



## Development and validation of work-family facilitation scale in Indian context

Dr. Shamini Srivastava<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Urmila Rani Srivastava<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Psychology, Feroze Gandhi College, Raebareli, Uttar Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Department of Psychology, BHU, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

### Abstract

The major purpose of the present study was to develop and validate a self report measure of work-family facilitation according to Indian working population that reflected the multidimensional content described in the literature. Evidence for the reliability and validity of the scales of WFFS come from several sources. First item total correlation for both the directions of the work-family facilitation scale i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation (computed through point-biserial method) and intercorrelation between both directions of WFFS were found to be significant at 0.01 level. Second inter consistency reliability for work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation scale (computed through Cronbach Alpha) was good. Finally to examine the validity of the scale principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was done. The result of the factor analysis of work-to-family facilitation scale yielded five factors (N=22) namely: psychological benefits at work-place, work-place skills, job autonomy, positive attitude and feeling and work-place support. While three factors were identified for family-to-work facilitation (N=15) such as: psychological benefits at home, family support and family skills. For the further assessment of the validity of the WFFS, correlation coefficient computed between individual's score on WFFS and measures of mental health and work-family conflict. The result of the correlations have shown that both the directions of work-family facilitation scale (i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation) were found to be significantly positively correlated with the measure of mental health and significantly negatively correlated with the measure of work-family conflict. At last limitations of the study and some new avenues for future research were discussed in the light of the findings of the present study.

**Keywords:** work-family, Indian working population, psychological benefits

### Introduction

During the last few decades researchers have developed a genuine interest in the interaction of the work and family domains in the disciplines of Psychology, Sociology and Management (Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Kalliath, Hughes, & Newcombe, 2012; Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts, & Pulkinen, 2006; Singh & Rai, 2004; Tiwari, 2003; Van Steenbergen & Ellemers, 2009; Tsionou & Konstantopoulos, 2015; Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007; Wayne, Musisca, & Flesson, 2004; Yu, Wang, & Zhang, 2017) [6, 30, 33, 46, 48, 50, 56, 57, 58]. Most of the researches have focused on the interface between work and family (Edward & Rothbard, 2000; Carlson, Kacmar, Zivnuska, & Ferguson, 2015) [13, 9], by emphasizing the negative spillover between work and family domains (Frone, 2003) [15]. That is when demands in one domain (i.e. work or family), limits one's ability to complete the required duties in other role (Crouter, 1984; Lambert, 1990) [12]. This results in work-family conflict, which is defined as "a form of interrole conflict in which role pressure from work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p-77) [20], and often results in negative consequences for both individual and organizational (Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Voydanoff, 2004, 2005; Wayne *et al.*, 2004) [6, 53, 57].

At first this relationship between the two domains was believed to be strictly negative (Work-Family Conflict), (e.g. work-family conflict) (Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon, & Kiger, 2007) [47]. Although work-family conflict is a useful construct to explain part of the relationship between work and family, it does not explain the complex nature of the

interaction in its entirety (Stevens *et al.*, 2007) [47]. Furthermore the existing work-family literature has been hindered by a lack of strong overarching theoretical framework that can integrate and capture a broader conceptualization of positive side of work-family interface (i.e. work-family facilitation) (Frone, 2003; Kinnunen *et al.*, 2006; Tsionou & Konstantopoulos, 2015, Choi & Kim, 2012; Russo & Buonocore, 2012) [15, 33, 50, 10, 43].

Recently some empirical and theoretical attention has been suggested that synergies between work and family exist (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Rankin, 1993) [3, 40], and this synergy is distinct from incompatibility or work-family conflict (Grzywacz & Butler, in Press; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a, 2000b; Kirchmeyer, 1992, 1993; Wayne *et al.*, 2004) [34, 57]. These studies have established fundamental framework for work-family facilitation, but the large majority of researches that examined work-family facilitation have just focused on the one side of work-family facilitation i.e. work-to-family facilitation, and neglecting the another side of work-family facilitation i.e. family-to-work facilitation. Even though this interface has been a vigorous area of research activity in recent decades, the best of author acknowledge there is not much research which focused on the measures of the work-family facilitation. In a recent study Greenhaus and Powell, (2006) [19] have identified that still the date only 19 studies have used self report scale to measure work-family facilitation and it required further attention by the investigators. Virtually no systematic study has done on the development and

validation of work-family facilitation scale in the Indian context.

Taking into consideration the limitations of current conceptualization of the existing measures of work-family facilitation the aim of the present paper is to develop and validate a self-report measure of work-family facilitation according to Indian working population.

