in conflicts. According to Duxbury et al (1994), the central view point of the rational view theory is that as the time constraint is the biggest factor for WFC, there is not enough time to fulfil all obligations from each domain. Also, Greenhaus, Bedeian and Massholder (1987) found that extensive time commitment causes increased levels of WFC.

Spillover theory

According to spillover explanation it may refers that the impact of satisfaction and affect from family domain has a direct impact on the work domain. Accordingly the impact between the two domains can be positive or negative. Positive spillover refers to situations in which the satisfaction, energy, and sense of accomplishments coming from work domain carry over to non work domain. Conversely, negative spillover refers to the problems, fatigue, or frustration carry over from the work domain to the non work domain (Bartolome & Evans, 1980). Zedeck and Mosier (1990) has conceptualise spillover in a similar manner. They asserted the increased satisfaction (dissatisfaction) in the work domain results to increased satisfaction (dissatisfaction) with family life. Therefore, spillover is likely to increase roll conflict, when an bidirectional relationship of WFC occurs in the work and family domains. This is due to the difficulty associated with the effort of trying to satisfy family domain responsibilities when dissatisfaction from work domain continues to interrupt. However, according to Bruke (1986), all affects and attitudes from work domain impact affects and attitudes in family life.


**Compensation**

This theory also asserts a reciprocal relationship between the work and family domains. Specifically the relationship between work and family domains is one in which individuals make various investments to each domain. Each domain compensates for what is missing in other domain, and individuals use the two domains (work and non-work) to balance experiences and make life more meaningful and rewarding (Zedeck and Mosier, 1990). For e.g. Bruke (1986) stated that individuals with an unsatisfactory affect from work domains rely on their family life to raise their feelings of fulfilsments. According to compensation theory, if individuals are unable to balance between efforts in the two domains, conflict between work and family occurs. For e.g. if individuals are satisfied with their family life and not satisfied in work domain, compensation theory suggest that they will spend more time with family for developing this domain. Clearly the central premises of this theory are reciprocity (between each domain), limited resources and balance (between each domain).

**Instrumental**

This is also a completely pragmatic theory and central premise of WFC according to instrumental theory is balance between work and family domains. This theory argues that one domain enables the success and existence of the others for e.g money earned from working outside family life enables individuals support to their family domains. According to Bruke (1986) work provides the means by which a successful family life is possible where as family provides the means to maintain a rewarding and successful career. Therefore according to instrumental theory WFC occurs when more time and energy are spend in required domain, resulting in neglect of the reward domain. Typically, work domain taken as required domain and family is considered as reward domain. For e.g the individuals spends an inordinate amount of time in required domain (work) and neglect the reward domain (family), and vice a versa, the individual will perceive inference from work to family.

**Segmentation**

According to this theory individual can compartmentalize each aspects of their lives, such that one domain does not impose on others. It is impose that WFC levels can be alleviated by compartmentalizing each domain of their lives. Therefore, according to Bruke (1986) each domain operates independently and separately such that satisfaction can be derived from both
the domains. Lobel (1991) also mentioned that if the work and life domains are not operated independently physically, temporally or psychologically, individuals attain high level of work life conflicts. In addition, segmentation theory suggest that compartmentalization of one’s life is a successful strategy for averting WFC in the long run. The central premises of this theory are reciprocity and balance. Specifically, segmentation theory suggests that the relationship between work and family life domains is not reciprocal. In addition, WFC is the result of individuals in ability to balance work and family domains as two separate domains, which foretells that any affects from one domain will not impinge on the other domain.

**Conflict theory**

Conflict theory explains the work and family interchange relationships and that there is a limited amount of available resources. For the success in one domain, energy, time, and attention are the necessary resources required. Thus in conflict theory, success in one domain leads to lack of resources in another domain. Satisfaction in one domain leads to dissatisfaction in another domain. According to Abramis (1994) factors leading to WFC include interrole conflict, role overload and role ambiguity. Interrole conflict is a main concern for DCC, since the conflict between the work role and home role has direct impact on various life relationships. In contrast Kand et al (1985) revealed from his study that individuals participations in more than one role, they gain perspective each role relative to other roles i.e. stress or conflict generated by any role is modified by the participations in other roles. It has theorized by Beutell and Greenhaus (1982) that as individuals progress in an organisation, they start resolving WFC which was a problem for them earlier. Further, this enables the individuals at higher level of organisations to resolve conflicts even more effectively than individuals at lower level of organisation, therefore, according to conflict theory WFC escalates high when individuals have limited resources (time, energy, and attention). Consequently conflict theory is considered to be one of the best explanations of WFC. Therefore above WFC theories confirms that WFC occurs more frequently when DCC have to much to handle either domain.

