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Abstract

The implementation of workplace family support programs such as on-site child care and flexible work arrangements, represents an important step toward acknowledging the increasing numbers of women and mothers of young children within the work force. Nonetheless, work organizations have been slow to adopt these programs. Managers have expressed the fear that some employees will view family support programs as unfair (Fernandez, 1986). The present study addressed how employees conceptualize the justice of family support. A scale designed to measure the perceived importance of six justice rules—equity, equality, need, equality of opportunity, profit maximization, and social responsibility—was administered to 233 employees of public and private sector organizations. Relationships between several background variables and endorsement of justice rules, and between the perceived justice of procedures used in benefit selection and favourability toward family support programs, were also assessed. Respondents conceptualized the six justice rules along two dimensions: one reflecting humanitarian considerations, the other reflecting more traditional, individualistic considerations. Humanitarian considerations, including employed parents' needs, equality of opportunity for women, and organizational social responsibility, were endorsed to a greater extent than were traditional considerations of equity and profit.
maximization. Gender, attitudes toward women, global distributive orientation, sample (private/public), perceived commonness of work-family conflict, and anticipated impact of the program on personal life and on the company, were associated with endorsement of justice rules. Perceived justice of procedures used in benefit selection was unrelated to favourability toward family support. Implications for the selection and implementation of family support programs are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Overview and Purpose of Research

The composition of the North American work force has been drastically changing, with more and more women and parents of young children assuming full-time jobs outside the home. The percentage of women in the labour force rose from 19.7% at the turn of the century to 66.9% (aged 25 to 64) in 1988, and this figure is projected to increase to 80.8% by the year 2000 (Matthews & Rodin, 1989). The most dramatic increases have occurred among women with young children (Matthews & Rodin, 1989).

Traditional work demands and inadequate government support for child care leave many employed parents on their own to cope with conflicts that arise between work and family responsibilities. Under these conditions, employed parents encounter day-to-day scheduling interference, overload and stress both at work and at home, and guilt and anxiety about the quality of care their children are receiving (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Chapman, 1987; Fernandez, 1990). Not only do these kinds of conflicts interfere with job performance, but they may also have an impact upon the employee's decision to remain employed or to return to work after childbirth (Fernandez, 1990).

Traditional role expectations in the home make the
problem of work and family conflict particularly acute for women. Women continue to assume most of the responsibilities at home (Berk & Berk, 1979; Rexroat & Shehan, 1987), so that not only do they work more hours a day than men do, but they are also primarily responsible for handling conflicting responsibilities.

Women who work full-time outside the home spend three times as much time in housework and childcare as their husbands (Michelson, 1985), and fathers of kindergarten-aged children in dual-earner families spend only three-quarters of an hour more a week with their children than fathers whose wives do not work outside of the home (Baruch & Barnett, 1983). Averaging estimates from the major time use studies conducted in the 1960s and 1970s, Hochschild (1989) determined that relative to men, women worked approximately fifteen hours longer per week, and that this translated into an extra month of 24-hour days a year.

Women are more likely than men to report experiencing both a shortage of time and work-schedule conflicts (Pleck & Staines, 1982; Sekaran, 1983; Voydanoff & Kelly, 1984). Many more mothers than fathers experience problems providing care for a sick child (Fernandez, 1986). As noted by Kamerman (1985), "Survey after survey reports the statement by women that without adequate child care arrangements they cannot work, or if they are employed, they cannot do their best on the job" (p. 265).
A number of work organizations have acknowledged the change, and are now offering a variety of innovative policies and programs for employed parents, such as on-site child care, resource-and-referral programs, flexible work arrangements, and extended parental leave. According to some predictions, employer-supported child care will be the fringe benefit of the 1990s (noted in Friedman, 1986; and in Wallis, 1987).

Nevertheless, progress has been painfully slow. Throughout the literature on work-family interaction and workplace-family support policies, a consistent point is made: North American work organizations have not kept pace with the feminization of the work force (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Fernandez, 1990; Stautberg, 1987; Stipek & McCroskey, 1989).

While advocates of workplace family support programs are adamant in their beliefs that organizations must show responsibility in this area (Akabas, 1984; Fernandez, 1986; Magid, 1989), these beliefs are clearly not shared by all members of the population. Research examining perceptions of employer responsibility for family support held by corporate officers (Stillman & Bowen, 1985), employees (Fernandez, 1986), and the general public (Roff & Klemmack, 1985) consistently reveals that many remain unconvinced that these programs should be adopted in work organizations.

There are indications that some members of the
workplace population believe that these programs are "unfair". Managers have cited "equity" as one of the explanations for their reluctance to implement family support programs (Fernandez, 1986; 1990). According to equity theory (Walster, Walster & Berscheid, 1978), individuals expect the ratio of their inputs to outcomes to be equal to that of similar others. Framed with respect to family support programs, Fernandez (1990) has noted that corporate executives don't want to appear to be favouring parent employees over nonparent employees by offering these programs.

Theoretically, however, individuals may utilize rules other than equity in evaluating the "fairness" of resource distributions (Brickman, Folger, Goode & Schul, 1981; Deutsch, 1975, 1985; Leventhal, 1976b). While critics of contemporary workplace programs such as affirmative action complain about injustice on the basis of equity, advocates find justifications within non-equity models focusing on need and equality, macrojustice, and procedural justice (Clayton & Tangri, 1989). Indeed, many of the justifications for family support expressed in the literature appear to be framed in terms of allocation norms identified in other theoretical perspectives on justice, such as need and equality of opportunity. Furthermore, legitimacy is often discussed with reference to the correspondence between family support programs and
organizational objectives of profit maximization and social responsibility. These objectives have been referred to both in the literature on justice and on organizational values.

Misunderstanding and conflict can occur within work organizations when members employ different allocation norms to assess the justice of resource distributions, and when they arrive at different conclusions regarding how fair these distributions are. Pearce and Peters (1985) advanced a "contradictory norms" view of employer-employee exchange. They stated that:

Much of the complexity of social exchange in organizational settings, and therefore much of the difficulty in managing, derives from the fact that employer-employee relationships are characterized by multiple and often contradictory normative expectations for the appropriate allocation of rewards. (p. 19)

Similarly, Connor and Becker (1975) argued that differences in organization members' value orientations would result in more frequent conflict and more difficulty in resolving conflict.

Such conflict and misunderstanding may have a profoundly negative effect upon the selection, implementation, and utilization of family support programs. As indicated above, managers are fearful that nonparent employees may perceive that these programs are inequitable. It has been suggested, however, that equity is less of an issue in the minds of employees with respect to family support than managers assume (Burud, Aschbacher & McCroskey, 1984; Fernandez, 1986). If organization decision-makers
suspect equity to be critical, they may be slower to implement these programs. Furthermore, they may select programs that they expect will be met with the least resistance from their nonparent population, but that do little to alleviate the problems of employed parents. For example, the decision might be made to implement a flexible benefit plan with one of the options being a subsidy for child care expenses, or to introduce this subsidy as a new option within the existing flexible benefit plan. Flexible benefit plans allow employees to select from a variety of benefits those that they expect to need, and differ from standard benefit packages that provide coverage regardless of employee preference or need. While a flexible benefit plan with a child care subsidy option may accommodate nonparent employees, it may be relatively useless to parents in communities where child care facilities are in short supply.

Perceptions of unjust treatment are associated with a variety of negative individual and organizational outcomes (Greenberg, 1982; Hatfield and Sprecher, 1984). Nacoste (1987) notes that affirmative action programs incur social psychological costs, which "range from resentment of majority group members toward affirmative action beneficiaries to the self-doubt instilled in beneficiaries of the policy" (p. 127). It has been observed that within some organizations, women receive messages that if they take
the extended leave provided for in their maternity leave policy they will be assessed as being "less than fully committed" to their work (Kamerman, Kahn & Kingston, 1983). Parents who perceive that they are being unfairly advantaged by benefits such as paternity leave, extended maternity leave, or leave for sick children, may be reluctant to fully utilize these benefits. Voydanoff (1987) notes that "it is not enough to change the structure of jobs and provide policies to facilitate work/family integration if the norms and expectations associated with them mediate against their use by both men and women" (p. 112).

If reactions toward corporate family support are due, in part, to individual beliefs and expectations about the kinds of criteria organization decision-makers should consider when making resource allocation decisions, advocates will need to be aware of these different beliefs and expectations and of the background variables associated with them. Attempts to promote or market the programs should be based upon information that is meaningful to those who will make, and those who will be affected by, the decision to implement family support programs. Different marketing strategies and different programs may be called for, depending upon the characteristics of the individuals, groups, and organizations involved.

Theoretically, there may also be certain strategies that organization decision-makers could utilize in the
selection and implementation of family support programs, 
that would increase the overall perception of fairness among 
employees regardless of the final distribution of resources. 
Most of the research on justice within organizations has 
focused upon the fairness of rewards, or distributive 
justice, rather than on the fairness of procedures used in 
distributing rewards (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987). However, 
research in the area of procedural justice (Leventhal, 1980; 
Thibaut & Walker, 1975) suggests that, in some cases, the 
outcome distribution itself is less important in determining 
fairness judgments than is the process leading to that 
distribution (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

The greatest research attention within the area of 
distributive justice and organizations has concentrated upon 
the notion of equity (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1984), and the 
resource that has received almost exclusive attention has 
been wages (Mowday, 1983). Almost no attention has been 
paid to employees' perceptions of justice with regard to 
organizational resources such as fringe benefits and 
employee programs. A broader focus is evident, however, in 
the growing literature on procedural justice within 
organizations (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

The purpose of this research is to develop a greater 
understanding of the nature of positive and negative 
employee reactions toward family support, specifically 
reactions related to justice notions, and to identify the
background variables associated with these reactions. This information is expected to be useful to individuals interested in increasing support for these programs among the workplace population. On a theoretical level, this research is designed to investigate the extent to which perspectives on distributive and procedural justice can be extended to the relatively unexplored realm of employee benefits in general, and family support programs in particular.

The following review is divided into four sections. In the first section, the kinds of options under the label of corporate family support programs are discussed, followed by evidence of mixed reaction toward these programs within the community and workplace populations. In the second section, theoretical perspectives on justice and organizational values are outlined, and arguments for and against family support programs framed along the lines of a variety of allocation norms are discussed. In the third section, sources of variance, including prior attitudes, work-unit variables, awareness, and personal impact, in the importance placed upon particular justice rules are discussed. Finally, procedures used in program implementation are discussed as a source of variance beyond distributive issues.
Program Descriptions and Employee Favourability

Family Support Options

Workplace family support initiatives fall into four general categories: corporate-provided child care, flexible work options, employee leave benefits, and training and information. The various options are described in detail in Burud et al. (1983) and Fernandez (1986).

Within the category of corporate-supported child care are those benefits and programs that provide child care support in the form of day care spaces and/or some financial coverage of child care costs. Organization decision-makers may choose to implement on-site child care, which is a day care centre for employees' children located at the worksite. The company typically covers the start-up costs and charges employees fees that are similar to those charged for community-based care, although in some cases the fees are partially subsidized by the company. Most centres are established in order to serve toddlers and preschoolers; however some programs include infant care, or care for school-aged children after school and/or during holidays. Some companies establish a child care consortium, whereby they join with other companies to set up a centre nearby that serves their combined employee populations. Others rent spaces for employees in existing community child care centres. Another approach is to provide a subsidy for child care costs as an option within a flexible benefit plan.
Such an approach allows parents the option of choosing the subsidy in lieu of other benefits, such as vision coverage, and the choice of centre is left to the employee.

Flexible work options include job sharing and flextime arrangements. Job sharing typically involves two people sharing the same job, with prorated salaries and benefits. Under flexible scheduling or "flextime," employees are offered a certain amount of control over their scheduling of work hours, so that starting and leaving times can be more compatible with family demands. Although flextime has been in existence for several years in many corporations, not only in those whose decision-makers have decided to make a commitment to family support, they may be particularly helpful to employed parents who identify time and scheduling as among their most critical problems (Pleck & Staines, 1982).

Until recently, Canadian companies were required to provide women with a four-month maternity leave, with a portion of their salary to be covered during leave by the Federal Government. Some companies chose to extend these leaves beyond four months, and some offered paternity leave, or a certain period of paid or unpaid time off for new fathers. The Canadian Government has now increased the minimum requirement to six months for parental leave, allowing for mothers and fathers to split the leave according to their own needs. Prior to this change, some
companies agreed to supplement the Government leave benefits for the four month period; it is likely that some companies will now offer additional paid leave for the six month period. Another option in the area of leaves is time off for the care of a sick child.

Finally, employers can offer support in the form of training and information. Resource-and-referral programs for employees provide information on available child care centres in the area. Additionally, parent education seminars may be provided by the employer, which can cover such topics as pregnancy, selecting quality child care, and how to cope with the stress of balancing dual roles. These kinds of programs are of relatively low cost in comparison to other initiatives.

**Employee Favourability**

While several organizations have adopted a range of innovative policies and programs for employed parents, others have been slow to respond to the needs of this employee population (Burke & Greenglass, 1987). Perceptions of employer responsibility for family support have been examined in both community and workplace populations (Fernandez, 1986; Roff & Klemmack, 1985; Stillman & Bowen, 1985). This research suggests that, although acceptance of corporate family support is high among some samples, there is still a segment of the organization membership that remains unconvinced about the responsibility of work
organizations in this area.

In a survey of employed and unemployed community residents, Roff and Klemmack (1985) found that 65% of respondents believed that employers should assume at least some responsibility in providing day care services to workers with young children. White collar employees were less likely than unemployed respondents (58% versus 73%) and males were less likely than females (56% versus 66%) to acknowledge employer responsibility for day care. A number of other demographic differences were observed, including greater support for employer-sponsored day care among black and single respondents than among white and married respondents. Within the total sample, support for day care was lower than was the support for employer-provided counselling for drug and alcohol problems (75%).

Stillman and Bowen (1985) conducted interviews with corporate officers in a random sample of 16 corporations from the Washington-Baltimore area. They found limitations both in corporate officers' awareness of issues surrounding work-family interaction and in the development of policies for employed parents. Although employers perceived that they had a responsibility to provide their employees with competitive salaries and benefits and flexible work schedules, the majority "perceived little responsibility to expand policies and services to provide greater support for the family responsibilities of employees" (p. 313).
Fernandez (1986) assessed favourability toward a variety of corporate family support policies in a sample of approximately 5,000 employees of five large, technically oriented companies. Acceptance was a function of gender, parental status, level of work/family stress, hierarchical level, and discriminatory attitudes, among other factors. Although 77% of women with children under age 18 agreed that companies should actively support employees' child care needs, 48% of men without children under 18 agreed. Craftworkers tended, in general, to be more favourable than managerial employees; however support within this population was also variable. For example, 27% of male craftworkers were not in favour of any form of company-supported child care, even when it was presented as a profitable on-site centre (as opposed to a totally company-subsidized centre). Some of the attitudes uncovered in this study were also expressed by employee respondents in later research conducted by Fernandez (1990).

Theoretical Perspectives on Justice and Organizational Values: Application to Family Support

Family support programs involve the distribution of resources (money, space, time, and/or information) to a subset of the employee population. A substantial body of theory and research has been developed around the notion that questions about "fairness" and "justice" will arise when resources are distributed to members of a group,
whether within society in general or within work organizations in particular (Deutsch, 1975; Walster et al., 1978).

There are indications in the literature that some of the resistance toward family support programs stems from the perception that these programs violate accepted allocation norms or justice rules. Leventhal (1976a) defines an allocation norm as "a social rule which specifies criteria that define certain distributions of rewards and resources as fair and just" (p. 94). The allocation norm that has received the greatest research attention with respect to employee-employer relationships has been equity (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1984; Walster et al., 1978). Indeed, managers have expressed the fear that family support programs violate equity and therefore may create problems among nonparent employees (Burud et al., 1984; Fernandez, 1986).

Nevertheless, examination of arguments in favour of family support presented in research and review articles suggest that other allocation norms may be considered at least as relevant, or perhaps more relevant than equity, particularly with respect to this kind of resource allocation. This evidence is consistent with theoretical perspectives on justice that have gone beyond equity, and that recognize the potential for multidimensional determinations of justice (Brickman et al., 1981; Deutsch, 1975, 1985; Leventhal, 1980).
Equity Theory

According to equity theory (Walster et al., 1978), observers will assess a relationship as being fair if all participants in the relationship are receiving equal relative gains from the relationship, where gains are defined as a participant's outcomes minus his or her inputs. Outcomes include both positive and negative consequences, and inputs include assets that entitle one to rewards, and liabilities that entitle one to costs. An important implication of equity theory for organizations is that those employees who make the same contribution will expect to receive the same rewards and that rewards should not be based upon characteristics other than contributions.

Clayton and Tangri (1989) note that some individuals believe affirmative action programs "violate equity because an irrelevant characteristic, such as race or gender, is factored into the equation" (p. 180). Similarly, as indicated above, equity is referred to as one of the reasons that managers are reluctant to implement family support programs. Some managers believe that such programs represent discrimination against nonparent employees (Fernandez, 1986) or against parents whose children are already grown. Indeed, some employees have expressed this sentiment, as evidenced in the following comment from a respondent in Fernandez's (1990) study: "I stayed home and raised my children before I came to work. Let them do the
same sacrificing I did. I don't think the company should do anything for one it won't do for the other" (p. 186).

Flexible benefit plans, whereby employees can select child care from among a variety of different benefits, have been recommended as a means to alleviate problems that might arise when nonparent employees perceive that parents are receiving "preferential" treatment (Fernandez, 1986).

Again, a comment from a respondent in Fernandez's (1986) study illustrates how flexible benefits are considered to address the equity issue:

I totally disagree with company support of child care at the expense of all employees. Employees should choose their own benefits, of which child care could be one, but those who choose this option should give up one of additional cost. (p. 192)

Parents may be seen by some employees as having certain liabilities that nonparents do not. When co-workers see parents' family lives interfering with their work demands, they may assume that penalties rather than "rewards" would be the most appropriate organizational response. As expressed by a respondent in Fernandez's (1986) study, "The 'problems' will never be solved as long as we never do much of anything to discourage absenteeism, fibbing about sickness, etc. Why pay for child care and discriminate?" (p. 158).

There are, nevertheless, a number of inherent problems with the assumption that employees will perceive these programs as violating the equity rule and conclude that they
are unjust. In the first place, it has long been acknowledged that variability can occur in the way in which inputs and outcomes are assessed. As noted by Walster et al. (1978), "If scrutineers assess participants' inputs and outcomes differently, and it is likely that they will, inevitably they will show some disagreements as to whether or not a given relationship is equitable" (p. 15).

Depending upon how they evaluate their own and others' outcomes, employees may view family support as being consistent with the equity rule. While some nonparent employees may perceive that the rewards of family support go only to parent employees, other nonparent employees may believe that they, too, receive certain beneficial outcomes from these programs. As noted by Fernandez (1990) and Burud et al. (1984), nonparent employees may see these programs as helping their parent co-workers to be more dependable and productive, so that the whole work unit ultimately benefits. As one of Fernandez's (1990) respondents stated, "my group includes four parents of little kids. When they're having problems with child care, we all feel it" (p. 187).

There may also be variability in the way in which inputs are assessed. Equity may not be seen to be violated if the contributions of recipients are considered to be greater than those of non-recipients. Some organizations have implemented corporate-supported child care for their management employees but not for their factory workers.
(Chapman, 1987), which may reflect the viewpoint that the inputs of the former group are of greater value.

As discussed earlier, women continue to assume most of the responsibility for child care and it is therefore women who will be most likely to benefit from these programs. Historically, employer-supported child care programs were available when the male workforce supply was low (see Fernandez, 1986 for a discussion of the impact of World War II), and gained renewed interest in the 1970s primarily within hospitals (In 1978, 71% of these programs were found in hospitals: Perry, 1979). Thus, when women are valued and in high demand, expenditures favouring women may be seen as justifiable under the equity rule. In general, however, women as a group tend to be undervalued and undercompensated within organizations (Bhatnagar, 1988).

A second and perhaps more important problem with the assumption that employees will view family support programs as violating the equity rule and therefore as unjust, is that such an assumption is based upon the belief that individualistic, competitive, and economic calculations necessarily underlie individuals' determinations of justice. Several theorists have seriously questioned this assumption (Deutsch, 1975, 1985; Leventhal, 1980; Sampson, 1980, 1981). They have suggested, alternatively, that there are many kinds of justice rules in addition to equity that may be used to determine the fairness of resource distributions.
Most of the original research on equity was conducted in the laboratory, and the resource that has received the greatest research attention has been wages (Nowday, 1983). Thus, an economic, individualistic model was applied to an economic, individualistic situation. Although little research attention has been directed at identifying employees' preferred justice rules for resources other than wages, there is some evidence that different rules are used for different resources (Tornblom & Foa, 1983). It is therefore quite possible that a resource such as family support will be evaluated according to justice rules that differ from those used to evaluate the justice of wage distributions. Although researchers have pointed out that managers often are concerned about equity with respect to family support programs, they add that most employees do not seem to be as concerned about equity as managers fear that they are (Burud et al., 1984; Fernandez, 1986).

The Justice Judgment Model

Several theorists, most notably Deutsch (1975; 1985) and Leventhal (1980) have criticized equity theory for its unidimensional focus. They have argued that while the "contributions" rule, implicit in equity theory, might be considered in certain justice judgments, it is only one of several possible justice rules. One of the changes in the 1980s with respect to justice theory, as noted by Deutsch (1983), was the "rejection of 'proportionality' as a
sovereign principle in favour of a situationally-appropriate, multi-principle approach" (p. 308).

The justice judgment model proposed by Leventhal (1976b; 1980) assumed that individuals' judgments of fairness might be based not only on the contributions rule, but also on a needs rule (i.e., persons with greater need should receive greater outcomes) or an equality rule (i.e., all persons should receive similar outcomes, regardless of contributions or needs).

In general, it has been assumed that the contributions rule is more normative than is the need rule within organizational settings. Need, however, is an important justification for family support. As discussed above, employed parents, particularly mothers, have been found to experience considerable stress in balancing work and home responsibilities (Pleck & Staines, 1982; Sekaran, 1983), and these kinds of programs can play an important role in reducing work-family conflict (Magid, 1989). Some of the employed parents in Fernandez's (1986) study refer to need as a justification for family support, as evidenced in the following comments:

Worrying about a sick child...Managers say leave your child at home, but I can never separate my child from my mind. I have to use vacation time to stay at home. This is not a fair policy. (p. 88)

I strongly believe in company day care. Since both sexes are working these days, the company should start thinking more of the needs of both sexes. A day care program would relieve a lot of worry on my part if my child could be close at hand. (p. 134)
On the other hand, the "needs" of employed parents may not be seen as legitimate, or at least not a legitimate concern of corporations. Employed parents, as a group, may be seen as responsible for their own plight. Some individuals believe that it is the woman's choice to have children, and she should be responsible for her own child care and scheduling arrangements. If she can't handle work and family responsibilities, she either shouldn't work or she shouldn't have children. In Fernandez's (1986) study, this attitude was evident in respondent comments, such as:

I don't think any employer should have to get involved in child care problems. The child is the parents' problem. If you need the extra income, you had better examine your own priorities: do you want money or children or both? (p. 135)

In a 1983 Public Agenda Survey (cited in Immerwahr, 1984), 50% of respondents expressed the belief that women who choose employment instead of staying home with their children shouldn't have children.

Using the equality rule, it might be argued that because other programs are in place for special employee populations, corporate family support should also be implemented. For example, one of Fernandez's (1986) respondents commented, "I feel if we can put in fitness centers and pay for most college classes being taken, then we should be able to put in a day care center that supports itself with maybe a little subsidizing" (p. 156).

A further justification on the basis of the equality
rule might be that these programs restore equality, as, for example, when schedule flexibility is extended to clerical staff in an organization where management employees always operated under flexible scheduling. Research by Scholl, Cooper and McKenna (1987) and others suggests that employees expect their own resources to be similar to those received by similar others in different organizations. As more and more organizations move toward the provision of special support policies, employees will be likely to expect such consideration from their own employers. Under the equality rule, then, family support may be justified if other companies are seen to be providing these kinds of programs to their employees.

The equality argument against family support would be similar in some respects to the equity argument against family support. While parent employees' contributions and liabilities would be irrelevant to the equality argument, the argument would nevertheless be based upon the notion that parent employees should not receive benefits that differ from those received by nonparent employees, since all employees should receive exactly the same benefits. Further, it might be argued that the program would be unfair if it could not be used by all parent employees, such as those who have infants or school-aged children.

Although the need, equity, and equality rules no doubt describe some of the reaction to family support, they fail
to capture justice considerations that extend beyond the level of individual deservingness, and that account for systemic issues, including past discrimination and the overall organizational role with respect to resource distributions. Once again, examination of arguments presented in research and review articles suggest that these kinds of system level considerations do indeed enter into judgments about the fairness of family support, along with individual level considerations. Perspectives on macrojustice and organizational values offer a framework within which to examine these considerations.

Macrojustice

Brickman, Folger, Goode and Schul (1981) drew a distinction between microjustice and macrojustice principles. Distributive justice rules of "need" and "merit" were considered to be within the category of microjustice rules. In contrast, macrojustice rules "do not call for a determination of the attributes of individuals and a fit between the individual's attributes and his or her rewards" (p. 177). Individuals employing a macrojustice perspective would perceive those allocations that result in an appropriate overall distribution of resources within a population as being just.

Sampson (1981) has argued that "equality" and "equity" rules present problems for contemporary conceptions of justice, partly because they fail to account for the fact
that certain groups may have been unfairly advantaged in the past. Brickman et al. (1981) noted that the debate over affirmative action "is largely a debate between micro- and macroprinciples of justice" (p. 196). Arguments in favour of affirmative action programs stress macroprinciples of justice, including the fact that society has discriminated in the past and that society would benefit from more equal allocations of resources for all. Arguments against affirmative action, on the other hand, focus upon the deservingness of the individual who is rejected in allocation decisions (Brickman et al., 1981).

