RESEARCH ARTICLE

Ting Wu, Jingfeng Uen, Suling Wu, Tzujung Chang

Family Supportive Culture, Work-Life Segmentation and Employee's Organizational Attachment: The Case of High-Tech Industry in Taiwan

Abstract   This study examines the relationship among family supportive culture, organizational attachment, and work-life segmentation in high-tech service industry in Taiwan, China. Using survey data from 369 professionals, this study shows that family supportive culture has significant influence on organizational attachment, namely, affective commitment. Results indicate that individuals' work-life segmentation has a significant negative effect on organizational attachment. Meanwhile, our results further apply employees' segmentation between work and life as a moderator to investigating the impact of individual's perceptions of family supportive culture and values on a sense of attachment toward organizations. The result illustrates that work-life

Ting Wu (✉)
Institute of Human Resource Management, National Sun Yat-sen University (Taiwan), Kaohsiung, China
E-mail: tinatrini@gmail.com

Jingfeng Uen
Institute of Human Resource Management, National Sun Yat-sen University (Taiwan), Kaohsiung, China
E-mail: uen@mail.nsysu.edu.tw

Suling Wu
Graduate Institute of Human Resource Development, National Hsinchu University of Education (Taiwan), Hsinchu, China
E-mail: sulin@mail.nhcue.edu.tw

Tzujung Chang
Microsoft Taiwan Corporation, Taipei, China
E-mail: olivecha@microsoft.com

segmentation does not moderate the relationship between supportive family culture and employees' organizational attachment. Findings from this research provide insights into the influence of organizational family supportive culture and how it may further encourage employees' organizational attachment in high-tech industry in Taiwan.

Keywords   family supportive culture, work-life segmentation, organizational attachment

1   Introduction

Since the 1980s, the Taiwan authorities have actively encouraged the development in the high-tech industry, and it has gradually shifted the patterns of employment and meaning of work (Xu, 2003). These changes underlying knowledge intensive industries shift organizations' focus to employees and their attitudes and behaviours on organizational performance (Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006; Xu, 2003). Along with the current environment changes as well as the complex demographic composition, employees' work-life issues have become an imperative issue to researchers and practitioners more than ever before (Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006). Contemporary technological advancements penetrate work-life domains and lead to blurring borders that requires employees to work longer as well as frequently contact with stakeholders (Baral and Bhargava, 2010). As a result, originally obvious boundary between work and life declines. Though organizations provide mechanisms to develop a family friendly environment, it is suggested not only to implement practical programs but also to facilitate the generation of family supportive culture at work to balance employees' work and personal life. Preceding findings explicate the significance to understand how individuals manage various roles while the work-life boundaries alter and how individuals segment or integrate their roles as well as the relevant consequences (Allen, 2001; Clark, 2000; Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006; Winkel and Clayton, 2009).

Family supportive culture is developed when individuals are supported by supervisors in managing work-family responsibilities; perceive less negative career consequences as well as less time demands. Past research findings have shown the significant effects on improving employee's positive affect, organizational commitment, and further enhance wellbeing in other domains (Baral and Bhargava, 2010; Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness, 1999). Similar to other culture aspects, family supportive culture can not only affect the implementation of related organizational practices but also influence employee attitudes, organizational attachment, for instance, toward organizational perfor-

mance (Thompson et al., 1999). Working within family supportive environment helps make an organization a pleasing place to stay and further affect employees' engagement in and dedication to the organizations (Eisenberger, Fasolo and Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Thompson et al., 1999). Therefore, this study adopts organizational attachment as one of the major variables while examining short-term turnover and re-training costs as well as long-term human resource sustainability to delineate the influence of organizational context (Allen, 2001; Baral and Bhargava, 2010; Grover and Crooker, 1995).