1.1 Work life challenges faced by dual career couple

When conflict between work and non work domains occurs there are adverse consequences for both individuals and organisations. Thus, DCC are playing more dynamic and pivotal role in meeting work life challenges faced by them in various corporate sectors. However these work life challenges requires and understanding of all the variables that trigger WFC.
Conflicts originating in the work domain may impinge on the family such as long working hours prevents the performance of domestic tasks. Similarly, those stemming from the family domain may have negative organisational consequences, such as care of sick child or elders in the family prevent attendance at work. According to Heraty Noreen, Morley J. Michael, Cleveland N. Jeanette, (2008) two separate forms of work-family conflict - work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW) have negative impact on organisation, family and personal outcomes. At individual level the problematic issues arising out are tensions between work and family, stress, reduced well-being and life satisfaction and dissatisfaction and disturbed psychological activities. At organisational level, critical issues emerging are negative organisational commitment, negative job performance and job attitude, absenteeism and turnover. At societal level, concerns relate to dumping of social and community activities, family disruption and reduced social citizenship. Specifically there are too many obstacles and hurdles DCC have to face when it comes to balancing the both phases- work and family. In addition, these challenges are even more catalyzed when work demand and family demand coincides due to non-supportive society and organisation. Frone et al (1997b) has defined long working hours as when employee is at work for more hours and less time for home activities. In addition, receiving conflicting direction from working environment may affect employee work activities and be perceived as work demand. Some of the basic reason of conflicting directions in works activities in the family domain. This leads to role overload which makes impossible task for DCC to perform roles adequately or comfortably (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). Work overload leads to increasing experience of negative emotions, fatigue, tension, lower level of energy and reduced mental health (Cooper and Hensman, 1985). These symptoms further leads to increasing work-life challenges faced by DCC. Furthermore, these detrimental work outcomes such as lower performance, burnout, increased turnover and adverse health effects (Carson, R. L., Baumgartner, J. J., Mathews, R. A., & Tsouloupas, C. N., 2010; Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S., 2003; Demerouti and Bakker, 2006; Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P., 2001; Moore 2000a; Shirom 2011; Swider and Zimmerman, 2010; Taris 2006) are the dramatic trends in corporate sector. The mixing of work and home domains results into workload and emotional exhaustion. Working couples often feel emotionally drained off when coming back to home after work. Work exhaustion is a growing concern for many professional level employees, who are working long hours and excessively breaking their work energy threshold level. Hence unable to meet the required job demands ( Moore 2000a, b; Hobfoll, 1989; Lee and Ashforth, 1996; Wright and
Cropanzo, 1998). In addition, many researchers have previously linked work exhaustion to an array of negative outcomes such as increased absenteeism, turnover, physical illness, reduced satisfaction, and lower job performance (Carson et al 2010; Cropanzo et al 2003; Demerouti and Bakker, 2006; Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P., 2001; Moore 2000a; Parker and Kulik, 1995; Shirom 2011). According to Hobfoll 1988, 1989 individuals strive to retain, protect and build resources such as energy and time. However, individuals prone to increased work overload, are likely to be draining off their emotional and physical energy. These increasing demands in the work domains that interfere with family obligations are more apt to psychological and physical drainage. Thus, WFC is a common problem and results in negative outcomes such as absenteeism at work, higher turnover ratio, mental and physical fatigue. Thus work overload, has been reported to be positively related to WIF and FIW. This entails constantly working under time pressures, decreased sociable hours and working overtime. Therefore, managing multiple roles, such as employee, spouse and parents makes difficult for DCC to segregate personal and social life from highly involved work commitment. This relates the workaholism to WFC or spillover. Spillover, or WFC is a within person across domains transmissions of demands and stress from one domain to another. Indeed, Bakker et al (2009) revealed that the spillover-crossover of workaholism from one partner to the other, and relationship satisfaction comes through the experience of WFC and reduced social support provided by the partner. More specifically, participation in one (work) domain negatively impacts participation in another (home) domain, is known as “work-family negative spillover” is often referred as work-family conflict (form of interrole conflict. From this perspective, various findings confirm that DCC faces conflicting demands