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ABSTRACT
Work-life balance (WLB) initiatives are becoming important in minimizing work-life conflict which can influence organizational outcomes. There is a lack of literature that differentiates the impact of the three areas of WLB (health and wellness, flexibility programs, family-friendly programs) on performance, and how gender moderates such relationship. In this paper, we will illustrate the reasoning on whether the three areas of work-life balance will have a greater effect on performance for females. The study provides a framework that illustrates how the three areas of work-life balance can have different effects on performance, and how gender moderates such associations.
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INTRODUCTION
The demographics of organizations’ employees has changed in recent years. This has been further amplified as technological innovation and globalization has required organizations to locate and retain employees that would serve as a competitive advantage. As a result, practitioners and academics have researched different factors that can optimize or detract the potential of employees that would create positive organizational outcomes.

Furthermore, changes in the workplace requirements have required the organizations to modify their policies and procedures to meet the needs of the employees and the organizations. Longer working hours, more traveling, and take home work has made it more difficult for employees to meet personal needs (Boswell and Olson-Buchanan, 2007; Bohle et al. 2014). As such, these additional requirements has increased the possibility of work-life conflict. This has resulted in several organizations implementing and modifying policies that would serve to meet the needs of work and personal roles.

In this paper, we propose that work-life balance initiatives can serve to optimize the performance of the employees, especially female employees as they have more roles. Literature has emphasized the relationship between work-life balance initiative and organizational outcomes; however, there is a need to understand if certain programs are more effective for a certain gender. Several studies have focused on just making a relation between work-life balance practices and organizational outcomes while disregarding the effect of an
employee's gender (Ng et al. 2006; Boswell and Olson-Buchanan, 2007). We believe that such contributions to the literature are crucial; however, there is a need for more studies that depict which types of programs have a greater impact depending on the gender of the employee.

The paper argues how important it is for organizations to implement work-life balance initiatives as part of their human resources strategy, especially those that are more inclined to females. Although we believe that work-life balance initiatives can benefit all the employees, we explicitly focus on illustrating whether the three areas of work-life balance initiatives (flexible working programs, health and wellness programs, and family-friendly programs) will have a distinctive impact on performance depending on gender. In this paper, we will illustrate the reasoning whether three areas of work-life balance initiatives will have a greater effect on performance for female employees. The main contributions are: identify whether all three areas of work-life balance initiatives can increase performance, and illustrate whether gender moderates such effect. Figure 1 illustrates this study’s conceptual model and the outcome for the organizations.

Figure 1.
The structure for this study will be as follows. Section 2 analyzes the concept and importance of work-life balance, the multiple roles for females, and how the three areas of work-life balance initiatives might affect organizational performance and how it is moderated by gender. Section 3 will illustrate the results of the study. Section 4 will have the limitations, discussion, and conclusion that can be derived from such study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Importance of Work-life Balance Initiatives

As the balance between work and personal roles have become crucial for employees, different organizations have implemented several policies that would serve to fulfill both requirements. As such, different studies have focused on understanding the effects of work-life balance initiatives on employees and organizational outcomes. Some studies have shown a positive relation between work-life balance initiatives and outcomes which include a higher level of commitment, engagement, firm productivity, and citizenship behavior (Konrad and Mangel, 200; Lambert, 2000; Casio and Boudreau, 2010). These results are important for both scholars and practitioners alike as they support the notion of the value created by implementing work-life balance policies. Such results are further supported by the notion of the meta-analysis by Butt, Casper, and Yang (2013), which indicated that work-life balance initiatives can serve to promote affective commitment and intention to stay. As the requirement for employees has increased over the years, the need for the implementation of this type of policies is necessary to create a balance between work and personal roles which can create positive organizational outcomes.

In concordance with the results of previous studies, we can argue that work-life balance initiatives can serve to minimize the negative effects of having multiple roles. As organizations are expecting more from the employees, such pressure can amplify the disturbance between work and personal roles. As such, work-life balance initiatives in the areas health and wellness, family-friendly programs, and flexible work programs can minimize the extra pressure of the employees, especially for females as they incurred more multiple roles. As females may have additional challenges than their male counterpart, work-life balance initiative will have a greater effect for female employees than male employees.