Although there may be several kinds of rules within the category of macrojustice, the rule referred to above can be conceptualized as the "equality of opportunity" rule. The equality of opportunity rule has been alluded to in a number of research articles (e.g., Clayton & Tangri, 1989; Dornstein, 1988). Deutsch (1975) listed as one of the key values underlying distributive justice, "the treatment of all people...so that they have equal opportunity to compete without external favoritism or discrimination" (p. 139).

One of the greatest justifications for corporate family support programs is that they help to equalize employment opportunities for women. Such programs enable women to have greater access to the jobs and promotions available to men. The separation of work and home, enforced through rigid scheduling expectations, evolved during a time when parents
stayed together and wives stayed at home. Continuing to maintain workplace demands based upon an antiquated model of reality violates the rights of a sizeable employee population. As argued by Burke and Greenglass (1987), "Lack of 24-hour childcare, inadequately paid maternity leave, and the assumption that all 'committed' employees should work an 8-hour day, constitute discrimination against women" (p. 310).

Kamerman (1985) developed the argument that child care "is a key economic and political issue for women" (p.261). She pointed out that the scarcity of adequate child care facilities has an impact on women particularly, because of their continued primary responsibility for children, that creates a major barrier to their labour force entry and career advancement.

Evidence that individuals employ macrojustice rules, such as equality of opportunity, suggests that norms and beliefs with respect to the system, such as the unacceptability of institutionalized discrimination and the importance of the pursuit of collective interests, enter into justice judgments over and above the level of individual deservingness. The notion that justice is not always assessed in terms of individual-level deservingness seems particularly critical to the understanding of justice perceptions within organizational settings. Work organizations are social systems, characterized by norms and
values that provide "the moral or social justification for system activities both for members and for people formally outside the system" (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 386). Thus, employees may evaluate system activities, including decisions to allocate resources in the form of employee benefits and policies, on the basis of value orientations that have to do with the legitimate rights and responsibilities of the organization itself, and that go beyond the level of individual deservingness. These kinds of rights and responsibilities are addressed in the literature on organizational values.

Organizational Values

Enz (1988) defines organizational values as the "beliefs held by an individual or group regarding means and ends organizations 'ought to' or 'should' identify in the running of the enterprise, in choosing what business actions or objectives are preferable to alternate actions, or in establishing organizational objectives" (p. 287). Two organizational values relevant to family support programs, which have been referred to in both the organizational values literature and in the justice literature, are profit maximization and social responsibility.

Pearce and Peters (1985) discuss the profit maximization norm as one of four distinct normative expectations within organizations, along with equity, equality and need. While their treatment of the profit
maximization norm is primarily with respect to the individual pursuit of self-interest in employer-employee exchange, they acknowledge that this norm tends to characterize marketplace exchanges in general.

Thirty years ago, economist Milton Friedman (1962) argued that the notion that corporate officials had a social responsibility other than to maximize stockholder profits was a "fundamentally subversive doctrine". Specifically, he stated that:

there is one and only one social responsibility of business—to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game (p. 133).

Friedman's theoretical perspective is frequently cited as a starting point in more current review articles on corporate social responsibility and edited volumes dealing with business ethics (e.g., Beauchamp & Bowie, 1983; Wartick & Cochran, 1985; Werhane & D'Andrade, 1985). Wartick and Cochran (1985) review challenges to the notion of "corporate social responsibility", and present "economic responsibility", strongly advocated by Friedman (1962), as the first challenge. Within the economic responsibility argument, there is the implication that "even on ethical grounds, the concept of social responsibility as anything more than profit maximization is inappropriate." (p. 760)

Contemporary perspectives on profit maximization and social responsibility are less rigid with respect to the sole objective of business. Cordero (1985) argues, for
example, that while the profit motive is central in the conduct of most business, it is not necessarily true that all other aims are subordinated to the aim of making a profit. Davis (1983) noted that support is developing for social propositions to guide business conduct which include acknowledgement of business as a powerful trustee of society's resources, and acknowledgment of business as having a citizenship role to develop and apply solutions to societal problems.

Wartick and Cochran (1985) describe two basic premises that underlie corporate social responsibility:

that business exists at the pleasure of society; its behavior and methods of operation must fall within the guidelines set by society [and]...that business acts as a moral agent within society.... Like states and churches, corporations reflect and reinforce values. (Wartick & Cochran, 1985, p. 759)

Leventhal (1976a) referred to the norm of social responsibility as the need norm. Corporate social responsibility, however, can be seen at a more abstract level. Employees may believe that the organization should adopt socially responsible policies, but disagree as to the strength or relevance of a subgroup's needs.

Family support innovations appear to be viewed, at least by some members of the organization, within the general perspective of profit maximization. The programs appear to provide a variety of benefits to the organization, such as increased recruitment potential, and reduced absenteeism and turnover (D.E. Friedman, 1986). The profit
maximization objective is exemplified in the following statements:

From the employer's perspective, the evaluation of employer-sponsored dependent care...is framed by market-oriented economic values and based upon the logic of profit-maximization. (Browne, 1985, p. 372)

Child care is not a do-good issue. It is not just kind-hearted CEOs who have taken the plunge. It is CEOs who have taken a hard look at their bottom line. (Sher & Brown, 1989, p. 31)

Among white male managers, only 23% of those who did not feel that child care problems were costly to the company believed that the company should support child care (Fernandez, 1986). Employed parents also appear to be concerned about the corporate payoff. In Fernandez's (1986) study, for example, 60% of women with children under 18 agreed that the company should provide a profitable on-site centre, but only 20% of this group agreed that there should be a totally company-supported on-site centre.

Corporate family support can also be conceived of as a broad societal issue, consistent with the notion of corporate social responsibility. Because the government in this country has failed to take a strong, supportive stance with respect to the child care issue, including providing sufficient subsidies for child care, we lag far behind other industrialized nations such as Sweden and France in the availability of quality, affordable care. As argued by Kamerman (1985), child care "is an issue for a society concerned with the quality of future generations" (p. 269).
Employees who believe that children may suffer without adequate support and that companies have a responsibility to direct some of their profits to meet community needs, may feel that corporate family support is justified on this basis.

Some employees may believe that the organization has a responsibility to its employees and that it should invest money in programs promoting employee welfare. To be consistent with the trend in corporate support in other areas, such as Employee Assistance Programs (i.e., programs that provide counselling to employees for personal problems), it may be believed that companies should include child support within their benefits. Other employees may recognize that employed parents experience child care problems, but feel that the responsibility for providing child care lies with the government and not with the company. As one of Fernandez's (1986) respondents commented, "Personally, I feel that the company-sponsored (especially subsidized) child care is about as acceptable as company-sponsored religious training. Both are needed, but I feel that they are outside a company's jurisdiction" (p. 157). Some research has found managers to be reluctant to move ahead in this area, in part because of the belief that employees' family circumstances fall outside the organization's domain of responsibility, and that the policies represent an intrusion into areas that should
remain the private concerns of employees (Stillman & Bowen, 1985). One of Fernandez's (1986) respondents commented:

Child care is an area where the company needs to stay away. The business world owes a person nothing but a paycheck when one works. Family problems should be kept away from the job. When you start doing this, you are entering a form of socialism. (p. 134)

**Conclusions**

Although wage distributions may be considered to be the most fair when based upon equity, for other resource distributions, different justice rules may be applied. Tornblom and Foa (1983) found that Americans favoured the use of the equity rule for money, and the use of the need rule for information. In the Brickman et al. (1981) study, which examined the endorsement of justice rules with respect to governmental allocation situations, in most cases the need rule was endorsed by a greater percentage of respondents than were the effort or ability rules. As discussed by Cohen and Greenberg (1982), at this point in our culture, equality seems to be the accepted norm for certain distributions (such as the distribution of votes to citizens), need for other distributions (such as medical care and some forms of economic welfare), and merit for still others (such as wages for jobs). This evidence suggests that rules differing from those applied to wages may be applied to the general category of family support programs, and that there may even be further distinctions made for different types of resources (e.g., information
versus subsidies) within the general category.

More and more, North American work organizations are introducing policies and programs that are justifiable under rules other than equity. Schneider (1985) has suggested that a paradigm shift is occurring in the role of human resources in American business, away from the old rationale, that emphasized profits exclusively, to a new rationale, that emphasizes people, society, and profit. Innovations such as Employee Assistance Programs and Family Support Programs may be particularly justifiable on the basis of rules emphasizing social responsibility and responsiveness to employee needs. Justifications for affirmative action programs are strongest at the macro justice level (Brickman et al., 1981; Clayton & Tangri, 1989).

There are a variety of other allocation norms, in addition to those discussed above, which have been identified in the literature. Reis (1984), for example, drew from psychological, philosophical, historical, and legal literature to identify 17 distinct justice rules. Nevertheless, those selected for the above discussion appear to be particularly relevant to judgments of family support programs. To understand the justice of family support programs, there is a need to go beyond traditional conceptions of justice in terms of individual level deservingness, and to consider issues having to do with the organizational role itself and with broader societal
impacts.

When it is acknowledged that different groups may be employing different rules to assess the justice of these programs, it becomes important to identify the sources of group differences. These sources will be addressed in the following section.

*Perspectives on Group Differences*

Explanations based on normative, instrumental, and cognitive factors have been advanced for group differences in the use of justice rules. Greenberg and Cohen (1982) contrast the normative and instrumental interpretations of justice. The normative approach assumes that individuals adhere to certain justice rules because they are dictated by the roles and role relationships within which they find themselves. The instrumental approach assumes that adherence to certain justice rules will result in favourable outcomes. Groups may prefer allocations based upon certain rules because they serve to gain the most from allocations based upon these rules. Finally, cognitive explanations focus upon perceptual biases and limitations that may affect an individual's ability to accurately assess reality. From this perspective, individual differences in justice notions can be traced to the level of awareness individuals possess regarding internal (individual) and external (environmental) influences upon their own and others' outcomes.

Based upon these three primary sources of variance in
emphasis placed upon justice rules, four categories of potential variance in employees' reactions to family support programs are identified. These categories are: personal norms and values, work-role norms and values, awareness of the problem, and personal impact.

**Personal Norms and Values**

The perceived justice of family support policies may be related, in part, to personal norms and values. Norms, which individuals bring to the organization as a consequence of their prior socialization histories, may predispose them to hold certain opinions regarding allocations within organizational settings. Two personal norms that may have an impact upon the justice rules emphasized in assessing corporate family support are proportionality/egalitarian orientation in general, and attitudes toward women, specifically with regard to their appropriate roles. Additionally, because of differences in past socialization and present circumstances with respect to responsibility for child care, gender itself would be expected to have an impact.

Internalized values may transcend specific resource allocation situations. Those who endorse proportionality as a general value may be more likely to endorse proportionality in specific organizational allocation situations. Rasinski (1987) developed a scale to measure two basic values--proportionality and egalitarianism--and
found that respondents' positions on these global scales were related to endorsement of specific governmental policies (based upon different underlying distributive justice rules) and presidential candidates. Several studies have found that endorsement of the Protestant Ethic, exemplified in statements reflecting the importance of industriousness and individuality, is associated with an emphasis upon equity within specific allocation situations (Major & Deaux, 1982). Klucgel and Smith (1986) found that belief in the dominant ideology (high individualism and low egalitarianism) was associated with opposition to equal opportunity policies.

Attitudes toward women may influence the extent to which the need rule is endorsed. Those who believe that women should remain exclusively in the traditional roles of mother and homemaker, and who perceive women to be responsible for their own work/family conflict problems, are less likely to endorse need as a legitimate basis upon which to offer support. Resolution of conflict will, under such conditions, be seen more as an individual than as an organizational responsibility. It is quite probable, then, that individuals with traditional sex-role attitudes will be less in favour of corporate family support programs in general, and will discredit justifications based upon need, social responsibility, and equality of opportunity. Fernandez (1986) reported that in his study "the more sexist
employees were, the more likely they were...to believe that companies should do little or nothing to assist employees with child care and family/work problems" (p. 16). The belief that women are unfairly treated within the work force has been found to be associated with support for affirmative action (Tougas & Veilleux, 1989).

Significant gender differences have been found with regard to the use of justice rules. In general, women tend to favour the equality rule, whereas men tend to favour the equity rule, although exceptions have been found (Kahn, O'Leary, Krulewitz & Lamm, 1980). As will be discussed in a subsequent section, need and equality rules tend to prevail over equity in close interpersonal relationships. As noted by Wine (1985), social-psychological theories that emphasize individualistic and competitive objectives in interaction may fail to accurately describe the experiences of women, whose moral judgments are "embedded in the context of human relationships, reflecting mutuality, communality, the interdependence of human beings" (p. 189). Thus, women may be more likely to favour need and equality rules in part because of their more cooperative orientation toward relationships in general. Kahn et al. (1980) discuss the gender difference in preferred justice rules in terms of the different socialization experiences of women and men:

the observed sex difference may be attributed, at least in part, to the differential socialization of males that fosters an agentic [sic] orientation (Bakan, 1966), reflecting a concern with competitive achievement. In
contrast, female socialization fosters a communal orientation (Bakan, 1966), expressed through concern with social achievement. (pp. 187-188)

Evidence for gender differences in systems level orientation is mixed. Powell, Posner and Schmidt (1984) expected female managers to place less emphasis on production-oriented goals and greater emphasis on socially oriented goals such as employee morale and community relations than would male managers. In fact, they found no gender differences among the managers they interviewed with respect to socially oriented goals, and a greater emphasis placed by female managers than by male managers upon production-oriented goals. Brickman et al. (1980) did find a gender difference in their study: females were more likely to endorse macrojustice rules than were males. Macrojustice rules, as discussed earlier, reflect a concern for collective rather than individualistic interests. Brickman et al. (1981) suggested that their findings were consistent with other research illustrating that females are more concerned with the collective interests and socioemotional requirements of a group than are men.

Since women continue to assume more of the home responsibilities than men do (Rexroat & Shehan, 1987), women more than men look to family support programs as a source of relief from the stress of combining dual roles. Not surprisingly, women have been found to be more favourable toward family support programs than have men (Fernandez,
1986). Furthermore, women have had more first-hand experience with discrimination on the basis of sex in the workplace with respect to working conditions and resources in general (Bhatnagar, 1988). In a study of Canadian government employees (Colwill & Josephson, 1983), women were more likely to attribute the underrepresentation of women in management, technical, and operational positions to sex discrimination, whereas men were more likely to believe that women's personal qualities were responsible for women's underrepresentation in these positions. For these reasons, women would be expected to endorse both need and equality of opportunity justifications for family support more than would men.

**Work-Role Norms and Values**

While prior norms and values may predispose individuals to employ particular justice rules in relation to family support programs, norms and socialization experiences within the work role may also have a significant influence. The norms with respect to resource distributions for individuals at higher levels of the organizational hierarchy may differ from those at lower levels. Additionally, cohesiveness within the work unit may play a role. Finally, cooperation and support from individuals at various levels of the organization may have an impact upon the justice rules accepted as legitimate bases for organizational resource allocations.
Hierarchical level appears to influence the degree of emphasis placed upon the equity rule. Lansberg (1984) examined justice assessments among members of three organizational groups: upper managers, middle managers, and clerical employees. A hypothetical reward allocation situation was used, whereby participants were asked: "If a lump sum was made available to this organization to distribute among its employees, what would be the fairest way to allocate that sum?" Participants were given six possible allocation choices, which they were asked to rate according to perceived fairness.

Lansberg expected that, as the institutional context was a work organization, the rule of equity would be preferred for the sample as a whole. He also expected, however, that there would be differences by level in the perceived fairness of the other distributional rules, which would reflect the particular subgroup concerns. He in fact found that whereas equity was perceived to be the fairest distributional principle for the total sample, significant between-group differences also appeared. In particular, upper-level managers perceived organization-wide equity to be more fair than within-unit equity, and upper- and middle-level managers perceived the equity principle as being significantly more fair than the equality principle. In contrast, for clerical employees, the equality principle was perceived as being just as fair as the equity principle.
In a sample of employees in Israel, a larger proportion of blue-collar employees referred to the criteria of "need" as a relevant standard for pay determination, whereas a larger proportion of white-collar employees focused upon "contribution" (Dornstein, 1985). Unions typically argue for equal distributions of wages and benefits. Hirsch (1982) found that unionism significantly decreases earnings dispersion. He also cites Freedman (1980) as noting that unions have traditionally aimed at equalizing wage rates and at basing differentials upon job category rather than merit. Unionized employees might therefore be expected to focus on "equality" as a relevant allocation norm.

Munson and Posner (1980) found that nonmanagerial employees placed more importance upon employee welfare than did managerial employees, whereas managerial employees placed more importance upon profit maximization. In a sample of supervisory, middle, and executive managers, Schmidt and Posner (1982) found that profit maximization was considerably less important at all levels than were other goals, such as organizational effectiveness; however it received increasing importance with hierarchical level. In a comparison of value systems of union leaders and managers (England, Agarwal & Trerise, 1971), union leaders were found to rate employee welfare as the most important organizational goal and profit maximization as the least important organizational goal, whereas managers included
profit maximization among their most important goals, and employee welfare among their least important goals. Union leaders also placed much more importance on social welfare than did managers.

In general, it appears that organizational efficiency outranks profit maximization as a goal among managers (England, 1967; England, Agarwal & Trerise, 1971; Schmidt & Posner, 1982). Additionally, social responsibility (classified as organizational value to the community, service to the public, social welfare) tends to receive low priority in general from management in the values studies (England, Agarwal, & Trerise, 1971; Schmidt & Posner, 1982).

Fernandez (1986) found that favourability toward corporate family support programs was greater among those occupying lower positions in the organizational hierarchy. As discussed earlier, there is some evidence that managers anticipate greater employee resistance to these programs than actually does occur. Burud et al. (1984) reported that among the managers of 35 companies involved in employer-supported child care who were initially concerned that equity would be a problem, only those from four of these companies felt that equity had become an issue.

Other findings from the Burud et al. (1984) study were obtained with a total sample of 415 companies, however it is not clear if managers from all of these companies were asked to address the equity issue. Additionally, Burud et al.
(1984) did not indicate the extent to which their results with respect to the equity issue were impressionistic, derived solely from discussions with human resource personnel, or based upon solid research evidence. In their discussion of the findings, Burud et al. (1984) identified four factors that might account for the low sense of inequity among non-users of the programs: these employees realized that they personally benefited from more dependable parent co-workers; they perceived the sponsoring company to be more caring and humane; they anticipated using the service in the future or could recall a past need; and they recognized that other benefits, such as dental care, were used differentially by employees.

Although these conclusions are difficult to interpret on the basis of the limited information provided by Burud et al. (1984) with respect to data collection, as discussed above, they nevertheless provide tentative support for the notion that that managers may be misreading employee perceptions of family support programs. Employees may be less dogmatic about strict proportionality allocations, at least with respect to these kinds of programs, than equity theory would predict. Interestingly, it is the "equity" rule that managers perceived these programs to violate, which is a rule managers tend to adhere to more strongly than employees in other categories. The suggestion that needs and social responsibility outweighed concerns with
equity fits with research demonstrating that employees at lower levels adhere more strongly to these rules than to the equity rule.

At higher levels of the organizational hierarchy, resources tend to be based upon equity, and job responsibilities are likely to explicitly dictate a concern for organizational efficiency and profit maximization, in contrast to lower levels of the hierarchy. On the basis of past research, therefore, it is likely that individuals at higher organizational levels will evaluate the justice of corporate family support using equity and profit maximization rules; whereas those at lower levels will be more likely to emphasize equality, need, and social responsibility.

Several researchers have suggested that the nature of the relationship will influence which distributional rule is salient (Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976a). Equity based upon contributions will be the predominant norm in economically oriented situations, such as business relationships. Equality, on the other hand, will be salient when cooperation, solidarity, and the maintenance of enjoyable social relationships is the focal concern. Finally, need will prevail when individuals are concerned with fostering personal welfare, and as such is particularly likely to influence allocation decisions in close interpersonal relationships, such as the family. While
equity has been found to prevail within task-performing groups, friendships tend to be characterized by the equality rule (Austin, 1980; Morgan and Sawyer, 1979) and families by need (Peterson, 1975).

Leventhal (1976a) cited several studies illustrating that equal distributions foster high levels of satisfaction and harmony among group members. Additionally, Deutsch (1985) presented results from several experimental studies that illustrated that, whereas proportionality was the initially preferred distributional rule among task-performing groups, those assigned to work under equality and need systems reported having more cooperative feelings toward each other than did those assigned to work under proportionality or winner-take-all systems. Greenberg (1982) concluded on the basis of research in the area that equality tends to reduce conflict and facilitate productivity in task-performing groups. Lansberg (1984) examined the impact of a cooperative work environment upon the selection of justice rules, and failed to find an effect, although he acknowledged that his measure of cooperation may have been limited.

Brief and Motowidlo (1986) identify group cohesiveness as a likely contextual moderator of prosocial behaviour within organizations, based upon prior research in the area of prosocial behaviour and interpersonal perception and attitudes. Group cohesiveness may inspire greater concerns
for the well-being of members. Members may be more willing to be flexible and to help out under such conditions. When members experience a sense of cohesiveness, changes requiring some degree of cooperation within the work environment might be seen as more easily coped with and less threatening than would be the case in competitive or independent work units. Narayanan and Nath (1984) employed a contingency perspective in an experimental study of flextime, a program that provides workers with the opportunity to schedule their own work hours within certain defined limits. In this study, group cohesiveness was examined as a contextual moderator. They expected that cohesiveness would be associated with more positive outcomes of flextime, in part because flextime requires cooperation between workmates in the form of filling in for each other during the flexible time band. They found that flextime was associated with improvements in flexibility, back up, superior-subordinate relations, and productivity, but only within highly cohesive work groups. They recommended that organization decision-makers considering implementing these programs make conscious efforts to raise work-unit cohesiveness through simple process interventions such as team-building.

Narayanan and Nath (1984) also point out that larger scaled organizational change directed at developing a collaborative climate within the total organization might
profitably be coupled with flextime. There seems to be some generalizability of such a statement to corporate family support policies. While work-unit cohesiveness may help to smooth out some of the potential temporary conflicts associated with such innovations as flextime, other innovations may require cooperation far beyond the work-unit. For example, extended maternity leave may require that assistance be obtained from outside of the work unit. Thus, a sense of cohesion and cooperation that extends beyond the work unit to the total organization may be critical to the favourable reception of at least certain kinds of family support programs. As stated by Brief and Motowidlo (1986):

An organizational climate characterized by warmth, friendliness, supportiveness, and cooperation is probably one in which there are strong norms of reciprocity, high levels of group cohesiveness, formal and informal reinforcement contingencies which reward prosocial acts, and role models behaving prosocially ....a warm, friendly, supportive, and cooperative climate— that is, a prosocial climate—probably induces individuals to behave more prosocially. (p. 719)

This research suggests that in work units and in organizations characterized by highly cohesive and cooperative relationships, allocations based upon need and equality may be more acceptable than allocations based upon equity. Alternatively, in work units and organizations characterized by distant, competitive relations, allocations based upon equity may be more acceptable than those based upon need or equality.
Finally, other organizational-level variables may have an impact upon the justice rules employed by members. Nonprofit or public sector organizations, for example, may be more likely to have members who endorse social responsibility and employee welfare as a legitimate organizational goal. Several researchers (Deutsch, 1985; Lansberg, 1989; Pearce & Peters, 1985) have discussed organizational-level variables likely to influence the salience of a given norm, such as climate, overall organizational goals (economic, family-business, "alternative organizations"), size, structure, and composition. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) recall prior research illustrating the fact that prosocial behaviour is influenced by observational learning and modeling. In general, within organizations with leaders who endorse the values behind innovative human resource programs, it will be more likely that other organization members will similarly endorse these values. With regard to affirmative action programs, it has been argued that strong and public commitment from top levels of management is critical to success (Blanchard, 1989).

Awareness

A variety of self-serving biases that may influence justice perceptions have been identified. In general, individuals tend to attribute their positive outcomes to their own efforts and abilities rather than to external
factors (Whitely & Frieze, 1986). Additionally, they tend to recall their own contributions to a group project more readily, and to accept more responsibility for the project than others attribute to them (Ross & Sicy, 1979). Furthermore, most people see themselves as less prejudiced than others (Fields & Schuman, 1976).

Attribution theory has been integrated with justice theory to provide some important insights into sources of disagreement in the perception of justice (Cohen, 1982; Utne & Kidd, 1980). Utne and Kidd (1980) argued that causal attributions can be invoked without altering the perception of inequity. In this sense, the awareness of one's own greater (or lower) outcomes remains, but one does not experience distress as a result of it. Responding to someone in need, Utne and Kidd (1980) argued, is a function of the intentionality, causal locus, and stability of that need. Research is cited that illustrates that people are more likely to provide assistance to another when they believe that the others' need is based upon an external cause rather than an internal cause (Utne & Kidd, 1980).

Perceptual and cognitive biases will likely affect the extent to which individuals and groups are willing to accept system-level change. In general, individuals have a tendency to commit the "fundamental attribution error," by underestimating external influences upon others' behaviour, and overestimating dispositional influences (Ross, 1977).
To the extent that the system is perceived to be just, and that individuals are perceived to be responsible for their own plight, system-level alterations will be perceived to be less legitimate.

Cognitive biases can be altered by providing groups with sufficient information regarding external system constraints and individual needs. Wegner (1982) has discussed the implications of awareness for justice. Crosby, Clayton, Hemker and Alksnis (1986) noted that cognitive biases can influence the extent to which discrimination is perceived. In their study, raters detected discrimination more readily when an aggregate of cases was presented than when individual cases were presented separately.

Crosby and Herek (1986) tested the "contact hypothesis" (Allport, 1954) that men's personal experience with employed women would influence their attitudes toward the situation of employed women. Personal experience was defined as having an employed wife or an employed mother. While personal experience was not found to be associated with male sympathy for women's situation, Crosby and Herek (1986) noted that defining experience more broadly, such as focusing upon men's personal experiences with women at work, might produce results in support of the hypothesis.