from two domains in either directions (W→F and F→W) such as psychological distress, higher level of exhaustion (Kyoko Shimada, Akihito Shimazu, Arnold Bakker, Evangelia & Norito Kawakami, 2010). A later study by Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J., 2000 and Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, revealed that strain based home-work interference (HWI) interferes with the work domain. They also revealed that work pressure, job and life dissatisfaction, life distress and poor physical health are the casual predictors of work-life challenges faced by DCC overtime. Sonnentags (2001) also revealed various problems and reasons why DCC feel strained off. Employees who work during their evening off-hours reported higher strain before going to sleep. In contrast those of whom were engaged in social or physical (sport), or low effort (watching television) activities reported less strain. Due to increased job strain, DCC fatigue and sleep deficit level increases, the duration and number of lapses of attention also increased (Ohslund, Dalton, Reams, Rose & Oswald, 1991).
Zhang, Jianwei., Liu Yuxin.(2011) also revealed in their studies the influence of various work variables in WFC such as work character, work/job stress, family friendly programs and highly committed work system. Work-stress is closely related to WFC. It’s closely related to role conflict, role vagueness, role strain and other dimensions (Grzywacz, J.G., & Marks, N.F., 2000). Through the researchers, they have noticed that employees who are more devoted to work role, the greater possibility is that he may bring work problems back home, and the bigger of WFC (Tenbrunsel, A. E., Brett, J. M., Maoz, E., & Stroh, L. K., 1995). In other words, family life is sacrificed due to high devotion into work. Wfc results in both negative behavioural and attitudinal organisational outcomes. WFC and role strain are associated with organisational outcomes as lowered job satisfaction (Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., & Conley, S., 1991; Bruke , 1988; Thomas and Ganster, 1995; Wiley, 1987), reduced job involvement (Wiley, 1987), lowered organisational commitment (Wiley, 1987; Bruke , 1988; Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S. and McMurrian, R. ,1996), higher intentions to leave organisation (Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R. ,1999), and higher absenteeism (Chapman, N. J., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Neal, M. B.,1994; Thomas and Ganster, 1995). All the above mentioned antecedents of poor work-life integration lead to overlapping of thoughts which creates distraction and product of poor role quality. However, Moorehead (2001) argued that this overlap is a relatively positive one and is called as “synchronizing work and family”. Theory and evidence also reflects that individuals who face high level of psychological strain and high levels of role ambiguity (Bromet, Dew & Parkinson, 1990; Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1992 (a)). Multiple threads of evidence consistently indicate that couples working in companies that downsized many employees and prioritize work above all, those DCC face more complaints about workplace inflexibility and heightened WFC. Another study extremely pertinent to the current research investigated the similar association of WFC with a number of job related stress variables such as work alienation (Bruke , 1988), quality of work life ( Duxbury and Higgins , 1994; Higgins and Duxbury, 1992), negative feelings and mood at work (Kiltzman, House, Israel & Mero, 1990; Stewart & Barling, 1996), job stress (Judge et al 1994), and burnout (Arye, 1992; Bacharach et al 1991; Bruke , 1988; Netemeyer et al 1996). Among WFC and the relationship to a myriad of stress related outcome, the strongest association were also found to be between WFC and work-related stress. Perhaps DCC who go through such type of stress prevailing in work environment confronts work to home conflict as well as home to work conflict.
For family role characteristics impacting family demand, several variables are considered. Time spent in family for caring child and other family members (Carlson and Perrewe, 1999; Frone et al 1997(b); Gutek et al, 1991; Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y.S. and Godshalk, V.M., 1996) have a significant effect on FIW. Further it has been argued that an increase in work demand may lead work to interfere with family (Carlson and Kacmar, 2000). Demerouti, E., Geurts, S. A. E., & Kompier, M. A. J. (2004) also reported that FWI was associated with both fatigue and health complaints and showed a more consistent negative relationships with well-being and satisfaction in contrast to WFI. It was also found that most of the WFC problems of DCCs solely comes from the woman’s perspective (Barnett and Hyde, 2001). Highly educated and career oriented female employees are finding it impossible to meet the needs of their organisation while starting and raising families (Bruke, 2003). The problems get even more complex when couples decide to raise children. Greeenhaus and Beutell (1985) also mentioned that as the actual hours spent at work increase, less time is available for family activities. In similar veins, couples who have less autonomy and control over their work activities, carry their work pressures and tension to home