Female Employees Challenges and the Role Conflict Dilemma

As the demographics in the working place has changed over the years, it is crucial for organizations to understand which factors affect such type of employees. One type of employee that has increased over the years is the number of females that have joined the workforce. As such, literature has focus on understanding the different roles that a female employee needs to fulfill. In alignment with the role conflict theory, female employees may have greater challenges and obstacles than their male counterpart as they need to satisfy multiple roles in their professional and personal areas. Balancing multiple roles can become a challenge for any person. Giving a greater effort in one role can mean being less effective in another role (Bagger, Li, and Gutek, 2008). Such precarious position can be seen more in females as they assume multiple roles. More females are entering or returning to the workplace as they want to be financially independent while others want to reconnect with their career (Hewlett and Luce, 2005). The resurgence and increase of female workers has made it necessary to explore which factors optimize or detriment their performance. Therefore, there is a need to develop studies
that will help understand the relationship between work-life balances initiatives and female employees.

From the different studies regarding the characteristics of female employees, we can reason that females might experience greater levels of role conflict between their family and work roles than male employees (Noor, 2004). Such statement is reasonable as the role of females has changed through time which includes adding additional roles. The study by Cinamon and Rich (2002) showed that female employees tend to have higher parenting and working values than their male counterpart. This can be seen as a result of females having greater housing responsibilities than males. Additionally, role conflict can create a "self-imposed" glass ceiling that detracts female employees to acquire managerial positions as they create additional roles and challenges (Cross and Linehan, 2006). As working females accumulate different roles, we expect that work-life balance initiatives will have a stronger effect for females than males.

Health and Wellness Programs and Performance

As the working place has required prolonged hours, more traveling, and additional tasks, this has created degradation in the health of the employees. As such, there are many employees that are facing different health problems which include burnout. Such decrease in the health of the employees does not only affect individuals but the organization overall as it can lead to direct costs which include higher levels of absenteeism, lower performance, and higher insurance costs (Burton et al. 1999; Serxner, Gold, and Bultman, 2001; Boles, Pelletier, and Lynch, 2004). These results have influenced organizations to implement programs that can help the employees as well as the organizations. One of the main health problems that organizations are trying to combat is job burnout. Job burnout can be defined as a response from emotional and physical exhaustion that can lead to negative outcomes on the job (Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter, 2001). As the health of the employees can create a direct impact on the performance of the company, this has required organizations to implement strategic actions to counteract such issues. The value of the employees has led to the implementation of health and wellness programs with the same effort as they do for their financial capital as it can lead to higher productivity (Loeppke et al. 2007).

The accumulation of multiple roles for female employees has been researched more frequently in recent years. In addition to job requirements like longer working hours and more tasks, they are also in charge of household activities like cooking, cleaning, and child care. The difficulty of creating a balance between work and personal roles can lead to the decline of health which includes job burnout. As previously mentioned, job burnout can lead to negative organization outcomes including higher turnover intention (Lee and Lee, 2011) and lower job performance (Ashtari, Farhady, and Khodaee, 2009). The level of burnout effect can also be distinguished by gender. Some studies have argued that job burnout is an effect that is mostly experienced by female employees (Maslach et al. 2001). As a result, the implementation of health and wellness programs can serve to reduce the effects of having multiple roles to fulfill. This also serves as a strategy for the promotion of health and wellness programs that can reduce health risks as well as increase an employee’s performance (Mills et al. 2007). Based on previous studies, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1A: Health and wellness programs will have a positive and significant relationship with an employee’s performance.
Hypothesis 1B: Health and wellness programs will have a greater positive and significant relation with a female employee’s performance.

