The 2011/12 National Study on Balancing Work, Life and Caregiving in Canada: The Situation for Alberta Teachers

By Linda Duxbury, Sprott School of Business, Carleton University, and Christopher Higgins, Ivey School of Business, University of Western Ontario

March 2013

Linda Duxbury, PhD, Professor, Sprott School of Business, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario Linda_Duxbury@Carleton.ca

Christopher Higgins, PhD, Professor, Ivey School of Business, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario Chiggins@Ivey.UWO.ca



Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	
1.1 Putting the Study into Context	
1.2 Objectives of the ATA Report	
1.3 Theoretical Framework	
1.4 Organization of the ATA Report	
Chapter Two: Who Answered the Survey?	7
2.1 Personal Characteristics	
2.2 Work Profile	
Chapter Three: Predictors	
3.1 Work Demands	
3.2 Non-Work Demands	
3.3 Total Roles	
3.4 Role Overload	
Chapter Four: Organizational Outcomes	
Chapter Five: Employee Outcomes	
5.1 Employee Well-being	
5.2 Work–Life Outcomes	
Chapter Six: Moderators	
6.1 Organizational Culture Is Key	
6.2 Perceived Control Is Also Key	
6.3 Perceived Flexibility	
Chapter Seven: Conclusions	
7.1 Characteristics of the ATA Sample	
7.2 Family and Other Role Demands on Teachers	
Appendix A: Data Tables	

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Putting the Study into Context

We all play many roles: employee, boss, subordinate, spouse, parent, child, sibling, friend and community member. Fulfilling these roles requires time, energy and commitment. Work– family or work–life conflict¹ occurs when the cumulative demands of these many work and nonwork roles are incompatible in some respect and, as a result, participation in one role is made more difficult by participation in the other role.² Work–life conflict has two major components: (1) lacking time and/or experiencing scheduling conflicts and (2) feeling overwhelmed, overloaded or stressed by the pressures of multiple roles.

Two decades ago (1991), we conducted the first national study of work–life conflict in Canada to "explore how the changing relationship between family and work affects organizations, families and employers." Almost 21,000 employed Canadians participated in that research. Just over 10 years ago (2001), we undertook a second national study of work–life conflict in Canada to determine how the "demographic, social and economic changes that occurred throughout the 1990s increased the percent of the Canadian working population at risk of high work–life conflict." Approximately 32,000 employed Canadians took part in that study.

A lot has happened over the course of the past decade that may change the landscape surrounding work–life issues in Canada. A number of these changes are demographic in nature. Increased longevity, coupled with declining fertility rates, means that Canada's population is aging as is its workforce. Canadian families today look very different than in the past. They are smaller; more diverse in terms of structure, patterns of functioning and heritage; more complex; less stable; less likely to have as much free time; and more likely to break up. There are also now more (1) dual-income families; (2) working heads of single-parent families; (3) working women of all ages; (4) working mothers, particularly mothers of young children; (5) men with direct responsibility for family care; (6) workers caring for elderly parents or relatives; and (7) workers in the "Sandwich Generation" who are responsible for both childcare and eldercare.

A number of economic factors may also affect the ability of Canadian employees to balance work and life. These differences include a growth in nonstandard (often poorly paid) forms of work in the service sector, a decline in the number of well-paying unionized jobs in the manufacturing sector and aggressive downsizing/rightsizing by Canadian organizations (public, private and not-for-profit) who have been battered by economic downturns in the United States and Europe. The labour market has also undergone a bifurcation, resulting in a situation that Rick Miner describes as "jobs without people, people without jobs." On the one hand, many Canadians are unemployed or underemployed because they do not have the specialized education/skills required to be hired into jobs that are currently vacant. On the other hand, in many areas the demand for highly skilled labour now exceeds the supply, and a lot of Canadian

¹In the 1970s through to the early 1990s, researchers studied *work–family conflict*. In the later part of the 1990s, the term was changed to *work–life conflict* in recognition of the fact that employees' non-work responsibilities can take many forms, including volunteer pursuits and education as well as the care of children or elderly dependents.

²We sometimes use the term *work–life balance* in this report to mean the opposite of *work–life conflict*, a reflection of the fact that conflict and balance are frequently viewed as a continuum. Employees with low work–life conflict and high work–life balance are at one end of the continuum, while those with high work–life conflict and low work–life balance are at the other.

firms are reporting shortages of "elite" workers (such as engineers, accountants, healthcare professionals and skilled trades). We have also seen a polarization in the hours Canadians spend in paid employment: some Canadians devote long hours to their work (fearing for their jobs and working in intensely competitive work environments), while others struggle to get enough hours of paid employment to provide for themselves and their families.

Technological advances that began several decades ago have exacerbated many of these issues by allowing people to work "anytime, anywhere." In many cases, these advances have blurred the boundaries between work and non-work, increased the pace of work and changed service delivery expectations.

Also relevant is research showing that many members of the new generation of workers (Generation Y and Generation X) say that they do not want to live the sort of lives their parents led. Rather, they want to spend more time with and be more available to their families.

Taken together, these changes suggest that the time had come for another rigorous empirical look at the issue of work–life conflict. Accordingly, in 2011/12 we undertook a third national study of work–life balance in Canada. Just over 25,000 employed Canadians participated in this study, the results of which are detailed in three reports:

- Report One: Revisiting Work–Life Issues in Canada: The National Study on Balancing Work and Caregiving in Canada (<u>http://sprott.carleton.ca/duxbury/</u>)
- Report Two: Causes, Consequences, and Moderators of Caregiver Strain Among Employed Caregivers
- Report Three: Employed Caregiving in Canada: A View from the Trenches

The Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) participated in the 2011/12 national study. This report outlines the key findings obtained using the ATA sample (n = 2,462).

1.2 Objectives of the ATA Report

This report was written with the following goals in mind:

- To describe the ATA sample.
- To quantify the issues associated with balancing work and family for those in the ATA sample.
- To quantify the benefits to teachers and school boards of work-family balance.
- To quantify the costs to teachers and school boards of work-family imbalance.
- To help the ATA identify what it needs to do to reduce work-family imbalance in the Alberta school system.
- To empirically examine how the ATA sample differs from the total 2011/12 sample.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

A vast academic literature deals with the issue of work–life conflict. A complete review of this literature is beyond the purview of this series of reports and counter to our primary objective, which is to get easily understood and relevant information on work–life conflict and employee caregiving into the hands of key stakeholders (governments, policymakers, employees, employers, unions). Readers who are interested in the theoretical underpinnings of this research are referred to Figure 1, which incorporates both fundamental concepts from the research literature and key insights that we have gained from years of research in this area. This framework allows the reader to see how the various predictors (demands, total roles), moderators

(perceived control over work and family, supportive manager, perceived flexibility) and outcomes (total-role overload, work–life conflict, organizational outcomes and individual outcomes) discussed in this report fit together. Here's what our framework demonstrates:

- Objective work demands, total roles and objective non-work demands predict work-role overload and family-role overload.
- Work-role overload and family-role overload predict total-role overload.
- Total-role overload predicts work-life conflict (operationalized as role interference and caregiver strain).
- Total-role overload predicts organizational well-being (e.g., absenteeism, intent to turnover, commitment, job satisfaction, employment changes index).
- Total-role overload predicts employee well-being (e.g., stress, depressed mood, physical health).
- The relationship between work-role overload and total overload will be moderated by organizational culture, control over work, perceived flexibility and management support.
- The relationship between family-role overload and total-role overload will be moderated by family control.

Items marked in red in this framework were *not* included in the ATA survey and, as such, are not discussed in this report. Furthermore, a complete description of the methodology used in the study is provided in *Report One* and, as such, is not repeated in this report.

1.4 Organization of the ATA Report

The ATA report is divided into seven chapters. Chapter One includes the introduction and research objectives. Information on the demographic characteristics of the sample (e.g., gender, age, marital status, socioeconomic status, dependent-care responsibilities) as well a description of their work circumstances (e.g., job type, time in position, union status) are given in Chapter Two. Chapter Three, which examines the demands borne by employed Canadians at work, at home and in life, also includes a discussion of overload (work, family, total). Chapter Four is devoted to data that speaks to the organizational outcomes included in this study, while Chapter Five focuses on data related to individual outcomes. Key findings with respect to the moderator variables included in this analysis are presented in Chapter Six. Conclusions, implications and recommendations are presented in Chapter Seven.

A complete set of data tables are provided for the interested reader in Appendix A. Details on how each of the constructs included in our theoretical framework are defined and interpreted are provided in *Report One*.





Note: The Supportive Manager measure was not included in the ATA survey

Chapter Two: Who Answered the Survey?

Understanding an employee's ability to balance work and life requires an appreciation of the constraints imposed and opportunities available in two domains: work and non-work. This section describes the key features of respondents' personal and work lives that may affect their ability to achieve a work–life balance.

Data in this section can be found in the following tables in Appendix A:

Table 1: Gender, Age, Marital Status and Community Tables 2a, 2b, 2c: Socioeconomic Status of the Respondents and Respondent's Partner Table 3: Family Type Table 4: Dependent Care—Children Table 5: Dependent Care—Eldercare Tables 6a, 6b, 6c: Work Profile Table 29: Economic Insecurity

2.1 Personal Characteristics

Women were more likely than men to respond to the survey

Because gender is associated with so many of the variables collected in the analysis, it is called the "primary determinant" in psychology. Women, for example, are typically more likely than men to report high levels of stress and depressed mood and to report higher levels of work–life conflict.

The majority (77%) of respondents in the ATA sample were females, a proportion that is higher than that of the total sample (60% of which was female). Interestingly, one in three teachers in the rural sample was male compared with one in five teachers working for urban boards. This gender imbalance in the teacher sample is likely due to the fact that teaching is a female-dominated profession.

Most of the teachers in the ATA sample were members of Generation X

We divided the sample into three age groupings: those under 30 years of age (Generation Y), those 30 to 45 years of age (Generation X) and those 46 years of age or older. Only 15% of the ATA sample could be considered Generation Y. Approximately half (49%) were Generation X, a finding that is consistent with the fact that many employees in this age group experience issues associated with work–life balance. The remainder of the sample (36%) were Baby Boomers. The ATA sample was younger than the total sample (see Figure 2). This age breakdown has several potential ramifications for the employer. First, school boards in Alberta will likely see an exodus of experienced teachers over the next several years. Second, these data suggest that succession planning is likely to be an issue for school boards in Alberta. Finally, research in the area has determined that Generation Xers have a very different set of work values and attitudes toward their employer than do Boomers whom they will be replacing. These findings suggest that many schools operating in Alberta may experience generational conflict within the workplace.



Figure 2: Age of the ATA Sample Versus the Total Sample

Most respondents were married

Three-quarters (76%) of respondents to the ATA survey were married, 15% were single and 9% were separated, divorced or widowed. This distribution is virtually identical to what was observed in the total sample.

The sample is geographically well distributed

As Figure 3 shows, the sample is geographically well distributed across Alberta. While a majority of the respondents (51%) lived in Calgary or Edmonton, one in three lived in rural communities with populations of 25,000 or less.



Figure 3: Percent Living in Communities of Various Sizes

Socioeconomic status can act as a buffer between conditions at work and home

Several factors can act as buffers between conditions at work and home, on the one hand, and positive or negative outcomes, on the other. One such variable is socioeconomic status. Three highly intercorrelated aspects of socioeconomic status are considered in this analysis: job type, education and income.

Most respondents were well-educated knowledge workers

Our research has determined that job type is a major predictor of employee and organizational outcomes. Workload is more of an issue for people in white-collar jobs, while lack of control, work environment and quality of work are often sources of stress for those in pink- and blue-collar jobs.

In our opinion, teaching can be considered a type of "knowledge work," which means that most of the respondents were knowledge workers. All of the teachers in the sample had a university (78%) or postgraduate university (22%) degree, a higher level of formal education than that observed in the total sample (38% had a university degree and 18% had a postgraduate degree).

Virtually all of the respondents to the ATA survey worked in the classroom (i.e., 80% were teachers). Thirteen percent combined classroom work with administrative duties, and 5% worked in office/administrative positions. The rest of the sample (3%) worked in "other" positions. By comparison, 60% of the total sample worked in managerial and professional positions.

According to the Conference Board of Canada, the average per capita income in Canada in 2010 was \$31,639. Two-thirds of the teachers/administrators in the ATA sample had personal yearly incomes of \$80,000 or more (see Figure 4). Although these data indicate that most ATA members are socioeconomically advantaged, it should be noted that, according to Statistics Canada, average weekly earnings in Alberta in 2012 were at least 17% higher than those in any other province. Higher-income families can usually afford to hire adequate household and childcare help to ease domestic burdens and may more easily purchase services and labour-saving devices to reduce demands on their time and energy (e.g., dining out, hiring a housekeeper, buying household appliances).





The teachers in the sample are married to people very similar to themselves

Recent research has determined that employees "bring work home with them" both literally (they do work at home in the evening and on weekends) and figuratively (they often bring work stress home). As a result, any research on work–life issues needs to consider the work demands and working conditions of both partners. The survey included a number of questions to help us better understand the work and family demands facing the couple.

Just over half the partners of the teachers in the sample work in executive, management or professional positions. Another 14% work in technical positions.

Partners of the teachers in the sample were also well educated (22% had college diplomas, 40% had one university degree and 14% had postgraduate degrees) and tended to be well paid (see Figure 5). The males in the ATA sample were more likely to have a homemaker partner who either was not working or worked part-time (see Figure 6). The teachers in this sample tended to live in three types of families: (1) ones in which they were the main breadwinner (men were more likely to be in this type of family), (2) ones in which they shared breadwinning duties with their partner or (3) ones in which their income and job were secondary to that of their partners (all teachers in this situation were female).



Figure 5: Income of ATA Respondents and Their Partners

The majority of respondents live in families in which the role of breadwinner is shared

Employees who live in families in which breadwinner status is shared equally are likely to have more challenges balancing work and family demands than are employees who live in families in which one partner is deemed to be the primary breadwinner (i.e., the primary breadwinner assumes fewer responsibilities at home, which the secondary breadwinner picks up). Just over half of the employees in the total sample lived in families in which the breadwinning role is shared (see Figure 6). These data are very similar to what was observed with the total ATA sample.



Figure 6: Breadwinner Status: ATA Sample Versus the National Sample

Families in the ATA sample are more secure than those in the national sample

To get an idea of the financial well-being of the families in the study (income levels are not directly comparable because cost of living varies by location and the need for money varies with dependent-care status), we asked respondents to select the response that best described their family's financial situation. As Figure 7 shows, families in the ATA sample are more financially secure than those in the national sample—a finding that is likely due in part to the higher levels of employment in Alberta. Gender is not associated with financial status.



Figure 7: Families' Financial Status: ATA Sample Versus the National Sample

Teachers live in a variety of family situations

We used job type and education data to determine the type of family in which respondents lived (see *Report One* for a discussion on how this determination was made). The data confirm the perception that Canadians/teachers live is a wider variety of family situations now than they did several decades ago. Interestingly, the ATA sample seems more skewed than the total sample with respect to family type:

- Half of the teachers in the sample are part of a dual-career family (i.e., both partners are highly educated professionals and enjoy higher incomes), double the percent in this family type than was observed in the national sample.
- One in five of the respondents in the total sample is part of a dual-earner family (i.e., both partners are in blue- or pink-collar positions that require less formal education and are awarded lower levels of pay). By comparison, none of the teachers in the sample were in a dual-earner family.
- Only 5% of the ATA respondents are part of a dual-income family in which the male is considered the primary breadwinner (i.e., the men in these families are highly educated, work in well-paid professionals positions and their partner's income is secondary). This is a smaller portion than was observed in the total national sample (15%).
- Twenty-two percent of respondents are part of a dual-income family in which the female is considered the primary breadwinner (i.e., the women in these families are highly educated, work in well-paid professionals positions and their partner's income is secondary). This is a higher percent in this family type than was observed in the total national sample (17%).
- Four per cent of ATA respondents are part of a "traditional" (i.e., male is breadwinner and female is homemaker) family. This is the same portion as noted in the total national sample.
- One per cent of both the ATA and total national samples are part of a "Mr. Mom" family (i.e., the female is the breadwinner and the male partner does not work outside the home).
- Twenty percent of ATA respondents are single and live alone compared with 16% of the national sample.

Females share breadwinning responsibilities in the majority of ATA families

Several things are of note in these findings. First, in the majority (75%) of families represented in the ATA sample, both partners work for pay outside the home. Balance is more likely to be an issue within these families. Second, women are the primary earner or equal partners in the breadwinning equation in just over half the families in the ATA sample. These findings suggest that a new paradigm is needed to describe and evaluate women's participation in Canada's labour market and their contribution to the economic well-being of their families.

Teachers appear to be less likely to have children

A large body of research has determined that dependent-care responsibilities are positively associated with the incidence of work–family conflict and stress. The data from this study show that the ATA sample includes two groups of employees. The first subset is made up of teachers (59% of the ATA sample) who have children. These employees have to balance heavy demands at work with equally heavy demands at home. The second subset (41%) is made up of teachers who do not yet have children. This group can be expected to have fewer family demands. However, the fact that most of these teachers are married (75% of the ATA sample is married or

lives with a partner) and are in their middle to late thirties suggests either that many are planning to have children in the near future or that they have elected not to have children. By comparison, 70% of the respondents in the total national sample have children at home.

Although people can choose not to have children, they cannot choose not to have parents. Of note, therefore, are our findings that 74% of those in the ATA sample were responsible for the care of at least one elderly dependent, 10% were part of the "Sandwich Generation" in that they spent at least an hour a day providing childcare and eldercare and 16% cared for a disabled dependent. These proportions are very similar to those observed in the total national sample. To be deemed to belong to the "Sandwich Generation," study participants had to spend an hour per week in each role, a very conservative definition. When we broaden the acceptance criteria to those who spend up to an hour a week in eldercare, the number in this group within the ATA sample increases to 24% of the sample.

Just over half of the teachers in the ATA sample are parents

While 41% of the respondents to the ATA survey do not have children, 15% have one child, 29% have two children and 15% have three or more children.

One in four respondents is a parent of children under the age of five

Research suggests that work–life conflict typically decreases as the age of the youngest child increases. One in four of the teachers in the sample (25%) has children under the age of five (preschoolers) and, as such, is at higher risk with respect to work–life conflict. Approximately one in three of the respondents is a parent to adolescent children (35% have children age five to 12) and/or teenagers (30% have children age 13 to 18 who still live at home). One in three (37%) has children who are older than 18 years of age. This age distribution is very similar to what was observed in the total national sample.

Responsibility for childcare is shared in one in four Canadian families

A parent who is responsible for childcare is accountable within the family for his or her children's supervision and well-being. Such a parent has been found to experience significantly greater stress and tension than the parent who "helps out." This increase in stress is associated with the greater number of worries connected with looking after the children. Data on responsibility for childcare are shown in Figure 8 for those in the sample having children (60% of the ATA sample and 70% of the total sample).

Virtually all the parents in the ATA sample said that they had some responsibility for childcare (only 3% of parents said that they had no such responsibility). However, responsibility for childcare is skewed: one in four of those in the ATA sample (all women) reported that in their family they are responsible for virtually all childcare, and one in four (nearly all men) reported that in their family their partner is primarily responsible for childcare. Responsibility for childcare is shared in just over one in five families.

Further examination of the data shows that, in both the national and ATA samples, women are more likely than men to say that they are primarily responsible for childcare in their families (50% of the women in both groups gave this response). This finding suggests that gender role expectations with respect to parenting have not changed substantially over time despite the influx of women into the paid labour market. The finding also supports the idea that many women in Canada "work a second shift" at home.