thereby increasing the degree of interference from work to family (Voydanoff, 1988). Continuous interference of work in family domain has become strenuous resulting in WFC. Similarly based on Cinnamon’s (2007) study, he argues that work has more deleterious impact on family life than vice-versa. Findings from the past studies provided evidences that the “absorptiveness” of jobs and one’s emotional involvement in one’s (spouse) job represents a continuous intrusion of work into the family domain. However, certain social role also affects the working life of DCC. For instance, one can be thinking about family issues at work (sick child at home), due to which they are not able to concentrate on job tasks. All these problems in family domain make it impossible for employees to perform job well excessive work/work overload has become a common process in many organisation cultures and is actually applauded by societies rather than recognized as an addiction like behaviour with bad consequences (Porter, 1996). It was also suggested that workaholism is associated with one’s partners’ well being. Because of lack of time and resources to be devoted to family life, FWC heightens even more. This leads to crossover of stress from family domain to work domain, which includes job demand factors which influence the crossover process (Westman 2001, 2006). Bakker et al (2009) also revealed that spillover-crossover process effects the relationship and quality of work life and reduced social support from partner. Further, it was concluded that FWC may lead to higher job and emotional demands, which in turn lead to WFC and social undermining. WFC influences FWC repeatedly and FWC influences WFC. This leads to social undermining and
increased in partner’s expectation in home demands. Therefore FWC brings multiple challenges for employed parents in balancing work and family demands. Several studies reveal a relationship between demanding aspects of family life such as childcare at home (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), parental work overload (Aryee, Srinivas & Tan, 2005), emotional tension or distress with family or partner (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), and spending time with family as a high demand (Demerouti, Guerts & Kompier, 2004; Frone et al 1997; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Voydanoff, 2004). From this perspective, general aspect of non-work life that may interfere with work behaviour include family obligations, child and elder care, conflict with family members, non-work hassles (Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. ,2005; Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R., & Wethington, E.,1989).experiencing high HWI suggests that employees who faces negative situations at home are mentally preoccupied when they are at work (Tetrick, L. E., Miles, R. L., Marcil, L., & Van Dosen, C. M., 1994). This has a direct impact on job performance and on well being of an employee. Adams and Jex (1999) revealed in one of their studies that controllability of working hours can predict FIW. This research indicated that working hours planning can be proceeded so as to avoid the rebound of family demand and FIW. However, due to increasing role pressure and role ambiguity, this infiltration to life boundary makes hard for employees to separate family from work (Olson-Buchanan, J., & Boswell, W., 2006). According to Parasuraman S. & Simmers C.A. (2001) have the following high HIW characteristics: high involvement into family affairs, much time demand from family, little support from family and spouse, tensed relationships etc. High level family demand makes DCC spend more time on family affairs, which causes spillover of related work stress to work domain and thus increasing FIW. Childcare responsibility is another important factor of FIW. DCC with more than one child (Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R.,1999) and child’s age plays an important role in FIW. Children and infants need more attention, time and energy of their parents (Bedeian, A. G., Burke, B. G., & Moffett, R. G., 1988). Definitely speaking, employed parents with 0-12 years old childcare has highest WIF and FIW. The challenges in integrating work and family are not only individuals problem bit couples’ corporate problem. Therefore extensive care-giving responsibility and intensive involvement with family responsibilities limits DCC career choices and creates negative influences on our work attitudes, behaviours and outcomes. Carlson, D.S. and Kacmar, K.M. (2000), also gave the similar findings that employees who were more involved in the family domain experienced more FIW. Thus, DCC who are trying to manage the demands of their work domain, are constantly struggling to create quality time for their children. The pressure of work impinges
on family and social life, leading to time squeeze relating to the commitment between work and family life. To improve the work-life balance of DCC we have to look at the other factors, such as employers roles and responsibility towards DCC, employer’s sensitivity, a change in workplace culture for DCC and changing workplace practices for DCC to make them compatible with the family and social life. Not, only this but also various coping strategies have also been adopted by DCC to face integrate work-life challenges from both the domains.