It appears probable that employees who possess a limited awareness of the needs of employed parents, and of
the systemic factors responsible for work-family conflicts, would be less likely to endorse the need rule as a justification for corporate family support. Groups with limited awareness may be more likely to focus upon the similarity between themselves and employed parents, rejecting programs which appear to them to violate the equality rule.

Awareness might be a function of several factors, including personal experience with work-family conflict, exposure to friends and family members who are experiencing work-family conflict, and workplace exposure. Work-units comprised mainly of male employees, or those in which employees work relatively independently of one another, might be expected to have members with limited awareness of the problems faced by employed parents. Similarly, awareness will likely be low in work units where work-family conflicts are intentionally kept private, as might be the case in non-supportive work environments.

Anticipated Personal Impact

The above categories of variables may exert an influence upon perceptions of family support in general, regardless of the anticipated personal impact of the specific program. Additionally, however, personal impact may play a highly significant role.

The role of self-interest was acknowledged in traditional distributive justice approaches. Both Homans
(1961) and Adams (1965) assumed that the threshold for one's perception of inequity may be higher for those who are advantaged in a relationship than it is for those who are disadvantaged. Adams (1965) proposed further that people choose to maximize profits, and will attempt to resolve inequity in a way that maximizes their profits. Walster et al. (1978) included as their first proposition that individuals will try to maximize their own outcomes, thus emphasizing the self-focus over inherent desires for justice. They also expected that while inequity would be unpleasant for all concerned, undercompensated individuals would react more negatively than would overcompensated individuals.

Some research has found that overcompensated individuals, over time, choose psychological restoration techniques to legitimize overpayment. Lawler, Koplin, Young and Fadem (1968) found that overpaid workers at the start of the study improved their performance to match their high income, but after several sessions their performance was indistinguishable from equitably paid workers, and they expressed greater confidence in their own qualifications. Walster et al. (1978) noted that among the psychological restoration techniques used by individuals who are exploiters in a relationship are blaming the victim for his/her own suffering, underestimating the extent of the victim's suffering, or denying personal responsibility for
the harmdoing. Laboratory studies have demonstrated that these effects occur (Brock & Buss, 1962, 1964; Davis & Jones, 1960).

The relative impacts of normative and instrumental factors on justice perceptions within organizations requires further exploration, particularly with respect to human resource innovations. Lansberg (1984) noted that contingency approaches to justice have posited that individuals will choose allocation rules that further their own interests (Lerner, 1975; Mei, 1978). Research reviewed above illustrates that self-interest is a factor both in proactive assessments of deservingness, and in reactive assessments of justice.

There is some evidence that individuals advantaged or disadvantaged by an allocation are less influenced by normative issues than are observers. Skarzynska (1989) tested the hypothesis that observers who were not personally affected by an allocation would place more emphasis upon appropriate allocation norms in evaluating justice, whereas individuals advantaged or disadvantaged by an allocation would be more sensitive to subjective (loss or benefit) aspects of the decision. In an experimental study, she varied the level of needs and contributions of dyads and allocated resources according to different rules: equality, need, and contributions. She found that individuals advantaged by the decision rated it as being significantly
more fair than did those who were disadvantaged by the
decision. The justice rule underlying the decision
accounted for much more of the variance among observers than
among recipients (69.06% versus 3.90%). While the
particular justice rule employed had a significant impact
upon recipients as well, it accounted for only a minor
portion of the variance relative to personal impact
(52.90%).

These findings might not be replicated to the same
degree in an organizational setting because the norms
governing allocations in such settings are likely to be
clearer and more generally acknowledged by participants.
Nevertheless, the findings are provocative, particularly
with regard to human resource innovations. Those unaffected
by the allocation may evaluate it according to standard
group-level and system-level norms. Alternatively, those
advantaged or disadvantaged are likely to focus more upon
their own outcomes. In so doing, they may emphasize
allocation rules that are congruent with the justice of
their own situation.

"Self-interest" has been found to be a factor
influencing support for affirmative action programs
(Jacobson, 1985), although evidence for this model has not
been consistent (e.g., McClendon & Pestello, 1983). In
Jacobson's (1985) study, self-interest was measured in terms
of the belief that blacks would be living in the
neighbourhood or going to local schools within five years. The affirmative action scale measured a variety of issues, particularly emphasizing quotas for blacks, women and other minorities in industry and higher education. Jacobson (1985) made the point that had the self-interest scale included items on respondent's own future job opportunities, the relationship between support for affirmative action and self-interest would have likely been even higher than was obtained.

There are indications that, with respect to certain kinds of innovations, normative factors play a particularly strong role regardless of personal impact. The term "preferential treatment" is commonly used to describe the selection of an individual on the basis of their membership in a disadvantaged gender or racial group. It might be expected that women would be accepting of "preferential treatment" as an affirmative action strategy because of the potential advantages it might afford them personally; however, women have been found to favour other kinds of strategies over preferential treatment (Colwill & Josephson, 1983; Tougas & Veilleux, 1988). In general, the debate concerning the impact of self-interest versus normative factors upon acceptance of policies designed to achieve equality for women and minorities appears to be unresolved. The "symbolic politics" perspective assumes that predispositions acquired through early socialization, such
as prejudice, will have a strong impact upon reactions toward policies, regardless of the personal costs or benefits of such policies (Sears, Hensler & Speer, 1979).

In conclusion, the personal impact of the program is likely to have an influence upon the justice rules used to evaluate the program. Those anticipating an advantage from the program may endorse rules supporting the justice of the program, regardless of whether these rules reflect issues of need, equality or equity. Those anticipating a disadvantage from the program may reject rules that support the justice of the program, again regardless of their specific content. As might be expected, employed parents with high need, who report that they are experiencing high levels of work/family stress, are much more in favour of corporate family support than are parents with low need (Fernandez, 1986).

Conclusions

In conclusion, several individual and contextual characteristics may have an impact upon the justice rules used to evaluate corporate family support programs. An issue currently under debate in the literature is the relative impact of certain of these variables, such as prior norms and attitudes versus personal impact, upon acceptance of other policies, such as affirmative action. Similarly, an important research question is the extent to which these variables influence the selection of justice rules. To the extent that the significant sources of variance can be
identified, organizations will be better equipped to tailor their efforts to foster support for these programs. For example, the extent to which one personally benefits from the program may be less a factor in acceptance than work-unit or personal norms and values. Furthermore, clarification of the constellation of justice concerns applied to this specific allocation problem, and of sources of variance in the application of justice rules themselves, will advance theoretical understanding of the nature of justice.

Procedural Justice

Justice research within organizations has been concerned primarily with equity theory and outcomes. A more recent theoretical conceptualization—procedural justice—draws attention to the processes involved in organizational allocation decisions. Folger and Greenberg (1985) provide contrasting definitions of procedural and distributive justice. Procedural justice, they state, refers to "the perceived fairness of the procedures used in making decisions...[whereas distributive justice]...is concerned with the perceived fairness of the content and consequences of those decisions" (p. 143).

According to the distributive justice perspective, employees will react to resource distributions on the basis of outcome-level issues. The procedural justice perspective suggests that this reaction may be tempered by the process
through which resources are distributed. Thus, the kinds of procedures used to select and implement family support programs may have an impact upon justice perceptions with respect to these programs, beyond that accounted for by distributional factors.

Two conceptual perspectives on procedural justice have been developed—that of Thibaut and Walker (1975, 1978), and that of Leventhal (1980; Leventhal, Karuza & Fry, 1980). While the former conceptualization was designed primarily for understanding dispute resolution, the latter was meant to address the issue of procedures involved in resource allocation. Leventhal's approach thus seems most relevant to the present study and will be reviewed here.

Leventhal (1980) suggested six procedural rules are to assess fairness. The consistency rule dictates that procedures should be consistent across persons and over time. He suggested that this rule was related to the notion of equality of opportunity. The bias-suppression rule dictates that self-interest and adherence to narrow preconceptions should be avoided. The accuracy rule dictates that the process should be based upon good information and informed opinion. The correctability rule dictates that there should be an opportunity to modify and reverse decisions if necessary. The representativeness rule dictates that the process should reflect the concerns and values of all important subgroups affected. Finally, the
ethicability rule dictates that procedures should be compatible with moral and ethical values.

Seven structural components of the allocative process were also outlined by Leventhal (1980), to each of which he believed that the procedural justice rules should apply. These components were the selection of agents, setting of ground rules, gathering of information, decision structure, appeals, safeguards, and change mechanisms.

The process of human resource innovation can be considered in terms of stages similar to Leventhal's (1980) structural components. Rogers (1983) has developed a model of the innovation process in organizations that clarifies some of the activities at each stage. Activities during the first stage, initiation, have to do with information-gathering, conceptualizing and planning, leading up to the decision to adopt the innovation. Activities during the second stage, implementation, involve fitting the innovation to the organization through redefining and restructuring, and ultimately, through routinizing. Similarly, innovation in the form of human resource programs such as family support may be considered in terms of a stage-like process, from program selection through implementation to evaluation and refinement.

Much of what is involved in procedural justice has to do with employee participation, an issue that has received a great deal of attention in the organizational psychology
Literature. Participation by the parties affected by the allocation decision is a primary element in both Leventhal's (1980) and Thibaut and Walker's (1975) models.
Participation seems to be reflected to varying degrees in the procedural justice rules of representativeness, accuracy, and bias-suppression.

Adherence to such procedural justice rules may be particularly critical to the success of human resource innovations, and may be relevant at all stages of the innovation process. Daft (1983) identified three strategies that may be used to overcome resistance to change: aligning the change with the needs and goals of users, providing early and extensive participation in the change, and providing open communication about the need for change, the consequences of the change, and the steps that will be taken to ensure that the change does not have adverse consequences for employees. The impact of employee participation in the allocation process was addressed in a recent review of procedural justice and personnel systems by Folger and Greenberg (1985). They concluded that "studies of reward allocation procedures have clearly demonstrated the prevalence of enhanced outcome-acceptance effects and greater perceived procedural fairness associated with procedures that give people process control in the form of 'voice'" (p. 156).

In the initial stages of program selection,
participation by program users as well as other employee subgroups can help to ensure that the final decision reflects the needs and interests of individuals who will be affected by the program. Daft (1983) suggested that "early and extensive participation in the change should be part of any implementation strategy.... Participation should normally begin in the initiation stage so that ideas and proposals from users can be incorporated in the change design" (p. 286). Studies of reactions to specific innovations, such as the compressed work schedule (Latack & Foster, 1985) illustrate that favourability is greater among those who participate in the decision to implement the program.

If family support programs are selected solely on the basis of input from upper management, these programs may reflect the idiosyncratic concerns of management and not the concerns of those who are directly responsible for program implementation and use. Of the sixteen corporations Stillman and Bowen (1985) studied, some had initiated family support policies and some had not; none, however, had sponsored a needs assessment among their employees. Burud et al. (1984) reported that out of 415 organizations providing family support programs, 147 had conducted feasibility studies prior to implementation. Presumably, the remaining 268 had selected and implemented programs on the basis of information from a small subset of the employee population, most likely management and/or human resource
personnel. Sometimes organization decision-makers will adopt a program as a response to trends in the external environment, even though the program is not the best solution for their own employee population. As noted by Kossek (1987a), companies "often search for the latest HR fix" to counter environmental uncertainty. She also suggested that costly innovations with high publicity value tend to diffuse rapidly, and she referred to on-site child care as one example. There is evidence that on-site child care is not the best solution for some groups of employed parents. It has been reported that expensive innovations such as on-site child care have been dropped by some organizations either because they have failed to attract sufficient numbers of employees or because of their high cost (Kamerman & Kahn, 1987; Kamerman & Kingston, 1982). On-site child care may be set up to accommodate only a small select sample of the employee population, and even when it is able to accommodate a larger group it may only be used by a small subset (Stautberg, 1987). Some employees' child care concerns may have to do primarily with reliability and accessibility, others with affordability, and still others with availability on special occasions, such as when a child is sick (Kamerman & Kahn, 1987; Miller, 1984). For employees who perceive affordability as the primary issue, subsidies and reimbursements would probably be more meaningful than
on-site care or perhaps even information and referral services. Some employed parents choose not to place their children in on-site child care because they would like their children to remain with neighbourhood friends and because they are reluctant to transport their children long distances through rush hour traffic (Kamerman & Kingston, 1982).

Similarly, certain kinds of scheduling innovations may adequately accommodate the needs of a large proportion of employed parents, whereas others may not. Some research examining scheduling innovations has found associated improvements in family relations and reduced conflict (Staines & Pleck, 1986; Winett, Neale & Williams, 1982), while others have found few effects (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). Flexible work schedules vary greatly in the amount of flexibility allowed. Flexible start and leave times may alleviate some of the problems with transporting children to and from child care or school. However, flexibility may or may not mean that one can come in late after a family emergency without being penalized, that one can schedule vacations at desired times of the year (for example, during childrens' summer or Christmas holidays), or that one can take breaks during the day to take a child to the doctor, to go to a school meeting or to breast-feed a child—time that could be made up later.

To the extent that potential program users anticipate
that the organizational effort to address their family needs is not in fact reflective of a sincere concern to meet these needs, they may be more likely to perceive these programs as unfair. Thus, if employees are surveyed within their organization with respect to their family needs, and if a program is selected on the basis of this information, it may be perceived as more fair even by those who do not end up being served by the program than if it had been selected solely on the basis of management input.

Participation during the selection stage by subgroups other than potential users will also likely be critical. For non-users, early participation can help to ensure that their needs are not overlooked in the change process. Schein (1980) noted that failure to achieve stable change "occurs most frequently when innovations are made in one subgroup without working through the consequences for other subgroups in the organization" (p. 237). Corporate family support may require more than a program directed specifically at the parent population; intervention in the form of additional support staff, training and information, and on-going evaluation may be required to ensure that appropriate adjustments are made to the new program.

It is probably critical for programs involving flexible and extended leaves that arrangements are made for someone else to assume the tasks of those absent, perhaps by retraining existing staff, by introducing on-going job
rotation, or by employing temporary part-time personnel where feasible. Work environments in which such support staff are unavailable may not respond well to employees taking days off to attend to sick children, or to employees taking extended maternity leave. Kamerman and Kahn (1987) found that flexibility and consideration around pregnancy and child care issues was partly dependent upon the nature of the job and the kind of arrangements that were in place to accommodate absent employees. In one company, for example, it was found that secretaries were able to take more maternity time because they had a pool of replacement staff, whereas this was not the case for professional women (Kamerman & Kahn, 1987). Fernandez (1986) noted that many managers in his study would concur with one of their peers who stated that:

Part-time work and job-sharing would just create havoc with getting the job done. There would be a lot of ill feelings about people not pulling their load. I suspect it would cost us dearly in terms of dollars. (p. 141)

There appears to be an underlying assumption being made here, however, that such programs would be implemented without any additional changes or support that might be necessary.

Conditions required to facilitate the transition for supervisors from controlling schedules to providing worker control should also be assessed in order to maximize success of scheduling changes. Folger and Greenberg (1985)
discussed the benefits of flextime in terms of procedural justice, making the point that flextime gives workers participation in the form of "choice." Supervisors, however, may have difficulty relinquishing control in areas in which they have traditionally held control.

When implementing flextime, employers must also ensure that those previously working under flexible schedules do not experience a reduction in their own schedule control. Narayanan and Nath (1982) found that professional employees who had previously worked under informal flexible schedules experienced a trend toward deterioration of superior-subordinate relations upon implementation of a flextime policy. Open-ended responses indicated that this was due to the perception that flextime formalized their previous informal scheduling arrangements, and to resentment regarding the obligatory use of punch cards and time accumulators. The researchers noted that there seem to be basic value conflicts built into flextime: "On the one hand, the intervention claims to enhance employees' sense of control over working time; on the other, use of time-keeping devices signals some degree of distrust of employees" (p. 228).

Issues to consider with regard to flexible benefit plans include providing sufficient information regarding the options available to all employees and minimizing restrictive features that limit their usefulness. Fernandez
(1986) has suggested that flexible benefit plans may alleviate the equity concerns of nonparent employees who may feel that they are subsidizing parent employees' child care expenses. While Folger and Greenberg (1985) suggest that cafeteria benefit plans are attractive to employees because they offer more employee control over their own benefits, Kossek (1989) found flexible benefits to be among the least preferred innovations in her study. Critical problems with this innovation in the company she studied were that employees were poorly informed about the program, and that certain key features of the program (such as the requirement that health care expenses be predicted a year in advance) made it difficult to apply (Kossek, 1988). In some cases, employees realistically may have no say in the actual choice of program. Extended maternity leave has been mandated by the Government in Canada; other options may be limited by company characteristics, such as size, financial restrictions, and, in the case of scheduling innovations, high task interdependence. Nevertheless, even when options are mandated or relatively restricted, employees might be involved in decisions having to do with finer features of the program, particularly those decisions related to work-environment changes required to accommodate the new program. Supervisors might respond more favourably to extended maternity leave, for example, if they are able to discuss with management the anticipated impacts of extended leaves
on the performance of their work units, and if they are provided with additional support from management when the leaves occur.

During the implementation phase, it is probably critical to inform employees adequately of the options available. Along with the rules previously mentioned, Leventhal's (1980) consistency rule seems particularly relevant here. If criteria for program use are clearly defined in the selection phase, it must be ensured that those who meet those criteria actually have access to the program. Unless employees are agreed that the organizational variables that restrict their ability to utilize the program are valid (for example, working on the assembly line may restrict one's ability to take advantage of flextime), they are likely to be resentful that they are being excluded. To the extent that employees anticipate or perceive favouritism with respect to extended or emergency leaves (depending, for example upon supervisor discretion), they are likely to perceive the policy as unfair.

One way to increase the likelihood of consistency across persons is to ensure that supervisors and other employees are adequately informed of the details of the program. As noted by Daft (1983), "A common mistake for managers is to assume that other people understand the change. Management should provide far more information than they think is necessary in order to be sure that users are
properly informed" (p. 286). In a study of employees' perceptions of Employee Assistance Programs (EAP) in seven corporations, Steele and Hubbard (1985) found that the majority were unaware of specific organizational and EAP policies and procedures, and that the programs were poorly integrated within the organizations' administrative hierarchy. As discussed above, Kossek (1988) found that acceptance of the flexible spending account in the company she studied was low, in part as a result of inadequate information. She found, for example, that 40% of respondents disagreed with the statement "In general, communication on the Flexible Spending Account has been good." Kamerman and Kahn (1987) cited numerous cases in which employees faced informal policies at odds with organizational policy and suggested that "organizational and leadership factors may overwhelm policy, even enlightened policy" (p. 64). For example, leave for personal emergencies was blocked in some companies by concurrent requirements for advance scheduling and negative evaluations of the use of sick time. They also noted that at times employees were unaware of available policies or believed that obsolete policies were still in effect.

Finally, on-going evaluation is probably critical to program success. Different kinds of problems may emerge once the program is in place that were not initially anticipated. Here, Leventhal's (1980) correctability rule
may apply: policies and programs that are modifiable at some point in the future should the need arise will likely be seen as more fair than those that cannot be changed. Again, at the evaluation stage all employees, including users and non-users, should contribute information regarding the functioning of the program. Evaluations of corporate family support programs, however, are rare. As noted by Friedman (1987), "One of the interesting anomalies in the work-family arena is that the majority of companies want to know the effects of family programs before implementation, yet those with such programs do not want to conduct follow-up research" (p. 36).

It is clear that the selection and implementation of family support programs can be a complicated process. The perceived justice of these programs may be a function, then, not simply of who will receive what outcomes and who will not, but also of how the decision will be made and what kinds of safeguards will likely be in place along the way. If employees are skeptical about the underlying motivations of management in the selection of these programs, if they feel that some parent subgroups are being overlooked because of inaccurate or insufficient information, or if they anticipate that management will be unwilling to provide needed support when problems arise as a result of the change, they may be less likely to perceive these programs as fair.
The impact of experience with human resource initiatives within one's organization on the acceptance of subsequent initiatives is discussed by Kossek (1987a). She states that:

If past efforts resulted in a negative experience for the social system, then skepticism and distrust are likely to arise in response to new programs. For example, if efforts to implement a quality control circle program met with dismal failure because management was not willing to alter the authority structure commensurate with new worker responsibilities, then employees will be unreceptive to future efforts involving participative management. (p. 88)

She also notes that faddishness with respect to human resource innovation in the past will increase skepticism amongst employees. She refers to Alderfer's (1986) "HERWEGA effect"—the Here We Go Again Effect—as a disdainful response often experienced by employees working in companies "beset by HR fads."

Procedural justice has been referred to in relation to human resource programs such as flextime and flexible benefit plans (Folger & Greenberg, 1985) and affirmative action programs (Nacoste, 1987); however there appear to be no studies directly investigating this relationship. Most of the organizational research has dealt with procedural justice in terms of performance appraisal and salary increases, whereas nonorganizational research has dealt with dispute-resolution and leadership endorsement (for a review, see Lind & Tyler, 1988).

There are indications that in the selection,
implementation, and evaluation of human resource innovations in general, and of family support programs in particular, the kinds of procedural justice rules outlined by Leventhal (1980) are often violated. Organization leaders could benefit from information regarding the impact of actual or anticipated violation of these rules upon employees' overall justice judgments with respect to these programs.

In summary, employees' ratings of the justice of any particular family support program may be a function, in part, of the perceived fairness of the procedures used in implementing that program. Employees might be more favourable toward programs that are developed on the basis of a thorough understanding of parent needs, organizational costs and benefits, and options available. They may be less favourable toward programs that appear to be adopted simply because other similar organizations have developed them, or because of some apparent self-interest on the part of management. Employees might be very resentful of high-cost programs adopted primarily for publicity value that fail to meet the needs of the employee population, and consequently are dropped. This appears to have been the case in some organizations with respect to on-site child care.

It is quite likely, then, that the procedure used in selecting and implementing family support programs may account for some of the variance in justice conceptions, beyond specific distributional issues. In other words,
employees who anticipate that "just" procedures will be used in selecting and implementing these programs may perceive them as more fair than those who anticipate that "unjust" procedures will be used. When new benefits and programs are being considered, it is likely that the procedures used in implementing similar benefits and programs in the past will have an impact upon attitudes toward these new programs. Similarly, for those programs already in place, employees who perceive that just procedures were used in selection and implementation will perceive them as more fair than those who perceive unjust procedures were used.
Statement of the Problem

Corporate family support programs are likely to be implemented in more and more organizations in the upcoming years. In order to facilitate their successful implementation, promoters and organization decision-makers will need to be cognizant of the different viewpoints that employees may hold with regard to these programs. Understanding the different frames of reference held by employees and the sources of individual differences will assist organization decision-makers in tailoring promotion and implementation of family support programs in order to achieve maximal support. The present research is directed toward facilitating this process.

This study has three primary objectives. First, it aims to extend distributive justice theory into a previously unexplored realm, the acceptance of new forms of employee benefits, specifically corporate family support programs. Second, it aims to identify the significant sources of variance in justice perceptions with regard to these programs. Third, it aims to identify the relative impact of procedural justice upon program acceptance.

In terms of the first objective, the research is directed at broadening the applicability of justice theory within organizations beyond the traditional focus upon equity and wage allocations. Distributive justice theory suggests that rules other than equity might be seen as fair
bases for resource allocations; however it has generally been assumed that equity would prevail within work organizations. Since many new kinds of organizational policies and programs appear to be consistent with rules other than equity, such as need and equality of opportunity, it seems important to assess the extent to which employees actually use these different rules in assessing such programs.

When it is recognized that many different rules may be used as justifications for or against a particular resource distribution, a number of interesting questions arise regarding the structure, generalizability and impact of justice perceptions within organizational settings. For example, to what extent do employees agree with justifications for and against family support that are based upon the rules identified in distributive justice theory, such as equity, equality, and need? What is the relationship between justifications based upon these different kinds of rules? Which rules are most influential in predicting favourability toward programs such as family support? This study aims to advance understanding of the structure of justice perceptions by examining these questions.

To the extent that individuals differ in the use of distributive justice rules to evaluate these programs, it also becomes important to identify the critical sources of
variance. Normative, instrumental and cognitive factors have been advanced as explanations for differences in preferred distributive justice rules. Studies attempting to identify the relative contributions of normative and instrumental factors to acceptance of other kinds of organizational programs, such as affirmative action, have produced inconsistent results. It cannot, therefore, be predicted from past research which of these factors is likely to exert the greatest influence. Identification of the critical sources of variance, however, will be of considerable use to organization decision-makers who may need to tailor promotional and intervention strategies for different organizational groups.

Since corporate family support programs may at times result in non-equivalent distributions of resources, it also seems important that organizations obtain information on how to increase acceptance when the actual distribution itself cannot be changed. One possibility is the use of procedural justice in implementation. Individuals who perceive that fair procedures have been used in the distribution of resources and who receive lower outcomes are more accepting of these lower outcomes than are those who perceive that unfair procedures have been used. It is probable, then, that individuals who expect fair procedures to be used will be more accepting of allocation decisions that involve unequal outcomes.
While procedural justice theory has been applied to other organizational allocation situations, such as performance appraisals, there is no research available that tests the relative importance of procedural justice and of specific procedural justice rules in the area of employee benefits. This study is intended to investigate the notion of "procedural justice" as applied to employee benefits in general and to corporate family support programs in particular.

Hypotheses

The Nature of Justice as Applied to Family Support

Theory and research in the area of distributive justice suggest that individuals do not perceive equity as being the only fair basis for resource distribution. In fact, individuals may weight other kinds of rules, such as need, more heavily than equity, depending upon the specific allocation situation in which they find themselves. In some cases, several rules may be perceived as fair bases for a particular resource distribution. Nevertheless, within work organizations, the rule of equity has been assumed to prevail.

With respect to the nature of justice as applied to family support programs, two issues will be explored: the extent to which employees endorse justifications for and against family support programs that are based upon justice rules other than equity; and the relationship between
favourability toward, and perceived fairness of, family support programs and justice rules.