Figure 8: Responsibility for Childcare (Parents Only): ATA Sample Versus Total Sample

Many Canadians are also responsible for the care of at least one elderly dependent

Research has shown that work–life conflict as well as stress and depression are linked to increased responsibility for elderly dependents. Eldercare responsibilities are bi-modally distributed in the ATA sample. While 25% of those in the ATA sample report that they have no eldercare, 36% say that they are responsible for the care of three or more elderly dependents! The rest of the sample is responsible for the care of one (18%) or two (20%) elderly dependents. These findings are virtually identical to what we observed in the total sample (28% of the total sample did not engage in any eldercare, while 31% were responsible for the care of three or more elderly dependents).

Virtually none of the employees in either the ATA or the national samples (95%) have responsibility for an elderly dependent living in their home. Just under half (45%) of the employees in both samples report that they are responsible for at least one dependent who lived nearby (16% have responsibility for one elderly dependent who lives nearby, 17% have responsibility for two and 10% have responsibility for three). Finally, half of those in the ATA sample (compared with 42% of those in the total sample) said that they are responsible for the care of at least one dependent who lives elsewhere (14% have responsibility for one elderly dependent who lives responsibility for two and 17% have responsibility for three).

The fact that those in the ATA sample are more likely than those in the geographically more diverse total sample to care for a dependent living elsewhere is consistent with the fact that the "hot" labour market in Alberta has attracted Canadians from other provinces to move to the west for work. As a result, they live in one location and their parents live in another. Caring for an

elderly dependent who lives in one's own home or lives elsewhere (defined as one or more hours away) is particularly stressful for caregivers.

2.2 Work Profile

To understand an employee's ability to balance work and life, one must appreciate the constraints imposed and opportunities available in two domains: work and non-work. The previous section described the key features of the respondent's non-work life. This section provides similar information with respect to the individual's work life. That data on job type itself (perhaps the most important work characteristic) was presented in the previous section.

Most Canadian employees still work a fixed 9-to-5 work schedule

Virtually all (75%) of the teachers in the ATA sample work a regular fixed work schedule (i.e., the start and stop times are fixed). While the proportion of teachers working a regular schedule was higher than the portion of respondents in the total national sample working a regular schedule (65%), the finding is not surprising given that teachers need to work around a fixed "school day." The use of flexible work arrangements, such as a compressed work week (3%) and flex time schedules (5%), is much less common in the ATA sample and tends to be worked by respondents who held administrative positions. Less than 2% of the teachers in the sample job share (a flexible work arrangement that has potential for those in the teaching profession who need more work flexibility), and 8% work part time.

Only 3% of the respondents in the ATA sample performed shift work—an arrangement that makes work–life balance much more difficult. By contrast, 17% of respondents in the national sample do shift work.

Succession planning is likely to be a problem for Alberta school boards

The sample is bi-modally distributed with respect to organizational tenure (see Figure 9). On the one hand, 44% of those in the ATA sample have been with their current organization for 11 or more years. On the other hand, 32% have worked for their current organization for five years or less. The percent of the ATA sample in the "succession planning pool" (i.e., having six to 10 years of experience in their current organization) is 24%—less than half as large as the group of experienced employees that our data (years to retirement) suggest that they may have to replace. These trends are also apparent in the total sample.



Figure 9: Years Working for Current Organization

This finding has several important implications for school boards in Alberta. First, the high proportion of employees with 11 or more years of experience suggests that many schools will have an entrenched organizational culture that will make it more difficult to successfully implement transformational change. Second, many schools in Alberta have a high number of people in their workforce who are "survivors" of the downsizing of the 1990s. Survivors have been found to be less loyal to and trustful of senior management. Finally, the relatively low number of employees with six to 10 years of work experience indicates that school boards in Alberta are likely to experience succession planning issues within the next several years.

Very little job mobility within Alberta Schools

As Figure 10 shows, virtually all (85%) of the employees in the ATA sample have been in their current job for four or more years. While one in 10 (11%) have been in their current job for one to three years, only 4% can be considered to be relatively new to their job (been in their position for a year or less). These data suggest that there has been little career mobility within Alberta schools over the past several years. These data also raise two concerns: (1) research on career development has found that the more time people spend in the same job, the more likely they are to feel frustrated with their ability to meet their career aspirations and career potential and (2) research on generational cohorts has determined that career development is very important to Generation X and Generation Y employees.



Figure 10: Years Working in Current Job

Chapter Three: Predictors

This chapter looks at the prevalence of the various predictors of the key organizational and employee outcomes examined in this study. A predictor is information that supports a probabilistic estimate of future events. Our theoretical framework (see Figure 1) includes several sets of predictors. The first set (demands, total roles) predicts the second set of predictors (work-role overload, family-role overload), which, in turn, predicts total-role overload. Three sets of "first order" predictors are examined: those pertaining to the work itself (Section 3.1), those relating to the family (Section 3.2) and those relating to the total number of roles assumed by the employee (Section 3.3). In Section 3.4, we examine the data on role overload (work, family, total).

3.1 Work Demands

Time at work is the single largest block of time that most people owe to others outside their family. Consequently, it is often the cornerstone around which other daily activities are made to fit. As a fixed commodity, time allocated to employment is necessarily unavailable for other activities, including time with family and time for leisure. Thus, time spent at work offers an important and concrete measure of one dimension of employment that affects people and their families. When asked to identify their biggest concern in life, working parents typically respond "time." Higher work demands are positively associated with increased levels of stress and depressed mood as well as increased levels of work–life conflict, increased intent to turnover and increased absenteeism.

We included two measures of work demands in this study: objective work demands (hours spent in work per week) and use of office technology. Stress and work–life conflict are positively associated with the total work demands within the couple (i.e., stress is greater when both members of a couple are trying to balance demanding careers with the demands of their partner's career and their family). As a result, we also asked respondents to estimate how many hours per week their partner spent in paid employment. A full description of the various measures examined in this section of the report and how they are interpreted is provided in *Report One*.

Data in this section can be found in the following tables in Appendix A:

Tables 7a and b: Work Demands of Respondents Tables 8a and b: Work Demands of the Partner Table 12a, b and c: Use and Impact of Work-Extension Technology

Those in the ATA sample devote long hours to work

Teachers and other respondents to the ATA survey devote long hours to work. The average employee in this sample spends 41.3 hours per week performing work at their school or office. Virtually all (88%) work more than 45 hours per week—a higher percent working more than 45 hours per week than was observed in the total sample (60%) as shown in Figure 11.

Virtually all (98%) of the respondents in the ATA sample cannot get everything done during work hours and take work home to complete during evenings and weekends. We refer to this as supplemental work at home (SWAH). These people spend another 13.9 hours in work per week (approximately two extra days of work a week).

Again, this is a higher percent performing SWAH than we observed in the total sample (55% of the total sample performed SWAH; these employees spent approximately seven hours per week in SWAH). Respondents also spend an average of four hours per week in work-related commuting (less than the 5.7 hours per week commuting noted in the total sample).

Teachers work longer hours than other professionals in the study

All things considered, the typical respondent in the ATA sample spends 60.8 hours in work-related activities per week—10 more hours in work per week, on average, than the professionals in the total sample (mean number of hours in work per week by employees in the total sample was 50.2).

Canadians donate a day's work of personal time to their organization each week

Downsizing and restructuring have increased the work demands placed upon many employees who are now doing their job as well as parts of jobs that used to be done by workers who are no longer with the organization. Employees with heavy work demands who cannot get their jobs done during regular work hours often have to work evenings and weekends to "catch up." Virtually all of the respondents in the ATA sample (98%) offer two days of work to their school board each week. In other words, they spend 13.9 hours on average in supplemental work at home.

Figure 11: Percentage Working 45 or More Hours Per Week and Doing Supplemental Work at Home (SWAH)



Time in work has increased dramatically over time

We used the same questions and the same methodology to calculate total time in work per week in the 1991, 2001 and 2011 surveys. As Figure 12 shows, the percent of the workforce working more than 45 hours per week has increased dramatically over time. While we have no data specifically on teachers in Alberta from our 2001 survey, the data from this study suggests

that workload has increased for the teachers in our ATA sample over the past several decades (unless, of course, teachers have traditionally devoted 60 hours to work each week).



Figure 12: Comparison Over Time: Hours in Work Per Week by Gender

Many teachers are married to people who work as many hours as they do

Families in which both the respondent and his or her partner report higher total time in paid employment per week are more likely to experience challenges with respect to work–life conflict than are families in which one partner or both partners spend fewer hours per week in paid employment.

When we exclude respondents whose spouse does not work, two thirds of the teachers in this sample had partners who worked more than 45 hours per week (as compared to the 56% in this situation in the total sample). Furthermore, a majority (66%) had partners who took work home to complete outside of their regular work hours (e.g., evenings and weekends). These partners spent approximately 9.5 hours in SWAH per week. For comparison purposes, 61% of those in the national sample had partners who performed SWAH. These partners spent an average of eight hours in SWAH per week.

One-third of teachers would like to decrease the amount of time spent in work

While just over half (57%) of the respondents in the ATA sample were happy with the number of hours they spend in work per week, one in three (31%) indicated that, if they had the choice, they would spent less time working for proportionally less money. These employees have very heavy work demands (all perform SWAH, and all work more than 45 hours per week) and may work for an organization that is understaffed or in which employees feel that they may lose their job if they do not devote more hours to work than they wish. Also interesting are data

showing that 12% would like to work more time to earn more money. The employees in this group were all working part time and are likely to be underemployed. These data are very similar to those observed for the total sample.

Canadian employees are highly dependent on email to stay connected to work

Canadian knowledge workers spend a significant proportion of their time at work sending and receiving emails. Virtually all (98%) respondents use email at work. While a third (35%) spend less than an hour each work day sending and reading emails, 37% spend between one and three hours, and 25% spend more than three hours a day processing email. The majority also check their email on their days off. In fact, the "typical" employee in this sample spends three hours per work day and one hour per non-work day (17 hours, or one third of their working hours) in email per week (see Figure 13).



Figure 13: Use of Email on Work Days and Non-Work Days

Teachers spend less time using email than other professionals

Examination of the data in Figure 13 support the following conclusions:

- Most teachers spend less than an hour per day on email for work—use that does not vary depending on day of the week.
- Very few respondents in the ATA sample are "power users" of email (i.e., use email more than three hours per day).

These conclusions are supported by looking at the mean number of hours spent in email per work day (1.5 hours per day for teachers, three hours per day for knowledge workers in the total sample).

Teachers are more likely to feel that technology has negatively affected them

The majority of employees in the total sample do not feel that work-extension technology such as email has affected the amount of stress they experience (66% reported no change), the amount of work they do each day/their workloads (59% reported no change) and their ability to balance work and family (66% reported no change). Although they use email less than other employees, the respondents in the ATA sample were more likely to report that work-extension technologies have increased their stress levels and their workloads. Also interesting are the data (see Figure 14) showing that, while one group of teachers (30%) said that technology had helped them to balance work and family demands, a second group of teachers (24%) said that email and other technology had made it more difficult for them to balance work and families.

It is hard to say what is behind these data. A possible explanation is that email has increased the amount of pressure that teachers feel to be continually available to their students and the parents of their students.



Figure 14: Impact of Email on Employees

3.2 Non-Work Demands

Family labour is defined as those tasks required to maintain a household and fulfill child and eldercare responsibilities. Non-work demands were quantified in this study by looking at how many hours per week the employee and their partner/spouse spent in childcare and eldercare. Research has found that, for full-time employees of both genders, an increased number of hours spent in dependent care places employees at high risk for work–family conflict, role overload and stress. This conflict, in turn, is strongly associated with decreased physical and emotional well-being as measured by depressed feelings, life satisfaction, health and energy levels, and days absent from work.

Data in this section can be found in the following tables in Appendix A:

Tables 9a and b: Non-work Demands of Respondents Tables 10a and b: Non-work Demands of Partner

Half the teachers in the ATA sample have substantive demands at home

Just under half of the respondents in the ATA sample (44%) spend time each week in childcare, and one in five (22%) spends time each week in eldercare. The typical ATA respondent with children spends an average of 18.8 hours a week in childcare or activities with their children. The typical respondent with eldercare spends an average of 5.2 hours a week in care or activities with their elderly dependents.

3.3 Total Roles

Most individuals perform a variety of roles, which may change as they move through their careers and lives. To fully appreciate the demands faced by employees in our sample, we need to look beyond the amount of time spent in work and dependent care and examine the individual's total role set. Total Life Roles was measured in this study using a scale developed and tested by the authors in a study on role overload in the healthcare sector. Respondents were given a list of 12 life roles and asked to indicate, for each role, the demand, in terms of time and energy, that the role places on them in a typical month. Respondents were given the following choices in terms of response: no time/energy in the role, almost no time/energy, a little time/energy, a moderate amount of time/energy and a lot of time/energy.

Data in this section can be found in the following tables in Appendix A: Table 11A: Total Life Roles: Percentage engaging in each role Table 11B: Total Life Roles: Energy spent in specific role

Table 11C: Total Life Roles: Summary of total energy required and total number of roles

Canadians are busy people who balance more than work and childcare

Canadians are busy people who balance more than work and family. As Table 1 shows, half the employees in this sample performed four to six different roles. One in three participated in seven to nine roles. While some of the roles employees participate in can be considered optional (exercise, sports, volunteer work), others are not (being an employee, maintaining a home, engaging in activities with spouse, parenting).

With one exception (volunteer work), the data for the teachers in the sample was virtually identical to that reported by the employees in the total sample. Teachers were significantly more likely than the knowledge workers in the total sample to spend time in volunteer activities.

Percentage Engaged in Role	Women: Total Sample	Total Sample	ATA Sample
Employee	100%	100%	100%
Exercise, sports	93%	94%	95%
Home maintainer	91%	90%	92%
Spouse/Partner	80%	82%	83%
Volunteer	50%	52%	62%
Supervisor/Manager	46%	50%	43%
Parent with children under 19	45%	46%	46%
Parent with adult children	33%	33%	33%
Grandparent	25%	26%	25%
Caregiver to disabled, ill	18%	17%	16%
Employed with a second job	13%	14%	17%
Divorced, with shared responsibility	11%	11%	8%
Total Number of Life Roles			•
0–3 roles	8%	8%	8%
4–6 roles	59%	57%	59%
7–9 roles	30%	32%	29%
10+ roles	3%	3%	4%

Table 1: Percent of Respondents Engaged in Various Life Roles

Teachers are more likely than other employees to devote a lot of energy to work

We asked employees to indicate, for each of the roles they engaged in, how much energy this role required of them. The percent of the sample indicating that the role required a lot of energy is shown in Table 2. Given the gender differences observed in the total sample with respect to the amount of energy spent in the parenting role and the fact that 80% of the ATA sample is female, we decided to show three sets of findings: total sample, women in the total sample and the ATA sample and the ATA sample.

Percentage Saying the Role Requires "A Lot" of Energy	' Women: Total Sample	Total Sample	ATA Sample
Parent with children under 19	71%	65%	74%
Employee	51%	50%	76%
Home maintainer	36%	29%	32%
Supervisor/Manager	28%	26%	26%
Caregiver to disabled, ill	27%	25%	23%
Spouse/Partner	23%	23%	27%
Divorced, with shared responsibility	20%	19%	29%
Employed with a second job	18%	18%	16%
Parent with adult children	11%	10%	12%
Exercise, sports	9%	9%	10%
Volunteer	7%	7%	11%
Grandparent	8%	6%	5%
Number of High-Energy Roles			•
Little to no Energy (0-1 high energy roles)	9%	11%	9%
Moderate Energy (2-3 high energy roles)	36%	37%	35%
High Energy (4-5 high energy roles)	42%	40%	41%
Very High Energy (6+ high energy roles)	14%	13%	15%

 Table 2: Percent of Respondents Engaged in the Role Who Say the Role Requires "A Lot"

 of Energy

Blue indicates that teachers are more likely than the women in the total sample to spend a lot of energy in this role.

The amount of energy that the women in the total sample spent in the role was similar to that spent by respondents in the ATA sample. Three-quarters of the respondents in these two samples indicated that parenting children under the age of 19 required a lot of their energy. Also important are the data showing that those in the teacher/ATA sample were significantly more likely than employees in the total sample to state that the role of employee required high energy (76% of teachers said that the work role consumed a lot of energy versus 50% of the employees in the total sample). These findings are consistent with the higher-than-average number of hours in work per week reported by employees in the ATA sample. One in three of those in the ATA sample indicated that maintaining their home required a lot of energy. One in four noted that working in a management position, acting as a caregiver to a disabled dependent and being a partner required a lot of energy. These data are essentially the same as those reported by the women in the total sample.

Finally, Table 2 suggests that the teachers/other employees in the ATA sample are very busy: the typical teacher juggles two to three high-energy roles (35%) or four to five (41%) high-energy roles. Fifteen percent are involved in six or more high-energy roles. Again, these findings parallel those observed for the females in the total sample.

3.4 Role Overload

Role overload is defined as a "a type of role conflict that results from excessive demands on the time and energy supply of an individual such that satisfactory performance is improbable." Three types of overload are examined in this study: total-role overload, work-role overload and family-role overload.

Work-role overload and family-role overload are referred to as domain-specific overload. In these two cases, the total demands on time and energy associated with the prescribed activities of their work roles (e.g., assigned to work on several major projects at the same time, too many clients making competing demands, demands associated with operational role responsibilities) and their family roles (spouse, parent, sibling, eldercare) are too great to perform the roles adequately or comfortably. Total-role overload, on the other hand, is a time-based form of role conflict in which an individual perceives that the collective demands imposed by multiple roles (e.g., parent, spouse, employee) are so great that time and energy resources are insufficient to adequately fulfill the requirements of the various roles to the satisfaction of self or others.

Overload is an important predictor of employee well-being

High levels of all these forms of role overload are problematic for organizations and employees alike. That is because overload is strongly linked to increased absenteeism, poorer physical and mental health, increased intent to turnover and higher benefits costs. Employees who are overloaded are also less likely to accept a promotion and attend career-relevant training, and they often cut corners at work. Finally, employees who are time crunched and whose demands are unremitting (e.g., no time to reflect, no down time) are more likely to find these demands overwhelming.

Data in this section can be found in the following table in Appendix A:

Table 22: Role Overload

Teachers report very high levels of total-role overload and work-role overload

Figure 15 presents data on the percent of the total sample, the women in the total sample and the ATA sample reporting high levels of total-role overload, work-role overload and family-role overload. One can draw the following conclusions with respect to the levels of overload experienced by respondents in the ATA sample by looking at the distribution of the three forms of role overload for the three samples shown:

- Just over one in four (28%) of the employees in the ATA sample reports high levels of family-role overload—a very similar percent to that reported by the knowledge workers in the total sample.
- Approximately three-quarters (71%) of the employees in the ATA sample report high levels of work-role overload—just over twice as many experiencing high work overload as reported by employees in the total sample. These findings are consistent with the fact that teachers spend about 10 hours more in work-related activities per week than the other knowledge workers in our sample (hours at work are a strong predictor of work-role overload).
- Respondents in the ATA sample are twice as likely as the knowledge workers in the total sample to report high levels of total-role overload. In fact, just over 80% of the teachers in the ATA sample reported high levels of total overload. This finding is not surprising given

the strong link between total overload and overload at work and at home, but it is cause for concern given the strong link between total overload and all the outcomes examined in this study.



Figure 15: Role Overload

Chapter Four: Organizational Outcomes

We collected data on six key indicators of organizational well-being: organizational commitment/engagement, job satisfaction, intent to turnover, employment changes due to work–life conflict, retirement intentions and absenteeism. Definitions of each of these outcomes and details on how they should be interpreted are summarized in *Report One*.

Data in this section can be found in the following tables in Appendix A:

Table 13: Organizational Outcomes Table 14: Job Satisfaction: Facet Analysis Table 15: Employment Changes Index—Details Tables 16a and b: Retirement Tables 18a, b and c: Absenteeism

Figure 16 presents data for the total sample and for the ATA sample on commitment, job satisfaction, intent to turnover and employment changes. The lack of a strong relationship between gender and these key organizational outcomes means that we do not need to present the data for the women in the total sample.