### Work-family facilitation

Based on the enhancement hypothesis work-family is defined as “the extent to which participation in work (family) is made it easier by virtue of experiences skills and opportunities gained or developed at home (work)” (Frone, 2003, p-145) [15]. This facilitation perspective emphasizes that strong commitment to one role does not necessarily preclude strong commitment to the other, and it focuses on the synergies or complementarities that occur when individuals combine work and family (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003) [3, 23].

In a very recent study Wayne *et al.*, (2007) [56] have defined work-family facilitation as “the extent to which an individual engagement in one life domain (i.e. work/family) provides gains (i.e. developmental, affective, capital or efficiency) which contribute to enhanced functioning of another life domain (i.e. family/work)”.

Several studies have reported that like the negative side of work-family interface (i.e. work-family conflict) the positive side of work-family interface (i.e. work-family facilitation) can also occurs in both the directions i.e. Work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Carlson *et al.*, 2006; Vanderpool & Way, 2013) [3, 6, 8, 52, 8]. Work-to-family facilitation characterized by “one’s involvement in work provides skills, behaviour or positive mood, etc. which positively influence the family” while family-to-work facilitation refers to “one’s involvement in family results in positive mood, support or a sense of accomplishment that help him/her to cope better, work harder, feel more confident or reenergized for one’s role at work” (Wayne *et al.*, 2004, p-111) and these two dimensions of work-family facilitation are distinct from each other (Wayne *et al.*, 2007; Wayne *et al.*, 2004).

More specifically work-family facilitation occurs when resource gained in one role either directly improve performance in other role (instrumental pathway) or directly through the influence of positive affect (affective pathway) (Carlson *et al.*, 2006; Crouter, 1984; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002; Wayne *et al.*, 2004) [12, 34, 8]. Through the instrumental path resources are directly transferred from one domain to another domain e.g. knowledge acquired in work domain is transferred and applied at home, resulting in improve interaction with family members/spouse (Crouter, 1984; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000) [13, 12, 20]. Instrumental facilitation refers to the skills or behaviors from one role are applied effectively in another, leading to increased performance in the receiving sphere since multiple roles provide the opportunity for skills, behaviors, and knowledge learned in one role to be transferred and applied to another role (Crouter, 1984; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000) [13, 12, 20]. The affective pathway associated with positive psychological resources from a role such as self-esteem, self-confidence, positive interpersonal interactions, and

emotional support, positive affect in that role is triggered, facilitating their functioning in the other role.

Although work-family facilitation is a new construct, researchers have previously examined the affect of work and family roles. This construct has also been referred to as positive spillover (Carlson *et al.*, 2006; Crouter, 1984; Edward & Rothbard, 2000; Grzywacz, 2000; Kinnunen *et al.*, 2006; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Sumer & Knight, 2001) [13, 12, 33, 34, 8], enhancement (Seiber, 1974), Work-family enrichment (Carlson *et al.*, 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2004), [15, 53, 8] and work-family facilitation (Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Frone, 2003; Voydanoff, 2004, 2005; Wayne *et al.*, 2007; Wayne *et al.*, 2004) [6, 15, 53, 56]. But recently several studies have reviewed and clarified that the constructs which researchers have used interchangeably may be different depending upon the measures employed (Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Carlson *et al.*, 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Wayne *et al.*, 2007) [6, 8]. These studies have identified that positive spillover, work-family enhancement and work-family enrichment focus on the individual as a unit of analysis while work-family facilitation focuses on the system as a unit of analysis (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Frone, 2003). This conceptual distinction between these constructs is important to consider when developing the measure of each construct (Carlson *et al.*, 2006) [8].

### Work-family interface in Indian context

Socioeconomic conditions in India, especially after the independence have shifted the extended families toward nuclear families and have increased the opportunities of education and employment for women (Kapur, 1974). The transition of gender equality and gender roles away from egalitarian to modern gender role has affected in turn two important focal point of adult life, namely work and family lives (Watanabe, Taka Hashi, & Minami, 1997; Nayarana & Bharadwaj, 2005). Growing participation of Indian women in urban, organized, industrial sector, professional and managerial position has been accompanied by a steady growth in dual earner families in India (Komarraju, 1997; Sekaran, 1992). Women participation in labor force have given the concept of new families which describes family systems defined by the characteristics (a) egalitarian norms of family relationships (b) equitable distribution of family labor, and (c) shared decision-making patterns and gender free perception (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005; Nayarana & Bharadwaj, 2005) [1].