Endorsement of justice rules. Justifications for and against family support found in the literature tend to be framed along the lines of one of six types of justice rules: profit maximization, equity, equality, equality of opportunity, need, and social responsibility. With respect to this kind of organizational resource, then, equity may not be the only, or even the most important, justice rule applied. The following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis 1:

Employees will agree with justifications for and against family support that are based upon rules in addition to equity, such as profit maximization, equality, equality of opportunity, need, and social responsibility.

Relationship between justice rules and favourability toward, and perceived fairness of, family support programs. Justice theories suggest that acceptance of allocations is based, in part, upon the extent to which these allocations are perceived to conform to relevant distributive justice rules. If many different kinds of justice rules are applied to family support programs, overall favourability toward the programs should be a function of the importance placed upon these rules. Some rules, furthermore, may be more closely tied to favourability than may others. The following hypothesis will be tested:
Hypothesis 2:

The perceived fairness of, and favourability toward, family support programs, will be a function of the importance placed upon justice rules of profit maximization, equity, equality, equality of opportunity, need, and social responsibility.

Sources of Variance in Importance Placed on Justice Rules

Several sources of variance in the emphasis placed upon particular distributive justice rules have been identified in previous research. It is expected that employees will differ in the level of importance placed upon specific rules as justifications for and against family support programs, and that the sources of individual differences will be consistent with those identified in other domains and with respect to other kinds of resource allocations. Individual, contextual, cognitive, and instrumental sources of variance will be examined.

Individual sources of variance. The set of individual variables to be examined include gender, attitudes toward women, and global distributive orientation. While evidence has not been entirely consistent, females have been found to be more favourable toward equality-based resource distributions than have males. In general, women tend to be more interpersonally oriented than do men, and would be expected to place less emphasis on individualistic rules such as equity. Furthermore, because women continue to assume primary responsibility for the care of children, they would be expected to be more attuned to need-based arguments
in favour of family support.

Sexism and beliefs about equality of opportunity have been found to influence support for proactive workplace initiatives for women. Individuals with traditional attitudes toward women's roles may be less likely to perceive a legitimate need for family support programs (arguing instead, for example, that women should remain at home to care for the children), and may be less responsive to equality of opportunity-based arguments for such programs. While the nature of the domain and of the resource have been found to influence the level of importance that individuals place upon particular justice rules, it would be expected that some generalization across domains and resources could occur. Thus, the global orientation individuals hold with regard to the distribution of resources in society as a whole should be related to the orientation they hold with regard to this particular resource distribution within their organization.

Thus, it is expected that the individual variables of gender, attitudes toward women, and global distributive orientation will have an impact on the degree of emphasis placed upon specific distributive justice rules applied to corporate family support. In particular, the following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis 3:

Employees who are female, who have non-sexist attitudes toward women, and who have adopted a global egalitarian
orientation toward resource distributions within society as a whole, will place greater importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than will employees who are male, who have sexist attitudes toward women, and who have adopted a global proportionality orientation.

Contextual sources of variance. The set of contextual variables to be examined include hierarchical level and perceived cooperative climate at the work-unit, supervisory, and organizational levels. Previous research has found that employees holding positions at the higher organizational levels are more likely to be concerned with equity and profit maximization, whereas members holding lower-level positions are more likely to be concerned with equality and employee welfare. Additionally, research has found that within close, cooperative groups, equality and need rules tend to prevail over equity considerations. Thus, it is expected that the contextual variables of hierarchical level and perceived cooperative work-unit climate will have an impact upon the degree of emphasis placed upon specific distributive justice rules applied to corporate family support. In particular, the following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis 4:

Employees who hold positions at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy, and those who perceive their work-unit climate to be cooperative and supportive, will place greater importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than will employees who hold
positions at the higher levels of the organizational hierarchy, and who perceive their work-unit climate to be unsupportive.

**Cognitive sources of variance.** Previous research has illustrated that systemic constraints upon others' behaviour are often difficult to perceive, and are often underestimated relative to dispositional factors. Perceiving a need for family support programs, and considering need to be a legitimate justification, is thus probably related to the extent to which individuals are able to see the system, rather than the individual, as requiring change. Thus, it is expected that cognitive factors, in particular the level of awareness of problems faced by employed parents, will have an impact on the degree of emphasis placed upon specific distributive justice rules applied to corporate family support. Awareness may be a function of personal experience with work-family conflict, and/or exposure to others, including friends, family members, and co-workers, who experience work-family conflict problems. The following hypothesis will be tested:

**Hypothesis 5:**

Employees who have a high level of awareness of work-family conflict problems will place greater importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than will employees who have less awareness of work-family conflict problems.

**Instrumental sources of variance.** There is evidence that individuals who are personally advantaged or
disadvantaged by an allocation are less influenced by normative issues than are observers. Traditional normative organizational resource allocation rules of equity and profit maximization may thus receive lower levels of endorsement by employees who expect to gain personally as a result of the allocation. It is therefore expected that instrumental factors, in particular the level of anticipated personal benefit or cost resulting from corporate family support programs, will have an impact on the degree of emphasis placed upon particular distributive justice rules applied to corporate family support. The following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis 6:

Employees who anticipate a favourable personal outcome from family support programs will place greater importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than will employees who do not anticipate a favourable personal outcome.

Procedural Justice

Past research and theory in the area of procedural justice suggests that employees will evaluate the justice of resource allocations in part according to the process involved rather than simply the outcome. In order to assess the relationship between procedural justice and perceptions of corporate family support, two issues will be addressed: the relationship between identified procedural justice rules and overall perceived fairness of procedures used in
selecting and distributing employee benefits; and the relationship between perceived procedural fairness and favourability toward family support programs.

Procedural justice rules and overall perceived fairness of procedures. It has been suggested that six procedural justice rules are used to assess fairness. These rules have been labelled consistency, bias-suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. If these rules can be generalized to the domain of employee benefit selection and distribution, it would be expected that overall perceived fairness of procedures used in benefit selection, and overall perceived fairness of benefits, would be a function of the extent to which such procedures have been consistent with these rules. The following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis 7:

Employees will utilize the procedural justice rules of consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality, in judging the overall fairness of procedures used in the selection, implementation, and evaluation of employee benefits.

Procedural fairness and favourability toward family support programs. Procedural justice theory suggests that individuals will be more favourable toward resource distributions that result in lowered outcomes for themselves relative to others if they perceive that fair procedures have been used. It is likely, therefore, that employees who believe that, in general, fair procedures are used in
selecting and distributing employee benefits within their organization will be more accepting of family support programs even if they do not expect to use the programs themselves. The following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis 8:

Those employees who perceive that fair procedures have been used previously in the implementation of employee benefits will be more favourable toward corporate family support programs than will those who perceive that fair procedures have not been used.
CHAPTER II

Method

Procedure and Participants

Human resource directors of twelve local organizations were sent proposals describing the general study objectives, with a cover letter inviting their employing organizations to participate in the study. Three organizations agreed to participate in the study--two from the private sector, and one from the public sector.

The two private sector organizations were in the same type of service industry. Organization A employed approximately 200 people, and Organization B employed approximately 35 people. The public sector organization, Organization C, was considerably larger than the two private organizations, employing approximately 650 people. The private sector organizations had been in existence for less than 7 years, whereas the public sector organization had been operating for over 25 years. The majority of jobs available in the private sector organizations were low skilled and low-salaried, whereas the public sector organization offered a wide range of job opportunities.

Organizations A and B were relatively traditional in the kinds of employee benefits currently offered, although Organization A was in the process of considering implementing on-site child care. The union within
Organization A expressed a strong interest in bargaining for this program in the near future.

Organization C already had a variety of progressive family support programs in place. This organization had two main sites and four satellite locations. At the main sites, on-site child care was available; however its primary objective was to serve as a training site rather than as a resource for employees, and employees were not given preference over community members in using the centre. While other kinds of family support programs were listed in the collective agreements, it appeared that employees were not uniformly aware of their options with respect to these other programs, and that in some cases availability depended upon the nature of the employee's job and the supervisor's discretion.

In order to foster support for the research, the human resource directors of each organization were offered the opportunity to tailor the research questionnaire and its method of distribution to the needs and interests of their own organization. The larger organizations, A and C, requested that questions be added to the questionnaire concerning their own organizations. Organization A was interested in having a needs-assessment conducted for on-site child care, while Organization C was interested in examining its employees' awareness, use, and general impressions of a variety of employee benefits already in
place.

Within Organization A, prior to distributing questionnaires, meetings were held with the human resource director, union representatives, supervisors and department heads. These meetings were aimed at clarifying study objectives, obtaining input, promoting support for the study, and determining a mutually acceptable approach to questionnaire distribution and collection. Additionally, many of the employees were approached individually. Questionnaires were then distributed either directly to employees or to their supervisors for distribution. After questionnaires were distributed, notices were posted listing times that the researcher would be available at the organization site to answer questions and to collect completed questionnaires. Employees were provided with the option of returning completed questionnaires directly to the researcher, mailing them to the researcher in stamped return envelopes available in the staff cafeteria, or bringing them to the human resources office to be collected on a regular basis by the researcher. Employees within Organization A, as in the other two organizations, were given a deadline date of approximately two weeks for questionnaire completion; however reminder notices were sent out at the deadline for all three organizations with extensions so as to encourage the greatest rate of participation.

Within Organization C, prior to distributing
questionnaires, meetings were held with the human resource
director, employment equity coordinator, employment equity
committee, presidents of the two unions and the vice-
president of the staff association. Telephone discussions
and/or brief meetings were also held with other organization
members, including the heads of the satellite sites. The
objectives of these meetings were the same as for those in
Organization A. Questionnaires were then distributed
directly to employees through the mail system within the
organization. Employees were provided with the option of
returning questionnaires to the mailroom at the main sites,
or to drop-off boxes in the human resource office at one
main site or the principal's office at the other. In the
mailroom at one site, questionnaires were mailed directly to
the researcher. In the other, questionnaires were held to
be picked up daily by the researcher.

The least amount of involvement between the
organization and the researcher occurred in Organization B.
Brief telephone discussions were held with the human
resources director, who agreed to distribute the
questionnaire as designed, without modifications. She
requested that she be in charge of distributing
questionnaires to employees and supervisors, and that
questionnaires be returned through the mail to the
researcher. Therefore, she was provided with packages
containing questionnaires and stamped return envelopes. No
further contact was established with the organization during the study, apart from sending reminder notices to be distributed to employees at the deadline date.

Within all the organizations, participation in the study was completely voluntary. All employees in the three organizations received a questionnaire package that contained an Introduction to the Study and Consent Form, and in Organization B only, a letter of endorsement of the study signed by human resource personnel, the presidents of the two unions, and the president of the staff association. The Consent Form or Introduction included a statement that approval for the study had been granted by the sponsoring organization, that confidentiality would be assured, and that results of the study would be supplied in summary form to management, unions, and employees. It was also suggested that the research findings could be of use in the future planning of employee benefits for the organization.

The measures described below were those used to test the research hypotheses. These measures are presented in Appendix A. As discussed above, several questions were added to the questionnaire with the sole purpose of providing the sponsoring organizations with information they required for their own objectives. These questions are presented in Appendix F. The findings resulting from them will not be discussed, however, as they do not pertain to the research hypotheses presented here.
Measures

Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support

In order to identify the kinds of attitudes and values that employees used to judge the fairness of family support policies, a 30-item scale was designed. This scale, which will be referred to as the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support, included two subscales, a 12-item Attitudes subscale and an 18-item Rules subscale. Each item was designed for use in identifying one of the six justice issues: profit maximization, equity, equality, equality of opportunity, need, and social responsibility.

The 12-item Attitudes subscale was designed to tap underlying attitudes and opinions expected to be associated with justifications for or against these programs. These items assessed the extent to which respondents anticipated certain kinds of outcomes from the programs (for example, reduced or increased profitability), as well as their views regarding special employee programs in general, the level of stress experienced by employed mothers, the kinds of contributions employed mothers make to the organization, and a number of other related issues.

The 18-item Rules subscale was designed to measure the importance of various justice rules as applied to family support. This scale contained items of several different forms, including those items which expressed favourability or unfavourability toward the implementation of family
support on the basis of a particular justice rule, those
which simply referred to the importance of the justice rule
as applied to family support, and items of the "if...then"
form, which referred to a particular outcome as a legitimate
basis for acceptance or rejection of the programs.

The Rules subscale was of primary importance to this
study. The hypotheses concerning the impact of background
variables (individual, contextual, cognitive, and
instrumental) on the importance placed upon distributive
justice rules required a measure of rule importance,
separate from other kinds of attitudes that might be related
to support. For example, it was of interest to determine
whether or not employees agreed that "need" should be an
important factor in decisions regarding family support,
regardless of the extent to which they perceived employed
parents to actually be in need. Similarly, it was of
interest to determine whether or not employees agreed that
"profits" should be an important factor, regardless of their
views about the actual financial benefits of the programs.
It was expected that certain beliefs, including beliefs
regarding parents' actual needs and program cost-
effectiveness, would be a function of a variety of factors
such as exposure and personal experience. The importance of
justice rules was expected to be a function of these factors
as well as others theoretically linked to justice notions in
general, apart from the specific issue of family support.
In the literature, the equality rule has been referred to in association with other humanitarian rules such as need (e.g., Rasinsky, 1987). As discussed in the Introduction, equality with regard to family support programs might be interpreted in at least three ways. Some employees might feel that the programs create inequality because only a subset of the employee population could use them. Other employees might feel the programs are a step toward the establishment of equality because they address current restrictions in the workplace for women and parent employees. Finally, some employees may feel that the programs establish equality because other companies are currently offering these programs to their employees. The Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support, therefore, included items to tap all three of these possibilities. The former two arguments are dealt with most extensively, and are expected to be tapped by the separate scales for equality, and equality of opportunity, respectively. It is important to note, however, that the equality items in fact refer more to the creation of inequality, and as such are more closely affiliated with equity issues than with need. The equality of opportunity items may be more in line with those generally considered under the label of equality.

While it was of interest to identify justice rules as applied to family support programs in general, it was felt that employees might have different, specific programs in
mind when they were responding to the items on this scale. Some employees might have had more exposure to certain kinds of programs than others within a particular organization. Furthermore, exposure was known to differ across organizations. In order to reduce the chances of uncontrolled variability in responding, it was decided that specification of a prototypical family support program prior to the presentation of the Justice Scale would be most appropriate. Therefore, a brief description of a typical on-site child care centre was provided in the introduction to the scale, and employees were instructed to keep this program in mind as a typical "family support" program when they were responding to the scale. Instructions were similar, although not identical, for all three organizations. As discussed previously, on-site child care was available in Organization C at the two main sites; however it differed from typical on-site child care in a number of ways. Employees of this organization were provided with the description of the typical centre, and were instructed to think of the typical centre, and not the centres available at their main sites, when responding to the items.

Favourability Toward, and Perceived Fairness of, Family Support Programs

After reading the description of the typical "family support" program, an on-site child care centre, and
responding to the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support, respondents were asked to indicate how "fair" they thought it would be for their work organization to offer this kind of program. Responses to this question were provided on a scale ranging from 1 (Extremely unfair) to 4 (Extremely fair). Respondents were also asked to indicate how much they would be "in favour" of their work organization offering this kind of a program, on a scale from 1 (Not at all in favour) to 4 (Very much in favour).

Additionally, respondents were provided with a list of eight other family support programs and asked to use the same fairness and favourability scales in assessing these programs. The eight additional programs were: a flexible-spending account with part of the child care fees as an option, extra days off to care for sick children, an information service about community child care services, parent education courses, after-school/vacation care for children aged 6 through 12 years, unpaid extended maternity leave, paid extended maternity leave, and paternity leave.

**Individual Factors**

**Attitudes toward women.** The 15-item short form of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was used to measure sex role attitudes. Originally developed as a 55-item scale, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale appears in two short forms, the one used for this study and a 25-item form. This scale is "one of the most extensively used"
(Nelson, 1988) measures of sex role attitudes. The validity and reliability of the longer versions of this scale have been adequately established (see for example, Ghafraradli-Doty & Carlson, 1979; Kilpatrick & Smith, 1974; Smith & Bradley, 1980), and it was recently reported that the 15-item scale retained high internal and test-retest reliability, and proved capable of discriminating between groups differing by age and sex (Daugherty & Dambrot, 1986). The shortened version was used primarily because of time considerations.

Some minor modifications were made to the scale. Because of anticipated language difficulties within at least two of the three sponsoring organizations, the simplified version of the items (Parry, 1983), adapted for American samples (Nelson, 1988), was used. Additionally, one item on the 15-item scale was replaced by another from the longer scale, that was considered to be more easily understood and possibly more germane to the issues of interest in this study. Item 14 on the 15-item scale, "Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men," was replaced by the item "A woman's place is in the home looking after her family, rather than following a career of her own." Finally, responses were scored on a 5-point scale rather than the usual 4-point scale, so as to maintain consistency with the Proportionality/ Egalitarianism scale.
presented in the same section of the questionnaire. Responses ranged from 1 (Disagree strongly) to 5 (Agree strongly).

**Global distributive orientation.** Rasinsky's (1987) measure of Proportionality/Egalitarianism was used to assess global orientations regarding resource distributions. Items for this scale were selected from numerous existing values scales and from prior research in the area, the sources of which can be found with the scale in Appendix A. Rasinsky (1987) found this scale to be useful in discriminating between individuals in terms of endorsement of political leaders and public policy, as well as in the relative emphasis placed upon procedural and distributive justice issues.

This measure originally included two six-item subscales, one of which was designed to tap the values of need and equality (Egalitarianism), and the other of which was designed to tap equity and economic individualism (Proportionality). Rasinsky (1987) found that one of the items on the Proportionality subscale, however, did not load significantly with the other items. This item was "Most poor people do not have the ability to get ahead." On the basis of the findings in this article, and a personal communication from Rasinsky (see Appendix E), this item was not included as part of the Proportionality measure. Thus, the six-item Egalitarianism measure, and the 5-item
Proportionality measure were used, with responses on a scale ranging from 1 (Disagree strongly) to 5 (Agree strongly).

**Contextual Factors**

Co-worker, supervisor, and management support. A 15-item scale was constructed to measure cooperation and support at three levels: work-unit, supervisor, and upper management. In the development of this scale, Lansberg's (1984) comments were attended to regarding the weakness of his one-item cooperation measure which referred to cooperation in the "work environment" rather than at a specific level, such as the work unit. Twelve of the items for this scale were derived from existing scales designed to measure co-worker and supervisory trust, work-unit and organizational supportiveness, and leader cooperation (Campbell & Beaty, 1971; Cook & Wall, 1980; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Scott, 1983; Tjosvold, Andrews & Jones, 1983). The constructed scales included questions relating to helpfulness, trust, and friendliness, which are characteristic of cooperative as opposed to competitive relationships (Deutsch, 1985; Tjosvold, 1984). The questions appeared to be comparable at each level. The remaining three items asked directly about the extent of cooperation at the level of the work group, first-line supervisor, and upper management. The final 15-item scale thus consisted of three 5-item subscales, designed to
measure cooperation and support at the work-unit level, at the supervisor level, and at the management level. Responses were on a scale ranging from 1 (Disagree strongly) to 5 (Agree strongly).

Hierarchical level. The human resource personnel in Organizations A and C were asked to define levels or classifications within the organizational hierarchy that would be meaningful to participants. In Organization A, three levels were identified: under collective agreement/direct guest contact employee (level 1), non-management, non-union (level 2), and private payroll (level 3). In Organization C, three levels were also identified: support staff (level 1), faculty (level 2), and administration (level 3). Because of the small size of Organization B, two levels were defined, with a third open-ended level offered. The defined levels were: non-management/direct guest contact employee (level 1), and management (level 3).

Cognitive Factors

Awareness of work-family conflict issues was measured by examining both personal experience and exposure to others. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they currently experienced, and recalled experiencing, problems balancing work and parental roles, and the extent to which they had ever considered quitting because of these problems. They were also asked to indicate the extent to
which they anticipated personally experiencing these problems within the next five years, and the extent to which friends, family, and co-workers appeared to be experiencing these problems. There were six items in total, with responses on a scale from 1 (Never) to 4 (Frequently). Finally, participants were asked to indicate how common they perceived the problem of work/family conflict to be. This last item was expected to serve as a composite of the preceding six items; belief that the problem was common was expected to be a function of the extent to which employees had personal experience with and/or exposure to others who themselves experienced work-family conflict problems. Responses for this item were on a scale ranging from 1 (Not at all common) to 4 (Very common). The total measure of awareness thus consisted of seven items.

**Instrumental Factors**

Perceived personal impact was measured by asking participants to indicate what kind of a personal impact they believed on-site child care would have upon their personal life, their enjoyment of work, their work performance, their future workplace opportunities (such as promotions), their opportunity for other employee benefits, the functioning of their work-unit, and the functioning of organization as a whole.

The personal instrumentality of family support might have been assessed in a number of ways. Information was
collected on participant's present and anticipated parental status, so that those who would have children in the appropriate age category for use of on-site child care could have been compared with those who would not. It was acknowledged, however, that other factors could influence use among parents, including a preference for other kinds of care, the presence of a non-employed spouse as primary caretaker, and so on. In the private sector sample, intention to use such a centre was assessed, but a comparable question could not be asked of employees in the public sector sample. This was because a centre was available at some locations and not others, and restrictions built into the programs may or may not have already precluded some employees from using the available centres. It was decided, therefore, that a subjective measure of impact upon one's personal life was the most appropriate instrumental measure.

While perceived personal gain or loss was of primary interest, the additional items on work-unit and company impact were included because it was thought that for some employees (particularly those at the managerial level) a positive or negative impact in these areas might be equally influential.

The measure of perceived personal impact contained seven items in total, with responses on a scale ranging from 1 (Extremely negative) to 5 (Extremely positive).
Procedural Justice

Based upon the literature, a set of items designed to tap different procedural justice rules as applied specifically to employee benefit selection, implementation and evaluation was administered to participants. This scale included ten items written to reflect each of Leventhal's (1980) six procedural justice rules: consistency, bias-suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. This scale will be referred to as the Procedural Justice Scale for Employee Benefits. Responses on this scale ranged from 1 (Disagree strongly) to 5 (Agree Strongly).

Respondents were also asked to indicate how fair they believed the procedures used in the selection and distribution of employee benefits within their own organization to be, and how fair they believed the actual benefits they now received to be. Responses were on a scale ranging from 1 (Extremely unfair) to 4 (Extremely fair).

Other Measures

A number of questions were also asked regarding participant's background, including length of time with the organization, age, sex, parental status, and children's ages. Other items dealt with perceived support for corporate-family support programs from various others in the organization and proportion of work group members who were mothers of young children.
Data Analyses

Preliminary Analyses

The Rules subscale of the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support was designed to tap six justice rules. Nevertheless, the possibility existed that some of the items on the scale would be poor measures of the construct, exhibiting low correlations with the other items designed to measure the construct, and thus would have to be eliminated in order to test subsequent hypotheses. Furthermore, it was possible that some of the rules themselves would be conceptually similar and not independent as was initially assumed. Thus, one of the first stages of data analysis involved an examination of the relationships among items on the Rules subscale. These analyses revealed important information on the structure of justice as applied to family support, much of which was not dealt with in the initial research hypotheses, and which had major implications for all subsequent hypotheses.

Intercorrelations among the items on the Rules subscale were examined, and principal components factor analysis was performed, with four, three, and two factor rotations. The two factor solution was selected, and items loading on these factors were retained as composite measures of the justice rules. Analyses of scale reliability and item-scale correlations were also conducted. The final two scales were labelled Contributions (Profit Maximization,
Equity, and Equality) and Social Justice (Need, Social Responsibility, and Equality of Opportunity). Detailed findings from these analyses are presented in the results section.

**Analyses Pertaining to Research Hypotheses**

The first two hypotheses were concerned with the nature of justice as applied to family support programs. Hypothesis 1 stated that employees would agree with justifications for and against family support that were based upon rules in addition to equity, such as profit maximization, equality, equality of opportunity, need and social responsibility. In order to test this hypothesis, means were calculated for the two subscales, Contributions and Social Justice, and for individual items on the Attitudes and Rules subscales of the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the perceived fairness of, and favourability toward, family support programs would be a function of the importance placed upon justice rules of profit maximization, equity, equality, equality of opportunity, need, and social responsibility. In order to test this hypothesis, a series of multiple regression analyses were performed. The criteria were scores on the 1-item measures of perceived fairness of and favourability toward family support programs, including on-site child care and each of the eight other programs listed, as well as the
summed scores of fairness and favourability across the eight programs. Summed scores on each of the two justice scales, Contributions and Social Justice, were entered as the predictors.

Hypotheses 3 through 6 were concerned with the relationship between background variables and scores on the justice rules. In order to test these hypotheses, a series of multiple regression analyses were performed, with summed scores on the Contributions and Social Justice scales as the criteria, and the sets of individual, contextual, cognitive, and instrumental variables entered separately as predictors. Additionally, the four sets were included together in regression in order to determine the total amount of variance accounted for. Finally, the significance of the change in R-square resulting from inclusion of each set to the other three was determined.

Hypothesis 3 referred to the impact of individual variables upon the use of justice rules. This hypothesis stated that employees who were female, who had non-sexist attitudes toward women, and who had adopted a global egalitarian orientation toward resource distributions within society as a whole, would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than would employees who were male, who had sexist attitudes toward women, and who had adopted a
global proportionality orientation. The predictors for regression therefore included four scores: gender, summed scores on the Attitudes Toward Women scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), summed scores on the Proportionality dimension of Rasinsky's (1987) scale and summed scores on the Egalitarian dimension of this same scale.

Hypothesis 4 referred to the impact of contextual variables upon the use of justice rules. This hypothesis stated that employees who held positions at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy, and those who perceived their work-unit climate to be cooperative and supportive, would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than would employees who held positions at the higher levels of the organizational hierarchy, and who perceived their work-unit climate to be unsupportive. As it was possible to obtain samples from both the private and public sectors, the nature of the organization was also included as a contextual variable. It would be expected that those from the public sector would be more oriented toward need and social responsibility, whereas those from the private sector would be more oriented toward profit maximization. The predictors for regression therefore included five scores: a classification score of the nature of the organization in which the respondent was employed
(private versus public sector), scores on the 1-item measure of hierarchical level, and summed scores on each of the three 5-item constructed measures of cooperation and support at the co-worker, supervisor, and management level.