1.2 Coping strategies adopted by DCC to face work-life challenges.

Had identified the major perceived causes of WFC, multiple researchers have proposed various coping strategies adopted by DCC. According to Hofstede, G. (1984) coping has been described as the active utilization of personal and societal resources in response to stress and strain. In order to reduce stress and strain from one’s life, social support has been found to benefit DCC in threefold: social support reduces strain, reduce the intensity of the stressor on the strain (Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, and Fisher, J., 1999). It has been observed that continuous work interference with family life necessitates more help from spouse in order to manage their multiple roles. Social exchange theory helps us to understand employee-employer relationships (Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M., 1997), co-workers relationships (Hudson, 2001) and supervisor subordinate relationship (Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J., 1975). According to them social support was developed in three ways. It was observed that supportive supervisor helps DCC in managing dual roles. And last, as the third type of social support, they have addressed the role of organisation culture towards combining the work and family roles. There are various factors influencing the coping resources adopted by DCC such as health, optimism. Problem solving, social skills, social support and material resources (Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S., 1984; Kenney, J. W. 2000) also gave certain coping resources so as to remove work-life imbalance constraints such as assertiveness, hardiness and ability to love, trust and confide. However, Chasteen, K. & Kissman, K. (2000) identified several unhealthy coping strategies such as alcohol, drugs use, over eating, depression or passive aggressive behaviour, which lead to even more stressful and uncontrollable situations. This fact combined the aspect of coping strategies DCC adopt to balance work and life front. They go for healthy coping strategies, perhaps some DCC also going for unhealthy practices. Using these wrong strategies impede the process to reduce stress. Strategies such as elderly parents and domestic helpers support, emotional support and empathy by social support (Beehr, T.A. and McGrath, J.E., 1992); Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S.,
French, J., Harrison, R., & Pinneau, R., 1975) helped DCC to balance out their professional and personal life. Carlson, D. S., & Perrewé, P. L. (1999) have also described social support as a combination of work and family roles. Social support involves empathy, care love, trust (emotional support); time, money and energy (instrumental support); self-appraisal support and advice and information support (House, J. S., 1981). Although, social support offered from domestic front is very important for DCC to balance dual role of their life, a supportive environment and supervisor support are also important work-life support. A supportive supervision helps the DCC to manage working couple role efficiently by discussing family related problems, giving advice on balancing dual roles, reducing stress by showing empathy for the employees and reinforcing positive self-image. Another type of social support which is very important from DCC perspective is improving organisation culture by eradicating work-life challenges faces by DCC. Indeed, Muse, L., Harris, S. G., Giles, W. F., & Feild, H. S., 2008) revealed that organisations which are having more family supportive culture their DCC employees are not only showing higher organisational commitment even more dedicated to their job showing higher work performance, but also invested in co-workers relationships. Overall it was found that depletion between work and family is higher when organisational support is low. Edwards, J., & Rothbard, N. (2000) depicted that social support from the supervisor and another, from the organisation culture and climate. Many studies have also drawn a direct implication for organisation. According to these studies organisation helps in moderating the effect of WFC and interrole conflict. Organisations have implemented various programs and benefits to enhance positive parenting skills and coping techniques of DCC. Work organisation also provides information and support to caregivers and persons with disability. Various child care programs have started, couples with dependent care facilities to enhance DCC work satisfaction and commitment. In addition to organisational support, spousal support has been identified as a significant resource in moderating WFC conflicts (Burke, R. J., Weir, T., & DuWors, R. E., Jr., 1980; Fox, M. L., & Dwyer, D. J., 1999; Gilbert, L. A. (1984; Lorech, K., Russell, J., & Rush, M., 1989). Support from spouse/life partner has been depicted to reduce interrole conflict (Carlson, D. S., & Perrewé, P. L., 1999; Polasky, L. J. & Holahan, C. K., 1998). Also it has negative correlation with FWC (Eagle, B. W., Icenogle, M. L., Maes, J. D., Miles, E. W., 1998). Spousal support has been considered to act as an buffer against role overload, coming from both family and work environment (Aryee, S., 1999). The parental overload can be reduced with the help of Employee Assistance Programs (EAP’s) offered by organisation for DCC so as to increase their parenting skills and coping technique. Such EAP’s had shown benefits for both
occupational and family systems. Christensen, K. E. & Staines, G. L. (1990) and Ralston, D. A. & Flanagan, M. F. (1985) also mentioned in their studies that organisation’s childcare program have a noted benefit by employees. Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J., Rabinowitz, S., Bedeian, A. & Mussholder, A. (1989) in one of his studies also mentioned the role of domestic helper in eliminating a lot of household and childcare pressure and increasing life satisfaction. Thus, there are many ways and coping techniques to trade off the effect of WFC on job satisfaction level and FWC on family satisfaction level. At least “the only way to survive is to be as flexible as possible about goals and maintain a sense of humour” (Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R., 1999, p.243).