Attitude towards work and family roles of professional men and women in India varies according to their gender roles. Traditionally, women have been expected to manage their home and identified in terms of their family roles where as men have been expected to work outside the home and identified in terms of their work roles (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005; Bhatnagar & Rajadhyaksha, 2002; Nayarana & Bharadwaj, 2005) [1, 5]. Bhatnagar and Rajadhyaksha, (2002) [5] have reported that reward value and commitment to work role is related to men in comparison to women, family roles are associated with the women than men and it stayed through out the life span of individual.

Consistent with the finding of the western literature (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) it has been also reported in Indian culture that family support is positively related to work-family facilitation. In India, family support is not

related to house hold help but also but also child care assistance, empathic understanding, active listening, advice and active discussion of work-place problems with family members (Rajadhyaksha & Bhatanagar, 2000; Aryee *et al.*, 2005). Supportive family experiences may allow individuals to work longer hours and avail themselves of developmental opportunities leading to family-to-work facilitation (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999). Consistent with these studies Kala Rani, (1976) has also reported working women felt stress due to the inability to perform their traditional gender role of home maker. But family support and positive attitude from husband towards wives' work help to reduce strain among Indian working women. Working women employed paid help for two reasons: to reduce the demand from housework and because they could afford to pay for human help (servants or maids). Technology (household gadgets like food processors, refrigerators, etc) was reported to reduce strain of household work on women (Kala Rani, 1976).

Recently Indian organization offered work-place service which is traditionally associated with the family and non-work domain within their premises such as gymnasiums, day care facilities, laundry facilities, canteen facilities, even futons to sleep on if employees felt a nap (Uma Devi, 2002).

#### **Limitations of existing scales of work-family facilitation**

As stated previously that growing multidisciplinary work-family researches have dominated by role stress perspectives and neglect positive benefits of multiple roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Kinnunen *et al.*, 2006) <sup>[33, 1]</sup>. This neglect of positive benefits of multiple roles has also been reflected in measures used in the work-family interface research they typically lack the positive perspective. Recently some measures of positive side of work-family interface i.e. work-family facilitation have been developed, but several characteristics of these existing measures have limited their usefulness. First, existing measures of work-family facilitation are not adequately developed and validated according to Indian working population.

Second, the existing measures pertaining to work-family facilitation have very little items. Therefore we can not be certain that these scales accurately measure the construct of work-family facilitation.

Finally, all the existing scales of work-family facilitation are unidimensional still now despite of the fact that like the other constructs, work-family facilitation is also posited to be multidimensional, e.g.-in the study of Wayne *et al.*, (2004) all the items of work-family facilitation scale have made globally without the distinction of any dimension.

#### **Aim and contribution of the present scale**

By taking into consideration the limitations of existing scales pertaining to work-family facilitation the aim of the present paper is to develop and validate a self report measure of work-family facilitation according to Indian working population. This measure capture the extent to which participation in one life domain is made it easier by virtue of experiences skills and opportunities gained or developed at another life domain.

Work-family facilitation can occur in both the directions (i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation). Therefore it is important to consider the both directions of

work-family facilitation when develop a measure of this construct because work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation are distinct from each other and provide different types of resources (Carlson *et al.*, 2006; Frone, 2003; McDermid, 2003; Wayne *et al.*, 2007, Wayne *et al.*, 2004) <sup>[8, 1]</sup>. Thus our scale measures the both the directions of work-family facilitation i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation.

There is no suitable scale of work-family facilitation in the Indian context. Therefore the present scale of work-family facilitation is developed and validate according to Indian working population.

### **Method**

#### **A. Sample of the study**

The sample size of the present paper is 250, married, male and female professionals. Data has been collected from different organizations such as: HCL, HAL, BSNL, CMC India, Info axon, Bajaj Capital, Head Strong, and 3D Technotech situated at Delhi, Noida and Nasik. Initially 397 questionnaires were administered to IT professionals, out of which 230 were regarded as complete. Participant's demographic characteristics such as: age, gender, educational qualification, length of service, no and age of children, spouse employment, working hours/week, income and no. of family member have presented in Table-1.