Hypothesis 5 referred to the impact of cognitive variables upon the use of justice rules. This hypothesis stated that employees who had a high level of awareness of work-family conflict problems would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than would employees who had less awareness of work-family conflict problems. The cognitive set of predictors for regression contained individual scores on the constructed 7-item measure of awareness.

Hypothesis 6 was concerned with the impact of instrumental variables upon the use of justice rules. It stated that employees who anticipated a favourable personal outcome from family support programs would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than would employees who did not anticipate a favourable personal outcome. The instrumental set of predictors for regression contained individual scores on the constructed 7-item measure of perceived personal impact.
The last two hypotheses were concerned with the relationship between procedural justice and favourability toward family support. Hypothesis 7 stated that employees would utilize the procedural justice rules of consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality, in judging the overall fairness of procedures used in the selection, implementation, and evaluation of employee benefits. In order to test this hypothesis, a multiple regression analysis was conducted, with scores on the 1-item measure of perceived fairness of procedures as the criterion, and individual scores on the constructed 10-item Procedural Justice Scale for Employee Benefits entered as the predictors.

Finally, Hypothesis 8 stated that those employees who perceived that fair procedures had been used previously in the implementation of employee benefits would be more favourable toward corporate family support programs than would those who perceived that fair procedures had not been used. To test this hypothesis, a series of multiple regression analyses were conducted. The criteria were scores on the 1-item measures of favourability toward family support programs, including on-site child care and each of the eight other programs listed, as well as the summed score of favourability across the eight programs. Three sets of predictors were entered. The first set contained scores on
the 1-item measure of perceived fairness of procedures used in benefit selection, and scores on the 1-item measure of perceived fairness of benefits. The second set contained these same predictors as well as the summed score on the constructed 10-item Procedural Justice Scale for Employee Benefits. The third set contained individual scores on each of the 10 items of the Procedural Justice Scale for Employee Benefits.

Additional Analyses

Two additional analyses were conducted which focused upon congruence in justice notions, and moderators of procedural justice. These analyses were not integral to the research hypotheses, and therefore will not be discussed within the results section. They are, however, presented in Appendix D.
CHAPTER III

Results and Discussion

Sample Characteristics

Within Organization A, the larger private sector organization, a total of 182 questionnaires were distributed, and 69 were returned, resulting in a return rate of 38%. Within Organization B, a total of 33 questionnaires were distributed, and 6 were returned, for a return rate of 18%. Within Organization C, the public sector organization, a total of 648 questionnaires were distributed and 158 were returned, for a return rate of 24%. It will be recalled that the extent of personal contact and visibility of the researcher varied by organization, with the greatest contact maintained with employees of Organization A, and the least with employees of Organization B. This may account for the differences in return rates for the different organizations. Overall, return rates were quite low; however, because of the length of the questionnaire, this was not entirely unexpected.

The total sample consisted of 233 employees, with 75 from the two private sector organizations and 158 from the public sector organization. Table 1 presents demographic information for the total sample and for the two subgroups. For the total sample, more females (57%) than males (43%) participated in the study. This gender distribution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=75)</th>
<th>Public (n=158)</th>
<th>Total (N=233)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30 years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60 years</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60 years</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some technical training/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community college</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed technical training/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community college</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some university</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree/doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Status, Youngest Child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None, no plans for children</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 13 yrs old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 yrs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2 - 5 yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 mths - 2 1/2 yrs</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 8 mths</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None, planning children</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/living together</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hierarchical Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (con't)

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample: Private Sector Organizations, Public Sector Organization, and Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Private (n=75)</th>
<th>Public (n=158)</th>
<th>Total (n=233)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10 years</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15 years</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 20 years</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approximates the distribution in the population, although the specific distributions were not known. Twenty-four percent of respondents in the total sample were 30 years or under, 26% were between 30 and 40, 34% were between 40 and 50, and 17% were over age 50. Thirteen percent had completed part or all of high school, 26% had completed part or all of a technical/community college program, 41% had completed part or all of a bachelor's degree, and 20% had completed graduate school.

Respondents were categorized as parents or nonparents, with the former category broken down by age of the youngest child in the family, and the latter category broken down by plans to have children, or no plans to have children, within the next five years. The largest group was parents with children over the age of 13 years (37%). The next largest group was nonparents with no plans for children within the next five years (22%). Fourteen percent of respondents had at least one child under 6 years old.

Two-thirds of the total sample were married or living with their partners, 19% were single, and 15% were separated, divorced, or widowed. The majority of respondents held positions at the lower and middle levels of the organizational hierarchy, with only 15% at the highest levels. Forty-nine percent had been employed with their organization for under 7 years, 23% had been employed with their organization for between 7 and 15 years, and 28% had
been employed for over 15 years.

There were a number of clear demographic differences between the samples, most of which were consistent with the nature of the organizations themselves and the kinds of jobs available within them. Two-thirds of the respondents in the private sector sample were female, as compared to only slightly more than half of the respondents in the public sector sample. The private sector employees tended to be younger and less well educated than those in the public sector organization. Fifty-six percent of private sector respondents were 30 or younger, in contrast with only 8% in the public sector sample. Marital and parental status differences were consistent with these age differences: in the private sector sample, the largest percentage of respondents were single (43%) with no children and no plans for children (29%) or with no children but planning children within the next five years (29%). In the public sector sample, 77% were married or living with their partners, and the largest percentage (48%) had children over 13 years of age. Thirty-one percent of the private sector sample had no education beyond high school, and none of the respondents in this group had completed a post-graduate degree. In contrast, only 4% of the public sector sample had no education beyond high school, and 20% had completed master's or doctoral degrees. The largest group of respondents in the private sector sample held positions at the lowest level
of the organizational hierarchy (66%), whereas the largest group of respondents in the public sector sample were at the middle level (49%). Because the private sector organizations had only been in existence a short time, all but one respondent reported tenure of under seven years, whereas in the public sector sample 51% reported tenure of over seven years.

**Analysis of Rules Subscale of Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support**

Prior to investigating the research hypotheses, it was necessary to conduct a series of analyses on the Rules subscale of the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support. Because this was a newly constructed scale, it was important to examine relationships among the various items, in order to determine if each item was measuring the rule it was designed to measure, and if indeed six unique rules were being tapped.

First, intercorrelations among the 18 items on the Rules subscale were examined (Table B1: Appendix B). It was clear from this table that many of the rules defined conceptually as unique were in fact highly positively correlated with other rules, and in several cases were highly negatively correlated with other rules. Furthermore, a number of the items were uncorrelated with those items intended to tap a similar rule.

In order to get a better understanding of the
underlying dimensions being measured by the Rules subscale, principal components factor analysis was performed on the subscale. Four factors were retained in the initial analysis, using the retention criterion of factor eigenvalues greater than 1.0, and varimax rotation was performed. Three- and two-factor solutions were also examined.

With the four-factor solution, presented in Table C1 in Appendix C, the percentage of variance accounted for by the four factors was 53%. The variance explained by the fourth factor was considerably lower than that explained by the first three factors (Factor 1 = 17%; Factor 2 = 15%; Factor 3 = 14%; Factor 4 = 7%). Results of the four-factor solution were consistent with what would be expected on the basis of inter-item correlations. Many of the rules within the justice scale were conceptually similar, loading positively on the same factor. Several items showed high positive loadings on one factor and high negative loadings on another. Additionally, two of the items seemed to fall out separately from the others onto the fourth factor, apparently explaining a small portion of variance unaccounted for by the rest of the set.

With the three-factor solution, presented in Table C2 in Appendix C, 47% of the variance was explained by the three factors. The first two factors accounted for most of the variance in the scale (Factor 1 = 20%; Factor 2 = 17%;
Factor 3 = 10%). Factor 1 showed the highest positive loadings from Profit, Equity, and Equality items, whereas Factor 2 and 3 both showed loadings from Need and Social Responsibility items. Factor 2 also showed high loadings from the Equality of Opportunity items.

Results of the two-factor solution are presented in Table 2. With the two-factor solutions, the total variance explained was 39%. Factor 1 accounted for 22% of the variance, and Factor 2 accounted for 17%. The second factor remained similar to the first factor in the three-factor solution, with high positive loadings from Profit, Equity, and Equality. The Need and Social Responsibility items fell together on the second factor, along with the Equality of Opportunity items.

The two-factor solution appeared to provide the best fit. Factor 1 exhibited high positive loadings from eight items designed to measure the rules of Need, Social Responsibility, and Equality of Opportunity. Factor 2 exhibited high positive loadings from seven items designed to measure Profit, Equity, and Equality. Factor 1 was labelled "Social Justice," and Factor 2 was labelled "Contributions." These findings are highly consistent with those of Rasinsky (1987). In this study, responses to items designed to tap the four rules of Economic Individualism, Equity, Equality and Need with respect to the general distribution of resources in society were found to fall into
## Table 2

**Factor-Analysis of the 18-Item Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support: Two Factor Solution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profit Maximisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. This company should not offer family support programs if they think these programs might interfere with efficiency and reduce overall profits.</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. This company should offer family support programs only if these programs are sure to increase work efficiency and overall profits for the company.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Whether or not these programs are costly or bring profits should not strongly affect this company’s decision to offer these family support programs.</td>
<td>- .22</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parents who can’t meet their work responsibilities should receive penalties rather than rewards like family support programs.</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Money should be spent on employees according to how hard they work and how much they contribute to the company: whether or not they have children should not be a factor.</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. This company should offer programs like family support as a reward to employees who really work hard and who make an important contribution to the company.</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. This company’s decision to offer family support programs should not be strongly affected by what employee groups in other companies do or do not receive.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. All employees should be given exactly the same benefits: this company should not offer family support programs because it means that employees who choose not to have children lose out.</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. This company should not offer this kind of program because only certain parents, depending on their income, work hours, and children’s ages, could use it.</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. This company’s decision to offer family support programs should not be strongly affected by what employee groups in the company do or do not receive.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality of Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Because men have had more privileges and opportunities than have women at work in the past, the extra time and money spent on programs like these for women now is justified.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Companies should be doing whatever must be done to make the workplace more fair and equal for women, including offering these family support programs.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If the working parents in our company really need these programs, then our company should provide them.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. This company should not be responsible for helping working parents just because they claim to have special problems.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How much parents seem to need these programs should not be an important factor in this company’s decision to offer family support programs.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This company should provide family support programs because the next generation of children and society would benefit from them.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. This company should not be concerned with problems in the community or society, whether or not family support programs would help.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How much the community will benefit should not be an important factor in this company’s decision about family support programs.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance explained
Percentage of total variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.97</th>
<th>3.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|          | 22.01 | 16.89 |

Note: n = 215.

* These items were reverse scored.
two basic dimensions which he labelled as Proportionality and Egalitarianism. Scores on these two scales were related to fairness judgments of public policies and political leaders. In his discussion of the findings, Rasinsky (1987) stated that:

The results of these studies have implications for the way psychologists and political philosophers should think about the psychology of fairness judgments. The evidence suggests that a variety of different value principles determining fairness judgments are psychologically organized under two generic values, proportionality and egalitarianism. This lends support to the theorists who have stressed the importance of these two values as the bases of justice, and it argues against a relativistic notion in which a multitude of goals and values determines what is judged to be fair. (p. 210)

Thus, items designed to measure six justice rules appeared to be tapping two basic underlying dimensions, similar in nature to previously defined dimensions of Proportionality and Egalitarianism. These dimensions were labelled Contributions and Social Justice.

The next step was to reduce the Justice scales into two separate scales corresponding to Contributions and Social Justice. Factor loadings and communality estimates for each item of the Rules subscale of the Justice Scale for Family support were examined, and those items with positive loadings greater than 0.40 on their respective factors, and with communality estimates of 0.30 or greater, were tentatively selected for inclusion in the reduced scales. This resulted in two six-item scales. The Contributions scale contained two items for each of the rules of Profit,

Reliability and item-scale correlations were then examined for each of the scales. These results are reported in Table 3. Alpha coefficients for both scales achieved acceptable levels, with 0.80 for the Social Justice scale and 0.71 for the Contributions scale. All of the items accounted for reasonable proportions of variance in the scales, with the weakest item being #30 on the Contributions scale (item-scale correlation: 0.25). Clearly, the Social Justice scale was the more internally consistent of the two scales. Several variations for the Contributions scale were examined, including deleting Item #30 or replacing it with other Proportionality items. Because the alpha was only moderately affected by these variations, however, it was concluded that the original six items chosen should remain together as the measure of Contributions.
### Table 3

Factor Loadings, Item-Scale Correlations, and Alpha Reliabilities for Justice Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading*</th>
<th>ISC</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale 1: Contributions (Factor 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Maximization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. This company should not offer family support programs if they think these programs might interfere with efficiency and reduce overall profits.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. This company should offer family support programs only if these programs are sure to increase work efficiency and overall profits for the company.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parents who can't meet their work responsibilities should receive penalties rather than rewards like family support programs.</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. This company should offer programs like family support as a reward to employees who really work hard and who make an important contribution to the company.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. All employees should be given exactly the same benefits: this company should not offer family support programs because it means that employees who choose not to have children lose out.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. This company should not offer this kind of program because only certain parents, depending upon their income, work hours, and children's ages, could use it.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale 2: Social Justice (Factor 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality of Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Because men have had more privileges and opportunities than women at work in the past, the extra time and money spent on programs like these for women now is justified.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The company should be doing whatever must be done to make the workplace more fair and equal for women, including offering these family support programs.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If the working parents in our company really need these programs, then our company should provide them.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. This company should not be responsible for helping working parents just because they claim to have special problems.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This company should provide family support programs because the next generation of children and society would benefit from them.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. This company should not be concerned with problems in the community or society, whether or not family support programs would help.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ISC = Item-scale correlation, For Contributions, r = .226; For Social Justice, r = .222.  
* These items were reverse scored.  
* Factor loadings are based on the two-factor solution for the 18-item scale, as presented in Table 2.
The Nature of Justice as Applied to Family Support Programs

The first two hypotheses concerned the nature of justice as applied to family support programs. Employees were expected to endorse justifications for and against family support programs which were based upon a variety of justice rules. These rules were expected to include equity, which has traditionally been assumed to be the preferred justice rule for resource distributions within work organizations, as well as other rules including need, social responsibility, equality, equality of opportunity, and profit maximization. The perceived fairness of, and favourability toward, family support programs was expected to be a function of the importance placed upon these kinds of justice rules.

Endorsement of Justice Rules

Hypothesis 1 stated that employees would agree with justifications for and against family support which were based upon rules in addition to equity, such as profit maximization, equality, equality of opportunity, need, and social responsibility. In order to test this hypothesis, means were calculated for the Contributions and Social Justice scales discussed above, and for each of the 30 items on the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support. Results are presented in Table C3 in Appendix C.

The preliminary analyses conducted on the Rules
subsidiary of the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support, discussed above, revealed that justice notions with respect to family support programs tended to be clustered along two dimensions. Contributions, the more traditional dimension, was represented by the rules of equity, profit maximization, and equality. Social Justice, the more contemporary, humanistic dimension, was represented by the rules of need, social responsibility, and equality of opportunity. Thus, while employees considered a variety of justice rules to be relevant to family support programs, as hypothesized, they did not distinguish between these rules to the extent that might have been expected. They did, however, appear to distinguish between these two dimensions. The mean score for the total Contributions scale was only 14.8 (with a possible range of 6 to 30), whereas the mean for Social Justice was 22.7. This suggests that, in general, respondents considered humanitarian factors, such as employed parents' needs and societal impact, to be more important to decisions regarding family support than other factors, such as profits and the impact upon nonparent employees.

The pattern became particularly clear upon examination of means for the individual items on the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support. Regardless of whether equity was presented as a justification for family support, as in Item 30 (M = 2.65), or a justification against, as in
Item 24 (M = 2.86), respondents tended to weight equity as relatively unimportant in decisions regarding family support. In general, respondents indicated that what other employees in the company did or did not receive was unimportant in decisions regarding family support (Item 31: M = 2.55), and they disagreed that all employees should receive the same benefits and that family support meant that nonparent employees would lose out (Item 18: M = 2.39). Similarly, the impact of these programs, whether positive or negative, upon the profitability of the organization was considered relatively unimportant (Item 27: M = 2.82).

On the other hand, respondents agreed that if the employed parents in the company really needed the programs, then the company should provide them (Item 16: M = 3.87), and they felt that need was an important factor in decisions regarding family support (Item 23: M = 3.59). They also endorsed justifications based upon social responsibility, agreeing that family support programs should be provided because the next generation of children and society would benefit from them (Item 19: M = 3.81). While they were not convinced that the way work hours, rules, and benefits are set up today discriminates against women and parent-employees (Item 2: M = 2.93), they did consider equality of opportunity to be an important factor in decisions regarding family support (Item 29: M = 3.95).

Respondents tended to agree that the programs would be
cost effective (Item 8: $M = 4.00$), although as discussed above, profits were not generally considered to be an important criterion. They were strongly in favour of different kinds of employee programs for different groups (Item 5: $M = 4.41$), and tended to perceive employed mothers as under a great deal of stress (Item 4: $M = 3.98$). They agreed that we are behind in services for families with employed mothers in Canada (Item 7: $M = 3.89$).

It was expected that there would be differences between the private sector and public sector samples in terms of the emphasis placed upon particular justice rules. As predictions concerning sample effects were integrated within the hypothesis on the relationship between contextual factors and justice rules, these effects will be discussed below.

The supportive attitudes exhibited on the Justice Scale for Family Support were further illustrated in responses to questions dealing with overall favourability toward, and perceived fairness of, a variety of family support programs. Means and standard deviations for favourability and fairness are presented in Table C4 in Appendix C.

Overall favourability was considerably higher than might be expected on the basis of previous literature (e.g., Fernandez, 1986). In general, respondents were in favour of all of the family support programs listed, with the highest level of favourability expressed toward a flexible-spending
account with part of child care fees as an option ($M = 3.43$), and the lowest level of favourability expressed toward extra days off to care for sick children ($M = 2.98$). Similarly, the flexible-spending account received the highest fairness rating ($M = 3.41$), and leave for sick children received the lowest fairness rating ($M = 2.96$). One other noteworthy finding was that six-month maternity leave with benefits only paid by the government for four months received lower favourability and fairness ratings by respondents than did six-month maternity leave with benefits paid for six months (Favourability: $M = 3.01$ versus $M = 3.13$; Fairness: $M = 3.08$ versus $M = 3.22$).

It is interesting that the program that has been recommended as a solution to the equity issue (e.g., Fernandez, 1986)—the flexible-spending account—received the highest favourability and fairness ratings and that the program that might be considered most closely tied to need—sick leave for children—received the lowest favourability and fairness ratings. On the basis of responses to the Justice Scale discussed above, one would expect need-based programs to be at least as acceptable as, if not more acceptable than, equity-based programs. These findings draw attention to the issue of social desirability in responding. Employees may be reluctant to endorse items that illustrate a lack of empathy for fellow employees and their children; however when they are required to express their support for
specific programs, they may become somewhat more attuned to their own internal standards and expectations. These internal standards and expectations may be more consistent with the assumptions of equity theory. Nevertheless, as discussed, overall levels of favourability were extremely high regardless of the nature of the specific program.

Respondents were informed that this research was being conducted primarily for academic purposes, but that the results would also be provided to the sponsoring organizations. In the introduction to the study, it was suggested that the findings could be useful to those who make decisions regarding employee-benefits within the organization. This suggestion may have resulted in more accurate reporting of attitudes toward family support on the favourability scale than on the Justice Scale. It is possible that greater discrepancies would have appeared if the research had been initiated from within the organizations themselves, and if the suggestion with respect to use of the findings had been stronger.

In conclusion, Hypothesis 1 was supported by the data. Employees were found to consider a variety of justice rules as relevant to decisions regarding family support. Traditional equity issues received a lower level of endorsement than did other issues, such as need, equality of opportunity, and social responsibility. In general, respondents leaned toward justifications for family support
rather than arguments against family support. They were
generally in favour of all forms of family support; however
they were more in favour of certain kinds of programs than
others.

**Relationship Between Justice Rules and Favourability Toward, and Perceived Fairness of, Family Support Programs**

Hypothesis 2 stated that the perceived fairness of, and
favourability toward, family support programs, would be a
function of the importance placed upon justice rules of
profit maximization, equity, equality, equality of
opportunity, need, and social responsibility. Two sets of
analyses were conducted in order to explore this hypothesis.
First, multiple regression analyses were conducted, with
scores on perceived fairness of on-site child care and
favourability toward on-site child care as criteria, and
scores on the justice rules as predictors. The same
analysis was then conducted for fairness and favourability
toward the eight other family support programs, and for the
sum of fairness and favourability scores across the eight
programs. Results of these analyses are presented in Table
4.

For these regressions and all others to follow, sums of
squares calculated using the simultaneous or standard
strategy are reported. This strategy was chosen over
hierarchical regression because several of the predictor
variables were intercorrelated, and it was of greatest
Table 4

Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship Between Favourability Toward and Perceived Fairness of Family Support Programs and Importance of Distributive Justice Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site day care</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.411*</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible benefits</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick child leave</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource &amp; referral</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school care</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid matern.leave</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid matern.leave</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 8 programs</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairness

| On-site day care            | -.027       | -1.99                | .049    | 3.50*| .15 | 18.75*| 2,213 |
| Flexible benefits           | -.013       | -.96                 | .014    | 1.01 | .02 | 2.27  | 2,211 |
| Sick child leave            | -.006       | -.33                 | .057    | 3.25*| .08 | 8.87* | 2,212 |
| Resource & referral         | -.033       | -2.81*               | .023    | 1.90 | .11 | 13.19*| 2,211 |
| Parent education            | -.031       | -2.54                | .028    | 2.28 | .11 | 13.77*| 2,213 |
| After-school care           | -.016       | -1.15                | .080    | 5.67*| .23 | 31.07*| 2,211 |
| Unpaid matern.leave         | -.038       | -2.42                | .056    | 3.59*| .17 | 21.58*| 2,212 |
| Paid matern.leave           | -.009       | -.55                 | .090    | 5.73*| .21 | 28.29*| 2,212 |
| Paternity leave             | -.041       | -2.90*               | .043    | 2.99*| .16 | 20.68*| 2,214 |
| Total 8 programs            | -.183       | -2.57                | .405    | 5.56*| .29 | 41.37*| 2,206 |

* p < .01
interest to calculate the proportion of variance which each predictor accounted for independently of the other predictors. One of the limitations of this approach, as noted by Tabachnick and Fidell (1983), is that an independent variable that shares variance with another independent variable in the analysis might be nonsignificant, even though together they are largely responsible for the size of $R^2$-square. Tabachnick and Fidell (1983) recommend examination of individual correlations between each independent variable and the dependent variable when using this method. All correlation tables relevant to the regression analyses are presented in Appendix B. Due to the size of the sample, the significance level for the regressions was set at .01.

Favourability toward, and perceived fairness of, on-site child care were the criteria chosen for the first set of analyses. The distributive justice rules significantly predicted favourability toward on-site child care, with 51% of the variance accounted for in the model. Employees who had low scores on Contributions and high scores on Social Justice, expressed greatest favourability toward on-site child care. The largest proportion of variance was accounted for by Social Justice.

Interestingly, the rules were much less effective in predicting perceived fairness of on-site child care, with only 15% of the variance accounted for in the model. For
fairness, only scores on the Social Justice scale achieved significance. Results of these analyses are generally consistent with correlations obtained between the rules and favourability toward and perceived fairness of on-site child care (Table B2: Appendix B). Contributions exhibited a significant negative correlation with both favourability and fairness, and Social Justice exhibited an even higher positive correlation with both favourability and fairness.

In examination of the actual questionnaires, it appeared that in some cases respondents may have misread the item on fairness. In several instances they would record a low fairness but high favourability rating, and this might be attributed to the way the rating was listed (from unfair to fair). The correlation between perceived fairness of and favourability toward on-site child care was lower than it was between fairness and favourability toward other family support programs. If notions of fairness were indeed unrelated to favourability, the same relationship would be expected when other types of family support programs were rated. Examination of intercrorrelations, however, reveal that for all other types of family support programs, ratings of favourability and fairness are highly correlated (for example, On-site Child Care: \( r = 0.52 \); Leave for Sick Children: \( r = 0.85 \); After-School Care: \( r = 0.82 \); Total for eight family support programs: \( r = 0.84 \)). Error in ratings for the other family support programs would be less likely,
because of the way the question was asked.

An alternative explanation could be that after responding to the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support, the variety of justice arguments for and against on-site child care were highly salient, and therefore respondents were more divided in their judgments of fairness. While they might have become attuned to the ways in which such programs might be considered unfair (e.g., because certain employee groups would not be able to use the programs), they may have remained convinced that the programs should nevertheless be implemented.

Respondents were also asked to rate eight other family support programs on favourability and perceived fairness. While the Justice Scale for Family support referred specifically to on-site child care, it was expected that some generalization might occur across types of programs.

For both favourability and fairness, seven of the eight programs were significantly predicted by scores on the rules, with the only exception being the flexible spending account. For simplicity, only those models for which 20% or more of the variance was accounted for will be discussed.

For favourability, variance of 20% or greater was explained by the rules for three of the eight programs (After-School Care, Paid Extended Maternity Leave, and Paternity Leave), as well as for a summed score of favourability across the eight programs. For fairness,
variance of 20% or greater was explained by the rules for two of the programs (After-School Care and Paid Extended Maternity Leave), as well as for a summed score of fairness across the eight programs.

For favourability toward After-School Care, Paid Extended Maternity Leave, and Paternity Leave, model R-squares were 0.22, 0.20, and 0.20 respectively, with only Social Justice achieving significance in standard regression. The greatest amount of variance was accounted for using the criterion of the total sum of favourability across the eight programs, with a model R-square of 0.29. For total favourability, again only Social Justice achieved significance.