Flexible Time Programs and Performance

As the competition among organizations has increased, so are the requirements that are needed for employees to fulfill their job roles. The stress of employees has increased over the years as there has been an increase of working hours, the intense challenge of acquiring higher profits, and the uncertainty of job security (Haworth and Roberts, 2008). Such requirements can result in further unbalance between job and personal roles. As such, the pressure of acquiring and retaining high-level talent has persuaded organizations to support employees in fulfilling their personal and work responsibilities (Cayer, 2003). The recognition of the importance of balancing an employee’s work and personal roles has required the organizations to implement day-to-day flexibility programs which include flexible working schedules, compressed work week, telecommuting and mandatory overtime policies. Flexible time programs do not only serve to create a balance for the employees as it can also be used as a strategic move to create positive organizational outcomes. The study by Eaton (2003) showed that flexible time policies are positively and significant associated with higher performance. Retaining and increasing the performance of the employees’ crucial as a result of intense competition. Technological innovation has made it possible for employees to work at any location with the permission of the organization. This can serve as a method for employees to work at a location they can feel more comfortable and have the opportunity to create a better balance in their life which can also result in positive organizational outcomes. In the study by Kossek, Lautsch, and Eaton (2006) it was shown that employees that formally used telecommuting policies demonstrated higher performance ratings. The perks that flexible time programs can offer will support the need to balance work and personal roles.

Literature has shown the importance of flexibility programs on employees; however, there is still the need to understand if benefits are differentiated according to the demographics of employees. As the number of female employees has increased over the years, there is need to demonstrate whether such programs can offer them a balance after acquiring additional roles. Literature has shown that mothers who are employed will take primary responsibility for child care in addition to domestic care (Lewis, Gambles, and Rapoport, 2007; Sidell and Gatrell, 2007). The use of flexibility programs can serve as a method to fulfill both work and personal roles which can lead to preferable organizational outcomes. The additional roles convene on female employees can decrease the time for healthy functions like sleeping and stress-relief. The implementation of flexible time programs can enhance the time that female employees can use to fulfill healthy functions. For example, telecommunication or flex-time can be an excellent choice for those female employees with the need to take care of their child or another family member. The satisfaction of having this type of programs can serve to increase performance as they can structure their time or place of work that fits their needs. Thus, based on previous we can hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 2A: Flexibility time programs will have a positive and significant relation with an employee’s performance.

Hypothesis 2B: Flexibility programs will have a greater positive and significant relation with a female employee’s performance.
Family-Friendly Programs and Performance

As employers have started to appreciate the importance of family in the lives of employees, they have centered some of their policies that would allow a more balanced routine between personal and work responsibilities. The implementation of family-friendly programs can help enhance the opportunity for employees to take care of personal needs like child care which can enhance performance (Budd and Mumford, 2006). As organizations are demanding more tasks from the employees, this can reduce the time to take care of personal and family needs which can lead to negative organizational outcomes. To reduce this type of conflict, organizations have turn into implementing family-friendly programs. Some of the family-friendly policies that organizations have implemented are maternity leave, child care support, and social events. Such implementation of family-friendly programs can serve as a strategic move by the organization that will lead to desirable organizational outcomes. This is further reinforced as the demographics in the workplace has changed over the last few years. For example, in the federal sector, the dramatic change in the demographics of the workforce has resulted in classifying family-friendly programs as crucial for the organization and the employees (Moon and Roh, 2010). Scholars and practitioners alike have focus in analyzing how the implementation of family-friendly programs can lead to positive organizational outcomes. Several studies have shown that the effective implementation of family-friendly programs can lead to the reduction of turnover rate, increase overall performance, and an increase in organizational commitment (O’Neill et al. 2009; Lee and Hong, 2011). As there is a support by the organizations of providing different initiatives that can result in more balancing between work and family roles, this may result in the employees demonstrating a behavior that would support the fulfillment of organizational goals.

As the demographic of workers has changed over the years, we can also see that the number of females has increased especially those who are mothers. During 2010, the percentage of mothers with children under the age of 6 consisted of 63.9 of total mothers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). In addition to be more inclined to be primarily responsible for the care of the children, female employees tend to be in charge of domestic chores. As such, family-friendly programs especially child care can have a greater effect on female employees’ performance. Because the price for child care services has become more expensive in recent years, families are having a more difficult time with preparing child care leading to higher level of work absenteeism (Weisberg and Buckler, 1994). As the mother assume primary responsibility for the children’s care, we can assume that the support of the organization can alleviate some of the stress related to this issue. Additionally, the implementation of family-friendly policies has been an organization’s response to the increase of female employees (Lambert, 2000). The support of the organization to create a balance between work and family roles can serve to increase the performance of the employees, especially females as they are considered to have more roles than males. Thus, based on previous we can hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 3A: Family-friendly programs will have a positive and significant relation with an employee’s performance.