#### **B. Development of work-family facilitation scale**

##### **Process of initial item generation**

The entire item pool of 50 items was initially generated which included following phases-

##### **Phase1: Extensive review of relevant literature of work-family facilitation**

The conceptual base for the development of work-family facilitation scale has been drawn from the literature. For the development of the scale, extensive literature, empirical studies and scale pertaining to work-family facilitation were reviewed (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005; Bharat, 1992, 1995, 2003, Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Edward & Rothbard, 2000; Frone, 2003; Grzywacz, 2000, 2002; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Hennessey, 2007 ; Kinnunen *et al.*, 2006; O'Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath, 2004; Rajadhyaksha & Bhatanagar, 2000; Ramu, 1989; Rothbard, 2001; Voydanoff, 2004, 2005; Washington, 2006, Wayne *et al.*, 2007; Wayne *et al.*, 2004) <sup>[1, 6, 37, 13, 33]</sup>. This search revealed the following important dimensions of work-family facilitation:

1. Family/spouse support ( in India family support is not only related to household help but also child care assistance by elderly family members, empathic understanding, active listening, advice and active discussion of work-place problem with family members etc.).
2. Behaviour and Skills (included communication skills, relationship management, responsibility, decision making skills etc.).
3. Job autonomy (it is associated with the resources such as time management skills, initiative, self-confidence, planning ability) and
4. Positive mood (Associated with positive emotions).

**Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=230)**

S.N.	Demographic Variables	Number	Percentage
1.	Age in years		
	(a). 25 and below	60	26.09%
	(b).26-35	128	55.65%
	(c).36-60	42	18.26%
	Mean age= 31.03		
2.	Education		
	(a). Diploma	22	9.57%
	(b). Undergraduate	135	58.70%
	(c). Post graduate and above	73	31.74%
3.	Length of service		
	(a). Below 3	106	17.39%
	(b). 3-9	84	36.52%
	(c). 10 and above	40	46.09%
4.	Sex		
	(a). Male	184	80%
	(b). Female	46	20%
5.	Spouse Employment		
	(a). Yes	97	42.17%
	(b). No	133	57.83%
6.	No. of Working Hours/week		
	(a). 36	10	4.35%
	(b). 45	128	55.65%
	(c). 48	77	33.48%
	(d). 54	15	6.52%
7.	Income in L/A	138	60%
	(a). Below 3 L		
	(b). 3L and above	92	40%
8.	No. of Family Members		
	(a). 1-4	141	61.30%
	(b). 5 and above	89	38.70%

**Phase 2: Interviews and discussion with managerial and professional employees**

In this phase, the author held in depth interview and group discussion with 50 managerial and professional employees. We asked them to describe how their involvement in work-life facilitates their functioning of family-life and how their involvement in family facilitates their functioning of work-life. Thus interview and discussion from managerial and professional employees contained rich comprehensive description about dimensions and resources of work-family facilitation.

During the interview a new dimension of work-family facilitation i.e. work-place support (associated with supportive organization, colleagues, subordinates and supervisors). Work-place support has emerged as a new dimension in the Indian organizations because Indian culture focuses on the fundamental collectiveness of human beings to each other which maintains interdependence among the individuals. Experience of interdependence involves seeing oneself as a part of encompassing social relationship and recognizing that one’s behaviour is going to be determined by feeling, thought and action of other in relationship.

**Phase 3- Discussion with the experts**

Taking into consideration these five dimensions, an initial item pool of fifty items were generated. This item pool was presented to the five experts of the area for examining the suitability of each item for the inclusion of the test. In this phase only those items were retained about which all the

judges were unanimous on the basis of maximum agreement.

By incorporating the changes of all the three phases’ thirty seven items were retained in the present scale in both the directions (i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation). Work-to-family facilitation (no. of items=22) includes behaviour and skills, positive mood, job autonomy and work-place support dimensions while family-to-work facilitation (no of items=15) has behaviour and skills, positive mood and family/spouse support dimensions. The scoring pattern of the scale is from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). All the items are true keyed items. Higher scores are the indicators of higher work-family facilitation and low scores are the indicator of low level of work-family facilitation.

**C. Data analysis**

The primary goal of work-family facilitation scale was to establish some basic psychometric properties of the work-family facilitation scale. Different statistics have been applied for analysis of the scale included the descriptive statistics (mean, SD and inter-scale correlation), item analysis, internal consistency reliability and factorial validity of the scale.

**D. Result and discussion**

**a. Descriptive statistics**

The Tables-2 and 3 present the mean, standard deviation and inter-scale correlation of work-family facilitation scale. It is evident from the Table-3 that inter-correlation between

both the directions of work-family facilitation scale (i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation) is found to be .58 (.58,  $p < .01$ ), which was found to be significant at .01 level. We can explain this finding that both directions of work-family facilitation scale are more dependent to each other.