There were limited empirical studies focusing on personal value regarding work-life boundary, namely, work-life segmentation (Rothbard, Phillips, and Dumas, 2005). Managing multiple roles across various domains has become essential for individuals and organizations to recognize the different needs of employees. If an organization can understand and better manage the environment to fit in with employees needs, it can not only increase members' organizational attachment but also retain these valuable human resources (Rothbard et al., 2005). As a result, the present research firstly illustrates the components of family supportive culture that explicate the influence of workplace context on employees' attitudes, namely, affective attachment toward organizations. Next, In contrast with earlier researchers highlighting demographic differences, we bring work-life segmentation into analysis to represent distinct personal value variables from one another. Subsequently, we illuminate the interaction effect of family supportive culture and work-life segmentation on organizational attachment to further clarify the importance to manage the boundary between work and life. Last, we address practical implications and suggestions for researchers and practitioners.

2 Theoretical Backgrounds and Hypotheses

2.1 Family Supportive Culture

Because of the dynamic changes of workplace, research in terms of family supportive work environment gradually receives more attentions and organizations are keen on providing a range of work-family benefits such as parental leave, telecommuting, and on-site child care. However, research suggests that organizational culture plays the key to affect if employees will participate in the work-family programs and their attitudes toward specific organizations (Thompson et al., 1999). Similar to other aspects of organizational culture to influence employee's attitudes and behavior, family supportive culture rooted in values and beliefs is characterized by "the shared assumptions, beliefs and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees' work and family lives" (Thompson et al., 1999: 394). It

is made up of at least three components, including managerial support, perceived career consequences and organizational time demands that are interdependent to some extent and represent organizational supportiveness regarding employees' work and family life (Thompson et al., 1999).

Managerial support as the first component indicates that "the extent to which managers were supportive and sensitive to employees' family responsibilities (1999: 401)." Supportive supervisors play an important role since they can either encourage employees to take part in relevant work-family policies or hinder them from making good use of benefits that influence employees' abilities to achieve the work-life balance (Thompson et al., 1999). Based on social exchange theory, employees perceive supportiveness from their supervisors may tend to show reciprocity in exchanging relationships with employers to demonstrate their attachment as well as loyalty (Baral and Bhargava, 2010; Chiu and Ng, 2001; Grover and Crooker, 1995). As the second component, perceived career consequences is, to some extent, related to employees' presence at work based on organizational norms and represents their commitment and devotion to work and the organizations (Perlow, 1995). Empirical studies are in favour of the idea that employees' future, such as performance evaluations and potential advancement may be undermined while participating in work-family relevant programmes (Allen, 2001; Perlow, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). The third factor, organizational time demand, describes that employees are expected to prioritise work before family responsibilities. These organizational norms suggesting the working hours that employees are supposed to spend and their use of time will affect employees' behaviour (Thompson et al., 1999). Long working hours may be characterised as an indicator of employees' commitment toward the organizations, and the time demands derived from workplace will make it difficult to comply with expectations from family (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Thompson et al., 1999).

As a result, family supportive culture is originated while individuals feel a sense of supportiveness by their employers, perceive less negative career consequences, and recognise less time demands (Baral and Bhargava, 2010). In different ways, these three dimensions are interdependently related to whether employees may use work-family benefits, whether they intend to remain in the organization, and how they committed to the organizations, and indicate the complex feature of family supportive culture (Thompson et al., 1999).

2.2   Work-Life Segmentation

Due to attention to the importance of employees, family-friendly programs have been taken as mechanisms to build up a family supportive culture in the organization. It is, thus, important to understand how employees transit between

the roles they play from one to another such as making a phone call to spouse while at the office (Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate, 2000; Winkel and Clayton, 2009). A growing body of literature in relation to transition is boundary theory that delineates how people management multiple roles by understanding the boundary between work and life roles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Rothbard et al., 2005). Research falls in this field mainly concerns the nature of boundary between work and life, the way people manage the boundary and related consequences of boundary strategies (Rothbard et al., 2005).

Based on prior literature, boundary theory investigates how people build borders around a given role to construct a domain, such as family and work domain (Ashforth et al., 2000; Winkel and Clayton, 2009). Individuals may vary in the degree to which their multiple roles are integrated or segmented across domains on a continuum (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996; Boswell and Olson-Buchanan, 2007; Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006; Rothbard et al., 2000). Segmentation refers to the separation between work and nonwork while integration happens when distinction doesn't exist between work and life domains, for instance (Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006; Rothbard et al., 2005).