Figure 16: Organizational Outcomes

Committed employees are loyal to their organization and engaged in their work

Commitment (or engagement, as it is often called in the practitioner literature) is loyalty to the organization. Why does commitment matter? An individual who has high work commitment is willing to exert effort on behalf of the organization and has a strong desire to remain an employee of the organization (i.e., low intent to turnover). Individuals who have high work commitment also tend to be involved in their work.

Teachers are less likely to be committed to their organization

Just over half of the respondents in the ATA sample report high levels of commitment to their organization—a lower percent than was observed in the total sample, in which two-thirds reported high commitment.

Intent to turnover is defined as an individual's desire to leave an organization

Turnover has a number of undesirable implications for organizations: the cost of losing an experienced worker, recruiting and re-training a successor (re-training is estimated to cost 1.5 times the employee's annual salary), lower productivity of a new worker, and secondary morale effects on managers, peers and subordinates.

Teachers are more likely to be thinking of leaving their organization

One in three (30%) of the teachers in the ATA sample have high intent to turnover (15% think of leaving their current situation several times a week or more, 15% think of leaving once a week). This is a higher level of intent to turnover than was observed for the total sample. Though not associated with gender, intent to turnover is associated with commitment (those with moderate to low commitment are more likely to be thinking of leaving their employer).

Job satisfaction measures how positively employees feel about their work

Why does job satisfaction matter? Although work can be a source of satisfaction and selfesteem, it can also foster dissatisfaction, depressed feelings and despair. Research has shown a negative relationship between job satisfaction and work stress, organizational commitment, morale, absenteeism, retention, and mental and physical health.

Many teachers are not satisfied with their jobs

Just under 40% of the teachers in the ATA sample report high job satisfaction (15% are dissatisfied with their jobs, and 48% have mixed feelings about their work). These findings contrast strongly with what was observed in the total sample in which 59% of the respondents reported high job satisfaction. With what aspects of their jobs are respondents satisfied? With what aspects are they dissatisfied? The answers to these questions are given in Table 3.

Teachers appreciate the extrinsic aspects of their jobs

Generally speaking, teachers find the extrinsic aspects of their jobs satisfying: the amount that they are paid, their job security, their job in general and the sorts of things that they do on the job. They are more likely than employees in the total sample to be satisfied with the amount of job security they have.

Percent indicating <i>satisfaction</i> with the following aspects:	Total Sample	ATA Sample
The amount of pay you get	72%	76%
The amount of job security you have	65%	75%
Your job in general	77%	75%
The sorts of things you do on the job	74%	60%
The schedule of your working hours	78%	54%
Your ability to meet career goals and aspirations	45%	49%
The development opportunities offered by their organization	41%	44%
The number of hours you work	74%	28%
Your current workload	56%	26%
Percent indicating <i>dissatisfaction</i> with the following aspects:	Total Sample	ATA Sample
Your current workload	26%	62%
The number of hours you work	15%	59%
The development opportunities offered by your organization	35%	35%
Your ability to meet career goals and aspirations	30%	28%
The schedule of your working hours	12%	28%
The sorts of things you do on the job	12%	25%
Your job in general	11%	14%
The amount of job security you have	16%	12%

Table 3: Aspects of Their Jobs that Canadians Find Satisfying/Dissatisfying

Blue indicates that those in the ATA sample were more likely to be satisfied/less likely to be dissatisfied with this aspect of their job than those in the total sample.

Red indicates that those in the ATA sample were less likely to be satisfied/more likely to be dissatisfied with this aspect of their job than those in the total sample.

Many teachers are dissatisfied with training and development opportunities available

With what aspects of work are knowledge workers (including teachers) dissatisfied? According to the data, knowledge workers are dissatisfied with (1) career development and (2) opportunities to meet their career goals. There were no differences between the ATA sample and the total sample. These findings suggest that Canadian employees (including school boards) need to increase the number of development opportunities they provide to employees if they want to improve job satisfaction and reduce turnover.

Workloads are particularly problematic for those in the ATA sample

Only 25% of the teachers/other employees in the ATA sample were satisfied with their workloads and the number of hours they devote to work each week, while approximately 60% of the sample were dissatisfied with these facets of their job. While consistent with the time-in-work and work-role-overload data reported previously, these levels of dissatisfaction are cause

for concern—especially in light of the fact that over half of the knowledge workers in the total sample were satisfied with these aspects of their work.

These data, in combination with the high levels of job satisfaction with things such as pay and the job itself, suggest that school boards across Alberta need to address workload issues if they want to improve such things as engagement, job satisfaction and intent to turnover.

Work-life conflict can have negative consequences for employers

Work-life conflict can have a number of negative consequences for employers when employees are not able to cope with the dual demands of work and family. The data shown in Table 4 indicate that school boards across Alberta are no exception to this rule.

Percent Indicating That Work and Family Challenges Had Caused Them to Do the Following:	Women: Total Sample	Total Sample	ATA Sample
Reduce their productivity at work	23%	22%	44%
Increase their use of employee benefits	23%	21%	34%
Reduce their work hours	20%	19%	30%
Be absent more often from work	27%	25%	30%

Table 4: Impact of Work–Life Conflict on Organization (Employer Changes Index)

Blue indicates that those in the ATA sample were more likely to report these issues than were those in the total sample.

Work-life conflict negatively affects the work performance of one in three teachers

While the majority of respondents report that work–life issues have not affected their work performance (see Figure 16), approximately one in three of the respondents in the ATA sample reported that in the last 12 months they had experienced negative changes in their circumstances at work because of conflicts with demands at home. More specifically, a substantive number of ATA respondents report that work–life challenges have caused them to be absent from work more often (30%), reduce their work productivity (44%), make greater use of the benefits offered by the organization (34%) and reduce their work hours (30%). One in 10 also said that they had turned down a promotion because of work–life issues. These data support the idea that to increase their efficiency and effectiveness, school boards in Alberta need to deal with the issue of work–life conflict in general and workloads in particular. The urgency of this issue is apparent from the fact that the negative impacts of work–life conflict are significantly more likely to be observed in the ATA sample than in the total sample.

One in four teachers in this sample is eligible to retire within five years

The aging of Canada's workforce (Boomers are getting older), the undersupply of young people (birth rates have declined in Canada during the past 40 years), and low hiring rates in the 1990s and the first part of this millennium mean that Canadian employers need to be aware of the retirement intentions of their workforce.

Respondents in the ATA sample say that they plan on retiring when they are 59 (not 65!) years of age. While the typical respondent in this sample is 14.5 years from retirement, 26% of the teachers in the sample said that they are fewer than five years from retirement. A higher

number of men in the sample are within five years of retirement (24%) than are women (20%). These findings are virtually identical to those noted in the total sample and reinforce the idea that it will be a "sellers" labour market for knowledge workers in Canada within the next five years.

What do respondents plan on doing after they retire?

While half of those in the ATA sample (46%) have no plans on working after retiring, approximately the same percent say that they intend to work part-time after they retire from their current job (48%). Finally, six percent plan on working full time for someone else post retirement.

These data support the following conclusions. First, employers across Canada (including school boards) need to consider changing their retirement policies and perhaps implementing phased retirement plans if they want to prevent their talent from taking early retirement or taking a part-time job elsewhere. Second, employers should not count on Canadians working past the age of 65 because they need the money. Our data do not support this assumption.

Absenteeism due to ill health and emotional fatigue are common in Canadian organizations

Many organizations use absence from work as a measure of productivity (if workers are not on the job, the work is definitely not being done). Although companies expect a certain amount of absenteeism and recognize that some absenteeism is even beneficial to the employee, too much absenteeism can be costly in terms of productivity and is often symptomatic of problems within the workplace. Absenteeism has been estimated to cost the Canadian economy between \$2.7 and \$7.7 billion annually. Data on absenteeism are shown in Figure 17 and Table 5.



Figure 17: Percentage Absent from Work in the Past Six Months

Three-quarters of ATA respondents (77%) had missed work in the six months prior to the study. The most common reasons for missing work were health problems (60%) and emotional, mental or physical fatigue (45%). One in five missed work because of childcare issues, and one

in 10 missed work because of eldercare or because their school board would not grant them a vacation day. Significantly, 3% of the sample had experienced long-term absenteeism during the past year (operationally defined at missing more than 30 days of work in a year).

The likelihood of someone in the ATA sample missing work was, with one exception, the same as observed in the total sample. Absenteeism due to the need to provide childcare was lower in the ATA sample, a finding that is likely a reflection of the fact that fewer teachers in the sample have children.

A typical employee misses 12 days of work per year

Respondents in the ATA sample missed an average of 10 days of work per year (see Table 5)—a lower number of days off work than was observed in the total sample.³ Approximately half the absenteeism was attributable to ill health (5.2 days absent per year due to ill health). However, the absence due to emotional, physical or mental fatigue (3.0 days per year) was also substantive.

Reasons for Missing Work	Mean Days Missed over Past 12 Months	
	Total Sample	Total ATA Sample
All causes (total absenteeism)	12.6	10.4
Health problems	5.4	5.2
Emotional, physical or mental fatigue	3.4	3.0
Child-related problems	2.4	1.4
Caring for an elderly dependent	1.0	0.6
A personal leave day/vacation day was not granted	0.6	0.4

Table 5: Days Absent

Work–life issues can be linked to absence from work

A different picture of absenteeism emerges if we look only at the number of days absent for those people in the sample who actually missed work for any of the reasons explored in this study. These data show that respondents in the ATA sample who missed work due to health problems missed 8.3 days of work in a 12-month period (slightly lower than the 9.2 days missed by those in the total sample). Similarly, those absent due to eldercare missed 10 days per year, those absent due to emotional or physical fatigue missed 6.8 days per year, and those who missed work due to childcare missed 6.2 days per year. With one exception—those in the total sample missed 7.8 days per year due to childcare—these findings are similar to those reported by respondents in the total sample.

These findings are consistent with the data reported earlier (absenteeism has increased due to work–life issues) and support the idea that work–life conflict, workload and work-stress issues are taking their toll on the physical and mental health of ATA members. Furthermore, these data provide yet another reason for addressing these issues: to decrease the costs associated with absenteeism. Given that emotional fatigue is a precursor to employee burnout, the high number of days absent due to mental and emotional fatigue is worthy of note.

³We estimated the total number of days missed per year by doubling the days missed in a six-month period.
Chapter Five: Employee Outcomes

This chapter examines data on a number of employee outcomes, including measures of employee well-being (Section 5.1) and work–life conflict (Section 5.2). Definitions of these outcomes and details on how they should be interpreted are summarized in *Report One*.

Data in this section can be found in the following tables in Appendix A:

Table 19: Employee Wellbeing Tables 20a and b: Use of Healthcare System Table 20c: Impact of Work–Life Conflict Table 21: Work–Life Outcomes Tables 36a and b: Caregiver Strain

5.1 Employee Well-being

This study considered four indicators of employee well-being: perceived stress, depressed mood, life satisfaction and perceived physical health. Data are shown in Figure 18 and discussed below.

High levels of stress are systemic in Canadian organizations

Perceived stress refers to the extent to which one perceives one's situation to be unpredictable, uncontrollable and burdensome. People who report high levels of perceived stress are generally manifesting the symptoms associated with "*distress*," including nervousness, frustration, irritability and generalized anxiety.

Teachers are more likely to report high levels of perceived stress

The data indicate that workload and work–life issues may be having a negative impact on the well-being of a substantive portion of Alberta teachers. Seventy percent of the employees in the ATA sample report high levels of perceived stress—a significantly greater percent with high stress than was observed in the total sample (57% of the total sample and 61% of the women in the total sample reported high stress).

One in three employees reports high levels of depressed mood

Depressed mood is a state characterized by low energy and persistent feelings of helplessness and hopelessness. Figure 18 shows that 36% of the employees in this sample and 46% of the women in the sample report high levels of depressed mood (76% report moderate to high depressed mood).

Teachers are more likely to report high levels of depressed mood

Just under half (47%) of the teachers in the ATA sample report high levels of depressed mood.

Relatively few employees report high levels of life satisfaction

Life satisfaction provides an assessment of an individual's overall sense of well-being (physical, emotional, social). Life satisfaction determines how people feel about their life as a whole, including such factors as whether they are achieving their goals, doing as well as the

people around them and feeling generally happy. Two-thirds of the employees report that they are moderately satisfied with their lives. The proportion of the sample reporting high life satisfaction (23%) is nearly double the number reporting low life satisfaction (12%). These findings did not vary between samples: those in the ATA sample reported the same levels of life satisfaction as those in the total sample.



Figure 18: Employee Well-being

Many Canadian employees are in poor physical health

Taken as a whole, there were no differences between the ATA and total samples with respect to perceived health. The following data paint a fairly consistent picture with respect to employee health:

- Forty-six percent say that their health is very good to excellent, 38% say that their health is good and 16% say that their health is poor/fair.
- Fifty percent of the sample have not seen a physician in the last six months, 25% have seen a physician once and 24% have seen a physician two or more times. Respondents who saw a physician made an average of three visits to their doctor in a six-month period.
- While virtually no one in the sample (93%) had an overnight stay in the hospital in the six months before the survey, 5% have been admitted to the hospital once and 2% had been admitted two or more times in the six months before the survey. Respondents who were admitted spent an average of three nights in the hospital in the last six months.
- While 87% of the employees in the sample have not visited the hospital's emergency department in the last six months for personal health issues, 11% made one visit to the emergency ward and 2% made two or more visits.

In all cases, greater use of the health care system is interpreted as an indicator of poorer employee health.

5.2 Work–Life Outcomes

This analysis includes two types of work–life conflict: *family interferes with work* and *work interferes with family*. In the first type, interference occurs when family-role responsibilities hinder performance at work (e.g., a child's illness prevents attendance at work). In the second type, problems arise when work-role activities impede performance of family responsibilities (e.g., long hours in paid work prevent the performance of duties at home). In both cases, higher scores indicate greater work–life conflict. Data on the work–life outcomes examined in this study are presented in Figure 19.



Figure 19: Work–Life Outcomes

Canadian employees are twice as likely to let work interfere with family as the reverse

One in three Canadian employees in the total sample experience high levels of work that interfere with family (i.e., they put work first), while only 15% of the sample report high levels of family that interferes with work (i.e., they meet family demands at the expense of work). These findings are consistent with the data on work and family overload reported previously. There are no gender differences in the incidence of either form of work–life conflict: men and women are equally likely to report both forms of interference.

Teachers report very high levels of work–life conflict

Three-quarters of respondents in the ATA sample report high levels of work interfering with family—more than double the number of employees in the total sample reporting high levels of this form of work–life conflict. These findings are consistent with the fact that teachers take work home often, work very long hours and report higher levels of work-role overload.

Interestingly, respondents in the ATA sample were twice as likely as other employees in the total sample to report that they experience high levels of family obligations interfering with

work. The higher levels of work–life conflict experienced by those in the ATA sample may be due to the lower levels of perceived flexibility reported by those in the ATA sample.

Work-life conflict negatively affects how employees spend their time

Earlier we looked at how work–life conflict affects the employer. An inability to cope with the dual demands of work and family might also have a negative impact on employees. To quantify the impact that work–life conflict has on employees, we asked respondents to indicate the extent to which challenges with respect to balancing work and family have caused them, during the past year, to reduce the amount of time that they have to themselves, the amount of sleep they get, the amount of energy they have and the amount of time they spent in recreational or leisure activities. In all cases, the greater the reduction in the amount of time the employee has for each of these activities, the greater the risk of mental and physical health problems. Responses to these questions are shown in Table 6.

Teachers are more likely to meet work expectations at the expense of time for themselves

The data in Table 6 indicate that teachers pay a high price personally when they try to do it all. Two-thirds of the teachers in the sample say that work–life challenges mean that they have less energy, and half of those in the ATA sample report that work–life challenges mean that they have less time for themselves, a social life, sleep and recreational activities. Furthermore, the data indicates that teachers are twice as likely to report these impacts than were the women in the total sample. These data, while consistent with many of the results reported previously (teachers work longer hours, report higher work–life conflict, have poorer mental health and feel less positively about their job and their employer) are concerning because they indicate that many teachers in Alberta are at risk of work burnout. They also emphasize the urgency of dealing with this situation before it is too late.

Percent Indicating that Work and Family Challenges Had Caused Them to Do the Following:	Women: Total Sample	Total Sample	ATA Sample
Reduce the amount of energy they have	38%	31%	62%
Reduce the amount of time they have for personal/recreational activities	32%	36%	58%
Reduce the amount of sleep they get	33%	23%	54%
Reduce the amount of time they have for themselves	27%	27%	49%
Blue indicates that those in the ATA sample were more like employees in the total sample.	cely to report this in	npact than	were

Table 6: Individual Changes Index (High Scores Only)

Canadian employees who care for elderly dependents may experience caregiver strain

Caregiver strain is a multidimensional construct that is defined in terms of "burdens" or changes in a caregiver's day-to-day life that can be attributed to the need to provide physical, financial or emotional support to an elderly dependent. Research has linked high levels of caregiver strain to increased levels of depression, anxiety, fatigue, anger, family conflict, guilt, self-blame, emotional strain and sleep loss.



Figure 20: Caregiver Strain in the ATA Sample

High levels of caregiver strain are relatively rare

Fifteen percent of those in the ATA sample report high levels of caregiver strain. Much of this strain stems from the physical challenges of caring for an adult (27% report physical strain) and from feeling overwhelmed by the caregiver experience (22% report high emotional strain). Very few of the employees in the ATA sample reported high levels of financial strain, a finding that is consistent with the fact that many respondents live in families that are not struggling financially. These findings are essentially the same as was observed with the total sample.

Chapter Six: Moderators

In statistics, a moderator variable is one that affects the direction and/or strength of the relationship between dependent variables (i.e., demands, overload, work–life conflict) and independent variables (i.e., employee and organizational outcomes). The moderators and the relationships they are likely to moderate are shown in Figure 1. Among the factors that might moderate the relationships explored in this study are organizational culture, control over work/control over family, supportive management and perceived flexibility. Information on the moderators is provided below.

Data in this section can be found in the following tables in Appendix A:

Tables 23a and b: Organizational Culture Table 24: Control over Work and Control over Family Table 28a and b: Perceived Flexibility

6.1 Organizational Culture Is Key

Organizational culture refers to the unwritten rules and corporate norms that dictate how things are done, how things work, what is to be done and what is valued in the organization (i.e., "the way things are done around here"). Research indicates that an organization's climate and culture can significantly affect an employee's ability to balance work and family demands, work stress, overall stress, job satisfaction, work involvement and commitment to the organization. In fact, an organization's culture often has more impact on how employees feel about their work and their ability to balance work and life than do the policies that are implemented within the organization.

This study assessed two sets of organizational beliefs: (1) that the culture values employees who keep their personal issues out of the workplace (referred to as *The Myth of Separate Worlds*) and (2) that the culture values employees who always give priority to work (referred to as *Work Takes Priority*). The items used to measure the two cultures are detailed in the box below. Scores on the items that make up this measure are reported in Table 7.

Employees in the ATA sample were more likely than those in the total sample to agree with all the statements included in the culture measure.

Organizational Culture

Work Takes Priority:

- Work should be a primary priority in a person's life.
- People who are highly committed to family cannot be highly committed to work as well.
- Employees who take time off work to attend to personal matters are not committed to work.
- The most committed employees are those who put their work before their personal issues.
- Offering employees flexibility in how they complete their work is a strategic way to do business (R).
- The ideal employee is one who is available 24 hours a day.

The Myth of Separate Worlds:

- Employees should keep their personal problems at home.
- The way to advance is to keep personal issues out of the workplace.
- Employees are given ample opportunities to perform both their work and their personal responsibilities (R).