#### b. Item analysis

The method of point biserial (rpbi) correlation was used for item analysis of the work-family facilitation scale. Point biserial provides a measure of relationship between variables (total score of scale) and two categorized or dichotomous variable (positive and negative scores). Table-2 show that in present scale of work-family facilitation all the 37 item total correlation were found to be significant at .01 level. The range of point biserial for work-to-family facilitation was found to be 0.28 to 0.56 and for family-to-work facilitation it was found to be 0.36 to 0.65.

#### c. Internal consistency reliability

The internal consistency of both the directions of work-family facilitation was measured by using the cronbach's alpha coefficient (Table-2). The cronbach's alpha coefficient for both the directions of work-family facilitation scale namely, work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation were found to be 0.86 and 0.85 respectively.

#### d. Validity

Validity of the scale was examined by computing separate factor analysis for both the directions and by assessing the relationship of both directions of work-family facilitation with measures of mental health and work-family conflict.

#### Factor analysis of work-family facilitation scale

Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser Normalization was applied to both the directions of work-family facilitation scale. Table-5 and 6 show the result of varimax rotation factor matrix for both the directions of work-family facilitation such as work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation.

##### 1. Work-to-family facilitation scale

The result of factor analysis of work-to-family facilitation scale (N=22), yielded four factor solution which together accounted for 47.11 % of variance. The first factor was closely related to psychological benefits of work-place (explained 27.25 % of variance). Second factor reflected concern over work-place skills (explained 7.22 % of variance), third factor was associated with job autonomy (explained 6.46 % of variance) fourth factor showed positive attitude and feeling (explained 6.16 % of variance) and at last fifth factor was related to work-place support (explained 4.74 % of variance) (Table-5).

##### 2. Family-to-work facilitation scale

Factor analysis of family-to-work facilitation identified three factor solutions that together accounted 52.65 % of variance. The first factor of family-to-work facilitation reflected psychological benefits of family (explained 31.14 of total variance). Second factor concerned with family support (explained 11.74 of variance), and the third factor of this direction related to the family skills (explained 6.75 of total variance) (Table-6).

Validity of the work-family facilitation was further assessed by computing correlation of both direction of work-family facilitation scale i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation scale with measures of mental health and work-family conflict. These variables taken are known correlation of work-family facilitation and these are consistent with literature (Henessey, 2007 ; Kinnunen *et al.*, 2006; O'Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath, 2004; Rajadhyaksha & Bhatnagar, 2000; Ramu, 1989; Rothbard, 2001; Voydanoff, 2004, 2005; Washington, 2006, Wayne *et al.*, 2007; Wayne *et al.*, 2004; Carlson *et al.*, 2006; Crouter, 1984; Edward & Rothbard, 2000; Grzywacz, 2000; Sumer & Knight, 2001; Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Hammer, 2003; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002) [37, 13, 12, 53, 33, 3, 8,].

Relationship between work-family facilitation and other related construct was presented in the table 4. Finding of the correlation revealed that all the correlation coefficients were significant at 0.01 level. The correlation coefficient between both the directions of work-family facilitation scale i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation and mental health were found to be 0.27 and 0.31 respectively. On the other hand negative correlation has been found between work-family facilitation and work-family conflict. The correlation coefficient between work-to-family facilitation and work-family conflict was 0.26 and between family-to-work facilitation and work-family conflict was 0.28.

Thus these findings clearly revealed within and cross domain effects of work-family facilitation.

#### Concluding comments and limitations of the study

As mentioned earlier that the aim of this study is to develop and validate a self report measure of work-family facilitation according to Indian working population that reflected the bidirectional and multidimensional content described in the literature. This measure capture the extent to which participation in one life domain is made it easier by virtue of experiences skills and opportunities gained or developed at another life domain.

Reliability and validity of the present scale was assessed by the application of different statistical techniques. First, finding of item total correlation (which was computed through point biserial correlation method) for both the directions of work-family facilitation scale were found to be significant at 0.01 level.

Second the result recorded in the Table-3 regarding the internal reliability (computed through cronbach alpha) of the scale demonstrated that reliability of the both directions of work-family facilitation scale was good. It indicated that in the present scale both the directions of work-family facilitation i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation scale possessed high internal consistency explored in terms of cronbach alpha ranging from 0.85 to 0.86. Therefore we can say that work-family facilitation scale is a reliable instrument for measuring the facilitation between work and family domain.

Third, the correlation between both the directions of work-family facilitation scale was significant at 0.01 level. The correlation between the directions was found to be 0.58 ( $p < 0.01$ ). It indicated that both directions of work-family facilitation scale (i.e. work-to-family and family-to-work

facilitation scale) are highly correlated and dependent to each other.