There are limited empirical studies directly emphasizing on individuals' values about work-life segmentation (Rothbard et al., 2005). To expand the understanding of boundary management strategies (e.g., Nippert-Eng, 1996), this study focuses on people's preference for work-life segmentation while coping with work and life role. We specify work-life segmentation as an individual's value that work and life domain are treated separately when the degree of work-life segmentation is high. The rationale why individual prefers segmentation or integration rests on lessening the difficulties while performing both work and nonwork roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). Once employees place importance on greater segmentation, it helps them minimize stress and negative psychological mood variation as well as preclude them from negative emotion spillover from one domain to another (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Rothbard et al., 2005). Furthermore, employees who hold greater segmentation may tend to decrease interruptions from other domains and fully focus on the salient role specifically (Ashforth et al., 2000; Boswell and Olson-Buchanan, 2007; Rothbard, 2001).

2.3 Organizational Attachment

Organizational attachment has been shown as a significant factor that influences the relationship between employees and organizations (Grover and Crooker, 1995). Different mechanisms explain how employees feel a sense of attachment and are willing to devote their time and efforts to the particular organizations

(Grover and Crooker, 1995). Past research has suggested that employees who are committed to the organization may make positive contributions, lower absence rate, and stay with the organizations to generate committed workforce and bring benefits to particular organization performance because of the emotional attachment to specific organizations (Chiu and Ng, 1999). There are different antecedents of organizational affective attachment categorized into four aspects, including personal characteristics, job characteristics, work experiences and structural characteristics (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Among these factors, though, work experience antecedents, such as management receptiveness and equity, have been suggested to be the most influential antecedents since these experiences help attain employees psychological needs to feel adaptable and comfortable in work roles (Allen and Meyer, 1990).

Subsequently, a certain amount of focus has been given to organizational attachment that links to the outcomes of organizational family supportive environment, such as intention remaining with the organizations and better organizational performance (Chiu and Ng, 1999; Grover and Crooker, 1995). Organizational attachment has been conceptualized and developed as a key factor in examining the relationship between employees and organization to delineate the psychological state that a person's identification with and is bound to a particular organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Chang, 1999; Grover and Crooker, 1995). Prior studies indicate that a balance has to be reached between individual's attitudes and behaviors on the basis of balance theory (Grover and Crooker, 1995). When an employee is treated well by the organizations, their work-related attitudes toward the organizations will generate positive affect and a sense of goodwill, and further engender loyalty and affective attachment to the organization (Grover and Crooker, 1995). Among different perspectives, affective commitment is the most widely-used component in relation to organizational attachment, and refers to employees' emotional attachment to, involve in and identify with the organizations through showing loyalty, affection and a sense of belonging (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Chang, 1999; Chiu and Ng, 1999; Grover and Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999).

2.4   Hypotheses

Following previous discussion, corporate culture has implications for promoting a sense of psychological attachment (Allen, 2001). For example, supervisors may highlight the significance of family and dependent care responsibilities, lessen the negative career consequences from opposite role status, and promote the flexibility of working schedules (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). When an employee personally feels respect and treated well by the

organization, such as being giving extra privileges, a sense of goodwill may be generated and further turned into greater involvement and loyalty to the organizations (Grover and Crooker, 1995). According to balance theory, employee's attitudes toward the organization may be more positive and balanced when receiving benefits from the organization (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Heider, 1958). Furthermore, whether employee personally is assisted, organizational family supportive culture may symbolize organization's concerns for work-family issues and may lead to organizational members' positive affective response and further generate a sense of affective commitment (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, and Brinley, 2005; Thompson et al., 1999). Thus, some research findings suggest that the perception of a family supportive culture is significantly related to work attitudes, affective commitment (Baral and Bhargava, 2010; Chiu and Ng, 1999; Thompson et al., 1999). Consequently,

H1 Employees' perceptions of a family supportive culture will be positively related to organizational attachment.