Note: The higher the agreement with all but the two statements followed by an (R), the greater the belief that these statements describe the culture of the organization. Items marked with an R are "reverse" coded, which means that the higher the disagreement with the statement, the greater the belief that the culture of the organization is one in which work takes priority and work and family lives should be kept separate.

Half the teachers in the sample believe that their employer expects them to keep work and family separate

Approximately half of those in the ATA sample perceive that their employer values and rewards those who keep their work and family lives separate (Figure 21)—double the percent of those in the total sample who have this perception. These findings are concerning given that employees with families experience difficulty keeping work and family domains separate, especially when more than half of them are taking work home on evenings and weekends.

Half the teachers in the sample agree that their employer expects them to be available 24/7

Half of the respondents in the ATA sample also perceive that their organization values an employee who is available for work 24/7. Again, a higher percent of the ATA sample agreed that this culture is in place in their organization than was observed in the total sample. Employees who work for such organizations are unlikely to benefit from any forward-thinking family-friendly policies or practices because the organizational culture would likely view the use of such benefits as a career-limiting move.

Finally, the data suggest that gender is not associated with how an employee perceives organizational culture.



Figure 21: Organizational Culture: ATA Sample Versus Total Sample

Table 7: Respondents' View of Organizational Culture

	Percent A	greeing
	Total Sample	ATA Sample
Culture: The Myth of Separate Worlds		
The way to advance is to keep personal issues out of the workplace.	37%	54%
Employees should keep their personal problems at home.	40%	53%
Culture: Work Takes Priority	•	
The ideal employee is one who is available 24 hours a day.	33%	44%
The most productive employees are those who put their work before their personal issues.	35%	53%
Work should be a primary priority in a person's life.	35%	61%
Employees who take time off work to attend to personal matters are not committed to work.	29%	51%
People who are highly committed to family cannot be highly committed to work as well.	25%	43%

6.2 Perceived Control Is Also Key

Perceived control is the belief that one can determine one's own behavior, influence one's environment and/or bring about desired outcomes. A vast body of research in the area of occupational health suggests that perceived control is an important moderator between demands and stress (the higher the control, the more able the employee is to cope with demands at work and/or outside of work). Two measures of perceived control are examined in this study:

- *Control over work* is the amount of perceived control people have over their work (i.e., they know how their work will be assessed and have some say over their workload or work schedule).
- *Control over home* is the ability to exert control over activities that take place at home.



Figure 22: Perceived Control Over Work and Family: ATA Sample Versus Total Sample

Employees have more control over their family than they do over their work

As Figure 22 shows, respondents in the ATA sample are more likely to report that they have higher levels of control over their home situation (57% report high control, while only 5% report low control) than their work situation (12% report high control, while 32% report low control). These data, when combined with the organizational culture data presented earlier, suggest that many teachers will use their higher levels of control at home to help them make work a priority.

This pattern is also apparent in the total sample. Although those in the ATA sample are less likely than those in the total sample to report high levels of control over work or family, the differences are not substantial (5% difference).

6.3 Perceived Flexibility

Perceived flexibility is the amount of control employees perceive that they have over their work hours and work location. Flexibility in work time and work location have the potential to balance work and family demands by increasing an employee's ability to control, predict and absorb change in work and family roles. Employees who perceive that that have high levels of control over when and where they work have been found to be more committed to the organization. They also report greater job satisfaction, lower absenteeism and a better work–life balance.

One in three employees has very little control over his or her hours of work

While perceived flexibility is normally distributed in the total sample (see Figure 23), the distribution in the ATA sample is highly skewed: virtually all respondents report low levels of flexibility with respect to hours of work. Perceived flexibility was not associated with gender. Given the type of work that teachers do and the restrictions that the job places on when and where work is done, these results are not surprising. At the same time, they are unfortunate because perceived flexibility can help to moderate the relationship between demands and outcomes.



Figure 23: Perceived Flexibility in the ATA Sample Versus the Total Sample

Most teachers lack the work flexibility needed to balance work and family demands

Data on the individual items that make up this measure are shown in Table 8. These data show that teachers are significantly less likely than the employees in the total sample to have any of the forms of flexibility explored in this study. In fact, the levels of perceived flexibility reported by respondents in the ATA sample were the lowest in the sample (substantially lower than reported by police officers and nurses). These findings are consistent with the high levels of work-life conflict and role overload reported by those in the ATA sample as well as the lower levels of control over work.

Table 8: Perceived Flexibility

	Total Sample	ATA Sample
Percent of respondents who find it easy to do the following:	-	-
Be home to have meals with the family.	57%	40%
Take a paid day off work when a child is sick.	56%	21%
Take their holidays when they want.	48%	2%
Vary their work hours (arrival and departure time).	43%	7%
Take a paid day off when an elderly relative needs them.	43%	8%
Interrupt their work day to deal with a personal/family matter and then return to work.	43%	4%
Take time off work to attend a course or conference.	37%	14%
Arrange their work schedule to meet personal/family commitments.	36%	4%
Spend some of their day working from home.	15%	2%
Be home when their children get home from school.	15%	10%
Percent of respondents who find it <i>difficult</i> to do the following:		
Spend some of their day working from home.	70%	95%
Be home when their children get home from school.	62%	73%
Vary their work hours (arrival and departure time).	37%	84%
Arrange their work schedule to meet personal/family commitments.	37%	85%
Take time off work to attend a course or conference.	34%	63%
Interrupt their work day to deal with a personal/family matter and then return to work.	33%	84%
Take a paid day off when an elderly relative needs them.	32%	79%
Take their holidays when they want.	29%	94%
Take a paid day off work when a child is sick.	21%	63%
Be home to have meals with the family.	21%	30%

Chapter Seven: Conclusions

The Alberta Teachers Association (ATA) participated in the 2011/12 National Study on Balancing Work, Life and Caregiving in Canada. This chapter outlines the key findings obtained using the ATA sample (n = 2,462). Where relevant, responses obtained from the ATA sample are compared with the results obtained from the total sample of 25,021 employees who answered the survey. Throughout this chapter, the term *teachers* is used for the sake of convenience, although 5% of the respondents did not work in this role and 13% combined classroom and administrative duties.

7.1 Characteristics of the ATA Sample

The following observations with respect to teachers in Alberta can be extrapolated from the results of this study:

- The majority (77%) of respondents in the ATA sample were females. This gender imbalance in the teacher sample is likely due to the fact that teaching is a female-dominated profession.
- The ATA sample was younger that the total sample: 49% of the teachers in the sample were Generation Xers and 36% were Baby Boomers.
- Three-quarters of the employees in the ATA sample were married. This distribution is virtually identical to what was observed in the total sample.
- In the majority (75%) of families represented in the ATA sample, both partners work for pay outside the home. Balance is more likely to be an issue for these families.
- Although a majority of the respondents (51%) lived in Calgary or Edmonton, one in three lived in rural communities with populations of 25,000 or less.
- All of the teachers in the sample had a university (78%) or postgraduate university (22%) degree. This is a higher level of formal education than observed in the total sample (38% had a university degree and 18% had a postgraduate degree).
- Teachers tended to be married to people very similar to themselves. The partners of the teachers in the sample were well educated (22% had a college diploma, 40% had one university degree and 14% had a postgraduate degree); worked in executive, management, professional or technical positions; and tended to be well paid.
- Most ATA members are socioeconomically advantaged (60% made \$80,000 a year or more).
- Families are more financially secure in the ATA sample than in the national sample—a finding that is likely due, in part, to the higher levels of employment in Alberta. Nevertheless, money is tight for one in five of the families in the ATA sample.
- The teachers in this sample tend to live in one of three types of families:
 - families in which they were the main breadwinner (men were more likely to be in this type of family than women),
 - o families in which they shared breadwinning duties with their partner or
 - families in which their income (and job) was secondary to that of their partners (all of the teachers in the third situation were females).
- Women are the primary earner or equal partners in the breadwinning equation in just over half the families in the ATA study. These findings suggest that a new paradigm is needed to

describe and evaluate women's participation in Canada's labour market and their contribution to the economic well-being of their families.

- The sample is bi-modally distributed with respect to organizational tenure. On the one hand, 44% of those in the ATA sample have been with the organization for 11 or more years. On the other hand, 32% have worked for their current organization for five years or less.
- Virtually all (85%) of the employees in the ATA sample have been in their current job for four or more years. These data suggest that there has been little career mobility within Alberta schools during the past several years.

These findings have several implications for the employer and the ATA. First, the age breakdown of the sample as well as the years-in-current-job data make it likely that school boards in Alberta will see an exodus of experienced teachers during the next several years. Hiring and retaining new teachers to replace these workers could be an issue given many of the findings from this study. Second, these data suggest that succession planning is likely to be an issue for school boards in Alberta. The percent of the ATA sample in the "succession planning pool" (i.e., people having six to 10 years of experience with the organization) is 24%—less than half as large as the group of experienced employees that our data suggests that they may have to replace. These trends are also apparent in the total sample, a finding that suggests that Alberta school boards will be competing with public and private sector employers for "talent." Third, research in the area has determined that Generation Xers have very different work values than the Boomers whom they will be replacing. This finding suggests that many schools operating in Alberta may experience generational conflict within the workplace.

The organizational-tenure data is also important for a number of other reasons. First, the high proportion of employees with 11 or more years of experience suggests that many schools will have an entrenched organizational culture that will make it more difficult to successfully implement transformational change. Second, many schools in Alberta have a high number of people in their workforce who are "survivors" of the downsizing of the 1990s. Survivors have been found to be less loyal to and less trustful of senior management.

These data on years in current position are cause for concern for two other reasons: (1) research on career development has found that the more time that people spend in the same job, the more likely they are to feel frustrated with their ability to meet their career aspirations and career potential and (2) research on generational cohort has determined that career development is very important to Generation X and Generation Y employees.

7.2 Family and Other Role Demands on Teachers

The following observations with respect to the non-work demands encountered by teachers in Alberta can be extrapolated from the results of this study:

• The ATA sample includes two approximately equally-sized groups of employees. The first subset (59% of the ATA sample) consists of teachers who have children. These employees have to balance heavy demands at work with equally heavy demands at home. The second subset (41%) consists of teachers who do not yet have children. This group can be expected to have fewer family demands. Given the data showing that most of the teachers without children are married (75% of the ATA sample is married or lives with a partner) and in their middle to late thirties, it can be predicted either that many are planning to have children in the near future or that they have elected not to have children.

- Three-quarters of the parents in the ATA sample and in the total sample indicated that being a parent to children under the age of 19 required a lot of energy.
- One in four of the teachers in the sample (25%) have children under the age of five (preschoolers) and, as such, are at higher risk with respect to work–life conflict.
- Responsibility for childcare is skewed: one in four of those in the ATA sample (all women) say that in their family they assume virtually all responsibility for childcare, and one in four (virtually all men) say that in their families their partner has primary responsibility for childcare. Responsibility for childcare is shared in just over one in five families.
- Eldercare responsibilities are bi-modally distributed within the ATA sample. While 25% of those in the ATA sample report that they have no eldercare responsibilities, 36% say that they are responsible for the care of three or more elderly dependents! The rest of the sample has responsibility for the care of one (18%) or two (20%) elderly dependents. These findings are virtually identical to what was observed in the total sample.
- One in four of the teachers in the ATA sample are part of the "sandwich generation."
- Half of those in the ATA sample (compared with 42% of those in the total sample) said that they are responsible for the care of at least one dependent who lives elsewhere.
- Just under half of the respondents in the ATA sample (44%) spend time each week in childcare, and one in five (22%) spend time each week in eldercare. The typical ATA respondent with childcare spends an average of 18.8 hours a week in care or activities with their children. The typical respondent with eldercare spends an average of 5.2 hours a week in care or activities with their elderly dependents.
- Teachers are busy people and balance more than work and family. The typical teacher in Alberta juggles two to three (35%) or four to five (41%) high-energy roles. Fifteen percent are involved in six or more high-energy roles. These findings parallel those observed for the females in the total sample.
- Teachers were significantly more likely than employees in the total sample to spend time each week in volunteer activities.

These findings have several implications for the employer and the ATA. First our analysis of the data (total and ATA samples) determined that women are more likely than men to say that they have primary responsibility for childcare in their families. This finding suggests that gender-role expectations with respect to parenting have not changed substantially over time despite the influx of women into the paid labour market. The finding also suggests that many women in Canada and teachers in Alberta "work a second shift" at home. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that half of the teachers in the ATA sample have very considerable demands at home.

Second, the fact that half the sample of teachers has children while half does not increases the probability that these two groups will experience conflict in the workplace because they likely have very different priorities with respect to how they use their time.

Third, the high number of teachers with eldercare issues suggests that both the employer and the ATA have to reframe work–life balance issues to recognize the concerns of those in the eldercare and sandwich groups. The data showing that respondents in the ATA sample are more likely than those in the geographically more diverse total sample to care for a dependent living elsewhere (a situation that is particularly stressful for caregivers) emphasize the need to address this issue.

Many teachers have very heavy work demands

The following observations with respect to the work demands assumed by teachers in Alberta can be extrapolated from the results of this study:

- Teachers devote long hours to work. The average teacher in the ATA sample spends 41.3 hours per week performing work at their school or office. Virtually all (88%) work more than 45 hours per week. A higher percent work more than 45 hours per week than was observed in the total sample (60%).
- Virtually all (98%) of the teachers in the sample take work home to complete outside of their regular hours on evenings and weekends, a practice that we refer to as supplemental work at home (SWAH). Each week, these individuals spend another 13.9 hours (approximately two extra days) working. A higher percent of the ATA sample performs SWAH than was observed in the total sample (55% of the total sample performed SWAH, which amounted to approximately seven hours per week).
- All things considered, the typical teacher in the ATA sample spends 60.8 hours in workrelated activities per week—10 more hours in work per week, on average, than the professionals in the total sample (mean number of hours in work per week by employees in the total sample was 50.2).
- Two-thirds of the teachers in this sample had partners who worked more than 45 hours per week (as compared with the 56% in this situation in the total sample) and took work home to complete outside of their regular working hours (e.g., evenings and weekends). These partners spent approximately 9.5 hours in SWAH. By comparison, 61% of those in the national sample had partners who performed SWAH. These partners spent an average of eight hours in SWAH per week.
- One in three teachers would like to decrease the amount of time spent in work per week. These employees have very heavy work demands (all perform SWAH, and all work more than 45 hours per week).
- While teachers spend less time using email than other professionals (1.5 hours per day for teachers, three hours per day for knowledge workers in the total sample), they are also more likely to report that email has increased their stress levels and their workloads. A possible explanation for these data may be that email has increased the pressure that teachers feel to be continually available to their students and the parents of their students.
- Teachers are more likely than other employees to devote a lot of energy to their work role (76% of teachers, compared with 50% of employees in the total sample, said that their work role consumed a lot of energy).

The time-in-work data are a cause for concern given the strong link between objective work demands and work-role overload.

Role overload is a challenge for many

Role overload is defined as a "a type of role conflict that results from excessive demands on the time and energy supply of an individual such that satisfactory performance is improbable." Total-role overload and work-role overload were found to be important predictors of organizational and employee well-being. The following observations with respect to the role overload experienced by teachers in Alberta can be extrapolated from the results of this study:

- Just over one in four (28%) of the employees in the ATA sample report high levels of family role overload—a percent that is very similar to that reported by the knowledge workers in the total sample.
- Approximately three-quarters (71%) of the employees in the ATA sample report high levels of work-role overload—just over twice as many with high work overload as reported by employees in the total sample. These findings are consistent with the fact that teachers spend about 10 hours more in work-related activities per week than the other knowledge workers in our sample.
- Teachers in the ATA sample are twice as likely as employees in the total sample to report high levels of total-role overload. In fact, just over 80% of the teachers in the ATA sample reported high levels of total overload. This finding is not surprising given the strong link between total overload and overload at work and at home.

These findings should be of concern given the very strong link between work-role overload and total overload and between total overload and all the outcomes examined in this study.

These issues are negatively affecting the bottom line

The following observations with respect to organizational well-being within Alberta schools can be extrapolated from the results of this study:

- Committed employees are loyal to their organization and engaged in their work. Just over half of the respondents in the ATA sample report high levels of commitment to their organization—a lower percent than was observed in the total sample, in which two-thirds reported high commitment).
- Intent to turnover is defined as an individual's desire to leave an organization. Turnover has a number of undesirable and potentially costly implications for organizations. One in three (30%) of the teachers in the ATA sample have high intent to turnover (15% are thinking of leaving their current situation several times a week or more, 15% are thinking of leaving once a week). This is a higher level of intent to turnover than was observed in the total sample.
- Job satisfaction measures how positively employees feel about their work. Just under 40% of the teachers in the ATA sample report high job satisfaction (15% are dissatisfied with their jobs, and 48% have mixed feelings about their work). These findings contrast sharply with what was observed in the total sample in which 59% of the respondents reported high job satisfaction.
- With what aspects of their jobs are teachers satisfied? The data from this study suggests that teachers appreciate the extrinsic aspects of their jobs (pay, job security) and love the work itself. They are more likely than employees in the total sample to be satisfied with the amount of job security they have.
- With what aspects of work are knowledge workers (including teachers) dissatisfied? The data suggest that knowledge workers are dissatisfied with career development and their opportunities to meet their career goals. These findings are consistent with the job mobility data reported earlier and indicated that school boards in Alberta need to increase the number of development opportunities they provide to employees if they want to improve job satisfaction and reduce turnover.

- With what aspects of their jobs are teachers dissatisfied? Only one in four teachers in the ATA sample were satisfied with their workloads and the number of hours they devote to work each week, whereas approximately 60% of the sample were dissatisfied with these facets of their job. While consistent with the time in work and work-role overload data reported previously, these levels of dissatisfaction are cause for concern given the fact that over half the knowledge workers in the total sample were satisfied with these aspects of their work.
- Many organizations use absence from work as a measure of productivity (if workers are not on the job, the work is definitely not being done). Three-quarters of the ATA respondents (77%) missed work in the six months before the study. Among the most common reasons for missing work were health problems (60%) and emotional, mental or physical fatigue (45%). One in five missed work because of childcare issues, and one in 10 missed work because of eldercare or because their school board would not grant them a vacation day.
- The likelihood of someone in the ATA sample missing work was, with one exception, the same as observed in the total sample. Absenteeism due to the need to provide childcare was lower in the ATA sample than in the total sample, a finding that is likely due to the fact that fewer of the teachers in the sample have children.
- Respondents in the ATA sample missed an average of 10 days of work per year—a lower number of days off work than was observed in the total sample. Approximately half of this absenteeism can be attributed to ill health (5.2 days absent per year due to ill health), but the absence due to emotional, physical or mental fatigue (3.0 days per year) is also substantive.

The organizational outcome data, combined with the high levels of job satisfaction with things such as pay and the job itself, suggest that school boards across Alberta need to deal with workload issues if they want to improve teachers' engagement, job satisfaction and intent to turnover. They also need to address issues with respect to career development if they wish to retain and engage employees within the Generation X and Generation Y cohorts.

Employee well-being is a cause for concern

The following observations with respect to the well-being of teachers in Alberta can be extrapolated from the results of this study:

- *Perceived stress* refers to the extent to which one perceives one's situation to be unpredictable, uncontrollable and burdensome. Seventy percent of the employees in the ATA sample report high levels of perceived stress—a significantly greater percent than was observed in the total sample (57% of the total sample and 61% of the women in the total sample reported high stress).
- *Depressed mood* is a state characterized by low energy and persistent feelings of helplessness and hopelessness. Almost half (47%) of the teachers in the ATA sample report high levels of depressed mood, a higher percent than was observed in the total sample (40% of the women in the total sample reported high depressed mood).

These data indicate that workload and work–life issues may be having a negative impact on the well-being of a substantive portion of teachers in Alberta.