For perceived fairness of After-School Care and Paid Extended Maternity Leave, model R-squares were 0.23 and 0.21 respectively, and again only Social Justice achieved significance in standard regression. For the total sum of fairness across the eight programs, the model R-square was 0.29, with only Social Justice achieving significance.

The correlation table of favourability with the two rules (Table B2: Appendix B) reveals that both rules significantly correlate with the three programs and with total favourability, in the expected direction (i.e., negatively with Contributions, positively with Social Justice). Correlations with Social Justice, however, are considerably higher than those for Contributions. The
correlation table of fairness with the two rules illustrates a similar relationship, with significant correlations for both rules but considerably higher correlations for Social Justice.

Because respondents were asked to consider the rule statements with respect to a particular family support program--on-site child care--it is not surprising that more of the variance in favourability with respect to this kind of program was accounted for by the rules than it was with respect to other kinds of programs. Nevertheless, there was evidence of some generalization across programs.

In conclusion, Hypothesis 2 was supported by the data. Scores on both rules significantly predicted favourability toward, and scores on Social Justice significantly predicted perceived fairness of, on-site child care. Considerably more of the variance in the model was accounted for when favourability was entered as the criterion than when fairness was entered as the criterion. Social Justice was the better of the two predictors for on-site child care. Scores on Social Justice were also significantly related to favourability, and perceived fairness of, other kinds of family support programs. These findings suggest that while traditional concerns about profit, equity, and the creation of inequality may have some effect upon the acceptance of family support programs, favourability is more strongly related to individuals' endorsement of egalitarian and
humanistic values.

It will be recalled that the Contributions scale was less internally consistent than the Social Justice scale, which could account, in part, for its reduced strength. Additionally, as discussed previously, the largest proportion of respondents was employed within a public sector organization, so their orientations may differ somewhat from the general work population. Clearly, some employees were more concerned with Contributions than were others. In the next section, individual, contextual, cognitive and instrumental sources of variance in the importance placed upon Contributions and Social Justice will be discussed.

Sources of Variance in Importance

Placed on Justice Rules

Four hypotheses were advanced regarding the relationship between background variables and the importance placed upon different justice rules as applied to corporate family support. These hypotheses were tested through a series of multiple regression analyses. Separate regression analyses were performed for each of the four sets of background variables, which included individual, contextual, cognitive, and instrumental variables, and for each of the two justice rules. Additionally, regressions were performed with the four sets of variables included together, and the significance of the change in R-square resulting from the
inclusion of each set to the remaining three was tested. These analyses are discussed below.

**Individual Sources of Variance**

Hypothesis 3 stated that employees who were female, who had non-sexist attitudes toward women, and who had adopted a global egalitarian orientation toward resource distributions within society as a whole, would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than would employees who were male, who had sexist attitudes toward women, and who had adopted a global proportionality orientation. This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis, with Contributions and Social Justice entered as the criteria, and gender, total scores on the Attitudes Toward Women scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), and total scores on the Proportionality and Egalitarianism scales (Rasinsky, 1987) entered as the predictors. Results of these analyses appear in Table 5.

Individual variables significantly predicted scores on both of the justice scales. For Contributions, the model R-square was 0.26. Two of the four individual variables significantly predicted Contributions, including low scores on the Attitudes Toward Women scale and high scores on Proportionality (Note: the lower the score on the Attitudes Toward Women scale, the more sexist the attitude). The
Table 5

Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship Between the Importance Placed upon Justice Scales and Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion: Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward women</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-2.82*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionality</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>5.10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion: Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.525</td>
<td>-2.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward women</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>3.07*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionality</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>5.49*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p < .01\)
individual variables were even more successful in predicting Social Justice, with a model $R^2$-square of 0.31 obtained. For Social Justice, three of the four individual variables achieved significance. Females and respondents with high scores on the Attitudes Toward Women scale and high scores on the Egalitarianism scale were those most likely to score high on the Social Justice scale. For both Contributions and Social Justice, the corresponding global distributive justice orientation was the most significant predictor in the model.

These results are generally consistent with correlations between the individual variables and the rules (Table B4: Appendix B). Sex was the only individual variable that failed to exhibit a significant correlation with one of the rules (Contributions).

In conclusion, Hypothesis 3 was, with only one exception, supported by the data. The results indicated that the basic orientations that individuals hold regarding appropriate resource distributions within society are carried into the workplace. These findings suggest that rather than simply formulating expectations based upon context, some generalization may occur across contexts. Furthermore, other kinds of values and beliefs, in particular sexist attitudes regarding appropriate roles for women, are associated with justice rules applied to family support policies in the workplace. Interestingly, Attitudes
Toward Women exhibited similar significant correlations with the global distributive orientations of Proportionality ($r = -0.35$) and Egalitarianism ($r = 0.23$). Finally, gender appeared to influence the importance placed on one of the rules—Social Justice—but not the importance placed upon Contributions.

Nevertheless, significant portions of variance were left unexplained by the individual variables. In the following section, the effects of other background variables are examined.

**Contextual Sources of Variance**

Hypothesis 4 stated that employees who held positions at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy, and those who perceived their work-unit climate to be cooperative and supportive, would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than would employees who held positions at the higher levels of the organizational hierarchy, and who perceived their work-unit climate to be unsupportive. Since samples were obtained from both private and public sector organizations, it was also possible to include the nature of the organization as a contextual variable. It would be expected that those from the public sector would be more oriented toward need and social responsibility, whereas those from the private sector would
be more oriented toward profit maximization.

Hypothesis 4 was tested using multiple regression analysis, with Contributions and Social Justice as the criteria, and with Sample, Hierarchical Level, and total scores on each of the three 5-item constructed measures of support at the co-worker, supervisor, and management level entered as the predictors. Results of these analyses appear in Table 6.

Contextual variables accounted for significant portions of variance with respect to only one of the criteria---Contributions. Clearly, however, contextual variables were less effective than were individual variables in predicting scores on both of the justice scales. Only one of the five contextual variables exerted a significant effect upon Contributions. As was expected, Sample had a significant effect, with employees in the private sector sample indicating greater concern with Contributions than employees in the public sector sample.

One caution regarding the Sample effect should be noted. As discussed earlier, a number of demographic differences were found between the samples. For example, respondents in the private sector sample were generally less well educated than were employees in the public sector sample, and education was found to exhibit a significant negative correlation with Contributions ($r = -0.30$). Additionally, employees within the private sector sample had
Table 6

Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship Between the Importance Placed upon Justice Scales and Contextual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-.3066</td>
<td>-4.81*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>7.48*</td>
<td>5,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical level</td>
<td>-.584</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management support</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion: Social Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical level</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management support</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t < .01
less experience with family support programs, at least within their own organization, than had employees within the public sector sample. Furthermore, there were no doubt other unmeasured differences between the samples which could have had an effect upon the importance of justice rules. Thus, while the sample effect is interpreted here as being due to the private/public sector component, the data do not allow for a conclusive statement in this regard.

The results of regression are generally consistent with the results of correlational analysis (Table B4: Appendix B). The only correlation above 0.25 between the contextual variables and the rules was obtained with Sample and Contributions ($r = -0.34$).

In conclusion, Hypothesis 4 was only partially supported by the data. Contextual variables accounted for small portions of the variance only for Contributions. The expected effect of Sample upon Contributions was observed; however other expected effects were not found. In particular, neither hierarchical level nor work-unit supportiveness exhibited significant effects on either of the scales.

The absence of an effect for hierarchical level is surprising in view of past research. There are, however, a number of possible explanations for the lack of findings. The managerial employees who volunteered to complete the questionnaire may have been a unique group who held
unusually egalitarian values. Additionally, most of these managers were employed within the public sector organization, and their roles in this kind of an organization may be equally tied up with private and social responsibility, unlike managers in private sector organizations.

The absence of an effect for work-unit support may be partially due to measurement problems. It should be noted that work-unit support did exhibit a significant correlation with Social Justice (r = 0.23), and in regression with Social Justice this variable achieved significance at the .05 level. Therefore, while the strength of this variable was limited, it did exhibit a trend in the expected direction. As a further test, work groups might have been distinguished in terms of the number of co-workers currently experiencing work-family conflict problems. Perceived support and cooperation at the work-unit level may have little effect upon an employee's endorsement of need-based Justifications for family support if his or her closest co-workers are primarily male and/or nonparent employees.

**Cognitive Sources of Variance**

Hypothesis 5 stated that employees who had a high level of awareness of work-family conflict problems would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit
maximization, than would employees who had less awareness of work-family conflict problems. It will be recalled that awareness was measured with seven items tapping personal experience of work-family conflict, exposure to a variety of individuals including friends, family-members, and co-workers who experience work-family conflict problems, and the perception that the problem of work-family conflict was very common. Hypothesis 5 was tested using multiple regression analysis, with Contributions and Social Justice as the criteria, and with scores on the 7-item measure of awareness as predictors. Results of these analyses appear in Table 7.

Small but significant portions of variance were explained by cognitive variables for both scales. Cognitive variables produced a model R-square of 0.12 for Contributions, and a model R-square of 0.13 for Social Justice. For both rules, the only item that achieved significance was the one that asked about how common the respondent thought the problem of balancing worker and parental roles was. Respondents who did not believe work-family conflict problems to be common were more likely to emphasize Contributions. On the other hand, the more common this problem was believed to be, the more likely respondents were to emphasize Social Justice.

The correlations between cognitive variables and the rules (Table B4: Appendix B) are consistent with these
Table 7

Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship Between the Importance Placed upon Justice Scales and Cognitive Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>- .731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered quitting</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict--friends,family</td>
<td>-1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict--co-workers</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>-1.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion: Contributions

| Own wk/fmly conflict | -.111 | -.19 |
| Considered quitting  | .471  | .86  |
| Past wk/fmly conflict| .197  | .40  |
| Future wk/fmly conflict|-.006 | -.02 |
| Conflict--friends,family| .370 | .75  |
| Conflict--co-workers | .378  | -.72  |
| Common wk/fmly conflict | 2.154| 4.41*|

Criterion: Social Justice

* \(P < .01\)
results. The common variable was the only one of the set to exhibit a correlation above 0.25, with the rules ($r = -0.27$ for Contributions; $r = 0.37$ for Social Justice).

The "common" item was expected to serve as a composite of the preceding six items: belief that the problem was common was expected to be a function of the extent to which employees had personal experience with, and/or exposure to friends, family members and co-workers who themselves experienced work/family conflict problems. Perceived commonness was significantly correlated with all of the other awareness items, with the only exception being the expectation of personal work/family conflict problems in the future. It is therefore not surprising that responses to this item explained the largest proportion of variance in both models.

In conclusion, Hypothesis 5 was supported by the data. Awareness of work-family conflict problems was associated with higher scores on Social Justice and lower scores on Contributions. The best predictor in both cases was the extent to which employees believed the problem to be common, which was itself related to personal experience of work-family conflict, and perceived experiences of friends, family members, and co-workers.

**Instrumental Sources of Variance**

Hypothesis 6 stated that employees who anticipated a favourable personal outcome from family support programs
would place more importance upon issues of need and social responsibility in decisions regarding family support programs, and less importance upon equity and profit maximization, than would employees who did not anticipate a favourable personal outcome. Anticipated impact was measured with a 7-item scale, which tapped anticipated impact upon one's personal life, enjoyment of work, work performance, future workplace opportunities, the chance to get other desired employee benefits, and the functioning of one's work group and of the company. Hypothesis 6 was tested using multiple regression analysis, with Contributions and Social Justice as the criteria, and with scores on the 7-item measure of personal impact as predictors. Results are presented in Table 8.

Instrumental factors accounted for significant portions of variance in both cases. The model R-square for the set of instrumental predictors was 0.20 for Contributions, and 0.31 for Social Justice. Two items significantly predicted scores on Contributions: employees who anticipated a negative impact of family support on their own personal life, and who anticipated a negative impact upon the functioning of the company, were more likely to consider profit, equity, and equality as important factors in decisions regarding family support. Only one item was a significant predictor in the model for Social Justice: an anticipated positive impact upon the functioning of the
Table 8

Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship Between the Importance Placed upon Justice Scales and Instrumental Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact, personal life</td>
<td>-1.831</td>
<td>-2.61*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work enjoyment</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>7.50*</td>
<td>7.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work performance</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, future opportun.</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, other benefits</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work group</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, company</td>
<td>-2.841</td>
<td>-6.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion: Social Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact, personal life</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>13.20*</td>
<td>7.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work enjoyment</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work performance</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, future opportun.</td>
<td>-1.147</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, other benefits</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work group</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, company</td>
<td>2.673</td>
<td>5.92*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .01
company.

As before, results of standard rather than hierarchical regression are presented in the tables. It is important to note, however, that other predictors achieved significance in the hierarchical regression consistent with the literature, and that probably because of the high correlations between the seven items on this scale, their effects were washed out with the standard strategy. For example, an anticipated positive effect upon one's personal life was a highly significant predictor of scores on Social Justice in the hierarchical regression ($SS = 516.36; p < .0001$). Had this been the only measure of impact, it would certainly have achieved significance for Social Justice.

As illustrated in the correlation table in Appendix B, a negative impact upon the functioning of the company was the only variable in the set that exhibited a significant correlation with Contributions, although impact on personal life also showed a negative correlation at the .05 level. All seven instrumental items exhibited significant, positive correlations with Social Justice.

In conclusion, the hypothesis that instrumental variables would be related to the importance placed upon justice rules was supported. Justice rules that are not commonly considered appropriate to organizational resource allocations, such as need and social responsibility, were given more weight by those individuals who expected to gain
from the allocation, and more traditional rules of equity and profit maximization were weighted more heavily by those who expected to lose. Direct personal impact, however, was not as strong a predictor as was anticipated impact upon the work organization. Those who believed that the functioning of the company would improve were more likely to endorse Social Justice, whereas those who expected it to deteriorate were more likely to emphasize Contributions.

Ultimately, the functioning of the work organization would very likely have a personal impact. These data were collected at a time when the economy was sliding into a recession, and employees within the larger private sector organization were experiencing widespread layoffs. If the personal impact hypothesis is correct, this might explain, in part, why the anticipated impact upon the functioning of the company was so strongly related to the importance placed upon justice rules.

As with any correlational study, however, the direction of causality cannot be determined. With some sets of predictors entered here, the direction seems more obvious than others. It is particularly difficult with this final set. An anticipated negative impact upon the company, for example, may simply be an associated attitude toward family support. Thus, rather than influencing the choice of rules, it may be simply part of the constellation of values and beliefs which include a focus on equity and profit.
maximization, and unfavourability toward family support, all of which are influenced by other kinds of factors.

**Total Model**

As a final test of the strength of the four sets of predictors, all four sets were entered into regression. Additionally, the $R^2$ was calculated for the model prior to the inclusion of each individual set. This procedure allowed for the determination of significance of the increase in $R^2$ resulting from the addition of each set to the remaining three. Tables 9 and 10 present results of these analyses.

For Contributions, the total model after all four sets were entered achieved an $R^2$ of 0.50. Four of the predictors achieved significance in the total model, including one individual variable (Proportionality), one contextual variable (Sample), one cognitive variable (Co-worker experience), and one instrumental variable (Impact on the company).

Testing the unique contribution of each set of predictors to the remaining three sets in the model revealed that individual, contextual, and instrumental variables produced a significant change in the $R^2$ for Contributions. Individual variables contributed the greatest proportion of variance to Contributions independent of the other sets, with an increase in $R^2$ of 0.12. Instrumental and contextual variables resulted in increases
Table 9

Multiple Regression Analysis: Total Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$B'$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Contributions</strong></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7.04*</td>
<td>23,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward women</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionality</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>4.46*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>2.627</td>
<td>3.86*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical level</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management support</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>-.586</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered quitting</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict--friends,family</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict--co-workers</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>3.08*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, personal life</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work enjoyment</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work performance</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, future opportun.</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, other benefits</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work group</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, company</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>3.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Criterion: Social Justice**     | .54   | 7.93* | 23,155|
| Gender                            | 1.204 | 1.95  |       |       |       |       |
| Attitudes toward women            | .063  | 1.50  |       |       |       |       |
| Proportionality                   | .154  | 2.29  |       |       |       |       |
| Egalitarianism                    | 2.211 | 2.89* |       |       |       |       |
| Sample                            | .190  | .29   |       |       |       |       |
| Hierarchical level                | -.139 | .35   |       |       |       |       |
| Co-worker support                 | .131  | 1.41  |       |       |       |       |
| Supervisor support                | .024  | .35   |       |       |       |       |
| Management support                | .055  | .67   |       |       |       |       |
| Present wk/fmly conflict          | .310  | .63   |       |       |       |       |
| Considered quitting               | -.038 | .08   |       |       |       |       |
| Past wk/fmly conflict             | .200  | .47   |       |       |       |       |
| Future wk/fmly conflict           | .327  | .97   |       |       |       |       |
| Conflict--friends,family          | .094  | .23   |       |       |       |       |
| Conflict--co-workers              | -.272 | .62   |       |       |       |       |
| Common wk/fmly conflict           | .874  | 1.92  |       |       |       |       |
| Impact, personal life             | 1.554 | 2.30  |       |       |       |       |
| Impact, work enjoyment            | -.788 | 1.01  |       |       |       |       |
| Impact, work performance          | .914  | 1.11  |       |       |       |       |
| Impact, future opportun.          | -.810 | 1.52  |       |       |       |       |
| Impact, other benefits            | .223  | .50   |       |       |       |       |
| Impact, work group                | -.272 | .52   |       |       |       |       |
| Impact, company                   | 2.166 | 4.71* |       |       |       |       |

* $p < .01$
Table 10

$R^2$ for Partial Model with Three Sets of Predictors, and $R^2$ Change upon Addition of Fourth Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{adj}}$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>9.58*</td>
<td>4, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.19*</td>
<td>5, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>7, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>7, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Social Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>5.89*</td>
<td>4, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>7, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>9.14*</td>
<td>7, 155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. For Contributions, $n = 184$; For Social Justice, $n = 179$.
* Partial $R^2$ for the combined three sets of predictors, with the indicated set removed. $^* R^2$ with respect to the total model $R^2$ of .50 for Contributions, and .54 for Social Justice.  
* $p < .01$
in $R^2$-square of 0.09 and 0.05, respectively.

For Social Justice, the total model after all four sets were entered achieved an $R^2$-square of 0.54. Only two variables achieved significance in the total model, including one individual variable (Egalitarianism), and one instrumental variable (Impact on the company). Testing the unique contribution of each set of predictors to the remaining three sets in the model revealed that individual and instrumental variables each produced a significant change in the $R^2$-square for Social Justice. Instrumental variables contributed the greatest proportion of variance to Social Justice independent of the other sets, with an increase in $R^2$-square of 0.19. Individual variables resulted in increases in $R^2$-square of 0.07.

In summary, individual variables contributed the greatest unique proportion of variance to Contributions, with scores on the global distributive orientation of Proportionality achieving significance in the total model. Instrumental variables contributed the greatest unique proportion of variance to Social Justice, with an anticipated positive impact upon the functioning of the company achieving significance in the total model. The next greatest contributors were instrumental variables for Contributions and individual variables for Social Justice. For Contributions, these results are consistent with the findings reported earlier, of a model $R^2$-square for
individual and instrumental variables of 0.27 and 0.20 respectively. For Social Justice, the results are somewhat inconsistent. Both instrumental and individual sets achieved a model R-square of 0.31, so it might have been expected that they would contribute equally high proportions of unique variance to the model. Clearly, other variables in the total model shared variance with the individual variables, so that the effects of some of them (in particular, Gender and Attitudes Toward Women) were reduced in the total model. Instrumental variables, on the other hand, remained strong and relatively independent as predictors of Social Justice.

**Summary**

Past research has demonstrated that individual, contextual, cognitive, and instrumental variables are associated with the kinds of justice rules individuals use to determine the fairness of resource allocations. In this study, all four sets of predictors were found to be significantly related to the emphasis placed upon contributions with respect to family support programs, and all but the contextual set were found to be significantly related to Social Justice. The most significant of all of the sets of predictors were individual and instrumental variables.

Fifty percent or less of the variance was left unexplained by the predictors. Further research is needed
to identify other potential sources of variance. Interesting correlations were found in this sample between the rules and other variables that were not included in the research hypotheses. For example, education correlated negatively with Contributions ($r = -0.30$), and perceived favourability toward family support amongst co-workers correlated negatively with Contributions ($r = -0.34$) and positively with Social Justice ($r = 0.42$). These kinds of background and contextual variables may be important contributors to the variance in justice rules applied to these programs.

Procedural Justice

In order to investigate what constituted "fair" procedures with respect to employee benefits, a 10-item scale was developed based upon the literature with items designed to tap consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. It was expected that scores on this scale would be related to scores on the overall fairness of procedures measure. It was also expected that employees who perceived that fair procedures were used typically in benefit selection would be more favourable to family support programs. Analyses related to these predictions are discussed below.

Procedural Justice Rules and Overall Perceived Fairness of Procedures

Hypothesis 7 stated that employees would utilize the procedural justice rules of consistency, bias suppression,
accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and
ethicality, in judging the overall fairness of procedures
used in the selection, implementation, and evaluation of
employee benefits. Table 11 presents results of multiple
regression analysis, with the overall perception of fairness
with respect to procedures in benefit selection as the
criterion, and scores on the Procedural Justice Scale for
Benefit Selection as the predictors.

As is illustrated in Table 11, much of the variance in
overall perceived fairness was left unexplained by the scale
(R-square = 0.23). In hierarchical regression, four of the
ten predictors achieved significance at the .01 level, and
the correlation table (Table B5: Appendix B) further reveals
that most of the items were related to the overall measure
of perceived fairness. However, none of the items achieved
significance when their shared variance with the other
predictors was removed through standard regression.

Thus, while the items in this scale were related to
overall fairness of procedures, they failed to explain a
large proportion of variance. The scale was thus not likely
to be particularly useful in elucidating strategies for fair
benefit selection and distribution. Further work needs to
be done in order to identify the underlying factors
associated with procedural fairness as applied to employee
benefits.
Table 11

Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship Between Overall Perceived Fairness of Procedures Used in Benefit Selection, and Scores on the Procedural Justice Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Representativeness</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>5.77*</td>
<td>10,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Bias Suppression</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: Consistency</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Bias Suppression</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: Accuracy</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6: Representativeness</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7: Accuracy</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8: Correctability</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9: Ethicality</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10: Consistency</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
Procedural Fairness and Favourability Toward Family Support Programs

Hypothesis 8 stated that those employees who perceived that fair procedures had been used previously in the implementation of employee benefits would be more favourable toward corporate family support programs than would those employees who perceived that fair procedures had not been used. To test this hypothesis, a series of multiple regression analyses were conducted, with favourability toward a specific family support program as the criterion, and perceived fairness of procedures and perceived fairness of current benefits as the predictors. Additionally, results using two other combinations of predictors were examined: overall measures of fairness of procedures and benefits, and total score on the Procedural Justice Scale; and individual item scores on the Procedural Justice Scale. However, none of these analyses achieved significance.

It seems safe to conclude from these analyses that the perception of fairness in benefit selection in general was unrelated to favourability toward specific family support programs for this sample. There are a number of possible explanations for the lack of support of the research hypothesis. In the public sector organization, benefits were administered at a provincial level, so that employees within the organization had, in reality, little input. It may be that this situation was not questioned by most, but rather accepted as an inevitable consequence of working
within this kind of an organization. "Fairness" may be
defined quite differently in these circumstances than it
might be in organizations where benefits are selected
specifically for the one population. Even in the larger
private sector sample, benefits were often contingent upon
what was available within other branches of the same
organization.

Additionally, there may have been problems with the
original assumption that support for a hypothetical program
would be influenced by the ways in which existing benefits
were selected and administered. A more definitive test of
the relationship between procedural justice and
favourability toward family support would involve an
examination of procedures used in implementing actual family
support programs, and overall favourability toward these
programs, once they are in place.

Summary

For this sample, items designed to tap six procedural
justice rules exhibited a relationship with overall
perceived fairness of procedures in the selection and
distribution of benefits, however much of the variance
remained unexplained by the scale. Procedural justice, as
measured in this study, failed to exhibit a significant
relationship with favourability toward family support
programs.
Conclusions

Results of this study suggest that favourability toward family support programs is a function of the importance placed upon justice rules. While traditional concerns about profit maximization, equity, and equivalent resources for all employees played a role in favourability, more contemporary concerns about equality of opportunity, need, and social responsibility played an even more important role for this sample. Several background variables associated with justice rules in other domains and with respect to other kinds of resources were found to be associated with justice rules as applied to family support programs. For both Contributions and Social Justice, Individual and Instrumental factors accounted for the greatest proportion of variance; however Cognitive variables also exerted a significant effect for both rules. Contextual variables were significantly related to scores only on Contributions. Procedural justice failed to exhibit a relationship with overall favourability toward family support programs.

Although it was initially expected that a variety of unique justice rules would predict favourability toward and perceived fairness of family support programs, it was found that justice notions were instead organized along two basic dimensions. These dimensions, labelled Contributions and Social Justice, were similar to dimensions identified in earlier research to explain justice notions with respect to
the general distribution of resources in society (Rasinsky, 1987). Because justice was measured in the present study using a closed-ended scale, it cannot be concluded that the two dimensions represent all that is involved in justice judgments. Nevertheless, this research does provide support for the importance of these two dimensions in justice assessments of specific organizational resource allocations, namely family support programs.

One of the most noteworthy findings from this research was the relative emphasis placed upon values and expectations traditionally assumed to characterize preferred resource distributions within work relationships, and those more commonly associated with close, interpersonal relationships. The findings from this study suggest that employees can be much more communal and humanitarian in their assessments of the justice of resource distributions within work organizations than equity theory would allow.