According to prior discussion, organizational attachment is taken as a linkage between employees and organizations that devoted employees show identification with, involvement in and enjoy being the member in the organizations (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Employees may dedicate themselves to the work role than to another because it provides positive reinforcement of their self-concept (Ashforth et al., 2000). Subsequently, these employees may further display their willingness to work and make extra efforts during their private time and enact their engagement in relevant work behaviors beyond the normal organizational boundaries (Boswell and Olson-Buchanan, 2007). However, on the contrary, if individuals prefer work-life segmentation to integration, this increasingly blurred border may reduce their willingness to continually connect with the targeted organization because of the higher degree of boundary permeability (Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006).

H2 Employees' work-life segmentation will be negatively related to organizational attachment.

On the basis of prior-mentioned continuum between segmentation and integration (Ashforth et al., 2000; Rothbard, 2001), employees who prefer greater segmentation between work and life roles and perceive more family supportive culture will be more committed to the organization because this relationship is in congruent with their values. Person-organization fit theory specifies the congruence between the individuals and organization (Cable and Judge, 1997), the compatibility between the employee's and organization's values may serve as

a predictor of organizational attachment (Rothbard, 2001). Organizations signal their support and respect by means of family supportive culture coherent with these "segmentor" who desire to remain boundaries to lessen the interference between work and life (Rothbard, 2001). Under this circumstance, employees, on the one hand, give more weight to work-life segmentation may display greater life engagement when they perceive greater family supportive culture with respect and autonomy; on the other hand, reveal less organizational attachment within workplace. Yet, if the misfit existing between employees and organizations regarding values of work-life boundary, this incompatibility may influence employees' engagement, result in negative affect, emotional distancing, and lead to lower commitment to the organization (Rothbard, 2001). In light of previous assumptions, we hypothesize that employees' work-life segmentation will moderate the relationship between the perceptions toward family supportive culture and their organizational attachment. Thus,

H3   Work-life segmentation will moderate the influences of family supportive culture perception on their organizational attachment.

3   Methods

3.1   Sample and Procedures

We collected research samples from white-collar workers in the high-tech services industry since the development of high-tech software industry has been rapid, and received much attention recently (Xu, 2003). The value of knowledge economy lying mostly in intangible fields, such as innovation, creativity, and software has gradually led to variability and flexibility of workplace and employment (Hyman, Baldry, Scholarios and Bunzel, 2003). In general, employees in high-tech industry face the changing pattern of traditional working hours and flexible work arrangement and may also result in the blurred work-life boundary (Hyman et al., 2003; Xu, 2003). Survey questionnaires were available in both electronic and paper versions for professional and managerial employees to complete. Questionnaires were sent with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey. The completed questionnaires were returned directly to the researchers to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents.

   The data were received from 369 professional and managerial employees in 32 high-tech services industry organizations in Taiwan. Of those who responded to the demographic questions, the overall sample consisted of 231 females and 206 males, average age was 33.41 years and average job tenure was 4.88 years (S.D. = 4.344). 24.5% ($n = 108$) of the respondents held management positions, 74.1% ($n = 327$) held non-managerial job. A total of 224 (50.8%) respondents were married and 175 (39.7%) had one or more children.

3.2   Measures

3.2.1   Family Supportive Culture

A family supportive culture allows employees to effectively cope with work and family responsibilities and more organizational commitment is generated (Thompson et al., 1999). We measured family supportive culture with a 20-item scale adopted from Thompson et al. (1999) who conducted major research in the work and family area. These items assessed respondents' perceptions of their organizations' support for employees' attempts to balance work and family responsibilities. Alpha for the scale was 0.861.

The scale measuring respondents' perceptions of their organizations' support for employees are made up of three components, including, managerial support, career consequences and organizational time demands. Alpha for managerial support (e.g., in general, managers/supervisors in this organization are quite accommodating of family related needs) was 0.853. Alpha for career consequences of devoting time to family (e.g., most employees are resentful when women in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children) was 0.803. Alpha for organizational time demands/expectations that might interfere with family life (e.g., to be viewed favorably by top management, employees in this organization must constantly put their jobs ahead of their families or personal lives) was 0.818. Respondents presented the extent that each item demonstrated their current firms by means of a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Some negative-worded items were recoded. Moreover, we adopted the same procedure from Thompson et al. (1999) to sum and average responses so that high scores indicated a supportive work-family culture.