Finally, for the establishment of the validity of the work-family facilitation scale, principal component analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser Normalization was done. Result of the factor analysis for work-to-family facilitation scale yielded five factors solutions (psychological benefits, work-place skills, job autonomy, positive attitude and feeling, and work-place support). The result of factor analysis for family-to-work facilitation scale revealed three factor solutions (psychological benefits, family skills, and family support). The factors emerged in both the directions of work-family facilitation scale are consistent with the researches on work-family facilitation (Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Edward & Rothbard, 2000; Frone, 2003; Grzywacz, 2000, 2002; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Hennessey, 2007 ; Kinnunen *et al.*, 2006; O'Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath, 2004; Voydanoff, 2004, 2005; Washington, 2006, Wayne *et al.*, 2007; Wayne *et al.*, 2004; Hill, Allen, Jacob, Bair, Bikhazi, Langeveld *et al.*, 2007) [6, 37, 13, 53, 33, 1]. For further examine the validity of the work-family facilitation scale, we have computed the correlation coefficient between the same respondent's score on the work-family facilitation scale and measures of mental health and work-family conflict. Results of the correlations have indicated that both the directions of work-family facilitation scale namely work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation scale is significantly positively correlated with measure of mental health (Grzywacz, 2000; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Frone, 2003; Barnett & Hyde, 2001) and significantly negatively correlated with measure of work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) [15, 1].

Thus on the basis of above discussion we can say that work-family facilitation scale appears to be reliable and valid

instrument for the measurement of work-family facilitation with special reference to Indian working population. Despite of this contribution, the study has several limitations. The work-family facilitation scale was developed completely on IT professionals. Data from different field will be needed for further establishment of the psychometric properties of work-family facilitation scale. The future researches should take the sample from different professions such as, from bank employees, from lawyers, from managerial positions, and most important from the low level employees who are less educated and less earners.

**Table 2:** Results of Psychometric Evaluation of WFFS

S.N.	Name of the Scales	Mean	SD	Range of rpbi**	Cronbach Alpha
1.	Work-to-family facilitation scale	81.25	10.24	0.28-0.56	0.86
2.	Family-to-work facilitation scale	57.30	7.76	0.36-0.65	0.85

\*\*p<.01

**Table 3:** Intercorrelation between Scales of WFFS

S.N.	Name of the Scales	1	2
1.	Work-to-family facilitation scale	-	
2.	Family-to-work facilitation scale	0.58**	-

\*\*p<.01

**Table 4:** Correlation between Scales of WFFS with Work-family Conflict and Mental health

S.N.	Name of the Scales	Mental Health	Work-family Conflict
1.	Work-to-family facilitation scale	0.274**	-0.260**
2.	Family-to-work facilitation scale	0.314**	-0.280**

\*p<0.05 \*\*p<0.01

**Table 5:** Factor Analysis work-to-family facilitation Scale

S. No.	Contents of Items	Psychological Benefits Factor-1	Work place skills Factor-2	Job Autonomy Factor-3	Positive Attitude and Feeling Factor-4	Work place Support Factor-5
1.	The communication skills, which I have developed during my job, are very helpful in dealing with my family.	.66				
9.	I am very responsible at home, because I am responsible at work.	.46				
20.	My job related activity makes me more interesting person at home.	.59				
22.	The decision making skill, which I have developed at work, make me more confident to take decision at home.	.63				
2.	The level of my job satisfaction keeps me in a good mood at home.	.40				
10.	My organization profit keeps me in a better mood which in turn affects my family life.	.64				
17.	I became a better companion for my family members, when I spent a good day on my job.	.50				
5.	The relationship, which I have developed at work, enables me to maintain sound and healthy relationship in my family life.		.64			
16.	The contact/ network, which I have developed at work is very helpful in my family life.		.45			
15.	The experience and skills, I gained during my work enables me to handle problems of my family life.		.64			
4.	The self-confidence, which I have developed at work make me more confident person at home.		.62			

8	The ability to plan my work related activities enables me to do all the work at home in a planned way.			.61		
14.	My job makes me efficient to take decisions at work which is also very helpful in my family life.			.45		
19.	The adequate time management, which I have learnt from my job, helps me in managing my time at home.			.65		
21.	I set substantial time for smoothly performing my household activities and work responsibilities due to my flexible work schedule.			.69		
11.	The salary from my job enables me to satisfy the needs of my family members.				.78	
6.	I return home in a fresh mood after a successful day at work.				.46	
12.	Good feeling about my job keeps me in a cheerful mood in my family.				.61	
13.	I participate efficiently in my important family activities due to the support of my organization.				.50	
3.	I easily solve my financial problems with the support of my colleagues/ supervisor/ subordinate.					.73
7.	My job has provided me such facts and information that are useful in my family life.					.54
18.	I balance my family and work life very easily with the support of my colleagues/ supervisor/ subordinate.					.55
	Eigen Value	5.997	1.589	1.423	1.351	1.048
	% of variance	27.25	7.22	6.46	6.16	4.76
	Cumulative %	27.25	94.47	40.94	47.11	51.87