It is possible that respondents in this study represented a unique group who were more humanitarian than the general workplace population. Respondents voluntarily chose to participate in the study, which required a considerable amount of time expenditure with minimal tangible pay-off, and the human resource directors within the participating organizations requested that employees complete the questionnaires on their own time. Perhaps those who did not volunteer held values and beliefs more
representative of the workplace population and more consistent with the assumptions of equity theory. Additionally, as discussed earlier, social desirability cannot be ruled out. Although anonymity was assured, there may still have been a tendency for respondents to want to appear, even in their own eyes, to be oriented more toward humanitarian than individualistic objectives.

An alternative explanation, however, is that equity theory itself is more culturally defined, and thus time-limited and context-specific, than has generally been assumed. Certainly this argument has appeared in the literature. As expressed by Deutsch (1983):

The parochial emphasis of equity theorists on 'proportionality' as the sole canon of distributive justice suggests that these theorists were neglecting other distributive principles, e.g. 'equal shares to all', 'to each according to his need', which have been the rallying slogans for different political ideologies. Beyond this, the economic and market orientation of equity theory appeared to reflect, unwittingly, the implicit assumption in much of current Western ideology that economic 'rationality' and economic values should pervade all social life (pp. 305-306).

Sampson (1980, 1981) felt that the emphasis upon individual contributions implicit in equity theory reflected the viewpoint of Western capitalistic society and of the upper income groups within this society. He suggested that "social comparison" itself is culture-bound, and that for some individuals justice is not a function of one's position relative to others, but a function of adherence to traditional norms or internal standards.
Within certain kinds of organizations, and with respect to certain kinds of resources, equity may be given less credence than other types of justice rules. Deutsch (1983) pointed out that one of the criticisms of the justice literature which he had expressed a number of years previously was that there was insufficient research on distributive justice within different institutional contexts, such as the school or the hospital. Similarly, other researchers have considered organizational-level variables, such as climate and culture, which might have an impact upon the salience of the equity rule (Lansberg, 1989; Pearce & Peters, 1985). In the present research, both public and private sector samples were included. Although the public sector sample in this study did not significantly differ from the profit sample on Social Justice, there was a sample effect for Contributions. It is important to reiterate, however, that conclusions with regard to the sample effect in this study must be interpreted with caution, in view of the substantial differences noted between the samples with respect to characteristics other than sector. Nevertheless, there is the suggestion that traditional equity norms may be more characteristic of private than public sector organizations.

Furthermore, family support programs may inspire thoughts of social welfare and individual need more than other kinds of resources, such as wages. Additionally, on-
site child care was the program focussed upon most heavily, and the actual cost to employees themselves was dealt with only in subjective terms. The results of this study do indeed suggest that an anticipated unfavourable personal impact was associated with lower scores on Social Justice. Perhaps these values become tempered as objective personal cost of this program increases, which is a question for further research.

While the above methodological factors may partially explain the limited emphasis upon equity in this study, it is also possible that the values expressed here reflect a general trend toward communal and humanitarian considerations with respect to resource distributions within the workplace, and away from economic and individualistic considerations. A variety of social changes may be altering the way in which individuals view the work environment generally, and appropriate resource distributions within that environment specifically.

Work organizations are becoming more socially responsible, and are offering benefits now, including family support programs, which were not generally available when equity theory was initially conceived. This increase in organizational social responsibility may be due to a variety of factors, such as tighter government controls, pressure from advocacy groups, enhanced social awareness of corporate officers, efforts to remain competitive with other
organizations, and increasing demands from employees and unions. It may be that these forces have been exerted as a result of changing societal norms. Nevertheless, as norms change with respect to what is being offered, norms may also change with respect to what is expected and preferred.

Additionally, women are working outside of the home in increasing numbers. Concern for individual needs and collective interests, in contrast to competitive self-interest, is typically more characteristic of female than of male relationships. In the present study, women were found to emphasize Social Justice more than were males.

Certainly, representative workplace samples today will include a greater proportion of women than those collected in earlier studies of equity. Whether or not women are actually altering the norms for resource distribution within the workplace is a question for further research. With respect to the impact of women's presence within the workplace, Colwill and Erhart (1985) noted:

Feminists have argued...that organizational hierarchies will become less rigid; that organizational climate will become more cooperative, less competitive, and less aggressive; and that the human values of trust, openness and acceptance will replace the quest for individual power. (p.27)

However, when Colwill and Erhart (1985) asked employees if they believed that organizational climates would become more cooperative and less competitive and aggressive as women gained power in the workplace, they found that the majority believed that the opposite had occurred. In this paper and
elsewhere (Bhatnagar, 1988), the limited power of women within the workplace, and the pressures upon women to adopt the dominant ideology in order to maintain credibility and to advance within the organization, are discussed. If the norms for resource distribution are not being altered by women's presence, these factors may be partly responsible.

Because equity has been assumed to prevail within work organizations, and much of the research attention has been focussed upon reactions to inequity, we know little about the nature of justice outside of equity theory within work environments. We do not know, for example, how communal and humanitarian concerns develop and come to characterize preferred resource distributions within work units. We do not know the kinds of reactions employees may feel and exhibit toward perceived injustices involving resource distributions that are unresponsive to need and community welfare. Nor do we know the kinds of reactions employees may have toward increased corporate responsiveness to employee need and community welfare. Furthermore, we remain limited by a model that is rational and reductionistic in orientation, whereby deservingness is assessed in terms of individual characteristics (this time "need" instead of "contributions"). The sense, then, of satisfaction from observing fair distributions based on need is still derived from a tally of inputs and outcomes, rather than from some other source, such as congruence with internal standards of
morality or a concern for the common good.

It should be noted that the process of formulating statements reflecting justifications for and against family support programs based upon justice rules, required for this research, revealed additional problems with respect to the present definitions and boundaries of some of these rules. One justification based upon the equality rule, for example, resembled an equity argument, whereas another justification based upon the equality rule resembled an equality of opportunity argument. This suggests that existing definitions of certain justice rules, particularly definitions of equality and equality of opportunity, may need to be expanded to accommodate the various different interpretations of these rules when they are applied to complex organizational resource allocations.

As discussed in the introduction, other research has suggested that equity is less of an issue for employees with respect to family support programs than managers have feared (Burud et al., 1984). The impressionistic accounts from this report revealed that while some of the benefits employees mentioned fit within the equity framework (e.g., that nonparents realized that they personally benefited from more dependable co-workers), others fell outside of the input-outcome tally (e.g., that the sponsoring company was perceived to be more caring and humane). Supporters of equity theory might attempt to fit the latter benefit within
the equity framework by suggesting that a humane company would eventually provide more benefits to the nonparent as well. An alternative perspective, however, is that such an organizational orientation is valued in its own right, apart from any present or anticipated personal pay-off.

Further research is needed to explore other kinds of justice notions employees hold regarding organizational resource distributions. Clearly, some of the variance in favourability and fairness was left unexplained in this study by the justice rules examined. Interviews, and open-ended questionnaire formats would be recommended, in order to elucidate perspectives that fall outside of the equity framework.

In addition to identifying the range of justice notions related to favourability and perceived fairness of family support programs, the present study was aimed at identifying some of the background variables that might be associated with differential emphasis upon justice rules. One of the objectives of this analysis was to help clarify strategies for organizations interested in promoting support for these programs. Resistance toward family support has typically been attributed to concerns about traditional issues such as equity and profit maximization. The results of this study suggest, however, that resistance may be at least as strongly related to, if not more strongly related to, the degree of endorsement of more contemporary values of social
responsibility, equality of opportunity, and need.

Nevertheless, the question remains a matter for further research whether endorsement of need, equality of opportunity, and social responsibility can be modified through information and intervention. Certainly, a large part of the variance in beliefs along the Social Justice dimension was explained by prior attitudes, such as attitudes toward women and global distributive orientation, and as such may be resistant to change. The findings of this study suggest that males, those with sexist attitudes, and those who do not endorse egalitarian values in general, will be less likely to view need, social-responsibility, and equality of opportunity as legitimate criteria upon which to base decisions about family support programs. At least one of the contextual variables also appeared to be associated with levels of endorsement of Contributions. In particular, employees in the private sector sample were more likely to endorse Contributions than were employees in the public sector sample.

If justice notions are stable, the appropriate strategy might be to design the intervention in a manner that is responsive to the differing issues of importance to the employee population. In large, traditional, profit-oriented, competitive companies, equity or Contributions may indeed prevail, and resistance toward family support programs would likely be greater. Employees high on
Contributions might be most favourable to programs for which the corporate pay-offs in terms of increased profits and efficiency are clearly outlined. Additionally, they might be most favourable to family support programs that are introduced at the same time as other programs are introduced for groups not intending to use these programs, such as profit-sharing, educational and fitness programs, and so on. In smaller, cooperative, not-for-profit organizations, Social Justice may prevail. Employees high on Social Justice might be most favourable to programs for which a need is clearly established, for example, through a thorough employee-needs assessment. Promotional campaigns that included family support within an overall corporate strategy of increased concern for social responsibility and the establishment of equality of opportunity for women might also increase the level of favourability amongst employees with this orientation.

On the other hand, justice notions themselves might be modified to a certain degree. Employees who do not initially see need as a legitimate justification for organizational resource expenditures, for example, might become more responsive if they are made more aware of the severity of the need. In this study, those who believed the problem of balancing work and parental roles to be common were more likely to endorse supportive arguments for family support programs based upon Social Justice and less likely to
endorse Contributions, and this was in turn related to
exposure on a personal level, to friends, family-members,
and co-workers who experienced the problem. Some employees
may not have a great deal of exposure to these kinds of
problems, and for these employees, providing information
regarding the kinds of problems employed parents face may
engender more support. This is consistent with other
research (Crosby, Clayton, Hemker & Alksnis, 1986), which
found that perceived discrimination was influenced by the
nature of exposure individuals had to particular cases.

Another variable strongly related to both Contributions
and Social Justice dimensions was perceived positive impact
upon the functioning of the company. Variance accounted for
by impact upon the company for both Contributions and Social
Justice was even greater than that accounted for by
perceived positive impact upon one's personal life. This
variable needs to be explored in greater depth in order to
determine specifically what kinds of company impacts (e.g.,
improved employee morale and corporate image, increased
recruitment potential) are meaningful to employees. It is
possible that awareness or knowledge of certain company
benefits helps to legitimize Social Justice as a basis for
decisions regarding family support programs.

Because this study was correlational, it cannot be
known whether background information (commonness of the
problem of balancing work/family roles, positive impacts
upon the company) lead to support based on humanitarian and communal values, or whether the initial endorsement of these values allows this information to become more salient to employees. Further, it cannot be known whether some other source of variance, such as gender and attitudes toward women, can account for differences both in values, and in perceived commonness and company impact. More research is needed that examines endorsement of Social Justice and Contributions before and after exposure to this kind of information, to determine whether there is a causal effect.

In general, the respondents in this study were strongly in favour of all types of family support programs mentioned, which is in itself a promising finding for advocates of corporate family support programs. There were, however, differences in favourability and fairness by program or resource, and the justice dimensions exhibited slightly different patterns by resource. It is possible that for different resources even within the major category of family support, different justice notions are applied. As discussed above, open-ended response formats might elucidate other kinds of justice rules not included in this study which account for variance by resource. Additionally, other sources of variance apart from justice notions could be responsible for some of the variation across programs.

In conclusion, there appears to be much that can be learned about justice notions within organizations applied
to resource distributions outside of the category of wages. There is a need for more research into employee perceptions of activities within the general category of corporate social responsibility, directed at employee and community welfare, of which family support programs are only one small part. Results of this study suggest that employees are highly receptive to communal and humanitarian justifications for such investments, and are less motivated by individualistic concerns as implied by equity theory. Our understanding of justice judgments within organizations, and of justice judgments in general, could be greatly advanced by examining the extent to which these findings can be generalized across other kinds of resource distributions and other employee populations.
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APPENDIX A
DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE SCALE FOR FAMILY SUPPORT

INSTRUCTIONS
(Organization A and B)

(31) Some companies have become interested recently in setting up family support programs for their employees. One example of a family support program is an on-site day care centre.

A typical on-site day care centre is financed in part by the company. The company pays some of the costs to first set the centre up, and either uses space available at the worksite or pays some or all of the rent for a space very close by. The centre operates during most employees' working hours, although there might be some limit on hours of operation. The centre has spaces for employees' children who are between the ages of around 9 months and 5 years. Employees who want to place their children in the centre pay fees which are similar to the fees they pay for community-based care.

With this program in mind as a typical "family support" program, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statements below.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(DS) 1</td>
<td>(DM) 2</td>
<td>(N) 3</td>
<td>(AM) 4</td>
<td>(AS) 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSTRUCTIONS
(Organization C)

(21) Some companies and work organizations have become interested recently in setting up family support programs for their employees. One example of a family support program is an on-site day care centre.

A typical on-site day care centre is financed in part by the company/work organization. The company/work organization pays some of the costs to first set the centre up, and either uses space available at the worksite or pays some or all of the rent for a space very close by. The centre operates during most employees' working hours, although there might be some limit on hours of operation. The centre has spaces for employees' children who are between the ages of around 9 months and 5 years. Employees who want to place their children in the centre pay fees which are similar to the fees they pay for community-based care. Employees with children are either given exclusive rights to the use of the centre, or priority status over others not employed by the company/work organization.

At [Organization C], day care centres are available at [two Organization C sites], however some of their features differ from those of the typical on-site day care centre described above. In responding to the statements below, please think of the typical on-site day care centre described above as an example of a family support program.
DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE SCALE FOR FAMILY SUPPORT
(Continued)

In other words, when "family support program" is referred to in the statement, assume the reference is to the typical on-site day care centre and not to the day care centres now available at [Organization C].

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly (DS)</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately (DM)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (N)</th>
<th>Agree Moderately (AM)</th>
<th>Agree Strongly (AS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT

1. It seems as if more and more companies are moving in the direction of providing family support programs.  

2. The way work hours, rules and benefits are set up today discriminates against women and parent-employees.  

3. Many of these family support programs will interfere with getting the work done and cost more than they're worth.  

4. Working parents are under a lot of stress and really need some kind of help.  

5. It is a good idea for companies to offer special programs for different employee groups, like fitness centres, paid university courses, and counselling for personal problems.  

6. Working mothers are less committed to their jobs and don't work as hard as other employees.  

7. In Canada, though more mothers of young children are working outside the home than ever before, we are very much behind in needed services for these families.  

8. Many of these family support programs will reduce costly problems like absenteeism, attract more employees to the company, and will increase overall profitability.  

9. Working parents just complain more today than they used to - their situation isn't that bad.  

10. Working parents of young children often work harder and are more committed to their jobs than other employees who don't have the same responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The way things are now, many infants and children suffer from inadequate care when their mothers work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There is no difference between parent- and non-parent employees in the advantages and opportunities they now have at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The government should be doing more than it is now to provide child care for working parents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. This company's decision to offer family support programs should not be strongly affected by what employee groups in other companies do or do not receive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. This company should not offer family support programs if they think these programs might interfere with efficiency and reduce overall profits.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If the working parents in our company really need these programs, then our company should provide them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parents who can't meet their work responsibilities should receive penalties rather than rewards like family support programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. All employees should be given exactly the same benefits; this company should not offer family support programs because it means that employees who choose not to have children lose out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This company should provide family support programs because the next generation of children and society would benefit from them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. This company should not be responsible for helping working parents just because they claim to have special problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. This company should offer family support programs only if these programs are sure to increase work efficiency and overall profits for the company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Because men have had more privileges and opportunities than have women at work in the past, the extra time and money spent on programs like these for women now is justified.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE SCALE FOR FAMILY SUPPORT

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. How much parents seem to need these programs should not be an important factor in this company's decision to offer family support programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Money should be spent on employees according to how hard they work and how much they contribute to the company; whether or not they have children should not be a factor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. This company should not be concerned with problems in the community or society, whether or not family support programs would help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. This company should not offer this kind of program because only certain parents, depending on their income, work hours, and children's ages, could use it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Whether or not these programs are costly or bring profits should not strongly affect this company's decision to offer these family support programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How much this community or society will benefit should not be an important factor in this company's decision about family support programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Companies should be doing whatever must be done to make the workplace more fair and equal for women, including offering these family support programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. This company should offer programs like family support as a reward to employees who really work hard and who make an important contribution to the company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. This company's decision to offer family support programs should not be strongly affected by what other employee groups in the company do or do not receive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The Attitudes Subscale included items 1 through 12; The Rules Subscale included items 14 through 31; Items written to reflect Profit Maximization were 3, 8, 15, 21, 27; Equity were 6, 10, 17, 24, 30; Equality were 1, 5, 14, 18, 26, 31; Equality of Opportunity were 2, 12, 22, 29; Need were 4, 9, 16, 20, 23; Social Responsibility were 7, 11, 19, 25, 28.

*These items were reverse scored.*
MEASURES OF PERCEIVED FAIRNESS OF, AND FAVOURABILITY TOWARD, FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

(32) Overall, how fair do you think it would be for this company to offer this kind of a family support program?

1. Extremely unfair
2. Somewhat unfair
3. Somewhat fair
4. Extremely fair

(33) Overall, how much would you be in favour of this company offering this kind of a family support program?

1. Not at all in favour
2. Not much in favour
3. Somewhat in favour
4. Very much in favour

(36) There are other kinds of family support programs besides on-site child care, some of which are listed below. Overall, how fair do you think it would be for this company to offer the following specific types of family-support programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A flexible-spending account (from which you could select those benefits you want, like vision coverage, life insurance, part of child care fees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra days off to care for sick children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An information service about community child care services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education courses (covering topics like handling the stress of being a working parent, helping children to learn social skills, how to select quality child care)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school care, or care during summer holidays or vacations, for children aged 6 through 12 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended maternity leave (6 months instead of 4, with part salary covered by U.I.C. for 4 months as it is now)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended maternity leave (6 months instead of 4, if part salary was covered by U.I.C. for 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave (a certain number of days off work for new fathers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURES OF PERCEIVED FAIRNESS OF, AND FAVOURABILITY TOWARD, FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

(Continued)

(37) Overall, how much would you be in favour of this company offering the following specific kinds of family support programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A flexible-spending account (from which you could select those benefits you want, like vision coverage, life insurance, part of child care fees)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra days off to care for sick children</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An information service about community child care services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education courses (covering topics like handling the stress of being a working parent, helping children to learn social skills, how to select quality child care)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school care, or care during summer holidays or vacations, for children aged 6 through 12 years</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended maternity leave (6 months instead of 4, with part salary covered by U.I.C. for 4 months as it is now)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended maternity leave (6 months instead of 4, if part salary was covered by U.I.C. for 6 months)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave (a certain number of days off work for new fathers)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE
(Spence & Helmreich, 1978)

INSTRUCTIONS

(25) Following are a number of statements. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement, using the scale below. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. I am simply interested in your personal opinion.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly (DS)</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately (DM)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (N)</th>
<th>Agree Moderately (AM)</th>
<th>Agree Strongly (AS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT

1. It sounds worse when a woman swears than when a man does.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

2. If a woman goes out to work her husband should share the housework, such as washing dishes, cleaning, and cooking.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

3. It is an insult to a woman to have to promise to "love, honour, and obey" her husband in the marriage ceremony when he only promises to "love and honour" her.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

4. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

5. Women should worry less about being equal with men and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

6. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

7. A woman should be able to go everywhere a man does, or do everything a man does, such as going into bars alone.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

8. It is ridiculous for a woman to drive a train or for a man to sew on shirt buttons.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

9. There should be more women leaders in important jobs in public life, such as politics.
   Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

10. Women should have as much opportunity to do apprenticeships and learn a trade as men.
    Scale: 1 2 3 4 5

11. Women earning as much as their dates should pay for themselves when going out with them.
    Scale: 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In general, the father should have more authority than the mother in bringing up children.*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A woman's place is in the home looking after her family, rather than following a career of her own.*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These items were reverse scored.
PROPORTIONALITY/EGALITARIANISM SCALE
(Rasinsky, 1987)

INSTRUCTIONS

(25) Following are a number of statements. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement, using the scale below. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. I am simply interested in your personal opinion.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly (DS)</td>
<td>Moderately (DM)</td>
<td>Nor Disagree (N)</td>
<td>Moderately (AM)</td>
<td>Strongly (AS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT | SCALE
-----------|--------
16. There are too many people getting something for nothing in this society. | DS 1 DM 2 N 3 AM 4 AS 5 |
17. Many poor people simply don't want to work hard. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
18. In Canada, everyone should be treated equally because we are all human beings. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
19. Anybody receiving welfare in this country should be made to work for the money they get. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
20. Those who are well off in this country should help those who are less fortunate. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
21. Basic services such as health care and legal assistance should be provided to everyone by the government, free of charge. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
22. Maybe it's not their fault but most poor people were brought up without ambition. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
23. If the government must go deeper in debt to help people it should do so. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
24. Compassion for others is the most important human value. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
25. Most poor people don't have the ability to get ahead. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
26. It is not right for people to go hungry in our country. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
27. All things considered, most people get just what they deserve out of life. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Note. The Egalitarianism subscale included items 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 26; The Proportionality subscale included items 16, 17, 19, 22, and 27.
PROPORTIONALITY/EGALITARIANISM SCALE
(Rasinsky, 1987)
(Continued)

Item #25 was deleted from the scale. Item 18 was worded in Rasinsky's (1987) scale as follows: In America, everyone should be treated equally because we are all human beings.

Rasinsky (1987) cites the following sources, in addition to his own earlier research, for the larger pool of items from which these twelve were finally selected: Feagin, 1975; Kallen & Miller, 1971; Ogren, 1973; Rubin & Peplau, 1975; Mirels & Garrett, 1971; Whitely, 1965; Bales & Couch, 1969; Perloe, 1967; Feldman, 1982.
COOPERATION AND SUPPORT SCALES:  
CO-WORKER, SUPERVISOR, MANAGEMENT LEVELS

INSTRUCTIONS

(26) The next set of statements have to do with the way things are at work right now. When the statement mentions your "work group", what I mean is the group of people who you now work with. That is, the people at work who have the same kind of job responsibilities as you, and the same supervisor or set of supervisors as you.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly (DS)</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately (DM)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (N)</th>
<th>Agree Moderately (AM)</th>
<th>Agree Strongly (AS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT  

1. If I got into difficulties at work, I know the people in my work group would try and help me out.  

2. I can trust the people I work with to lend me a hand if I need it.  

3. Most of the people in my work group can be relied upon to do as they say they will do.  
4. An extremely friendly atmosphere prevails among people in this work group.  

5. In general, the people in my work group and I cooperate rather than compete with each other.  

6. I can count on my immediate supervisor for help if I have difficulties with my job.  

7. My boss helps me find ways to achieve my objectives.  

8. I have complete trust that my immediate supervisor will treat me fairly.  

9. My supervisor is friendly and approachable.  

10. In general, my supervisor and I cooperate rather than compete with each other.  

11. Help is available from the company when I have a problem.  

12. The company is willing to help me when I need a special favour.  

13. If given the opportunity, the company would take advantage of me.
COOPERATION AND SUPPORT SCALES:  
CO-WORKER, SUPERVISOR, MANAGEMENT LEVELS  
(Continued)

STATEMENT                                           SCALE

14. There is a lot of warmth in the relationships   1 2 3 4 5
    between management and workers in this
    company.

15. In general, upper management and I cooperate    1 2 3 4 5
    rather than compete with each other.

Note. Items 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, selected from: Cook & Wall, 1980; Campbell &
Beaty, 1971, in O'Reilly, 1977; Scott, 1983; Tjosvold, Andrews & Jones,
1983; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986; Litwin & Stringer,
1968. Co-worker support included items 1-5, supervisor support included
items 6-10, and management support included items 11-15.

* This item was reverse scored.
(11) Sometimes parents have difficulties balancing work and parental responsibilities. Some may feel that they have trouble being good parents, good workers, or both, because of the demands that are placed on them from these two roles. Some may experience conflicting time demands, or simply feel overwhelmed a lot of the time. The questions below refer to difficulties like these.

Some of these questions refer to difficulties you might have had in the past or difficulties you might have in the future. So please answer all questions even if you are not a parent at the present time.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION

1. How often do you experience these kinds of difficulties at the present time?  
   SCALE: N R S F
   1 2 3 4

2. Have you ever considered quitting this job because of these kinds of difficulties?  
   SCALE: N R S F
   1 2 3 4

3. How often did you experience these kinds of difficulties at some time in the past?  
   SCALE: N R S F
   1 2 3 4

4. How often do you think that you might experience these kinds of difficulties at some time within the next five years?  
   SCALE: N R S F
   1 2 3 4

5. How often have your friends or family members experienced these kinds of difficulties?  
   SCALE: N R S F
   1 2 3 4

6. How often do your co-workers seem to have these kinds of difficulties?  
   SCALE: N R S F
   1 2 3 4

7. How common do you think the problem of balancing worker and parent roles is?  
   1 Not at all common  
   2 Not very common  
   3 Somewhat common  
   4 Very common
(35) What kind of an impact do you think that a program like this would have on the areas listed below?