3.2.2   Organizational Attachment

Organizational attachment was operationalized as affective commitment, consistent with previous research (e.g., Grover and Crooker, 1995). Affective commitment was assessed with a 6-item version of Allen and Meyer's (1990) affective commitment scale. The response scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) that high scores represented greater affective commitment. Existing studies suggest that it is a reliable measure while investigating commitment since it helps achieve a more comprehensive understanding of employee-organization relationship (Allen and Meyer, 1990). In this paper, organizational attachment was defined as the level of emotional attachment to the organization (e.g., ''this organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me'') and alpha was 0.800.

3.2.3 Work-Life Segmentation

Work-life segmentation was measured employees' desire for segmentation between work and family by applying Edwards and Rothbard's (1999, 2000) four-item scale. This scale measures desire for segmentation showing good psycho metric features by asking for acceptable amounts for various job characteristics (e.g., Edwards and Rothbard, 1999). In this section, we asked respondents: "How much of the characteristic do you personally feel is acceptable? We would like to know how much you personally feel is acceptable." We included this statement within the survey. The four job characteristics that comprised the desire for segmentation scale were: (1) not being required to work while at home, (2) being able to forget work while I am at home, (3) not having to think about work once I leave the workplace, and (4) not being expected to take work home. These items were rated on a seven-point scale ranging from "not at all" to "very much." The reliability for these four items was 0.881.

3.2.4 Control Variables

Gender, age, education, marital status, organizational tenure, level of family responsibility (i.e., elders and children under 12 year-old), job position (i.e., management level or not) were included as control variables in the regression equations because of their potential relationships with the dependent variables. Gender was coded as a dummy variable (male = 0 and female = 1). Age was reported in years. Education level were coded as 1 = high school, 2 = university, 3 = graduate school, 4 = PhD. Marital status was coded as a dummy variable (not married and not living with partner = 0 and married or not married but living with partner = 1). Organizational tenure was reported in years and months. Level of family responsibility was measured by applying the responsibility for dependents (Allen, 2001). Moreover, position as a non-managerial role or managerial roles may be associated with perceived work family culture and affective commitment (Chiu and Ng, 2001).

4   Results

4.1   Descriptive Statistics and Correlation

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of all study variables are presented in Table 1. Employees who reported family supportive culture, including, managerial support ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.01$), career consequences ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$) and organizational time demands ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$) were significantly positively correlated to organizational attachment.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of All Variables

Variables	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Gender [a]	0.46	0.49												
Age	33.41	5.62	0.17**											
Education [b]	2.24	0.51	0.02	−0.08										
Marriage [c]	0.50	0.50	0.13*	0.51**	−0.06									
Tenure	4.89	4.34	−0.02	0.52**	−0.19**	0.31**								
Elder	0.45	0.49	0.08	0.12*	−0.10	0.13**	0.14**							
Kid	0.38	0.49	0.06	0.46**	−0.12*	0.70**	0.33**	0.19**						
Management level [d]	0.26	0.436	0.13*	0.44**	0.09	0.23**	0.32**	−0.05	0.24**					
Managerial support [e]	4.48	0.83	0.16**	−0.03	0.06	0.05	−0.07	−0.05	0.05	0.06				
Career consequences [e]	4.20	0.94	0.15**	−0.09	−0.02	−0.09	−0.08	−0.01	−0.08	0.02	0.36**			
Organizational time demands [e]	3.97	1.17	0.09	0.08	−0.04	0.04	−0.02	−0.04	0.01	0.13*	0.46**	0.65**		
Organizational attachment	3.47	0.57	0.14**	0.07	0.01	0.11*	0.04	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.44**	0.29**	0.27**	
Work-life segmentation	5.20	1.38	−0.04	−0.07	−0.05	−0.06	−0.10*	0.01	−0.03	−0.08	0.07	0.13*	0.08	−0.13*

Note: * indicates $p < 0.05$; **indicates $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

N = 369 (Missing values were excluded listwise).

a: 1 = Male, 0 = Female; b: 1 = high school, 2 = university, 3 = graduate school, 4 = PhD, 5 = others; c: 1 = Married, 0 = Single; d: 0 = Non-management level, 1 = Management level; e: Higher values reflect more supportive cultures.