**Table 6:** Factor analysis of family-to-work facilitation scale

S.no.	Contents of Items	Psychological Benefits Factor-1	Family Support Factor-2	Family Skills Factor-3
24.	I am responsible at work, because I am responsible at home.	.50		
27.	The relationship, which I have developed at home, enables me to maintain good interpersonal relationship at work.	.55		
25.	Good feeling about my family keeps me in a good mood during working.	.71		
28.	Mostly, I come at work in a fresh mood from the family.	.76		
30.	After having good time with my family members/spouse, I come cheerfully at work which in turn positively affect atmosphere at work.	.63		
26.	My family members give me enough trust and respect that makes me better person at work.	.64		
23.	I devote sufficient time to my work activities with the support of my family members/ spouse.		.46	
31.	After discussing the problem with my family members I am in a better position to take important decision at work.		.62	
33.	The level of self-confidence, which I have developed at home make me more confident person at home.		.51	
35.	The contact/ network which I have developed in my personal life is very helpful in promoting my career.		.74	
36.	My family has provided me such facts and information that are useful for my work life.		.76	
37.	My home life energizes me for next day's work.		.54	
29.	The decision making skills, which I have developed at home makes me more confident person to take decision at work.			.59
32.	The problem solving approaches, which I have learnt from home, are effective in resolving problem at work.			.73
34.	I have learnt adequate time management skills from my family that help me to affectively manage my time at work.			.74
	Eigen Value	5.12	1.76	1.01
	% of variance	34.14	11.74	6.75
	Cumulative %	34.14	45.89	52.65

## Reference

1. Aryee S, Srinivas ES, Tan HH. Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,2005;90:132-146.
2. Ashforth BE, Kreiner GE, Fugate M. All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transition. *Academy of Management Review*,2000;25:472-491.
3. Barnett RC, Hyde JS. Women, men, work and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*,2001;56:781-796.
4. Bharat S. 'Attitude and Sex-role Perception among Working Couples in India', *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*,1995;26(3):371-88.
5. Bhatnagar D, Rajadhyaksha U. "Attitudes Towards Work and Family Roles and Their Implications for Career Growth of Women: A Report from India," *Sex Roles*, 2002, 45(7/8).
6. Boyar LS, Mosley DC Jr. The relationship between core self-evaluation and work and satisfaction: The mediating role of work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,2007;71:265-281.
7. Brett JM, Stroh LK. Working 61 plus hours a week: Why do managers do it? *Journal of Applied Psychology*,2003;88:67-78.
8. Carlson DS, Kacmar KM, Wayne JH, Grzywacz JG. Measuring the positive side of work-family interface: Development and validation of work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,2006;68:131-164.
9. Carlson DS, Kacmar KM, Zivnuska S, Ferguson M. Do the benefits of family-to-work transitions come at too great a cost? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*,2015;20:161-171.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038279>
10. Choi HJ, Kim YT. Work-family conflict, work-family facilitation, and job outcomes in the Korean hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*,2012;24(7):1011-1028.
11. Clark SC. Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*,2000;53:747-770.
12. Crouter AC. Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of work-family interface. *Human Relations*,1984;37:425-442.
13. Edwards JR, Rothbard NP. Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*,2000;25:178-199.
14. Friedman SD, Greenhaus JH. *Allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
15. Frone MR. Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 2003, 143-162.
16. Goode WJ. A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*,1960;25:483-496.
17. Graves LM, Ohlott PJ, Ruderman MN. Commitment to family roles: Effects on managers' attitudes and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,2007;92:44-56.
18. Greenhaus JH, Parasuraman S. Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1999, 391-412.
19. Greenhaus JH, Powell GN. When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*,2006;31:72-92.
20. Greenhaus J, Beutell N. Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*,1985;10:76-88.
21. Grzywacz JG. Work-family spillover and health during midlife: Is managing conflict everything? *American Journal of Health Promotion*,2000;14:236-243.
22. Grzywacz JG. Toward a theory of work-family facilitation. Paper Presented at the 2002 Persons, Processes. And Places: Research on Families, Workplaces and Communities Conference. San Francisco, 2002.
23. Grzywacz JG, Bass BL. Work-family and mental health: Testing different model of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family*,2003;65:248-261.
24. Grzywacz JG, Butler AB. The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: Testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*,2005;10:97-109.
25. Grzywacz JG, Marks NF. Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*,2000;5:111-126.
26. Grzywacz JG, Marks NF. Family, work, work-family spillover and problem drinking during midlife. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*,2000a;62(2):336-348
27. Hofstede G. The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review*,1984;9:389-398.
28. Ishii-Kuntz M. Work and family life: Findings from international research and suggestions for future study. *Journal of Family Issues*,1994;15:490-506.
29. Kahn RL, Wolfe DM, Quinn RP, Snoek JD, Rosenthal RA. *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity.* New York, NY: Wiley, 1964.
30. Kalliath P, Hughes M, Newcombe P. *When Work and Family are in Conflict: Impact on Psychological Strain Experienced by Social Workers in Australia.* *Australian Social Work*,2012;65(3):355-371.
31. Kanungo RN, S Misra. 'The Bases of Involvement in Work and Family Context', *International Journal of Psychology*,1988;23:267-82.
32. Kapur P. *Marriage and the Working Women in India,* Vikas Publications, Delhi, 1970.
33. Kinnunen V, Feldt T, Geurts S, Pulkkinen L. Types of work-family interface: Well-being correlates of negative and positive spillover between work and family. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*,2006;47:149-162.
34. Kirchmeyer C. Perceptions of nonwork-to-work spillover: Challenging the common view of conflict-ridden domain relationships. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*,1992;13(2):231-249.
35. Marks SR. Multiple role and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Psychological Review*,1977;42:921-936.