1.3 Employer’s Sensitivity towards DCC

Although today organisation has many work-life policies on the HR books, still the overall organisation culture is not particularly supportive of work-life integration. To balance the dual roles of DCC supervisor/employer’s support is utmost required, since without their support working couples might not be able to access work-life benefits. Therefore, employer sensitivity is known as the employer’s roles and responsibilities towards DCC. The role of employers is important in implementing formal flexible scheduling, formal work policies as well as informal work arrangements and schedules for DCC. Valcour P. Monique & Batt Rosemary (2003) also revealed that employers support provides more flexibility than existence of written work-life policies of the organisation to DCC. A family responsive employer provides a work culture which is formally supported by organisational policies and informally by supervisors and co-workers. They also take due care of work-design characteristics in meeting work-life demands. They also mentioned that work-life policies are present on the books; it doesn’t mean that organisation culture is supportive of work-life integration. The overall conclusion they have drawn that formal work-life policies do not make a family responsive employer. Therefore, many past researches shows that informal workplace support from supervisors and formal work-life policies represent two complementary elements of a family responsive organisation. Valcour P. Monique & Batt Rosemary (2003) made a focus group analysis of many DCC suggest that supervisors who stretches the work of DCC beyond working hours, providing less flexible policies and put DCC in a mode of grovelling, begging, feeling anxious about whether to use organisation work-life benefits is going to be okay or not faces higher level of WFC. It was observed that DCC who avails organisation work-life benefits also faces negative career consequences.
However, supervisors who are helpful and supportive of DCC’s family demands tends to engender more gratitude, loyalty, and respect from workers, and are less likely to quit the job. In lieu of work-life balance, employers have offered many EAP’s which proves to be an excellent resource for DCC under stress. These (EAP’s) provide manifold of services such as addressing and counselling family and marriage problems. It was also observed that employers who are sensitive to DCC needs, such as initiatives have a positive return on investment. EAP’s leads to improve in work-quality and reduces the impact of WFC on professional life. However, it was also observed that employees do not lack interest in work-life policies but rather feel hesitant in using them. This is so because of the fear of negative consequences faced for using work-life benefits (Hays, Sharon., 1998; Blair-Loy, Mary and Amy S. Wharton., 2002; Clarkberg, Marin and Phyllis Moen., 2001; Jacobs, Jerry A. and Kathleen Gerson. 2004). Thus, availing work-life benefits does not facilitate DCC work-life balance but sometime it counters by the negative consequences working couples faces for availing them. Furthermore, Schoenfeld Gregg, (2005) mentioned in his research report for employers that “the cost to your business failing to improve work-life balance include: poor performance, absenteeism and sick leave; and higher staff turnover, recruitment and training costs”. Supportive supervision helps employees to have greater control over work and family life which leads to lower WFC and indeed higher job security (Bailyn, Lotte; Drago, Robert; Kochan, Thomas, 2001). Therefore, supportive supervision reveals the sensitivity of employers toward DCC’s work-life integration issues. Job-sharing, part-time working, flexible working schedules and getting off instead of payment for overtime are some of the indicators which indicate the employer’s sensitivity towards DCC work-life challenges. In addition, it was also revealed that flexitime schedules were the rewards and perks for some workers; however these privileges are not considered as DCC’s rights but as a part of perks which they may or may not avail. Henceforth, he was quoted in one of his studies that “estimated a million dollar cost saving from flexibility’s impact on stress. That’s because an organisation culture might not support that very programs that it has implemented”. Therefore employers who develop, implement, and publicize work-life balance policies in their HR books send a signal throughout the organisation about the importance of work-life issues. This signal serves to legitimate employees’ desires and efforts to integrate work and non-work domain. Many DCC have reported that higher employer support and sensitivity are main force behind career development, encouragement of innovative ideas and high level of job satisfaction. Thus employers play a very active and sensitive role for helping DCC to achieve them work-life balance. They are responsible for providing work-life balance supportive workplace culture. Supportive workplace culture
comes through the implementation of formal and informal work-life policies. Informal policies include co-worker support, sharing of domestic problems in organisation, providing psychological support, and many more. Therefore, these evidences reinforce the need for employers and policy makers to address workload and work schedules as the cause of work-life imbalance. Corroborating previous research studies, supervisors play a critical role in work-life balance. As such, flexible options that reduce work stress and provide tangible benefits like work from home can significantly reduce employees’ absenteeism and increasing organisation commitment. It should be agreed by the supervisors that work-life balance and providing potential sources to achieve desirable work demands. As revealed by Straub, C. (2012) supervisor have the power to act as a gatekeeper and have the power to provide the access and availability to work-life balance. Supervisor support is, therefore, associated with DCC organisation commitment and loyalty. Perhaps by providing training to supervisors regarding the sensitivity on work-life issues, organisation should make sure they have programs or practices set in place that allow for employees to attend to their personal lives when needed.