4.2   Hypotheses Test

We used hierarchical multiple regression to test all hypotheses, with control variables entered in the first step, followed by the variables to be tested, using simultaneous entry of all variables within a step. In this study, H1 stated that employees would show higher organizational attachment if they perceived more family supportive culture. For the analyses predicting perceived family supportive culture and organizational attachment, control variables were entered first in step 1, with family supportive culture and work-life segmentation entered in step 2 to test H1. In the third step of each equation, we included the interactions between work-life segmentation and family supportive culture. Significance of the results was determined from the F test for R^2 change, associated with the variables added in the last step as well as significance of beta coefficients for hypothesized predictors.

Table 2 showed the results of the regression analyses for the effect of perceived family supportive culture, work-life segmentation on organizational attachment. H1 predicated that employees' perception of family supportive culture has significant impact on their organizational attachment. The results indicated that employees' organizational attachment were predicated by two components of family supportive culture, including managerial support (β = 0.384, p < 0.001) as well as career consequences (β = 0.188, p < 0.001). On the basis of correlation shown in Table 1, three components forming family supportive culture shown high degree of collinearity and was taken as an integrated construct to examine in this study. As a result, H1 was supported.

Table 2   The Impact of Family Supportive Culture on Organizational Attachment

	Organizational attachment		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Control variables			
Gender [a]	0.124	0.024	0.024
Age	−0.033	0.019	0.020
Education [b]	0.016	−0.003	−0.004
Marriage [c]	0.057	0.067	0.066
Tenure	0.011	0.019	0.015
Elders	0.026	0.047	0.044
Kids	0.048	0.014	0.017
Management level [d]	0.056	0.013	0.015

(*To be continued*)

	Organizational attachment		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Main effects			
Managerial support		0.384[***]	0.264
Career consequences		0.188[***]	0.272
Organizational time demands		−0.014	−0.039
Work-life segmentation		−0.178[***]	−0.265
Interaction effects			
Managerial support ×Work-life segmentation			0.206
Career consequences ×Work-life segmentation			−0.135
Organizational time demands ×Work-life segmentation			0.037
R^2	0.032	0.258	0.259
ΔR^2		0.226	0.001
F	1.503	10.319	8.218
ΔF		27.079[***]	0.121

Note: 1. [+]denotes $p < 0.1$; * denotes $p < 0.05$; ** denotes $p < 0.01$; ***denotes $p < 0.001$.
2. $N = 369$.
3. Standardized regression coefficients were shown.
4. The coding scheme: a: 1 = Male, 0 = Female; b: 1 = high school, 2 = university, 3 = graduate school, 4 = PhD, 5 = others; c: 1 = Married, 0 = Single; d: 0 = Non-management level, 1 = Management level.

Next, the results of step 2 presented that employees' organizational attachment is predicated by their work-life segmentation ($\beta = -0.178$, $p < 0.001$) and H2 was supported. In the step 3, based on the result of work-life segmentation as a moderator in the family supportive culture and organizational attachment relation, the interaction effect, work-life segmentation interacted with all three components of family supportive culture as shown in Table 2. In H3, we expected that the interaction between work-life segmentation and family supportive culture would be positively related to organizational attachment. Table 2 revealed that there was not a significant interaction effect between work-life segmentation and family supportive culture in the organizational attachment equation. Therefore, the results did not support H3.