Work–life conflict is an issue

Two types of work–life conflict are considered in this analysis: *family interferes with work* and *work interferes with family*. In the first type, family-role responsibilities interfere with performance at work (e.g., a child's illness prevents attendance at work). In the second type, problems arise when work-role activities impede performance of family responsibilities (e.g., long hours in paid work prevent the performance of duties at home). This study supports a number of conclusions with respect to the ability of teachers in Alberta to balance work and family:

- Three-quarters of the teachers in the ATA sample report high levels of *work interferes with family* more than double the number of employees in the total sample reporting high levels of this form of work–life conflict. These findings are consistent with the fact that teachers take work home often, work long hours and report higher levels of work-role overload.
- Teachers were twice as likely as employees in the total sample to report that they experience high levels of *family interferes with work*. In this case, the higher levels of work–life conflict experienced by those in the ATA sample may be due to the lower levels of perceived flexibility reported by those in the ATA sample.
- Many teachers pay a high price personally when they try to do it all. Two-thirds of the teachers in the sample say that work–life challenges mean that they have less energy, and half of those in the ATA sample report that work–life challenges mean that they have less time for themselves, for a social life, for sleep and for recreational activities. Furthermore, the data indicate that teachers are twice as likely to report these impacts than were women in the total sample.
- The data also shows that work–life conflict can have a number of negative consequences on employers. A substantive number of the teachers in the ATA sample reported that work–life challenges had caused them to be absent from work more often (30%), reduce their work productivity (44%), make greater use of benefits offered by the organization (34%) and reduce their work hours (30%). One in 10 also said that they had turned down a promotion because of work–life issues.

These data, while consistent with many of the results reported previously (teachers work longer hours, report higher work–life conflict, have poorer mental health and feel less positively about their job and their employer), are concerning because they indicate that many teachers in Alberta are at risk of work burnout. These data support the idea that to increase their efficiency and effectiveness, school boards in Alberta need to deal with the issue of work–life conflict in general and workloads in particular. The urgency of this issue can be appreciated by noting that the negative impacts of work–life conflict are significantly more likely to be observed in the ATA sample than in the total sample.

Teachers have very little flexibility with respect to their hours of work

Perceived control is defined as the *belief* that one can determine one's own behavior, influence one's environment and/or bring about desired outcomes. A vast body of research in the area of occupational health supports the importance of perceived control as a moderator between demands and stress (the higher the control, the more able the employee is to cope with demands at work and/or outside of work). Control over work is strongly linked to perceived flexibility, which is defined as the amount of control employees perceive they have over their work hours and work location. Work time and work location flexibility have the potential to balance work

and family demands by increasing an employee's ability to control, predict and absorb change in work and family roles. Unfortunately, the data from this study are unequivocal: teachers have very little workplace flexibility or control over their work domain or their work schedule:

- Virtually all (75%) of the teachers in the ATA sample work a regular work schedule (i.e., start and stop times are fixed). While this is a higher proportion working a regular schedule than was observed in the total national sample (in which 65% reported working a regular schedule), the finding is not surprising given that teachers' time at work corresponds to a fixed school day.
- Less than 2% of the teachers in the sample job share—a flexible work arrangement that has potential for those in the teaching profession who need more work flexibility.
- The employees in the ATA sample are more likely to report that they have higher levels of control over their home situation (57% report high control, while only 5% report low control) than their work situation (only 12% report high control, while 32% report low control). This pattern is also apparent in the total sample. While those in the ATA sample are less likely than those in the total sample to report high levels of control over work or family, the differences are not substantial (5% difference).
- While perceived flexibility is normally distributed in the total sample, the distribution in the ATA sample is highly skewed: virtually all respondents report low levels of flexibility with respect to their hours of work.
- Teachers are significantly less likely than employees in the total sample to have any of the forms of flexibility explored in this study. In fact, the levels of perceived flexibility reported by respondents in the ATA sample were the lowest in the sample (substantially lower than those reported by police officers and nurses).

While these results are not surprising given the type of work that teachers do and the restrictions the job places on when and where work is done, they are unfortunate in light of the finding that perceived flexibility is a very strong moderator of the relationship between work-role overload and total-role overload (the greater the perceived flexibility, the weaker the link between work-role overload and total-role overload).

These findings speak to the need, in Alberta's school system, for flexible work arrangements such as job sharing and part-time work with pro-rated benefits.

The organizational culture is part of the problem

Organizational culture refers to the unwritten rules and corporate norms that dictate how things are done, how things work, what is to be done and what is valued in the organization (i.e., "the way things are done around here"). Two sets of organizational beliefs were assessed in this study: the belief that the culture values employees who keeps their personal issues out of the workplace (referred to as *The Myth of Separate Worlds*) and the belief that the culture values employees who always give priority to work (referred to as *Work Takes Priority*). The data from this study suggest that the culture in many Alberta schools exacerbate the problems noted above:

- Approximately half of those in the ATA sample perceive that their employer values and rewards those who keep their work and family lives separate—double the percent having this perception in the total sample.
- Half of the employees in the ATA sample also perceive that their organization values an employee who is available for work 24/7. Again, a higher percent in the ATA sample had

this perception of their organization than was observed in the total sample (in which 36% agreed).

These findings are cause for concern for a number of reasons. First, employees with families experience much difficulty in keeping work and family domains separate, especially when more than half of them are taking work home on evenings and weekends. Second, employees who work for organizations that reward and recognize hours at work and presenteeism are unlikely to benefit from any forward-thinking, family-friendly policies or practices. Drawing on these benefits in such an organizational culture would likely be viewed as a career-limiting move. Finally, organizational culture was found to be a very strong moderator of the path between work-role overload and total overload (i.e., the path between work-role overload and total-role overload was stronger for employees who perceived that the culture in their organization was one in which work takes priority and work and family are expected to be kept separate). Taken together, these findings suggest that the culture in many schools is contributing to—rather than mitigating—the issues noted above. For this reason, we recommend that, to address issues with respect to employee well-being and workloads, school boards across Alberta focus on changing their organizational cultures.

Tables
Data
۲
pendix
Apl

				Sector	tor		
Personal Information		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Sex	Male	33.9%	39.3%	74.1%	22.3%	18.1%	36.4%
	Female	66.1%	60.7%	25.9%	77.7%	81.9%	63.6%
Age categories	29 and younger	9.1%	13.1%	8.2%	17.1%	8.8%	10.0%
	30-45	44.8%	45.4%	56.3%	49.2%	40.1%	46.1%
	46-55	32.9%	26.2%	32.4%	24.0%	33.8%	31.5%
	56+	13.3%	15.3%	3.1%	9.6%	17.2%	12.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Marital status	Never married	12.9%	15.4%	6.2%	16.0%	11.8%	12.3%
	Married or living with a	%8'92	74.7%	84.6%	75.4%	74.4%	76.6%
	partner						
	Separated, divorced, widowed	11.3%	9.9%	9.2%	8.6%	13.9%	11.0%
	Total	400.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
What is the approximate	Less than 1,000 people	%7'7	2.1%	4.4%	6.1%	4.5%	4.3%
	1,000 to 24,999	19.0%	20.0%	23.7%	24.8%	20.1%	20.4%
munity in which you	25,000 to 49,999	7.2%	8.3%	10.4%	3.8%	11.1%	8.0%
live?	50,000 to 99,999	10.1%	7.9%	13.0%	11.0%	11.1%	10.5%
	100,000 to 249,999	13.7%	11.6%	15.9%	3.0%	15.3%	13.1%
	250,000 to 499,999	9.3%	8.1%	13.3%	1.0%	11.4%	9.3%
	500,000+	36.2%	42.0%	19.2%	50.4%	26.5%	34.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Geographic area	Maritimes	9.4%	1.0%	3.6%	%0.	4.5%	6.3%
	Quebec	15.9%	45.0%	.8%	%0.	1.4%	12.9%
	Ontario	47.1%	28.4%	50.8%	%0.	60.4%	43.6%
	Prairies	13.4%	14.1%	22.9%	93.7%	19.7%	22.9%
	B.C.	8.0%	3.4%	12.7%	%0.	6.4%	7.3%
	NWT/Yukon	.1%	%0.	1.0%	%0.	.5%	.3%
	Other	6.1%	8.1%	8.2%	6.1%	7.0%	6.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 1: Gender, Age, Marital Status, and Community

		Table 2A: 3	Socioeconomic St	Table 2A: Socioeconomic Status of the Respondents	dents		
				Sector	or		
Job Type		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Job type	Executive	2.9%	10.3%	%0.	%0`	1.3%	2.7%
	Manager	13.3%	12.1%	%0.	%0.	15.4%	10.5%
	Professional	31.8%	33.3%	%0.	%0.	31.8%	24.8%
	Technical	12.6%	14.9%	%0.	%0.	.3%	8.2%
	Administrative	21.9%	8.3%	%0.	%0.	4.3%	13.3%
	Clerical	10.2%	15.4%	%0.	%0.	23.1%	10.2%
	Other	7.3%	5.6%	%0.	%0.	23.8%	7.8%
	Teachers	%0.	%0.	%0.	100.0%	%0.	9.1%
	Police	%0`	%0.	100.0%	%0.	%0.	13.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Partner job type	Manager	11.1%	8.8%	10.1%	11.8%	13.3%	11.1%
	Professional	27.5%	28.5%	37.8%	34.0%	24.3%	29.2%
	Technical	14.4%	13.1%	4.5%	14.1%	13.1%	12.6%
	Administrative	7.6%	3.9%	10.7%	3.3%	5.2%	7.0%
	Clerical	3.3%	3.9%	4.0%	1.3%	2.6%	3.2%
	Retail	2.8%	3.2%	3.6%	2.4%	2.6%	2.9%
	Production	3.6%	4.8%	.9%	3.1%	5.5%	3.5%
	Retired	5.0%	4.4%	1.6%	3.1%	6.5%	4.5%
	Homemaker	5.6%	8.5%	11.1%	4.2%	3.4%	6.2%
	Other	15.6%	14.3%	13.5%	20.2%	19.5%	16.1%
	Executive	3.5%	6.5%	2.2%	2.5%	4.1%	3.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

espondents
۳
the
ъ
Status
oeconomic
Ö
ŝ
Ä
3
ble

				Sector	or		
Education		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Education	Some high school	%6`	%2.	.2%	%0`	%9.	.7%
	High school diploma	8.8%	7.5%	5.7%	%0.	8.0%	7.3%
	Some college/some university	14.6%	8.9%	23.0%	%0.	17.7%	14.3%
	College diploma	21.5%	21.1%	32.4%	%0.	30.7%	22.3%
	University degree	34.4%	36.9%	34.2%	78.8%	29.5%	37.9%
	Postgraduate degree	19.8%	25.0%	4.5%	21.1%	13.6%	17.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse: Education	Some high school	4.6%	2.8%	.8%	2.1%	4.6%	3.7%
	High school diploma	15.6%	13.4%	12.7%	9.2%	16.2%	14.5%
	Some college/some university	14.0%	10.4%	17.5%	12.8%	17.7%	14.6%
	College diploma	22.8%	21.5%	30.7%	21.8%	28.4%	24.6%
	University degree	28.5%	35.1%	29.7%	39.8%	23.2%	29.5%
	Postgraduate degree	14.5%	16.7%	8.6%	14.3%	9.9%	13.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondents	
f the	
P	
able 2B: Socioeconomic Status	

	Table	2C: Socioecon	Table 2C: Socioeconomic Status of the Respondents	Respondents			
				Sector	tor		
Financial Situation		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Income	Less than \$20,000	.7%	%8.	%0`	.3%	1.2%	.7%
	\$20,000 to \$39,999	2.6%	14.1%	.3%	1.8%	9.2%	4.2%
	\$40,000 to \$59,999	31.6%	24.7%	2.0%	7.9%	31.5%	24.9%
	\$60,000 to \$79,999	32.2%	17.0%	8.9%	27.6%	32.7%	27.4%
	\$80,000 to \$99,999	19.7%	12.0%	51.5%	53.3%	14.2%	25.6%
	\$100,000 to \$149,999	11.3%	15.6%	35.1%	8.0%	9.3%	14.3%
	More than \$150,000	1.8%	15.7%	2.2%	1.1%	1.9%	3.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse: Income	No employment income	6.8%	9.1%	8.7%	4.5%	4.9%	6.8%
	Some but less than \$20,000	6.6%	5.6%	8.9%	6.1%	5.9%	6.7%
	\$20,000 to \$39,999	13.1%	15.0%	13.5%	9.7%	12.9%	13.0%
	\$40,000 to \$59,999	23.4%	25.0%	19.4%	16.4%	23.8%	22.3%
	\$60,000 to \$79,999	22.3%	15.7%	16.9%	18.7%	19.7%	20.2%
	\$80,000 to \$99,999	15.8%	13.2%	21.6%	23.7%	17.2%	17.3%
	\$100,000 to \$149,999	9.6%	9.3%	9.3%	15.2%	12.3%	10.4%
	More than \$150,000	2.4%	7.2%	1.7%	5.7%	3.2%	3.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Who is considered the	l am	33.9%	34.4%	53.7%	33.5%	29.5%	36.2%
primary breadwinner in	Both of us	52.8%	56.6%	42.0%	49.3%	48.9%	50.7%
your family?	My spouse	13.2%	9.0%	4.3%	17.3%	21.6%	13.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Please select the category	Our family's financial	3.8%	1.7%	2.3%	2.1%	4.7%	3.4%
that best describes you family's financial situation	resources are not enough to get by on						
	We get by on our financial resources but it is tight	20.7%	15.6%	17.6%	17.5%	22.8%	19.9%
	We live comfortably on our	33.3%	29.7%	33.7%	37.8%	33.4%	33.5%
	tinancial resources but no money for extras						
	We live more than comfortably and have	37.1%	43.4%	40.6%	37.3%	34.3%	37.7%
	money for extras.						
	Money is not an issue for our family	5.1%	9.6%	5.8%	5.4%	4.8%	5.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondents
(1)
Ĕ
₽
٣
ŝ
두
g
5
~
.≅
Ξ
0
E
<u>N</u>
ă
ŏ
5
ŏ
õ
ő
e
able

				Table 3: Family Type	/pe			
					Sector			
Percent in each Family Type	Family Type ו		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Family type	Dual-career		26.5%	30.7%	%0.	48.0%	23.9%	24.8%
	Dual-earner		22.0%	18.6%	27.0%	%0.	19.0%	20.0%
	Dual Income	Dual Income: Male primary	15.3%	15.0%	13.5%	5.2%	21.3%	14.9%
	Dual Income	Dual Income: Female primary	14.0%	8.3%	40.0%	21.7%	15.9%	18.0%
	Traditional		4.6%	7.5%	11.8%	3.6%	2.3%	5.5%
	Mr. Mom		%6.	%9.	.1%	.6%	1.2%	.8%
	Single		16.7%	19.3%	7.6%	20.9%	16.4%	16.0%
	Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
			Table	Table 4: Dependent Care—Children				
					Sector	tor		
Children Age Groups	iroups		Public Sector	 Private Sector 	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Children		None	29.8%	%		41.5%	27.8%	29.7%
		1 child	17.2%	% 16.2%	15.0%	14.3%	16.4%	16.4%
		2 children	35.4%	% 35.4%	40.6%	28.5%	36.2%	35.6%
		3 children	12.4%	% 11.8%	16.1%	10.3%	13.7%	12.8%
		4 or more children	5.2%	% 3.8%	6.8%	5.4%	5.9%	5.4%
		Total	100.0%			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Parents with children	nildren	Children under 5	21.8%	% 25.4%		25.3%	15.6%	22.4%
		Other	78.2%			74.7%	84.4%	77.6%
		Total	100.0%			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Parents with children	nildren	Children 5-12	33.2	% 34.4%	42.5%	35.0%	27.9%	34.0%
		Other	66.8			65.0%	72.1%	66.0%
		Total	100.0		`	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Parents with children	nildren	Children 13-18	29.1%	% 25.3%	35.1%	29.8%	31.2%	30.1%
		Other	70.9			70.2%	68.8%	69.9%
		Total	100.0%	% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Parents with children	nildren	Children 18+	47.1%			37.4%	52.1%	44.5%
		Other	52.9%			62.6%	47.9%	55.5%
		Total	100.0%	10	10	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Responsibility for childcare	for childcare	None	5.1%	% 5.6%	2.3%	2.9%	7.1%	4.8%
		1-20%	21.1%	% 23.8%	21.9%	20.0%	23.2%	21.6%
		21-40%	14.8%	% 19.6%	28.5%	15.3%	11.2%	16.8%
		41-60%	22.9%		27.4%	20.0%	18.6%	22.6%
		61-80%	16.6%	% 13.0%	9.5%	17.5%	16.9%	15.3%
		81-100%	19.6%	% 17.3%	10.4%	24.3%	23.0%	18.8%
		Total	100.0%	% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		Table	Table 5: Dependent Care—Eldercare	e—Eldercare			
				Sector	or		
Location of Elder Care		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Elderly relatives living in your	0	94.2%	94.7%	96.6%	97.3%	95.1%	95.0%
home	1	3.9%	2.9%	2.1%	1.5%	3.7%	3.3%
	2	1.4%	1.5%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%
	3 or more	.5%	.9%	.2%	.1%	.1%	.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Elderly relatives living nearby	0	56.1%	56.7%	56.5%	56.9%	50.7%	55.5%
(i.e., within a one-hour drive)	1	16.7%	15.3%	13.0%	15.8%	19.4%	16.4%
	2	16.5%	18.2%	17.2%	17.1%	18.6%	17.1%
	3 or more	10.7%	9.8%	13.3%	10.2%	11.3%	11.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Elderly relatives living	0	56.3%	62.2%	63.2%	20.0%	64.2%	58.3%
elsewhere (i.e., more than a	1	15.7%	12.5%	11.4%	14.3%	14.7%	14.6%
one-hour drive away)	2	16.3%	16.2%	14.0%	19.1%	12.5%	15.7%
	3 or more	11.7%	9.1%	11.5%	16.6%	8.5%	11.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Elderly relatives—all cases	0	26.2%	30.9%	35.0%	25.2%	28.7%	28.0%
	1	20.7%	17.9%	14.4%	18.3%	21.1%	19.4%
	2	22.8%	23.6%	17.7%	20.1%	22.9%	21.9%
	3 or more	30.4%	27.7%	32.9%	36.4%	27.3%	30.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sandwich Generation	No	89.0%	92.0%	86.9%	89.2%	86.0%	88.6%
	Yes	11.0%	8.0%	13.1%	10.8%	14.0%	11.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Caregiver to a disabled or ill	No	82.9%	86.1%	%0.	84.1%	77.8%	82.7%
person	Yes	17.1%	13.9%	%0.	15.9%	22.2%	17.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	%0.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

e
a
5
ę
ы
۳
4
ar
Ű
Ħ
ē
E
ē
e
Δ
ŝ
Ð
q
Та
•

		Table	Table 6A: Work Profile				
				Sector	or		
Work Arrangement		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Do you work shifts?	No (I work a regular day schedule)	%9.66	93.2%	43.8%	97.5%	74.9%	83.5%
	Yes, I work a fixed shift (e.g., afternoons,	3.9%	5.3%	14.1%	2.5%	7.3%	6.1%
	evenings, nights) Ves 1 work a rotating shift	%V C	1 5%	40.1%	%U	17 0%	10 5%
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Has Guerilla Telework	No	87.7%	76.0%	83.1%	83.3%	83.6%	85.1%
	Yes	12.3%	24.0%	16.9%	16.7%	16.4%	14.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Please select the category	REGULAR: you work a set	66.4%	48.1%	72.8%	74.8%	64.1%	64.7%
that best describes how	number of hours each						
your employment is	week, arriving and						
arranged.	departing around the same						
		10.00	100 00	1 20	ì	10.00	101.01
	FLEX IIME: you vary your	12.0%	30.0%	1.9%	9.0%	10.8%	13.5%
	arrival and departure times						
	around a core time when which he at work						
	you should be at work						
	COMPRESSED WORK WEEK: you get one	16.2%	10.3%	15.6%	3.0%	14.8%	15.2%
	working day off every						
	week or two in return for						
	longer hours						
	PART-TIME: you work a	3.1%	3.4%	1.0%	6.9%	5.3%	3.3%
	reduced number of hours						
	each week						
	JOB SHARING	%0.	.2%	.0%	1.5%	.6%	.2%
	OTHER: your schedule	2.2%	7.4%	2.7%	8.9%	4.4%	3.2%
	does not conform to any of						
	those described above						
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			I AUIE OD. WULN FIUIIE	OIIIC			
				Sector	or		
Job Demographics		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Years with organization	1-5 years	39.7%	44.9%	15.0%	31.7%	37.0%	35.8%
	6-10 years	20.3%	20.0%	20.9%	24.0%	22.3%	21.0%
	11+ years	40.0%	35.1%	64.1%	44.3%	40.7%	43.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Years in current job	1 year or less	21.2%	30.8%	23.8%	4.4%	18.3%	20.5%
	1-3 years	29.9%	26.5%	34.5%	10.9%	24.4%	27.7%
	4+ years	48.9%	42.7%	41.7%	84.6%	57.3%	51.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My manager/supervisor is:	Male	48.9%	70.4%	89.2%	54.0%	39.5%	53.8%
	Female	51.1%	29.6%	10.8%	46.0%	60.5%	46.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Are you a member of a	Yes	82.9%	10.9%	70.1%	98.0%	66.6%	73.2%
union/bargaining	No	17.1%	89.1%	29.9%	2.0%	33.4%	26.8%
association?	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ð
Ę
Ö
5
논
ō
2
~
ö
9
Φ
abl
a
F