36. Netemeyer R, Boles J, McMurrian R. Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,1996;81(4):400-410.
37. O'Driscoll M, Brough P, Kalliath T. Work-family conflict and facilitation. *Applied Health Psychology Work Stress*, 2004, 6.
38. Parasuraman S, Greeehaus JH. Toward reducing some critical gaps in work-family research. *Human Resource Management Review*,2002;12(3):299-312.
39. Rani K. *Role Conflict in Working Women*, Chetana Publications, New Delhi, 1976.
40. Rankin EA. Stresses and rewards experienced by employed mothers. *Health Care for Women International*,1993;14:527-537.
41. Rothbard N. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,2001;46(4):655-684.
42. Ruderman MN, Ohlott PJ, Panzer K, King SN. Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal*,2002;45:369-386.
43. Russo M, Buonocore F. The relationship between work-family enrichment and nurse turnover. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*,2012;27(3):216-236.
44. Schein EH. Culture as an environmental context for careers. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*,1984;5:71-81.
45. Sieber SD. Towards a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*,1974;39:567-578.
46. Singh AP, Rai S. Stress, social support and well-being among dual career couples. In A. Husain & T. Rashid (Eds.), *Stress Behaviour*, vol-II, Sources & Effects. New Delhi: Friends Publication, 2004.
47. Stevens D, Minnotte KL, Mannon SE, Kiger G. Examining the "Neglected side of the work-family interface": Antecedents of positive and negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues*,2007;28(2):242-262.
48. Tiwari P. Relationship of job and family involvement, family social support and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. Unpublished. Department of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 2003.
49. Triandis HC. *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995.
50. Tsionou T, Konstantopoulos N. The complications and challenges of work-family interface: A review paper. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*,2015;175:593-600.
51. Uma Devi S. 'Globalisation, Information Technology and Asian Indian Women in US', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2002. October 26, available on line at <http://www.epw.org.in>.
52. Vanderpool C, Way SA. Investigating work-family balance, job anxiety, and turnover intentions as predictors of health care and senior services customer-contact employee voluntary turnover. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*,2013;54:149-160.
53. Voydanoff P. The effect of work demands and resources on work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*,2004a;66:398-412.
54. Voydanoff P. The differential salience of family and community demand and resources for family-to-work conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Family Economic*, 2005, 26.
55. Washington FD. The relationship between optimism and work-family enrichment and their well-being. Published. Thesis submitted to faculty of Drexel University, 2006.
56. Wayne JH, Grzywacz JG, Carlson DS, Kacmar MK. Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*,2007;17:63-76.
57. Wayne J, Musisca N, Fleeson W. Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationship of big-five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,2004;64:108-130.
58. Yu Y, Wang Y, Zhang J. Relationship between work-family balance and job satisfaction among employees in China: A moderated mediation model. *PsyCh Journal*, 2017. DOI:10.1002/pchj.174.