Hypothesis 3B: Family-friendly programs will have a greater positive and significant relation with a female employee’s performance.
METHODOLOGY

Sample

For our study, participants were gathered by using the Mechanical Turk website. The usage of this website is acceptable as other researchers have used the data for their own research. The study by Buhrmester, Kwang, and Gosling (2011) showed that the responses gathered from Mechanical Turk can be considered a representation of the general population. As such, we can generalize the responses from the participants as a reflecting of the population. In order to acquire the highest sample size possible, we provided a monetary incentive of 50 cents for the completion of the survey. From the use of Mechanical Turk, we were able to acquire 427 samples for our study. We decided to drop the surveys that were missing many values which led to our final sample size of 416 responses. From our final sample size, the gender demographic consisted of 217 males (52%) and 190 females (46%) while some responses did not specify their gender (2%). Since there are no major percentage differences between genders, this makes it ideal to test our hypotheses. The mean age of the respondent was 36 years with a mean of 14 years of full-time work experience.

Survey

For our questionnaire, the respondents were asked to respond 20 questions regarding the availability of different work-life balance practices in the firm they are employees as well as 9 questions regarding their performance. The work-life balance practices questions consisted of yes or no responses as we wanted to show whether the availability or absence of work-life balance practices makes a difference in performance levels. Since we want to illustrate whether the three types of work-life balance practices (health and wellness, flexible programs, and family-friendly programs) will have a different effect on the employees’ performance. Appendix 1 shows the questions that were used to construct the variables. The following sections will illustrate how we determined each variable that was used in the study.

Independent variables

The independent variables implemented for this study consists of health and wellness programs, flexible working programs, and family-friendly programs that were constructed from 20 indicators. The items regarding the WLB practices were developed for another study that was presented at the Decision Science Institute Conference (Wei et al., 2015). The construction of the latent variable health and wellness programs consisted of questions 3, 6, and 16. The construction of the latent variable flexible working programs consisted of questions 1, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 19. The construction of the latent variable family-friendly programs consisted of questions 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, and 20. Based on literature, we arrived at the conclusion that each initiative in our study corresponded to one of the three areas of WLB that we are studying. After running a pre-analysis, some indicators showed some reliability and validity issues. From careful consideration of our study, we decided to drop some indicators. The construction of the latent variable health and wellness programs consisted of questions 3 and 16. The construction of the latent variable flexible working programs consisted of questions 1, 10, 14, and 15. The construction of the latent variable family-friendly programs consisted of questions 2, 4, and 8. For the moderating variable of gender, we used a dummy variable assigning 0 if the responded was a female while 1 represented a male respondent.
Dependent variable

To explore how each work-life balance area affects performance levels, we adopted a performance measure that is an adaptation of (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2009) derived from Mott (1972) performance rating. The latent variable performance was measured by 9 indicators that illustrate the performance of an employee by supervisor rating, production, and adaptation. We believe that such indicators are acceptable for our study. Appendix 1 illustrates the indicators that we used to construct performance.

Results

For our study, we implemented the software WarpPLS 5.0 created by Dr. Kock. Dr. Ned Kock is a distinguished professor that currently teaches at Texas A & M International University. Our first analysis consisted of verifying whether there were no issues regarding multicollinearity, validity, and reliability of the indicators. A convergent validity test was performed to verify that all factor loadings were .5 or higher. Factor loadings that are exactly or above .5 are acceptable in research (Kock, 2015). Factors loadings are shown in Table 1 with all the indicators passing the convergent validity test.