Table 6C: Work Profile

				Sector		
Pay Questions		Public Sector	Private Sector	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Pay for performance	Pay depends on time	54.6%	30.7%	%0.	48.3%	52.1%
	Pay depends equally on time/performance	33.6%	39.8%	%0.	38.8%	34.4%
	Pay depends on Performance	11.8%	29.5%	%0.	12.9%	13.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	%0.	100.0%	100.0%
Work for money	Work less time for less money	29.0%	23.7%	30.8%	26.7%	28.2%
	Work same time for same	55.6%	55.2%	57.4%	51.9%	55.4%
	money					
	Work more time for more	15.4%	21.1%	11.8%	21.4%	16.3%
	money					
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Percent involved in Activity				Sector	or		
		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
		.3%	.4%	.3%	.4%	.5%	.4%
overall		99.7%	99.6%	99.7%	99.6%	99.5%	99.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Has Guerilla Telework No		87.7%	76.0%	83.1%	83.3%	83.6%	85.1%
Yes		12.3%	24.0%	16.9%	16.7%	16.4%	14.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Has job-related work at No		53.9%	45.8%	35.8%	2.2%	52.1%	45.8%
home outside regular office Yes		46.1%	54.2%	64.2%	97.8%	47.9%	54.2%
hours (i.e., evenings or Total weekends)		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Has commuting time No		3.4%	6.8%	12.3%	4.5%	13.3%	6.4%
Yes		96.6%	93.2%	87.7%	95.5%	86.7%	93.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total work-related hours <35 hrs. per	. per week	3.9%	5.7%	2.1%	5.6%	8.4%	4.6%
35-44 hrs. p	rs. per week	44.5%	35.0%	19.8%	6.3%	39.1%	36.1%
45+ hrs. per	. per week	51.6%	59.2%	78.1%	88.1%	52.5%	59.3%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

뛽
e
p
2
ã
S
ñ
f
~
ő
⊑
ũ
e
Δ
¥
ō
≥
2
đ
ā
, co
-

Table 7B: Work Demands of Respondents

			Se	Sector		
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Hours in Work Activities	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Hours spent in paid employment overall	38.75	40.54	44.26	41.91	39.15	39.98
Guerilla Telework	1.40	2.75	1.24	2.27	1.75	1.63
Hours spent doing job-related work at home	2.25	3.28	4.34	13.56	3.04	3.76
outside regular office hours (i.e., evenings or						
weekends)						
Hours spent commuting	5.20	5.59	4.28	3.88	4.33	4.86
*** Hours spent in paid employment overall	38.74	40.48	44.39	41.47	39.14	39.95
*** Guerilla Telework	11.39	11.44	7.34	13.62	10.66	10.90
*** Hours spent in job-related work outside	4.88	90.9	6.76	13.86	6.35	6.94
regular office hours						
*** Hours spent in commuting	5.67	6.23	5.56	4.38	5.55	5.57
Total work-related hours	45.95	48.69	52.20	58.15	46.04	48.14

		I ADIE OA. W	I ANIE OM. WUIN DEIIIAIIUS UI UIE FAI UIEI	IIE FALUIEI			
				Sector	or		
Percent involved in Activity		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Spouse: Has paid	No	10.4%	12.3%	12.7%	6.3%	9.3%	10.4%
employment overall	Yes	89.6%	87.7%	87.3%	93.7%	90.7%	89.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse: Guerilla Telework	No	58.1%	55.3%	65.5%	53.7%	55.2%	58.0%
	Yes	41.9%	44.7%	34.5%	46.3%	44.8%	42.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse: Has job-related	No	37.9%	39.9%	42.2%	33.8%	37.4%	38.2%
work at home outside	Yes	62.1%	60.1%	57.8%	66.2%	62.6%	61.8%
regular office hours (i.e., evenings or weekends)	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse: Total work-related	<35 hrs. per week	20.2%	22.8%	25.8%	15.3%	19.2%	20.7%
hours	35-44 hrs. per week	25.7%	24.9%	21.7%	20.6%	22.2%	24.1%
	45+ hrs. per week	54.1%	52.3%	52.5%	64.1%	58.6%	55.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Partner
of the
ands c
(Dem
Work
8A:
Table

Table 8B: Work Demands of the Partner

			Sector			
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Hours in Work Activities	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Spouse: Hours spent in paid	34.23	33.52	32.82	37.53	36.20	34.53
employment overall Spouse: Guerilla Telework	2.84	2.79	2.47	3.87	3.11	2.91
Spouse: Hours spent doing	3.75	3.20	4.06	5.15	4.40	3.97
job-related work at home						
outside regular office hours						
(i.e., evenings or weekends)						
*** Spouse: Hours spent in	40.00	40.18	39.30	41.38	41.58	40.26
paid employment overall						
*** Spouse: Guerilla Telework	13.69	11.69	12.36	16.36	13.22	13.49
*** Spouse: Hours spent in	7.74	6.96	8.29	9.58	9.02	8.11
job-related work outside						
regular office hours						
Spouse: Total work-related	41.63	40.14	39.81	45.94	43.88	41.92
hours						

				Sector	or		
Percent involved in Activity		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Has child-care or activities	No	51.8%	52.2%	37.9%	56.2%	55.1%	50.9%
with your children	Yes	48.2%	47.8%	62.1%	43.8%	44.9%	49.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Has elder-care activities	No	77.5%	82.3%	80.5%	78.6%	71.1%	77.5%
	Yes	22.5%	17.7%	19.5%	21.4%	28.9%	22.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 9A: Non-Work Demands of Respondents

Table 9B: Non-Work Demands of Respondent

			Se	Sector		
	Public Sector	ublic Sector Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Hours in Work Activities	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Hours spent in childcare or activities with your children	10.22	8.84	14.63	8.25	9.83	10.45
Hours spent in eldercare activities	1.59	1.02	1.42	1.11	2.09	1.55
*** Hours spent in childcare or activities with your children	21.20	18.51	23.55	18.84	21.90	21.27
*** Hours spent in eldercare activities	7.05	5.78	7.28	5.18	7.23	6.86
Total hours per week in dependent care	11.81	9.86	16.05	9.36	11.92	11.99

Table 10A: Non-Work Demands of Partner

				Sector	or		
Percent involved in Activity		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Spouse: Has childcare or	No	6.9%	5.1%	11.2%	4.5%	11.0%	7.7%
activities with your children	Yes	93.1%	94.9%	88.8%	95.5%	89.0%	92.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse: Has eldercare	No	7.5%	6.1%	19.0%	6.0%	14.6%	9.8%
activities	Yes	92.5%	93.9%	81.0%	94.0%	85.4%	90.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tabl	e 10B: Non-Wor	Table 10B: Non-Work Demands of Partner	rtner			
			S	Sector		
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Hours in Work Activities	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Spouse: Hours spent in childcare or activities with your children	19.07	19.62	26.80	19.66	15.88	20.15
Spouse: Hours spent in eldercare activities	4.21	3.43	3.95	3.43	3.16	3.84
*** Spouse: Hours spent in childcare or activities with your children	22.30	21.93	31.92	21.96	20.61	23.78
*** Spouse: Hours spent in eldercare activities	7.08	5.70	9.34	5.23	6.30	7.04
Spouse: Total family-related hours	18.18	18.48	27.48	18.46	15.17	19.38

Partner
2
Demands
÷
ō
ş
ġ
ž
ä
÷
Table

		Table	Table 11A: Total Life Roles	S		
				Sector		
Percent in Each Role		Public Sector	Private Sector	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Parent to children under 19	No	53.2%	58.8%	55.6%	56.7%	54.1%
	Yes	46.8%	41.2%	44.4%	43.3%	45.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Parent to adult children	No	66.5%	64.3%	76.3%	58.6%	66.8%
	Yes	33.5%	35.7%	23.7%	41.4%	33.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse/partner	No	17.6%	16.6%	17.3%	17.5%	17.5%
	Yes	82.4%	83.4%	82.7%	82.5%	82.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Divorced—shared	No	88.2%	90.9%	91.6%	89.2%	88.9%
responsibility	Yes	11.8%	9.1%	8.4%	10.8%	11.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Grandparent	No	74.3%	72.5%	74.9%	72.3%	74.1%
	Yes	25.7%	27.5%	25.1%	27.7%	25.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Employee	No	22.4%	18.7%	24.6%	21.1%	22.4%
	Yes	%9'.22	81.3%	75.4%	78.9%	77.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Supervisor/manager	No	49.1%	35.2%	56.8%	50.6%	49.4%
	Yes	%6.03	64.8%	43.2%	49.4%	50.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Home maintainer	No	9.8%	15.5%	8.5%	8.9%	9.9%
	Yes	90.2%	84.5%	91.5%	91.1%	90.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Employed—second job	No	86.4%	86.9%	82.8%	83.3%	85.7%
	Yes	13.6%	13.1%	17.2%	16.7%	14.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Volunteer	No	50.0%	44.3%	38.2%	49.8%	48.2%
	Yes	50.0%	55.7%	61.8%	50.2%	51.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Exercise, sports	No	6.7%	4.4%	5.3%	5.8%	6.3%
	Yes	93.3%	95.6%	94.7%	94.2%	93.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Caregiver to disabled, ill	No	82.9%	86.1%	84.1%	77.8%	82.7%
	Yes	17.1%	13.9%	15.9%	22.2%	17.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

es
20
e
Ę
tal
ř
Ä
5
le
Tab

	Table 11E	3: Total Life Roles-	Table 11B: Total Life Roles—Energy Spent in Specific Role	ecific Role		
				Sector		
Percent by Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Parent to children under 19	Little Energy	9.5%	10.3%	4.3%	8.2%	8.8%
	Moderate Energy	27.0%	32.6%	21.9%	24.7%	26.5%
	Lots of Energy	63.5%	57.1%	73.8%	67.0%	64.7%
	Total	400.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Parent to adult children	Little Energy	52.4%	58.8%	44.2%	49.0%	51.7%
	Moderate Energy	38.0%	35.0%	43.6%	42.4%	38.8%
	Lots of Energy	%9.6	6.1%	12.2%	8.5%	9.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spouse/partner	Little Energy	21.4%	20.2%	16.4%	22.3%	20.8%
	Moderate Energy	56.3%	57.2%	56.6%	56.2%	56.4%
	Lots of Energy	22.3%	22.6%	27.0%	21.5%	22.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Divorced—shared	Little Energy	55.9%	60.7%	41.3%	52.9%	54.6%
responsibility	Moderate Energy	25.7%	29.8%	30.0%	25.5%	26.3%
	Lots of Energy	18.4%	9.5%	28.8%	21.6%	19.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Grandparent	Little Energy	70.4%	70.1%	67.8%	59.6%	69.0%
	Moderate Energy	23.4%	25.7%	27.3%	31.3%	24.7%
	Lots of Energy	6.3%	4.2%	5.0%	9.2%	6.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Employee	Little Energy	17.8%	21.6%	8.4%	13.6%	16.6%
	Moderate Energy	39.6%	37.9%	15.9%	35.1%	36.3%
	Lots of Energy	42.6%	40.4%	75.7%	51.3%	47.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Supervisor/manager	Little Energy	41.6%	37.6%	37.4%	32.8%	40.1%
	Moderate Energy	34.0%	35.1%	36.4%	32.8%	34.2%
	Lots of Energy	24.3%	27.3%	26.2%	34.3%	25.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Home maintainer	Little Energy	25.2%	42.2%	19.8%	22.4%	25.2%
	Moderate Energy	46.2%	40.3%	47.4%	46.4%	46.1%
	Lots of Energy	28.5%	17.5%	32.8%	31.2%	28.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Employed—second job	Little Energy	47.6%	52.8%	52.9%	48.2%	48.7%
	Moderate Energy	34.6%	29.1%	31.5%	33.2%	33.7%
	Lots of Energy	17.9%	18.1%	15.6%	18.6%	17.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Volunteer	Little Energy	71.3%	71.8%	62.7%	71.2%	70.1%
	Moderate Energy	22.6%	21.6%	27.2%	21.8%	23.1%

e
Role
LF.
<u>,</u>
ecifi
ĕ
°,
~
<u>∟</u> .
F
e
å
5
5
E.
Ener
щ
Roles-
Ť
ĕ
ij.
-
a
đ
⊢
11B:
Ŧ
•
able
đ
Ĕ

	Lots of Energy	6.2%	6.6%	10.0%	7.0%	6.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Exercise, sports	Little Energy	58.6%	54.0%	53.1%	56.9%	57.5%
	Moderate Energy	33.0%	37.0%	35.6%	35.3%	33.8%
	Lots of Energy	8.4%	9.0%	11.3%	7.8%	8.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Caregiver to disabled, ill	Little Energy	45.7%	57.2%	48.0%	46.0%	46.5%
	Moderate Energy	28.4%	27.5%	29.5%	31.3%	28.8%
	Lots of Energy	26.0%	15.2%	22.5%	22.7%	24.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 11C: Total Life Roles

				Sector		
Overall Summary		Public Sector	Private Sector	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Total energy	Little to no Energy (1 or fewer high energy roles)	11.0%	11.4%	8.9%	6.6%	10.6%
	Moderate Energy (2-3 high energy roles)	36.9%	42.1%	34.7%	33.6%	36.6%
	High Energy (4-5 high energy roles)	39.5%	35.0%	40.7%	41.5%	39.6%
	Very High Energy (6+ high energy roles)	12.6%	11.6%	15.7%	15.3%	13.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of life roles	0-3 roles	7.9%	7.3%	8.2%	6.7%	7.8%
	4-6 roles	56.8%	53.1%	58.7%	54.8%	56.6%
	7-9 roles	32.0%	36.1%	29.1%	34.9%	32.2%
	10+ roles	3.3%	3.6%	4.0%	3.6%	3.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			Sector			
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Hours in Work Activities	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
On a typical WORK day how	3.36	3.12	2.33	1.41	2.88	2.96
many hours do you spend in						
email communication						
On a typical WORK day how	1.81	1.72	1.08	1.50	1.62	1.65
many hours do you spend						
using the web						
Time spent in email on a	26.	.91	1.04	.94	1.20	1.00
typical NON-WORK day						
Time spent on web on a	1.65	1.60	1.84	1.94	1.60	1.69
typical NON-WORK day						

Table 12A: Use of Work-Extension Technology

Table 12B: Use of Work-Extension Technology

				Sector	tor		
Distribution of Use		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Time spent in email on a	No use	1.8%	3.4%	2.1%	2.5%	3.2%	2.3%
typical WORK day	Less than 1 hour per day	26.3%	29.5%	45.3%	72.2%	39.8%	35.2%
	1-3 hours per day	39.9%	41.0%	36.6%	21.5%	34.6%	37.1%
	More than 3 hours per day	31.9%	26.0%	15.9%	3.9%	22.4%	25.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Time spent on web on a	No use	8.6%	16.8%	23.6%	6.0%	17.3%	12.3%
typical WORK day	Less than 1 hour per day	24.0%	54.5%	59.4%	60.8%	55.8%	55.6%
	1-3 hours per day	25.7%	18.4%	13.3%	27.5%	17.7%	22.5%
	More than 3 hours per day	11.6%	10.4%	3.7%	5.7%	9.2%	9.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Time spent in email on a	No use	21.8%	26.4%	20.7%	15.8%	20.4%	21.3%
typical NON-WORK day	Less than 1 hour per day	65.0%	61.3%	65.0%	71.8%	63.9%	65.1%
	1-3 hours per day	9.2%	9.2%	10.9%	10.4%	11.3%	9.8%
	More than 3 hours per day	4.0%	3.1%	3.5%	2.0%	4.5%	3.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Time spent on web on a	No use	11.1%	11.0%	11.0%	5.7%	13.8%	11.0%
typical NON-WORK day	Less than 1 hour per day	51.1%	56.1%	56.3%	47.2%	53.4%	52.2%
	1-3 hours per day	28.7%	24.7%	27.4%	36.6%	25.5%	28.4%
	More than 3 hours per day	9.1%	8.2%	5.4%	10.5%	7.4%	8.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Table 12C: II	Table 12C: Impact of Work-Extension Technology	ension Technolo	3y		
----------------------------	-----------	---------------	--	-----------------	---------	----------------	--------
				Sector	tor		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Amount of stress	Decreased	6.6%	8.1%	6.4%	6.5%	2.0%	6.8%
	No change	68.7%	73.7%	65.4%	48.4%	66.2%	66.5%
	Increased	24.7%	18.1%	28.2%	45.0%	26.8%	26.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Amount of work you do in a	Decreased	6.8%	6.5%	7.4%	4.8%	5.5%	6.5%
day	No change	61.0%	63.5%	55.4%	37.8%	58.4%	58.0%
	Increased	32.2%	30.1%	37.1%	57.4%	36.1%	35.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work-life balance	Decreased	13.4%	11.3%	13.7%	24.0%	12.5%	14.1%
	No change	71.9%	73.6%	69.5%	45.8%	69.0%	68.9%
	Increased	14.7%	15.1%	16.8%	30.2%	18.5%	17.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	>
	5
	×
	<u> </u>
	o
	⊆
	2
	υ
	Ð
	-
	_
	≍
	2
1	S
	č
	ā
	÷.
1	×
	ų
	J
	÷
	ō
1	s
	>
	-
	o
	÷
	υ
	g
	Ω
	E
	5
	()
	~
	-
	1
	ø
1	0
	1
	<u> </u>
1	_