5   Discussion and Conclusion

The contemporary global market representing adaptability, high responsiveness, great innovation and abundant creativity directly or indirectly cause the changing patterns of employment, such as increasing working-hour and demanding

workloads (Hyman et al., 2003; Perlow, 1998). While working within this so-called knowledge industry, though employees offered a certain degree of autonomy are usually asked to present routinely to demonstrate their commitment and performance in the workplace (Hyman et al., 2003; Perlow, 1998). Organizations expect employees to make their work their priority over and above their life and other domains in response to market and customers worldwide promptly. These trends may make difficult for organizational members to manage multiple roles and lead to choose either separation (segmentation) or interference (integration) among different domains (Perlow, 1998; Rothbard, 2001).

The first hypothesis predicted that the perceptions of family supportive culture will significantly affect employees' organizational attachment. The finding illustrates that people feel more attached to organizations with a family supportive culture, such as managerial support, less negative consequences while using relevant practices. Our finding that the managerial support is related to organizational attachment is consistent with earlier research (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Moreover, employees' organizational attachment increases while they perceive less negative consequences once they adopt related practices within organization that signal the supportiveness and care from organizations (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999).

The second hypothesis-employees' work-life segmentation will be negatively related to organizational attachment-was also supported. Individuals are distinct from one another when decide to segment or integrate different roles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996; Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006). In order to lessen the burring situations between roles, an individual with high work-life segmentation prefers to have less boundary permeability and tends to psychologically separate from various roles through deliberately construct boundary (Ashforth et al., 2000; Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006). With the defending perimeter between work and life, it will reduce the role permeability and increase the chance to fully engage in the organization. Therefore, our findings respond to prior studies (e.g., Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2006) that individual holds higher work-life segmentation may demonstrate less involvement in and emotional bond with the organizations.

In terms of interaction of H3, these findings revealed that there were no significant effects of work-life segmentation as a moderator to influence the relationship between employee's perceptions of family supportive culture and their organizational attachment. The finding though does not correspond to earlier research (e.g., Rothbard et al., 2005) that employee's preference for segmentation between work and life moderates the relationship between organizational practices and employees' commitment. One explanation depends on the strength regarding individual's preference to work-life segmentation. As

stated earlier, work-life segmentation enables the employees to maintain impermeable temporal and spatial boundaries between work and life roles based on individual's unique values (Rothbard et al., 2005). Subsequently, individual may make decision according to their own faith as well as preference of work-life segmentation and the organizational contexts act rather small extent of influence on the decision-making process. Future research may further delve into the relative influence of each party such as work and family when understanding the process of managing multiple roles in organizations (Rothbard et al., 2005).

In particular, this study expands the understandings regarding individuals' value in terms of work-life segmentation by empirically testing the relationships among family supportive culture, organizational attachment, and work-life segmentation. By incorporating boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000; Winkel and Clayton, 2009) and border theory (Clark, 2000) with as the theoretical bases, this article not only illuminates the importance and influences of organizational contexts, but also provides other aspects to expand the scope of work-family relevant literatures in relation to the ways people manage their different roles (Winkel and Clayton, 2009).

To managers and human resources departments, one of the practical implications lies in investigating the related consequences of family supportive culture within workplace. The finding that is consistent with recent research that organizations with family supportive culture will affect employees' attachment to the organization and may help make the workplace a more attractive place to work for current and potential employees (e.g., Thompson et al., 1999). It is suggested to examine the rationale why and how organizations incline to motivate family supportive culture and the related consequences, such as alleviation of stress and work-family conflict, family involvement and turnover intentions (e.g., Thompson et al., 1999). Furthermore, the mechanisms that facilitate the effects of family supportive culture on organizational attachment may be included in the following studies. Additionally, future research can expand the scope of variables to investigate other possible elements of family supportive culture that may be crucial to certain organizational environment to delve into the relationships among contexts, family-supportive culture and related employees' attitudes and behaviors.