Table 1. Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HWP</th>
<th>FWP</th>
<th>FFP</th>
<th>PERF</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Gen*HWP</th>
<th>Gen*FWP</th>
<th>Gen*FFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife06</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.424</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife16</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.359</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife01</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>(0.960)</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife10</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>(0.959)</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife14</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>(0.851)</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife15</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>(0.689)</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.484</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife02</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>(0.748)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife04</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>(0.728)</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkLife08</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>(0.735)</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.394</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf01</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>(0.926)</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf02</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>(0.971)</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf03</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>(0.981)</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf04</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>(0.972)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf05</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>(0.985)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf06</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>(0.972)</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf07</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>(0.965)</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf08</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>(0.965)</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf09</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>(0.966)</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Worklife</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>-0.233</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>(0.745)</td>
<td>-0.302</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Worklife</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>(0.777)</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 illustrates the results for the reliability and multicollinearity test performed for this study. As illustrated by Kock (2015) composite reliability measures are acceptable if they are above .6 while for multicollinearity test are acceptable if VIF are below the cut-off of 3.3.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HWP</th>
<th>FWP</th>
<th>FFP</th>
<th>PER</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Gen*HWP</th>
<th>Gen*FWP</th>
<th>Gen*FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. variance</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Collinearity VIF</td>
<td>4.871</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>5.411</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>4.379</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>4.715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final results showed some interesting details regarding how the three areas of work-life balance affects performance while being moderated by gender. The result of our analysis is presented in Figure 2 of our study. Based on our results, H1A is not supported since the relationship between HWP and Performance is nonsignificant and a path coefficient of -0.01. The moderating effect of gender is statistically significant (P<.01) and a path coefficient -.13, but since H1A was shown to be statistically nonsignificant it is also discarded. H2A is not supported since the relationship between FWP and Performance is statistically nonsignificant and a path coefficient of 0.04. The moderating effect of gender is also statistically nonsignificant and a path coefficient of -.06. H3A is supported since the relationship between FFP and Performance is statistically significant (P<.01) and with a path coefficient of 0.18. The moderating effect of gender for H3B is statistically significant (P<.01) and has a path coefficient of 0.19; however, it was the opposite of what we hypothesize. We hypothesized that the effect would be greater for females, but the results showed that FFP initiatives will have a greater effect on the performance of males which is something that we will discuss. As illustrated, the R-Squared of performance is .04. Further analysis illustrates that Average block VIF is 3.594 which is acceptable if it is below 5. Additionally, average full collinearity VIF is 2.989, which is shown to be below the ideal value of 3.3. The Tenenhaus (GOF) is shown to be .149, which is consider
small. Finally, Table 3 illustrates the paths effect sizes. The study by Cohen (1998) argued that effect sizes can either be considered small (.02), medium (.15), or large (.35). As shown in Table 3, the effect sizes are small with only FFP being considered medium size.

Figure 2. Model Results

Table 3. Effect Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HWP</th>
<th>FWP</th>
<th>FFP</th>
<th>Perf</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Gender* HWP</th>
<th>Gender* FWP</th>
<th>Gender* FFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

In our study, we analyzed how three areas of work-life balance practices can affect performance, and how gender moderates such relationship. Based on our results, H1B was
statistically significant; however, we discard it since the main relationship showed to be statistically nonsignificant. H3A and H3B were statistically significant illustrating that family-friendly policies have a positive effect on performance which such effect is greater for male employees. This is contrary to what we hypothesize as we believed that family-friendly policies would have a greater effect for female employees; however, there are some assumptions that support such results. Family-friendly policies like paternity leave are becoming to be used more frequently in the last few years. One of the reasons is the change of mindset regarding the role of the father in the life of their children. Paternity leave increases the opportunity father-child bonding which can create a long-term impact in child care (Tanaka & Waldfogel, 2007). We assume that policies that facilitate such relation have a greater effect for males than females. The inception of maternity leave has provided the opportunity for female workers to spend time with their newborn as it has been assumed that it is the responsibility of the mother. As male workers are taking advantage of maternity leave, this can change the perception of child-care responsibility. Since the role of childcare for male employees has been minimized over the years, the opportunity to spend time with their newborns will instigate a sense of support by the organization which in turn will improve their performance. As maternity leave is regularly offered in organizations, the adoption of paternity leave will illustrate the support of the organization toward male employees.

LIMITATIONS

As any other research, our research contains some limitations that will be analyzed in this section. First, the indicators regarding work-life balance practices consist of "yes" or "no" answers. A Likert-scale should provide a better estimation of the effects of work-life balance practices on performance. Such data may have provided different results. The second limitation present in the study is the lack of generalization of the results. Since all of our respondents work in the United States, we cannot assume that the results will hold for other countries. For future studies, we recommend the usage of indicators with a Likert-scale to see if there are any differences with this study. Secondly, there should be a greater variety of respondents to see if culture moderates the relationship between WLB practices and performance.