Table 13: Organizational Outcomes

				Sector	or		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Organizational	Low satisfaction	7.1%	2.5%	9.9%	10.5%	4.7%	7.1%
commitment	Neutral	30.8%	15.1%	29.5%	34.2%	25.1%	28.7%
	High satisfaction	62.1%	82.4%	60.7%	55.3%	70.1%	64.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Turnover intentions	Monthly or less	71.9%	83.8%	78.9%	%6.07	%1.67	74.9%
	Weekly	13.3%	8.8%	9.9%	14.5%	10.6%	12.2%
	Several days per week++	14.8%	7.4%	11.2%	14.6%	9.6%	12.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Job satisfaction	Dissatisfied	6.7%	3.1%	5.5%	14.7%	5.5%	6.8%
	Neutral	35.7%	21.1%	30.2%	47.6%	34.0%	34.5%
	Satisfied	57.6%	75.8%	64.4%	37.8%	60.5%	58.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Employment change index No Change	No Change	87.5%	90.8%	85.9%	82.2%	90.8%	87.6%
	Moderate Change	10.2%	8.0%	11.2%	15.2%	7.6%	10.2%
	High Change	2.3%	1.2%	2.9%	2.7%	1.5%	2.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		Table 14: Jo	Table 14: Job Satisfaction: Facet Analysis	cet Analysis			
				Sector	tor		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Your job in general	Low satisfaction	12.4%	5.8%	11.0%	14.4%	8.8%	11.3%
	Neutral	12.5%	8.7%	11.1%	10.2%	11.7%	11.7%
	High Satisfaction	75.1%	85.6%	77.9%	75.3%	79.5%	77.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
The amount of pay you get	Low satisfaction	14.8%	14.2%	9.6%	12.4%	19.4%	14.5%
	Neutral	12.7%	17.3%	10.9%	11.9%	14.3%	13.0%
	High Satisfaction	72.5%	68.4%	79.3%	75.7%	66.2%	72.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
The number of hours you	Low satisfaction	%6'8	10.8%	13.0%	58.6%	13.5%	14.8%
work	Neutral	10.0%	9.9%	14.4%	13.4%	11.7%	11.1%
	High Satisfaction	81.2%	79.4%	72.6%	28.0%	74.8%	74.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
The schedule of your	Low satisfaction	7.5%	7.5%	18.2%	27.6%	12.1%	11.4%
working hours	Neutral	8.6%	9.1%	14.2%	18.2%	10.7%	10.5%
	High Satisfaction	83.9%	83.4%	67.6%	54.1%	77.2%	78.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
The sorts of things you do	Low satisfaction	12.6%	7.3%	10.1%	25.4%	8.2%	12.3%
on the job	Neutral	15.0%	12.8%	14.7%	14.6%	13.5%	14.5%
	High Satisfaction	72.4%	79.9%	75.1%	60.0%	78.3%	73.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Your current work load	Low satisfaction	23.4%	14.3%	22.7%	61.9%	25.0%	26.2%
	Neutral	18.3%	16.8%	17.5%	12.2%	17.1%	17.3%
	High Satisfaction	58.4%	68.9%	59.8%	25.9%	57.9%	56.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
The development	Low satisfaction	38.1%	15.9%	35.6%	34.0%	35.2%	35.0%
opportunities offered by your	Neutral	24.0%	24.9%	22.6%	21.6%	25.3%	23.9%
organization	High Satisfaction	37.9%	59.2%	41.7%	44.3%	39.6%	41.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Your ability to meet career	Low satisfaction	31.2%	14.0%	30.5%	28.1%	25.8%	28.5%
goals and aspirations	Neutral	27.2%	22.8%	24.1%	23.1%	27.0%	26.0%
	High Satisfaction	41.6%	63.2%	45.4%	48.8%	47.2%	45.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
The amount of job security	Low satisfaction	23.8%	8.3%	1.6%	16.6%	10.8%	16.9%
you have	Neutral	23.7%	15.3%	3.7%	8.9%	16.4%	17.9%
	High Satisfaction	52.5%	76.4%	94.7%	74.5%	72.9%	65.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

S
5
ž
a
Ē
◄
÷
<u>ب</u>
ğ
шĽ
5
.9
5
, m
2
1
a
S
ę
_
~
4
-
Ð
ā
a
F

		гаріе то: Етрі	I able 15: Employment Changes Index—Details	ngex—Detalls			
				Sector	or		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Work and family challenges	No Change	82.7%	80.8%	80.2%	69.9%	83.4%	81.1%
have caused you to reduce	Moderate Change	10.7%	13.3%	13.6%	18.3%	11.5%	12.1%
your work hours	High Change	6.6%	6.0%	6.2%	11.8%	5.1%	6.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	80.0%	82.5%	77.5%	56.3%	83.2%	78.2%
have caused you to reduce	Moderate Change	13.3%	12.4%	15.0%	26.3%	11.6%	14.4%
your work productivity	High Change	%2'9	5.2%	7.5%	17.4%	5.2%	7.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	89.2%	90.3%	81.2%	89.1%	91.1%	88.5%
have caused you to turn	Moderate Change	4.6%	5.0%	7.0%	5.0%	4.2%	4.9%
down a job offer or	High Change	6.2%	4.8%	11.8%	5.8%	4.7%	6.6%
promotion	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	90.3%	91.1%	87.2%	91.5%	91.1%	90.2%
have caused you to suffer a	Moderate Change	4.1%	4.7%	5.9%	3.5%	3.9%	4.3%
reduction in income	High Change	5.7%	4.2%	6.8%	5.1%	5.0%	5.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	72.7%	84.8%	80.1%	69.8%	81.9%	75.8%
have caused you to be	Moderate Change	15.8%	9.8%	11.6%	17.6%	10.9%	14.2%
absent more often from	High Change	11.4%	5.4%	8.3%	12.5%	7.2%	10.0%
work	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	79.7%	85.6%	80.9%	66.1%	81.6%	79.4%
have caused you to	Moderate Change	10.0%	8.7%	9.5%	16.8%	9.7%	10.4%
increase your use of	High Change	10.4%	5.7%	9.6%	17.2%	8.7%	10.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Details
Index-
Changes
yment (
: Emplo
Table 15

Table 16A: Retirement

			Sector			
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Mean Age	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Retirement age	59	61	22	59	61	59
Years until retirement	14.36	16.11	13.30	14.12	15.82	14.51

				Sector	stor		
		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
		Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N Column Valid N Column Valid N Column Valid N Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N
Percent in each Category		%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than 5 years till	Yes	22.7%	20.5%	20.5%	25.6%	19.0%	21.5%
retirement	No	77.3%	79.5%	79.5%	74.4%	81.0%	78.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Once you retire, do you	Not work	52.5%	51.6%	34.2%	46.1%	50.5%	49.1%
plan to:	Work part-time	43.7%	45.6%	52.2%	48.4%	46.6%	45.9%
	Work full-time elsewhere	3.7%	2.8%	13.6%	5.5%	2.9%	5.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

t
_
e
Ξ
ē
·Ξ
æ
Re
m
9
ς-
e
q
, CD
F

Table 17: Money

			Sector	stor	
		Public Sector	Private Sector	Not for profit	Total
		Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N
Percent in each Category		%	%	%	%
I value money very highly	Disagree	19.9%	10.5%	18.8%	19.6%
	Neutral	33.7%	20.1%	33.7%	33.3%
	Agree	46.5%	%£'69	47.6%	47.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Money is important	Disagree	4.4%	2.2%	4.1%	4.3%
	Neutral	12.7%	6.5%	12.2%	12.6%
	Agree	82.8%	91.3%	83.7%	83.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
I daydream about being rich	Disagree	40.8%	33.1%	47.4%	40.8%
	Neutral	26.3%	%8'82	25.2%	26.3%
	Agree	32.9%	38.1%	27.4%	32.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
I believe the more money you	Disagree	63.5%	53.6%	72.4%	63.5%
have, the happier you are	Neutral	23.7%	27.6%	18.8%	23.6%
	Agree	12.8%	18.9%	8.8%	12.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			I ADIE TOA. ADSEILEEISIII				
				Sector	or		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Been unable to work or carry	No	29.8%	54.8%	49.5%	39.4%	43.9%	37.5%
out your usual activities	Yes	70.2%	45.2%	50.5%	60.6%	56.1%	62.5%
because of health problems?	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Been unable to work or carry	No	65.6%	75.9%	72.2%	78.9%	78.9%	70.5%
out your usual activities	Yes	34.4%	24.1%	27.8%	21.1%	21.1%	29.5%
because of child-related problems?	Total	%0.001	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Been unable to work or carry	No	88.5%	93.4%	94.7%	93.1%	90.2%	90.4%
out your usual activities	Yes	11.5%	6.6%	5.3%	6.9%	9.8%	9.6%
because of challenges	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
elderly dependent?							
Taken day off because you	No	45.7%	70.3%	72.1%	56.9%	66.3%	55.4%
were emotionally, physically or	Yes	54.3%	29.7%	27.9%	43.1%	33.7%	44.6%
mentally fatigued?	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Taken day off because a	No	91.8%	93.6%	92.8%	88.5%	94.8%	92.2%
personal leave day/vacation	Yes	8.2%	6.4%	7.2%	11.5%	5.2%	7.8%
day was not granted?	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Has been absent	No	15.3%	37.0%	35.1%	25.6%	30.1%	22.9%
	Yes	84.7%	63.0%	64.9%	74.4%	69.9%	77.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Is on long-term absenteeism	No	96.8%	97.9%	96.5%	97.5%	97.0%	97.0%
	Yes	3.2%	2.1%	3.5%	2.5%	3.0%	3.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ε
S
Ð
e
Ξ
Ð
S
9
◄
~
~
÷
6
-ĕ
육
Ë

L L	Table 18B: Absenteeism	teeism				
			Sector	r		
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Mean number of Days	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
In the last six months, how many days have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of health problems?	3.26	1.47	1.97	2.56	2.26	2.72
In the last six months, how many days have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of child-related problems?	1.44	.78	.91	.65	.80	1.15
In the last six months, how many days have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of challenges associated with caring for an elderly dependent?	.54	.45	.17	.31	.51	.46
In the last six months, how many days have you taken a day off because you were emotionally, physically or mentally fatigued?	2.13	1.10	1.08	1.46	1.22	1.70
In the last six months, how many days have you taken as a "sick day" off work because a personal leave day/vacation day was not granted?	.32	.22	.18	.21	.14	.25
Total absenteeism	7.72	4.02	4.31	5.19	4.92	6.30

- E
S
~
۳
E
-
õ
ö
7
-
11
0
œ
-
d)
-
9
a
-

			Sector	or		
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Mean number of Days	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
*** In the last six months, how many days have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of health problems?	4.86	3.42	4.18	4.40	4.25	4.58
*** In the last six months, how many days have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of child-related problems?	4.22	3.25	3.27	3.10	3.77	3.91
*** In the last six months, how many days have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of challenges associated with caring for an elderly dependent?	4.78	6.76	3.30	4.48	5.24	4.84
*** In the last six months, how many days have you taken a day off because you were emotionally, physically or mentally fatigued?	3.94	3.70	3.88	3.38	3.61	3.84
*** In the last six months, how many days have you taken a "sick day" off work because a personal leave day/vacation day was not granted?	3.84	3.39	2.44	1.84	2.61	3.25
**** Total absenteeism	9.11	6.38	6.64	6.98	2.03	8.17

				Sector	or		
Percent in each Category	igory	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Perceived health	Poor/Fair	17.5%	10.1%	14.1%	17.0%	15.2%	16.0%
	Good	38.9%	35.3%	35.5%	38.5%	37.1%	37.8%
	Very Good/Excellent	43.6%	54.7%	50.4%	44.5%	47.7%	46.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Stress	Low stress	3.0%	5.3%	4.0%	1.2%	3.1%	3.2%
	Medium stress	39.4%	49.7%	45.7%	28.7%	40.6%	40.3%
	High stress	57.6%	45.0%	50.2%	70.1%	56.2%	56.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Depressed mood	Low depression	22.4%	34.1%	29.8%	15.0%	23.4%	23.9%
	Medium depression	39.8%	42.1%	40.5%	38.2%	42.3%	40.3%
	High depression	37.8%	23.8%	29.6%	46.8%	34.2%	35.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Life satisfaction	Low satisfaction	10.9%	19.9%	%0.	10.4%	5.9%	11.6%
	Medium satisfaction	65.6%	61.3%	%0.	65.6%	64.7%	65.1%
	High satisfaction	23.5%	18.8%	%0.	24.0%	29.4%	23.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	%0.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Б
.≘
Ð
우
=
ŝ
5
e
é
6
0
Ē
Ъ.
6
-
<u>e</u>
q
50
-

Table 20A: Use of Healthcare System

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					Sector	or		
No 47.6% 63.1% 52.3% 45.9% 45.9% Yes 52.4% 36.9% 47.7% 54.1% 1 Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 No 92.6% 93.1% 93.1% 93.5% 9 Yes 7.4% 6.9% 6.9% 6.5% 10 No 92.6% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 Yes 7.4% 6.9% 6.9% 6.5% 10 No 86.7% 88.4% 85.5% 86.3% 10 Yes 13.3% 11.6% 14.5% 100.0% 10 Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10	Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	In the last six months, have	No	47.6%	63.1%	52.3%	45.9%	49.2%	49.7%
Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 No 92.6% 93.1% 93.1% 93.5% 10 Yes 7.4% 6.9% 6.9% 6.5% 10 Yes 7.4% 0.00% 100.0% 100.0% 10 Mo 92.6% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 No 86.7% 88.4% 85.5% 86.3% 8 No 86.7% 11.6% 14.5% 13.7% 1 Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 1	you seen a physician other	Yes	52.4%	36.9%	47.7%	54.1%	50.8%	50.3%
ave No 92.6% 93.1% 93.1% 93.5% 1 e Yes 7.4% 6.9% 6.9% 6.5% 10 e Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 ave No 86.7% 88.4% 85.5% 86.3% 8 ave Ves 13.3% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 al's Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10	than for a regular check-up or maternity-re	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Fes 7.4% 6.9% 6.9% 6.5% 6.5% 11 it to the Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 11 ave No 86.7% 88.4% 85.5% 86.3% 8 8 ave Yes 13.3% 11.6% 14.5% 13.7% 1 al's Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 1	In the last six months, have	No	92.6%	93.1%	93.1%	93.5%	93.7%	93.0%
to the Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% ave No 86.7% 88.4% 85.5% 86.3% ave No 86.7% 88.4% 85.5% 86.3% ave No 13.3% 11.6% 14.5% 13.7% o seek Yes 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	you spent any time in the	Yes	%4.7	6.9%	6.9%	6.5%	6.3%	2.0%
ave No 86.7% 88.4% 85.5% 86.3% o seek Yes 13.3% 11.6% 14.5% 13.7% al's Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	hospital (excluding visits to the emergency room).	Total	400.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
o seek Yes 13.3% 11.6% 14.5% 13.7% al's Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	In the last six months, have	No	86.7%	88.4%	85.5%	86.3%	86.7%	86.7%
al's Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	you personally needed to seek	Yes	13.3%	11.6%	14.5%	13.7%	13.3%	13.3%
	medical care at a hospital's emergency department)	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

1 (1)	ו מטוב בטם. טפר טו הכמונוונימוב טאפוכווו	calificate oysiel	-			
			Sector	tor		
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Mean number of Visits	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Number times seen a physician in last 6 months	1.64	36.	1.40	1.76	1.55	1.55
Number of visits to hospital in last 6 months	.22	.19	.16	.17	.17	.20
Number of visits to an emergency dept. in last 6 months	.21	.16	.21	.22	.20	.21
*** Number times seen a physician in last 6 months	3.17	2.61	2.97	3.29	3.09	3.11
*** Number of visits to a hospital in last 6 months	3.24	2.86	2.43	2.77	3.01	3.03
*** Number of visits to an emergency dept. in last 6 months	1.66	1.48	1.47	1.67	1.59	1.61

두
9
÷
2
6
•••
e
a
ö
5
¥
g
÷
-
*
0
se
<u> </u>
ő
ő
ő
ő
20B: Us
le 20B: U
ő
le 20B: U
le 20B: U

Table 20C: Impact of Work–Life Conflict

ć

				Sector		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Work-life conflict	No Change	56.6%	63.2%	23.6%	50.4%	52.6%
	Moderate Change	20.4%	20.4%	23.0%	19.7%	20.7%
	Substantial Change	23.0%	16.4%	53.4%	29.9%	26.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	60.0%	63.0%	27.2%	51.0%	55.7%
have caused you to reduce	Moderate Change	19.3%	19.3%	24.0%	21.7%	20.0%
amount of time to yourself	High Change	20.7%	%2.71%	48.8%	27.3%	24.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	63.2%	66.4%	31.3%	56.3%	59.0%
have caused you to reduce	Moderate Change	17.2%	17.6%	22.9%	20.6%	18.1%
amount of personal freedom	High Change	19.6%	16.1%	45.8%	23.2%	22.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	52.8%	62.6%	24.7%	49.3%	49.8%
have caused you to reduce	Moderate Change	19.2%	18.4%	21.5%	20.1%	19.5%
amount of sleep you get	High Change	28.0%	19.0%	53.8%	30.5%	30.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	47.5%	54.4%	18.5%	42.6%	44.1%
have caused you to reduce	Moderate Change	20.3%	23.1%	19.3%	21.0%	20.4%
amount of energy you have	High Change	32.2%	22.5%	62.2%	36.5%	35.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work and family challenges	No Change	55.3%	61.7%	22.3%	47.4%	51.2%
have caused you to reduce	Moderate Change	18.5%	18.1%	20.1%	17.3%	18.6%
amount of time in	High Change	26.3%	20.3%	57.6%	35.4%	30.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Sector	or		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Work interferes with family	Low	46.5%	56.1%	24.4%	6.7%	44.8%	40.6%
	Medium	31.3%	27.2%	32.2%	19.3%	31.1%	29.9%
	High	22.2%	16.7%	43.4%	74.0%	24.1%	29.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Family interferes with work	Low	46.6%	52.0%	33.9%	11.5%	49.4%	42.6%
	Medium	41.2%	38.8%	46.4%	52.4%	40.9%	42.7%
	High	12.2%	9.2%	19.7%	36.1%	9.7%	14.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

s
Ð
F
5
ŏ
ž
3
0
-
۳
-
<u> </u>
÷
ō
Š
>
••
Σ.
3
Φ
5
*
<u> </u>
·

Table 22: Role Overload

				Sector	or		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Total overload	Low	31.1%	36.2%	25.6%	3.5%	29.1%	28.0%
	Medium	33.2%	34.0%	35.4%	13.0%	33.2%	31.7%
	High	35.6%	29.8%	39.0%	83.4%	37.7%	40.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Work-role overload	Low	39.5%	47.3%	27.3%	4.4%	29.3%	33.9%
	Medium	35.5%	35.6%	41.2%	24.4%	38.7%	35.7%
	High	24.9%	17.1%	31.4%	71.2%	32.0%	30.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Family-role overload	Low	36.6%	47.8%	38.2%	30.5%	38.8%	37.1%
	Medium	36.6%	34.1%	39.0%	41.6%	35.6%	37.1%
	High	26.9%	18.1%	22.8%	27.9%	25.6%	25.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		Table 23	Table 23A: Organizational Culture	Culture			
				Sector	or		
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Culture: Work takes priority	Low agreement	48.3%	58.5%	25.7%	20.5%	48.3%	43.0%
over family	Neutral	30.4%	26.0%	27.7%	31.1%	29.9%	29.8%
	High agreement	21.3%	15.5%	46.6%	48.4%	21.8%	27.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Culture: Myth of separate	Low agreement	11.2%	11.5%	9.7%	6.7%	12.8%	10.8%
worlds	Neutral	55.8%	58.3%	49.4%	43.1%	54.6%	53.6%
	High agreement	33.0%	30.2%	40.9%	50.2%	32.6%	35.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	ture
č	3
-	onal
-	zatio
-	an
Ċ	5
	3
Ċ	Й Ө
1	ap
÷	_