Although parts of our proposed perspectives were supported, the study still has some limitations. The first is the common method variance, as each respondent self-reported independent, dependent, and moderating variables. This limitation can be mitigated in the future research by means of collecting multi-source data, for instance, if colleagues provided responses regarding family supportive environment, including family supportive culture, specifically. A second limitation is the cross-sectional data since they were collected from respondents in each organization at one point in time. It is suggested to apply a longitudinal

data collection method to examine how individual deals of boundary management and their strategies to switch between different roles. Moreover, in this study, we measure family-supportive culture by using individual's perceptions and have analyzed the data at the individual level as have been applied in prior studies than using agreement reached within organization concerning family-supportive culture (e.g., Baral and Bhargava, 2010; Thompson et al., 1999). Future research can apply multilevel method to expand the scope of related issues in terms of work-family issues.

The present study makes an empirical contribution by addressing the importance and influence of organizational contexts, namely, the family supportive culture. Prior research delineates that organizational family friendly programs may be impractical and even counter-productive if the work context does not support them (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). When supervisors do not encourage employees to adopt the relevant practices, it may symbolise that the organization feels less concerned and the perceived less care for employees may then, fail to engender a positive affective response from employees (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). Therefore, while considering the implementation of family friendly practice, the organization should take further steps to facilitation a family supportive culture that values employees' responses and needs to succeed in obtaining long-term organizational performance from employees as well as establishing better reputation among stakeholders.

References

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology,* 63: 1–18.

Allen, T. D. 2001. Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour,* 58: 414–435.

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. 2000. All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review,* 25: 472–491.

Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. 2010. Work-family enrichment as a mediator between organizational interventions for work-life balance and job outcomes. *Journal of Management Psychology,* 25(3): 274–300.

Boswell, W. R., & Olson-Buchanan, J. B. 2007. The use of communication technologies after hours: The role of work attitudes and work-life conflict. J*ournal of Management,* 33 (4): 592–610.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. 1997. Interviewers' perceptions of person-organizational fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82: 546–561.

Chang, E. 1999. Career commitment as a complex moderator of organizational commitment and turnover intention. *Human Relations,* 52(10): 1257–1278.

Chiu, C. K., & Ng, C. W. 1999. Women-friendly HRM and organizational commitment: A study among women and men of organizations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Occupational and*

Organizational Psychology, 72: 485–502.

Chiu, C. K., & Ng, C. W. 2001. The differential effects of work- and family-oriented women-friendly HRM on OC and OCB: The case for single female employees in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 12(8): 1347–1364.

Clark, S. C. 2000. Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations,* 53: 747–770.

Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. 2005. Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of Vocational Behaviour,* 66: 124–197.

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. 1999. Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behaviour Human Decision Processes,* 77: 85–129.

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. 2000. Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review,* 25: 178–199.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. 1990. Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 75: 51–59.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, S. J. 1985. Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review,* 10(1): 76–88.

Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. 1995. Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology,* 48: 271–288.

Heider, F. 1958. *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* New York: Wiley.

Hyman, J., Baldry, C., Scholarios, D., & Bunzel, D. 2003. Work-life imbalance in call centres and software development. *British Journal of Industrial Relations,* 41(2): 215–239.

Nippert-Eng, C. 1996. *Home and work: negotiating boundaries through everyday life.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & Boswell, W. R. 2006. Blurring boundaries: Correlates of integration and segmentation between work and nonwork. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour,* 68: 432–445.

Perlow, L. A. 1995. Putting the work back into work/family. *Group and Organizational Management,* 20: 227–239.

Perlow, L. A. 1998. Boundary control: The social ordering of work and family time in a high-tech corporation. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 43: 328–357.

Rothbard, N. P. 2001. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 46: 655–684.

Rothbard, N. P., Phillips, K. W., & Dumas, T. L. 2005. Managing multiple roles: Work-family policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science,* 16(3): 243–258.

Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. 1999. When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilisation, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour,* 54: 392–415.

Winkel, D. E., & Clayton, R. W. 2009. Transitioning between work and family roles as a function of boundary flexibility and role salience. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour,* doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.10.011.

Xu, D. X. 2003. *The antecedents and consequences of work values on work attitude for the different generations—A study of high technology industries in Taiwan.* Unpublished dissertation, National Central University, Taiwan, China