CONCLUSION

The extent of literature regarding work-life balance initiatives has been expanding in recent years as a result of changes in the workplace. As there has been a change in the demographics of employees in the workplace, there is a need to understand which type of practices can lead to positive employee and organizational outcomes. This study is a contribution to the literature as it illustrates the effect of WLB initiatives on performance and the role of gender in such relationship. Based on our results, it seems that family-friendly initiatives are the only area of WLB that has an effect on performance. Additionally, the effect on such relationship is greater for males than female employees. Since demographics as well as values change over time, there is a need to analyze how such changes affect the necessity for certain programs over others. The topic of WLB is an interesting topic as the change of working demographics has created a need to have a better understanding of which practices can create positive outcomes for the workers and organization. Scholars and practitioners alike should have a better understanding of the effects of work-life balance practices and how it might have a different effect depending on the gender of the employee using them.
APPENDIX 1.

Work-Life Balance

For the following statements, please indicate Yes if the statement describes your organization or No if the statement does not describe your organization.

1. My organization allows me to choose the times that I work during a day.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

2. My organization will provide me with paid time off if I have a child.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

3. My organization has an onsite or nearby gym I can use for free.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

4. My organization lets me have paid time-off for personal matters (in addition to vacation time).
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

5. My organization gives me paid holidays.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

6. My organization gives me paid sick leave.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

7. During most work weeks, my organization expects me to work more than 50 hours.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

8. My organization regularly sponsors social events for workers and their families.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

9. My organization lets me bring a pet to work.
   No [ ] Yes [ ]

10. My organization will let me work longer hours and fewer days if I want to.
    No [ ] Yes [ ]

11. At least once a month, my organization expects me to work six or seven days a week.
    No [ ] Yes [ ]

12. My organization will help an employee’s spouse in finding work.
    No [ ] Yes [ ]

13. My organization allows two people to share a single professional position.
    No [ ] Yes [ ]

14. My organization allows me to work from home at times.
    No [ ] Yes [ ]

15. My organization lets me take equal time off when I have to work outside of normal work.
times.  
No [ ] Yes [ ]

16. My organization will provide me with professional counseling if I need help for personal problems.  
No [ ] Yes [ ]

17. My organization only gives me a half-hour or less for lunch.  
No [ ] Yes [ ]

18. My organization expects me to respond to work e-mails or voice mails that are sent to me outside of normal work hours.  
No [ ] Yes [ ]

19. My organization often requires me to work overtime.  
No [ ] Yes [ ]

20. My organization provides day care.  
No [ ] Yes [ ]

Performance

Every worker produces something in his or her work. It may be a "product" or "service". Please think carefully of the things that you produce in you work and how your performance compares to others in your work group. Please select the response that best describes your work compared to your colleagues’ work.

(Supervisor’s Rating)
1. Which of the following selections best describes how your supervisor rated you on your last formal performance evaluation.

   Below Average [ ] Average [ ] Above Average [ ] Far Above Average [ ] Excellent [ ]

(Production: Quantity)
2. How does your level of production compare to that of your colleagues’ production levels.

   Below Average [ ] Average [ ] Above Average [ ] Far Above Average [ ] Excellent [ ]

(Production: Quality)
3. How does the quality of your products or services compares to your colleagues output.

   Below Average [ ] Average [ ] Above Average [ ] Far Above Average [ ] Excellent [ ]

(Production: Efficiency)
4. How efficiently do you work compared to your colleagues? In other words, how well do you use available resources (money, people, equipment, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Far Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adaption: Anticipating Problems and Solving Them Satisfactorily)

5. Compared to your colleagues, how good are you at preventing or minimizing potential work problems before they occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Far Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adaption: Awareness of Potential Solutions)

6. Compared to your colleagues, how effective are you with keeping up with changes that could affect the way you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Far Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adaption: Promptness of Adjustment)

7. How quickly do you adjust to work changes compared to your colleagues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Far Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adaption: Prevalence of Adjustment)

8. How well would you rate yourself compared to your colleagues in adjusting to new work changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Far Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Flexibility)

9. How well do you handle workplace emergencies (such as crisis deadlines, unexpected personnel issues, resources allocation problems, etc.) compared to your colleagues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Far Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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