		lable 23B: Organizational Culture	ational culture				
				Sector			
Percent in each Category		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
My organization believes that work should	Disagree	43.4%	48.8%	27.5%	18.9%	44.6%	39.3%
be the primary priority in a person's life	Neutral	27.8%	25.4%	22.6%	20.1%	25.4%	25.9%
	Agree	28.8%	25.8%	49.9%	61.0%	30.0%	34.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that employees	Disagree	24.7%	65.4%	36.7%	28.2%	57.5%	50.6%
who are highly committed to their personal	Neutral	24.8%	19.5%	23.3%	28.5%	23.8%	24.5%
lives cannot be highly committed to their	Agree	20.6%		40.1%	43.3%	18.7%	24.9%
work	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that employees	Disagree	30.9%	38.5%	27.7%	16.5%	32.2%	29.7%
should keep their personal problems at	Neutral	32.5%	32.2%	24.9%	27.6%	30.2%	30.6%
home	Agree	36.6%	29.3%	47.4%	55.9%	37.6%	39.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that the way to	Disagree	33.3%	41.3%	23.3%	14.5%	31.6%	30.2%
advance in this company is to keep non-	Neutral	34.7%	30.9%	27.8%	31.2%	34.2%	33.1%
work matters out of the workplace	Agree	32.0%	27.8%	48.9%	54.3%	34.2%	36.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that individuals	Disagree	54.4%	21.8%	36.2%	26.4%	52.9%	49.8%
who take time off to attend to personal	Neutral	22.0%	14.8%	20.2%	22.8%	22.5%	21.5%
matters are not committed to their work	Agree	23.6%		43.6%	50.8%	24.6%	28.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that the most	Disagree	46.4%	25.6%	30.3%	23.7%	50.3%	43.0%
productive employees are those who put	Neutral	23.9%	21.3%	16.7%	21.0%	22.6%	22.3%
their work before their family life	Agree	29.8%	23.1%	53.0%	55.3%	27.1%	34.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that employees	Disagree	9.7%	7.2%	16.9%	17.0%	12.8%	11.7%
are given ample opportunity to perform both	Neutral	27.2%	18.3%	29.5%	23.4%	30.4%	27.2%
their job and their personal responsibilities	Agree	63.1%	74.6%	53.6%	59.6%	56.8%	61.0%
well	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that offering	Disagree	25.0%	16.3%	41.4%	48.4%	28.4%	29.7%
employees flexibility in completing their	Neutral	26.0%	18.6%	30.7%	31.5%	28.3%	27.2%
work is viewed as a strategic way of doing	Agree	49.0%	65.1%	27.9%	20.0%	43.2%	43.2%
business	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
My organization believes that the ideal	Disagree	53.2%	56.5%	23.1%	34.7%	48.5%	46.7%
employee is the one who is available 24	Neutral	21.7%	17.8%	16.8%	21.0%	21.6%	20.7%
nours a day	Agree	25.1%	25.7%	60.0%	44.3%	29.9%	32.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			Sector	Sector	or		
Percent in each Category	sgory	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Control at work	Little control	24.7%	13.7%	39.2%	31.7%	30.2%	27.1%
	Moderate control	56.1%	51.3%	49.7%	56.4%	52.5%	54.3%
	Much Control	19.3%	35.0%	11.1%	11.9%	17.3%	18.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Control at home	Little control	5.5%	2.0%	7.1%	5.2%	4.4%	5.2%
	Moderate control	34.0%	15.3%	43.4%	37.8%	30.5%	33.4%
	Much control	60.5%	82.8%	49.5%	57.0%	65.1%	61.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 24: Control over Work and Control over Family

Table 28A: Perceived Flexibility

				Sector	tor		
Percent in each Categor	Jory	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Work flexibility	Very difficult	20.6%	15.2%	46.4%	88.6%	33.9%	31.6%
	Not easy or difficult	47.4%	42.4%	39.3%	10.8%	42.1%	41.8%
	Very easy	32.0%	42.5%	14.3%	.6%	24.0%	26.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 28B: Perceived Flexibility

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
				Sector	or		
Individual Flexibility Items: Percent in each	ercent in each Category	Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Flexibility to vary your	Very difficult	29.0%	21.1%	47.3%	84.4%	39.1%	37.2%
working hours (i.e., arrival	Not easy or difficult	21.1%	16.7%	22.6%	8.5%	22.4%	20.0%
and departure times)	Very easy	49.9%	62.2%	30.1%	7.1%	38.6%	42.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Flexibility to spend some of	Very difficult	66.8%	48.3%	82.4%	95.1%	69.7%	70.3%
your regular work day	Not easy or difficult	17.6%	19.9%	10.5%	2.9%	14.2%	15.0%
working at home	Very easy	15.6%	31.8%	7.1%	2.0%	16.1%	14.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Flexibility to take your	Very difficult	19.2%	19.6%	31.6%	94.2%	28.4%	29.0%
holidays when you want	Not easy or difficult	24.9%	21.9%	28.2%	4.2%	25.2%	23.2%
	Very easy	55.9%	58.6%	40.1%	1.7%	46.4%	47.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

difficult 30.0% 20.6% asy or difficult 29.1% 28.7% easy 100.0% 100.0% difficult 24.3% 17.5% easy or difficult 24.3% 17.5% asy or difficult 24.3% 17.5% asy or difficult 24.3% 17.5% difficult 24.3% 100.0% 1 asy or difficult 28.2% 22.2% easy 100.0% 100.0% 1 difficult 28.2% 55.6% 1 asy or difficult 28.2% 55.6% 1 difficult 20.3% 55.6% 1 asy or difficult 22.3% 24.9% 1 asy or difficult 25.0% 47.8% 1 difficult 25.0% 55.6% 1 1 asy or difficult 25.3% 55.6% 1 1 asy or difficult 25.0% 55.6% 1 1 asificult 25.0% 55.6			Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Not easy or difficult 29.1% 28.7% Very easy 41.0% 50.7% Very easy 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 24.3% 17.5% Very difficult 28.2% 22.2% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 25.7% Very difficult 28.2% 25.6% Very difficult 28.2% 25.6% Very difficult 28.2% 25.6% Very difficult 28.2% 55.6% Very difficult 28.3% 55.6% Very difficult 28.3% 55.6% Very difficult 28.3% 55.6% Very difficult 27.4% 74.9%	-	Very difficult	30.0%	20.6%	40.4%	62.8%	34.7%	34.2%
Very easy 41.0% 50.7% Total 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 24.3% 17.5% Very difficult 25.7% 22.2% Not easy or difficult 25.7% 22.2% Very difficult 25.7% 22.2% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 25.0% Very difficult 28.2% 25.6% Very difficult 28.2% 25.6% Very difficult 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 22.3% 25.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4%	_	Vot easy or difficult	29.1%	28.7%	29.6%	23.1%	30.2%	28.7%
Total 100.0% 100.0% 1 Very difficult 24.3% 17.5% 17.5% Not easy or difficult 25.7% 22.2% Very difficult 25.0% 60.3% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 25.0% Very difficult 28.2% 25.6% Very difficult 28.2% 55.6% Very difficult 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 28.2% 55.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.0% 55.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.0% 7.4% Very difficult 25.6% 7.4% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% <tr td=""> 7.6% 27.4% <</tr>		Very easy	41.0%	50.7%	30.0%	14.1%	35.2%	37.1%
Very difficult 24.3% 17.5% Not easy or difficult 25.7% 22.2% Very easy 50.0% 60.3% Very difficult 25.0% 50.0% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 25.0% Very difficult 28.2% 25.6% Very difficult 28.2% 55.6% Very difficult 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4%		Fotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Not easy or difficult 25.7% 22.2% Very easy 50.0% 60.3% Very difficult 50.0% 60.3% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 25.0% Very difficult 29.0% 25.0% Very difficult 29.0% 25.6% Very difficult 29.0% 25.6% Very difficult 29.0% 25.6% Very difficult 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very easy or difficult 20.3% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very easy or difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very easy or difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very easy or difficult 26.4% 7.4% Very easy or difficult 26.4% 7.4% Very easy or difficult 27.4% 7.4% Very difficult 27.4% 7.4% Very difficult 27.		Very difficult	24.3%	17.5%	41.5%	87.2%	33.9%	33.1%
Very easy 50.0% 60.3% Total 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Very difficult 28.2% 25.0% Very difficult 29.0% 52.6% Very difficult 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 29.0% 52.6% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 21.5% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 24.9% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 25.0% 7.4% Very difficult 25.4% 47.8% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 27.4% 7.4% <t< td=""><td></td><td>Vot easy or difficult</td><td>25.7%</td><td>22.2%</td><td>26.9%</td><td>8.9%</td><td>28.2%</td><td>24.4%</td></t<>		Vot easy or difficult	25.7%	22.2%	26.9%	8.9%	28.2%	24.4%
Total 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Not easy or difficult 29.0% 25.0% Very easy 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 29.0% 52.6% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 27.4% 16.7%	-	Very easy	50.0%	60.3%	31.6%	4.0%	37.9%	42.5%
Very difficult 28.2% 22.4% Not easy or difficult 29.0% 25.0% Very easy 42.8% 52.6% Very difficult 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 25.6% 100.0% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 24.9% Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very difficult 25.7% 24.9% Very difficult 20.0% 100.0% Very difficult 20.2% 27.4% Very difficult 27.4% 16.7%		Fotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Not easy or difficult 29.0% 25.0% Very easy 42.8% 52.6% Very easy or difficult 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very easy or difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very easy or difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 20.2% 100.0% Very difficult 20.2% 100.0% Very difficult 20.2% 13.7% Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% Very difficult 27.4% 100.0% Very difficult 20.2% 19.4% Very difficult 27.8% 59.2% Very difficult 27.4% <		Very difficult	28.2%	22.4%	50.5%	85.9%	37.2%	37.2%
Very easy 42.8% 52.6% Total 100.0% 100.0% Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% Very difficult 20.0% 100.0% Very difficult 20.2% 18.7% Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% Very difficult 24.7% 19.4% Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% Very difficult 27.8% 59.2% Very difficult 27.4% 19.4% Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% <	e., shifts,	Vot easy or difficult	29.0%	25.0%	25.7%	10.8%	27.9%	26.4%
Total 100.0% 100.0% 1 Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% 18.7% Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% 1 Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% 1 Very difficult 20.3% 25.7% 1 Very difficult 20.3% 25.6% 1 Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% 1 Very difficult 25.7% 27.4% 1 Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% 1 Very difficult 25.0% 47.8% 1 Very difficult 25.4% 64.7% 1 Very difficult 20.2% 18.7% 1 Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Very difficult 57.8% <td< td=""><td></td><td>Very easy</td><td>42.8%</td><td>52.6%</td><td>23.8%</td><td>3.3%</td><td>34.9%</td><td>36.4%</td></td<>		Very easy	42.8%	52.6%	23.8%	3.3%	34.9%	36.4%
Very difficult 11.5% 18.7% Not easy or difficult 20.3% 25.7% Very easy 68.2% 55.6% Very difficult 20.3% 55.6% Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Very easy 100.0% 100.0% 1 Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% 1 Very easy 52.0% 47.8% 1 Very easy 52.0% 47.8% 1 Very easy 52.0% 100.0% 1 Very easy 100.0% 100.0% 1 Very easy or difficult 20.2% 64.7% 1 Very easy 65.4% 64.7% 1 Very easy or difficult 57.8% 21.5% 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 1 1 Very easy or difficult 57.8% 51.5% 1 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 1 1 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 1		[otal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Not easy or difficult 20.3% 25.7% Very easy Very easy 55.6% Very easy 100.0% 1 day Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% day Very easy 27.4% 1 Very easy 52.0% 47.8% 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 1 Very easy 14.4% 16.7% 1 Very difficult 20.2% 18.7% 1 Very easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% 1 Very easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Very easy Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Very easy Not easy or difficult 54.7% 1 Very easy Very easy 100.0% 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 1 <td></td> <td>Very difficult</td> <td>11.5%</td> <td>18.7%</td> <td>28.0%</td> <td>63.1%</td> <td>28.8%</td> <td>21.3%</td>		Very difficult	11.5%	18.7%	28.0%	63.1%	28.8%	21.3%
Very easy 68.2% 55.6% Total 100.0% 1 day Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Not easy or difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very easy 52.0% 47.8% Very easy or difficult 100.0% 1 Very easy or difficult 14.4% 16.7% Very easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% Very easy or difficult 20.0% 100.0% 1 Not easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% 1 Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Very easy Not easy or difficult 59.2% 1 Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 1		Vot easy or difficult	20.3%	25.7%	25.8%	16.2%	27.2%	22.3%
Total 100.0% 100.0% 1 day Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Not easy or difficult 25.7% 24.9% Very easy 52.0% 47.8% Very easy 100.0% 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 Very easy 14.4% 16.7% Very easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% Very easy 100.0% 100.0% 1 Very easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% 1 Total 100.0% 100.0% 1 1 Very easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Not easy or difficult 54.7% 1 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 1 1 Very easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 1 Very easy or difficult 24.7% 1 1 1 1	-	Very easy	68.2%	55.6%	46.2%	20.6%	44.0%	56.4%
day Very difficult 22.3% 24.9% Not easy or difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very easy 52.0% 47.8% Very easy 100.0% 1 Very difficult 14.4% 16.7% Not easy or difficult 14.4% 16.7% Very easy 14.4% 16.7% Very easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% Total 100.0% 100.0% 1 Very easy or difficult 27.8% 59.2% 1 Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 1 1 1		Fotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Not easy or difficult 25.7% 27.4% Very easy 52.0% 47.8% Very easy 100.0% 1 Very difficult 14.4% 16.7% Very easy 0.0% 18.7% Very easy 100.0% 1 Very easy 14.4% 16.7% Very easy 14.4% 16.7% Very easy 100.0% 1 Not easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% Total 100.0% 100.0% 1 Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 1		Very difficult	22.3%	24.9%	37.9%	78.5%	40.0%	32.3%
Very easy 52.0% 47.8% Total 100.0% 1 Very difficult 14.4% 16.7% Very difficult 20.2% 18.7% Not easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% Very easy 100.0% 1 Very easy 100.0% 1 Not easy or difficult 27.8% 64.7% Not 65.4% 64.7% Very easy 100.0% 1 Very easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% Very easy 17.4% 19.4%		Vot easy or difficult	25.7%	27.4%	29.0%	13.6%	26.3%	25.3%
Total 100.0% 1 Very difficult 14.4% 16.7% Very difficult 20.2% 18.7% Not easy or difficult 20.2% 65.4% Very easy 65.4% 64.7% Total 100.0% 100.0% 1 Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% 1 Not easy or difficult 24.7% 19.4% 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 1		very easy	52.0%	47.8%	33.1%	7.9%	33.8%	42.4%
Very difficult 14.4% 16.7% Not easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% Very easy 65.4% 64.7% Very easy 100.0% 1 Not easy or difficult 57.8% 59.2% Very easy 17.4% 19.4%		Fotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Not easy or difficult 20.2% 18.7% Very easy 65.4% 64.7% Very easy 100.0% 1 Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% Not easy or difficult 24.7% 19.4% Very easy 17.4% 19.4%		Very difficult	14.4%	16.7%	41.6%	30.2%	22.0%	21.1%
Very easy 65.4% 64.7% 3 Total 100.0% 100.0% 10 Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% 7 Not easy or difficult 24.7% 21.5% 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 1		Vot easy or difficult	20.2%	18.7%	26.5%	29.4%	22.0%	22.1%
Total 100.0% 100.0% 10 Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% 7 Not easy or difficult 24.7% 21.5% 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 1	-	Very easy	65.4%	64.7%	31.9%	40.4%	56.1%	56.9%
Very difficult 57.8% 59.2% 7 Not easy or difficult 24.7% 21.5% 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 1		Fotal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Not easy or difficult 24.7% 21.5% 1 Very easy 17.4% 19.4% 10.4%	-	Very difficult	57.8%	59.2%	73.4%	72.5%	62.0%	62.2%
Very easy 17.4% 19.4%			24.7%	21.5%	19.5%	17.6%	24.5%	23.0%
		Very easy	17.4%	19.4%	7.1%	9.9%	13.6%	14.8%
100.0% 100.0%	_	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Sector		Γ
		Public Sector	Private Sector	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
Layoffs, Job changes		%	%	%	%	%
No employers last 5 years	1	60.9%	64.2%	71.3%	57.0%	61.3%
	2	26.3%	26.0%	17.8%	32.0%	26.4%
	3 or more	12.8%	9.6%	10.9%	11.0%	12.3%
No times changed job	None	88.7%	74.1%	%0.	54.7%	85.6%
involuntarily in last 5 years	1	7.4%	16.9%	77.0%	33.8%	9.7%
	2	2.4%	2.0%	12.3%	8.4%	3.2%
	3 or more	1.4%	2.0%	10.7%	3.1%	1.6%
Extent to which employees	To a little extent	70.1%	78.3%	%0.	78.3%	71.1%
laid off in organization in last 5	To a moderate extent	18.2%	15.6%	%0.	13.9%	17.9%
years	To a great extent	11.7%	6.0%	%0.	7.8%	11.0%
Extent to which employees	To a little extent	81.6%	88.1%	%0.	88.5%	82.4%
laid off in department in last 5	To a moderate extent	10.9%	8.8%	%0.	6.9%	10.6%
years	To a great extent	7.5%	3.1%	%0.	4.6%	7.0%
Probability will lose job in next	No chance	18.8%	29.3%	44.3%	26.2%	20.7%
12 months	1-10% chance	22.5%	33.3%	18.9%	22.4%	23.9%
	11-29% chance	15.8%	16.2%	9.5%	16.4%	15.8%
	30-49% chance	10.9%	7.6%	4.0%	10.0%	10.3%
	50-79% chance	20.9%	9.9%	15.4%	18.3%	19.3%
	80% or more	11.1%	3.6%	8.0%	6.8%	9.9%

urity
sect
ц.
^o
ы
29:
e
Tab

Table 30: Decision-making re: Children

			Table of Posicial Indaning is: Chinaten				
				Sector	tor		
		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
		Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N	Column Valid N
Percent in each Category		%	%	%	%	%	%
Have fewer children because	Disagree	76.4%	80.2%	70.6%	54.4%	78.7%	74.3%
of work	Neutral	11.1%	10.7%	12.3%	22.1%	11.2%	12.1%
	Agree	12.5%	9.1%	17.1%	23.5%	10.1%	13.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Have not yet started family	Disagree	77.4%	80.6%	72.3%	47.2%	78.5%	74.4%
because of career	Neutral	15.5%	13.0%	19.3%	29.0%	15.9%	17.1%
	Agree	7.1%	6.4%	8.4%	23.9%	5.6%	8.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Sector	stor		
		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
		Column Valid N					
Percent in each Categon	ategory	%	%	%	%	%	%
Caregiver strain	Monthly or less	80.9%	89.8%	85.8%	84.4%	84.8%	82.8%
	Weekly	13.0%	7.7%	9.4%	11.4%	10.6%	11.8%
	Several days/week or more	6.1%	2.4%	4.8%	4.2%	4.6%	5.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 36A: Caregiver Strain

Table 36B: Caregiver Strain

				Sector	stor		
		Public Sector	Private Sector	Police	Teacher	Not for profit	Total
		Column Valid N					
Percent in each Category		%	%	%	%	%	%
Eldercare is a physical	Monthly or less	69.0%	76.4%	75.0%	72.8%	74.2%	71.2%
strain	Weekly	18.2%	14.6%	16.9%	17.4%	13.9%	17.1%
	Several days per work+	12.8%	8.9%	8.1%	9.7%	11.9%	11.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Eldercare is a financial	Monthly or less	88.6%	95.5%	89.3%	91.3%	93.1%	90.0%
strain	Weekly	5.2%	3.3%	5.8%	3.9%	3.1%	4.7%
	Several days per work+	6.2%	1.2%	5.0%	4.9%	3.9%	5.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Eldercare leaves me	Monthly or less	77.6%	85.7%	84.3%	78.2%	79.9%	79.1%
completely overwhelmed	Weekly	11.2%	8.6%	8.4%	12.4%	10.3%	10.7%
	Several days per work+	11.2%	5.7%	7.3%	9.5%	9.8%	10.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%