1.4 Organisation Support for DCC

Evidences from various researches on work-life issues confronted by DCC, reveals that organisational support for work-life issues has been associated with job satisfaction and reductions in turnover (Gooler, L. E., 1996). Organisation supportive policies act as a resource in balancing DCC work and non-work lives. Therefore, organisation provides a culture which includes both formal and informal work-life policies which are perceived to be understanding and sympathetic for family responsibilities. However the adoption of family-friendly policies depends on organisation commitment and employer’s ongoing support for DCC. Hence employers should have adequate knowledge about work-life policies in the company and they should believe that handling family issues is part of managerial role (Galinsky, E., Friedman, D.E., Hernandez, C.A., 1991). There are various bottom line benefits which are compatible with lifestyles of working couples such as raise retention by organisation, power up productivity, promote participation in training, improved family and social relationships and decrease absenteeism. Gorissen Rick (2009) also gave various DCC family supportive policies and ensured that these policies need to be embedded in the organisation culture for both empathetic and supportive special needs of dual career employees. Few studies document the prevalence of organisation family friendly supportive
policies or practices. According to Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999), work-family culture in an organisation is defined as “the shared beliefs, values and assumptions regarding the extent to which an organisation supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives” (p.394). There are various formal policies such as childcare arrangements, pooling all leave entitlements, dependent care policies, paid maternity leaves, flexible working hours and work from home which are proved to be more fruitful and productive for DCC. These policies do protect the interest of DCC in ways that allow them to experiment with new ideas providing a strong “socio-emotional support” component (Tesluk, P. E., Farr, J., & Klein, S. R., 1997). Much of the literature suggest that a number of corporate experiences, increases productivity, work performance and employee morale; and reduces absenteeism and turnover ratio, stress and reduce accident rates. Other research argues that parental leave (Scarr, S., Phillips, D., and McCartney, K., 1989), flexible schedules (Ralston, D.A. 1990; Shinn, M.,Wong, N.W.,Simko, P.A.,and Ortiz-Torres, B. 1989; Staines, G.L.,and Pleck, J.H. 1983), and help with elder care (Burden, D .S.,and Googins, B. 1987; Castro, J. 1988) reduces multiple role strain. A writer for employee benefit plan review report: “studies have shown that employees are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and suffer less stress and fewer stress related illness, if they have sensitive supervisors”. This clearly indicates that organisation supportive policies are useless if the supervisors are not sensitive to the DCC work-life issues. Also Goff, S.J., Mount, M.K., & Jamison, R.L. (1990) found that supportive organisation policies and supervision helps in reducing WFC.