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Negative</th>
<th>Somewhat Negative</th>
<th>Neither Positive nor Negative</th>
<th>Somewhat Positive</th>
<th>Extremely Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EN) 1</td>
<td>(SN) 2</td>
<td>(N) 3</td>
<td>(SP) 4</td>
<td>(EP) 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREAS

1. Your personal life
2. Your enjoyment of work
3. Your work performance
4. Your future workplace opportunities (such as promotions)
5. Your chance to get other desired employee benefits
6. The functioning of your work group
7. The functioning of the company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This question followed description of on-site child care as typical family support program.
PROCEDURAL JUSTICE SCALE FOR EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

INSTRUCTIONS

(28) Companies offer a variety of employee benefits and programs. A benefit package might include, for example, medical and dental coverage, pensions, and vacation pay. New kinds of benefits and programs, such as those listed on pages 2 and 3 of this questionnaire, are also being offered in some companies. Below are several statements about the way decisions are made in terms of employee benefits. Please think of these statements in terms of the way things are at this company, and indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly (DS)</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately (DM)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (N)</th>
<th>Agree Moderately (AM)</th>
<th>Agree Strongly (AS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT SCALE

1. In this company, I have a say in what benefits I end up receiving. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Those who select the benefits are guided by their own self-interests, and not necessarily the interests of the rest of the employees. 1 2 3 4 5

3. In this company, you can count on the same procedures being used for all employees in benefit selection; if one group gets what they want one year, the other groups will get what they want in the following years. 1 2 3 4 5

4. In this company there are some benefits that supervisors and management interpret differently, depending on their own self-interests. 1 2 3 4 5

5. All employees are well informed of the benefits and programs in place, so that we can all use them to our full advantage. 1 2 3 4 5

6. When benefits are being put in place, the feelings and concerns of some employee groups are overlooked. 1 2 3 4 5

7. All of the important information needed to make good decisions about benefits is collected and considered here before the benefits are put in place. 1 2 3 4 5

8. Once new employee benefits and programs are finally in place, there is no opportunity here to change them or to drop them if they don't seem to be working out. 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. When existing benefits are evaluated and/or changed, those who gather the information maintain high ethical standards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sometimes benefits are changed or dropped for no apparent reason, whereas at other times a standard procedure seems to have been followed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items written to reflect Representativeness were 1, 6; Bias Suppression were 2, 4; Consistency were 3, 10; Accuracy were 5, 7; Correctability was 8; Ethicality was 9.
* These items were reverse scored.
MEASURES OF PERCEIVED FAIRNESS OF PROCEDURES AND BENEFITS

(29) Think about the procedures that are used here in the selection and distribution of employee benefits and programs. That is, think about the way decisions are made about benefits, and not about what you actually end up receiving. Overall, how "fair" are the procedures used here for the selection and distribution of employee benefits and programs?

1 Extremely unfair
2 Somewhat unfair
3 Somewhat fair
4 Extremely fair

(30) Now think about the actual benefits that you receive. Overall, how "fair" would you say the actual benefits that you now receive are?

1 Extremely unfair
2 Somewhat unfair
3 Somewhat fair
4 Extremely fair
BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

(1) Are you (Please circle response number):
    1 Female        2 Male

(2) What is your current marital status?
    1 Never married
    2 Married or living with partner
    3 Separated or Divorced
    4 Widowed

(3) If married or living with partner, is he/she currently employed?
    1 Yes, full-time
    2 Yes, part-time
    3 No

(4) How old are you? ________________

(5) What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
    1 Some elementary school
    2 Completed elementary school
    3 Some high school
    4 Completed high school
    5 Some technical training or community college
    6 Completed technical training or community college
    7 Some university
    8 Bachelor's degree
    9 Master's degree
    10 Professional degree or doctorate
    11 Other _________________________

(6) Do you work here full-time or part-time?
    1 Full-time        2 Part-time

(7) Within which of the following categories does your job at this company fall?
    1 under collective agreement/direct guest contact support employee
    2 non-management, non-union
    3 private payroll

(8) How long have you worked at this company? ____________

(12) Do you have any children?
    1 Yes
    2 No
(13) How many children do you have in the following age categories? (Write the number of children in the spaces provided)

13 years old or over
6 years through 12 years old
2 years through 5 years old
9 months through 23 months
8 months or younger

(15) If you are separated or divorced, how much of the time do your children live with you, and not with their other parent? (Please circle)

1 Almost all of the time
2 More than half of the time
3 About half of the time
4 Weekends or holidays only
5 Summer only
6 Almost none of the time

(22) Do you plan to have children within the next five years?

1 Yes
2 No

(27) About how many of the people in your workgroup are mothers of children 5 years old or under?

1 All or almost all
2 More than half
3 About half
4 Less than half
5 Almost none
6 None

(34) How much do you think that the following groups would be in favour of this company offering this kind of a family support program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all in favour</th>
<th>Very much in favour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your co-workers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your supervisor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management in general</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The union</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Question 34 followed description of on-site day care centre as typical family support program.
CONSENT FORM: ORGANIZATION A

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS STUDY CONSENT FORM

Researchers: Vicky Macfarlane, M.A. (University of Windsor)
Ann McCabe, Ph.D. (University of Windsor)

This study is being conducted for the purposes of fulfilling a research requirement for the PhD degree in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor. Representatives of the [Union in Organization A] and the management of [Organization A] have been informed of the study, and it has received approval from [Organization A].

The purpose of this research is to obtain information on individual viewpoints with regard to employee benefits in general and family support policies in particular. It includes several questions designed to measure these viewpoints and a number of questions about your background, general attitudes, and experiences at work. The total questionnaire should take about one hour to complete.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you volunteer to participate, you have the right to withdraw at any time and/or to refrain from answering whatever questions you prefer to omit.

Please do not record your name on the questionnaire so that you remain anonymous. All completed questionnaires will remain the property of the researchers identified above. The only persons with access to the completed questionnaires will be these researchers and their associates at the University of Windsor.

Results of the study will be provided in summary form to employees, the union, and the management of [Organization A]. This means that only group averages will be provided, and no one will be able to identify individual responses.

At no time will any person or persons associated with [Organization A] see the completed questionnaires, nor will they be provided with any specific information which might identify a particular employee of [Organization A].

This study has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Windsor's Psychology Department. If you have any complaints regarding procedures used in this study which appear to violate your welfare you may report these complaints to the Office of Research Services (253-4232 Ext. 3916) for referral to the Ethics Committee.

I fully understand and consent to the procedures of this study.

Dated this ______ day of __________________, 1990.

__________________________
Signature of Participant
CONSENT FORM: ORGANIZATION B

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS STUDY CONSENT FORM

Researchers: Vicky Macfarlane, M.A. (University of Windsor)
            Ann McCabe, Ph.D. (University of Windsor)

This study is being conducted for the purposes of fulfilling a
research requirement for the PhD degree in Applied Social Psychology at
the University of Windsor.

The purpose of this research is to obtain information on individual
viewpoints with regard to employee benefits in general and family support
policies in particular. It includes several questions designed to measure
these viewpoints and a number of questions about your background, general
attitudes, and experiences at work. The total questionnaire should take
about 30 to 45 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you
volunteer to participate, you have the right to withdraw at any time
and/or to refrain from answering whatever questions you prefer to omit.

Please do not record your name on the questionnaire so that you
remain anonymous. All completed questionnaires will remain the property
of the researchers identified above. The only persons with access to the
completed questionnaires will be these researchers and their associates at
the University of Windsor.

Results of the study will be provided in summary form to employees of
[Organization B]. This means that only group averages will be provided,
and no one will be able to identify individual responses.

At no time will any person or persons associated with [Organization
B] see the completed questionnaires, nor will they be provided with any
specific information which might identify a particular employee of
[Organization B].

This study has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the
University of Windsor's Psychology Department. If you have any complaints
regarding procedures used in this study which appear to violate your
welfare you may report these complaints to the Office of Research Services
(253-4232 Ext. 3916) for referral to the Ethics Committee.

I fully understand and consent to the procedures of this study.

Dated this ________ day of ________________, 1990.

__________________________
Signature of Participant
CONSENT FORM: ORGANIZATION C

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS STUDY CONSENT FORM

Researchers: Vicky Macfarlane, M.A. (University of Windsor)
Ann McCabe, Ph.D. (University of Windsor)

This study is being conducted for the purposes of fulfilling a research requirement for the PhD degree in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor.

The purpose of this research is to obtain information on individual viewpoints with regard to employee benefits in general and family support policies in particular. It includes several questions designed to measure these viewpoints and a number of questions about your background, general attitudes, and experiences at work. The total questionnaire should take about one hour to complete.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you volunteer to participate, you have the right to withdraw at any time and/or to refrain from answering whatever questions you prefer to omit.

Please do not record your name on the questionnaire so that you remain anonymous. All completed questionnaires will remain the property of the researchers identified above. The only persons with access to the completed questionnaires will be these researchers and their associates at the University of Windsor.

Results of the study will be provided in summary form to employees, the unions, and the management of [Organization C]. This means that only group averages will be provided, and no one will be able to identify individual responses.

At no time will any person or persons associated with [Organization C] see the completed questionnaires, nor will they be provided with any specific information which might identify a particular employee of [Organization C].

This study has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Windsor's Psychology Department. If you have any complaints regarding procedures used in this study which appear to violate your welfare you may report these complaints to the Office of Research Services (253-4232 Ext. 3916) for referral to the Ethics Committee.

I fully understand and consent to the procedures of this study.

Dated this _______ day of __________________, 1990.

__________________________________________
Signature of Participant
QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS
(Organization B)

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS QUESTIONNAIRE

University of Windsor
Department of Psychology

Researchers
Vicky Macfarlane, M.A.
Ann McCabe, Ph.D.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please read and sign the enclosed CONSENT FORM, required by the Ethics Committee at the University of Windsor, prior to filling out the questionnaire. When you have completed the questionnaire, please seal the questionnaire and consent form inside the enclosed stamped envelope addressed to Vicky Macfarlane, University of Windsor, to be mailed directly to the University. Please return both the consent form and the questionnaire by Friday, December 7th.

If you have any questions about the study, please leave your name and number for me with the Psychology Department at the University of Windsor (253-4232), and I will return your call.

Thank you for your participation in this study.

Vicky Macfarlane
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Avenue
Windsor, Ontario
N9B 3P4
QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS
(Organization C)

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS QUESTIONNAIRE

University of Windsor
Department of Psychology

Researchers
Vicky Macfarlane, M.A.
Ann McCabe, Ph.D.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please read and sign the enclosed CONSENT FORM, required by the Ethics Committee at the University of Windsor, prior to filling out the questionnaire. When you have completed the questionnaire, you may seal it inside the enclosed envelope addressed to Vicky Macfarlane, University of Windsor, and deposit it in the mailroom at [Organization C] to be mailed directly to the University. If it is more convenient for you, you may drop the sealed questionnaire off to [the Employment Equity Officer] in Human Resources. I will be collecting questionnaires on a regular basis from her office. If you do not wish to enclose the consent form inside the envelope that contains your completed questionnaire, you may seal the consent form separately inside the small white envelope enclosed, and drop it off to [the Employment Equity Officer]. Please return both the consent form and the questionnaire by Tuesday, December 4th.

If you have any questions about the study, please leave your name and number for me with the Psychology Department at the University of Windsor (253-4232), and I will return your call.

Thank you for your participation in this study.

Vicky Macfarlane
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Avenue
Windsor, Ontario
N9B 3P4

Note. Instructions regarding questionnaire return varied slightly depending on site.
INTRODUCTORY LETTER
(Organization C)

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of a research requirement for the PhD degree in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor. All full-time employees of [Organization C] will be receiving the questionnaire. As indicated on the enclosed Consent Form, your participation in this study is completely voluntary.

Some of the questions on the questionnaire are required for my own purposes, to test certain theoretical hypotheses I have. Others have been designed specifically for [Organization C], with the hopes of providing some relevant and useful information for future planning around employee benefits and policies within [Organization C].

Your participation in this study is very much appreciated. It is through the support of employees and organizations such as [Organization C], that applied research through the University of Windsor is made possible.

Vicky Macfarlane
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM SPONSORING ORGANIZATION
(Organization C)

[Organization C]

To: All Full Time Employees

[Organization C] is participating in a research project in conjunction with the University of Windsor which focuses on employee perceptions of workplace benefits and policies. Such cooperation between the academic institutions of Windsor promotes on-going research and the attainment of training objectives to which our academic institutions are committed.

This questionnaire is designed to provide [Organization C] with some important information on employee viewpoints regarding specific employee benefits and programs. Such information could be very useful to Human Resources and to [Staff Association] in planning for employee benefits at [Organization C] in the future. We are therefore in support of this research, and would like to encourage all employees to participate by completing the enclosed questionnaire.

______________________________  ______________________________
Union President                      Union President

______________________________
Staff Association President

______________________________  ______________________________
Executive Director, Employment Equity Officer
Human Resources and Planning
APPENDIX B
Table B1

Correlations Between Items on the Rules Subscale of the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations 0.17 or greater are significant at p < .01 level.
Table B2

Correlations Between Contributions and Social Justice Scores, and Favourability Toward, and Perceived Fairness of, Family Support Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site day care</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible benefits</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick child leave</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource &amp; referral</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school care</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid matern.leave</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid matern.leave</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 8 programs</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site day care</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible benefits</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick child leave</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource &amp; referral</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school care</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid matern.leave</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid matern.leave</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 8 programs</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations above 0.17 are significant at p < .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L14</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N16</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B3 (con't)

Correlations Between Favourability Toward Family Support Programs and Scores on the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P27</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations of 0.17 or greater are significant at p < .01 level.
Table B4

Correlations Between Contributions and Social Justice Scores, and Individual, Contextual, Cognitive, and Instrumental Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward women</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionality</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical level</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management support</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered quitting</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict--friends,family</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict--co-workers</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common wk/fmly conflict</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B4 (continued)

Correlations Between Contributions and Social Justice Scores, and Individual, Contextual, Cognitive, and Instrumental Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Variables</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact, personal life</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work enjoyment</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work performance</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, future opportun.</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, other benefits</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, work group</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, company</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations above 0.17 are significant at p < .01 level.
Table B5

Correlations Between Individual Item Scores on Procedural Justice Scale and Perceived Fairness of Procedures and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>OVERALL FAIRNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00 00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R = Representativeness; B = Bias Suppression; C = Consistency; A = Accuracy; T = Correctability; E = Ethicality; Pr = Procedures; Be = Benefits. Correlations of 0.17 or greater are significant at p < .01 level.
Table C1

**Factor Analysis of the 18-item Rules Subscale of the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support: Four Factor Solution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profit Maximization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality of Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance explained</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total variance</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 215\).
Table C2

Factor Analysis of the 18-item Rules Subscale of the Distributive Justice Scale for Family Support: Three Factor Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profit Maximization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality of Opportunity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance explained  
3.53 3.12 1.73
Percentage of total variance 19.61 17.33 9.61

Note. $N = 215$. 
Table C3

**Justice Statements: Means and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: Contribution</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale: Social Justice</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profit Maximization**

3. Many of these family support programs will interfere with getting the work done and cost more than they’re worth. 4
   Mean: 3.62 SD: 1.07

8. Many of these family support programs will reduce costly problems like absenteeism, attract more employees to the company, and will increase overall profitability.
   Mean: 4.00 SD: .94

15. This company should not offer family support programs if they think these programs might interfere with efficiency and reduce overall profits.
    Mean: 2.66 SD: 1.14

21. This company should offer family support programs only if these programs are sure to increase work efficiency and overall profits for the company.
    Mean: 2.99 SD: 1.19

27. Whether or not these programs are costly or bring profits should not strongly affect this company’s decision to offer these family support programs.
    Mean: 2.82 SD: 1.16

**Equity**

6. Working mothers are less committed to their jobs and don’t work as hard as other employees.
   Mean: 4.44 SD: .89

10. Working parents of young children often work harder and are more committed to their jobs than other employees who don’t have the same responsibilities.
    Mean: 3.08 SD: 1.11

17. Parents who can’t meet their work responsibilities should receive penalties rather than rewards like family support programs.
    Mean: 2.11 SD: 1.08

24. Money should be spent on employees according to how hard they work and how much they contribute to the company; whether or not they have children should not be a factor.
    Mean: 2.86 SD: 1.33

30. This company should offer programs like family support as a reward to employees who really work hard and who make an important contribution to the company.
    Mean: 2.65 SD: 1.22
Table C3 (con't)

**Justice Statements: Means and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It seems as if more and more companies are moving in the direction of providing family support programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is a good idea for companies to offer special programs for different employee groups, like fitness centres, paid university courses, and counselling for personal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. This company's decision to offer family support programs should not be strongly affected by what employee groups in other companies do or do not receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. All employees should be given exactly the same benefits; this company should not offer family support programs because it means that employees who choose not to have children lose out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. This company should not offer this kind of program because only certain parents, depending upon their income, work hours, and children's ages, could use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. This company's decision to offer family support programs should not be strongly affected by what other employee groups in the company do or do not receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The way work hours, rules and benefits are set up today discriminates against women and parent-employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There is no difference between parent- and non-parent employees in the advantages and opportunities they now have at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Because men have had more privileges and opportunities than have women at work in the past, the extra time and money spent on programs like these for women now is justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Companies should be doing whatever must be done to make the workplace more fair and equal for women, including offering these family support programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C3 (con't)

**Justice Statements: Means and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working parents are under a lot of stress and really need some kind of help.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Working parents just complain more today than they used to - their situation isn't that bad.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If the working parents in our company really need these programs, then our company should provide them.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. This company should not be responsible for helping working parents just because they claim to have special problems.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How much parents seem to need these programs should not be an important factor in this company's decision to offer family support programs.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In Canada, though more mothers of young children are working outside the home than ever before, we are very much behind in needed services for these families.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The way things are now, many infants and children suffer from inadequate care when their mothers work.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This company should provide family support programs because the next generation of children and society would benefit from them.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. This company should not be concerned with problems in the community or society, whether or not family support programs would help.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How much this community or society will benefit should not be an important factor in this company's decision about family support.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Means on 5-point scale, with 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree. Because of missing values, n ranged between 225 and 229. *These items were reverse scored.*
Table C4

Overall Favourability and Toward and Perceived Fairness of Family Support Programs: Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Favourability</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site day care</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible benefits</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick child leave</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource-and-referral</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education courses</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school care</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid matern.leave</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid matern.leave</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means on a 4-point scale, with 1 = Not at all in favour or Extremely unfair, and 4 = Very much in favour or Extremely fair. Because of missing values, N ranged between 216 and 225.
Additional Analyses

In addition to the analyses conducted for the main study, two further analyses were conducted. The first pertained to the issue of congruence in justice perceptions, and the second pertained to moderators of procedural justice. These analyses will be discussed below.

Congruence in Justice Perceptions

Literature review and research hypothesis. Instrumental factors may have an influence upon the level of congruence that individuals hold with regard to justice perceptions. Brickman et al. (1981) pointed out that macro-level allocation rules may direct one course of action whereas micro-level allocation rules may direct another. Similarly, Leventhal (1980) acknowledged that different rules (equality, equity, and need) might suggest different courses of action, although he suggested that a compromise might be made under such conditions. Models designed to explain integration under conditions of multiple inputs and multiple rules are in short supply (Cook & Yamagishi, 1983).

Cognitive consistency theories (e.g., Festinger, 1957) suggested that incongruence in cognitions was unpleasant and resulted in efforts to restore congruence. Presumably, the more an allocation can be justified on several grounds, the more fair it will seem. It is possible, then, that individuals will seek consistency in their assessments of fairness, placing greater weight on the rules that support their own position.

There is some evidence that adherence to system-level objectives is related to the perceived justice of an allocation at the individual level. Research examining reactions to affirmative action programs has found that when the procedure involved is perceived to be unjust, the actual program goals are perceived to be less fair. Tougas and Veilleux (1988; 1989) presented females and males with a description of the goals of affirmative action program, as follows:

Because of women's situation in the work force, institutions have decided to implement affirmative action programs. These programs aim at increasing the percentage of women in the higher levels of the hierarchy as well as in job categories traditionally held by
Participants then received one of two procedure descriptions. In one version, the procedure involved eliminating discriminatory administrative practices and assisting women in their job search. The second procedure involved preferential treatment. Both males and females presented with a procedure involving preferential treatment were significantly less in favour of the goals of the program than were those presented with the alternative procedure, even though the program goals were exactly the same in the two conditions.

One possible interpretation of these findings is that the strict, individual-level contributions rule received greater weight than did the more general, system-level equality of opportunity rule, and that the system-level rule was discredited to a certain degree when coupled with violation of the individual-level rule. Most likely, if violation of the individual-level rule resulted in personal impact (i.e., if participants were members of a work organization planning to implement the program, and the program was expected to have an impact upon promotional opportunities), acceptance of the system-level objectives would be even more strongly affected. Tougas and Veilleux (1988) suggested that personal impact might be profitably integrated within their model.

In summary, past research has illustrated that individuals may simultaneously endorse two or more rules applied to the same situation as being fair, and it has been acknowledged that in some cases the different rules may suggest different courses of action. Therefore, some employees may agree with justifications for family support based upon a particular rule or set of rules, while at the same time agreeing with justifications against family support based upon other rules. On the other hand, cognitive consistency theories suggest that individuals strive for congruence in cognitions. It is expected that employees will differ in the extent to which they experience congruence in their justice perceptions, and that one source of individual differences will be the
anticipated personal impact of the programs. In particular, the following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis D1:

Those employees who anticipate a favourable personal outcome from family support programs will exhibit greater congruence in their justice perceptions than will those employees who do not anticipate a favourable personal outcome.

Results. It was expected that some individuals would exhibit greater congruence in their justice perceptions than would others. The factor analysis revealed that in general, rules did tend to cluster together. Thus, rather than endorsing Need and rejecting Social Responsibility justifications, for example, respondents tended to conceptualize these rules along the same dimension. When a median-split was performed on scores for Contributions and Social Justice and cross-tabulations were run, the majority of respondents were found to be either high on Contributions and low on Social Justice, or high on Social Justice and low on Contributions. There was, however, a small proportion of respondents who exhibited either high scores on both rules (16%), or low scores on both rules (12%).

Hypothesis D1 stated that employees who anticipated a favourable personal outcome from family support programs would exhibit greater congruence in their justice perceptions. It has already been illustrated that anticipated personal gain was associated with higher scores on Social Justice, as well as with lower scores on Contributions. Because of the nature of these scales, these findings provides tentative support for the hypothesis. Further analyses were necessary, however, to confirm the congruence hypothesis.

Respondents were given a congruence score based upon the cross-tabulation results. Four groups were formed: (1) those with high scores on Contributions and low scores on Social Justice, (2) those with high scores on Social Justice and low scores on Contributions, (3) those with high scores on both rules, and (4) those with low scores on both rules. Means for the four groups on the two impact items which showed the
strongest relationship to scores on the justice scales, perceived impact upon one's personal life and perceived impact upon the functioning of the company, were then examined. Additionally, means for the four groups on favourability toward day care were examined. Results are presented in Table D1.

It would be expected that those who endorsed Social Justice while also discrediting Contributions would have the highest scores on the dependent variables, and that those who endorsed Contributions while also discrediting Social Justice would have the lowest scores. Those with less congruent profiles, either high on both scales or low on both scales, would be expected to exhibit intermediate scores.

Table D1 illustrates that the expected pattern was obtained for two of the three dependent variables: perceived impact on the functioning of the company and favourability toward day care. For these two variables, the greatest divergence in scores was found between those groups that were most congruent in their endorsements of justifications for and against support.

To test the significance of the interaction effects, regression analyses were conducted, with the two impact measures and favourability toward day care as criteria and Contributions, Social Justice, and the interaction between Contributions and Social Justice as predictors. The interaction between Contributions and Social Justice did not achieve significance for any of the three models (for favourability toward day care, however, the probability for the interaction term bordered on significance, at 0.09).

In conclusion, the pattern expected on the basis of the congruence hypothesis was observed; however it did not prove to be significant. Further tests might be done to provide stronger support for this hypothesis. As discussed, the Contributions and Social Justice scales themselves were largely, although not exclusively, comprised of arguments for and against support on the basis of justice rules. Had
Table D1

Means on Personal Impact, Impact on Company, and Favourability Toward Day Care for Four Groups Varying on Levels of Endorsement of Contributions and Social Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>High Social Justice</th>
<th>Low Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (n = 72)</td>
<td>High (n = 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact, personal life</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, company</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourability</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
separate scales been created that exclusively contained justifications for and against support, greater support for the congruence hypothesis may have been obtained.

**Moderators of Procedural Justice**

**Literature review and research hypothesis.** Sources of group differences with respect to procedural justice rules have received much less attention than have sources of group differences with respect to distributive justice rules. Nevertheless, the following sources of variance might be found with respect to procedural justice: personal norms and values, work-unit norms and values, personal impact and program characteristics.

Rasinski (1967) predicted that individuals with an egalitarian orientation would be less concerned with procedural fairness than would those with a proportionality orientation. Proportionality requires that individual inputs are carefully assessed. Those with an egalitarian orientation, he suggested, would be more concerned with the final distribution of outcomes: in other words, that outcomes are equal. For judgments of governmental policies, his results generally confirmed this hypothesis, although the effect was moderated by level of education.

As discussed earlier, egalitarian distributions are more likely to occur when the maintenance of group harmony is the motivational goal. If an egalitarian orientation is associated with less emphasis on procedures, it might be expected that in groups characterized by positive interpersonal relations, procedural justice will be less of an issue. However, Barett-Howard and Tyler (1986) found that concerns for procedural justice were higher when the motivational goal was to enhance positive feelings and maximize welfare than when the goal was to maximize productivity. On the other hand, concerns with procedural justice were higher in formal than in informal relationships. They concluded that "the degree to which the interpersonal relationship is valuable but vulnerable
may dictate the amount of concern for procedural fairness" (p. 302). Therefore, in work units in which employees are very concerned about maintaining positive interpersonal relations, procedural justice may be particularly critical. Thus, employees in cohesive, interdependent work units may place greater emphasis upon procedural justice than employees in more independent work situations.

Hierarchical level may also influence perceptions of procedural justice. Fair procedure from a managerial perspective may not be the same as fair procedure from an employee perspective. Within organizations, decisions have traditionally been made from the top down; employee participation is a relatively new concept, and a concept that certainly has not yet spread throughout all North American organizations. The failure of quality of worklife innovations, which are based upon the principle of employee participation, has often been attributed to a lack of shared values (Hartenstein & Huddleston, 1984; Goodman & Dean, 1981). Katz and Kahn (1978) noted that organizational leaders often view participation by employees as "a fringe benefit to be given or withheld" (p.766). Fair procedure, from a lower-level employee perspective, helps to ensure that he/she is not taken advantage of. The same procedure, from a managerial perspective, limits personal discretion, which may be considered a critical component of this role.

Presumably, those who expect to experience personal benefits or costs from the allocation will be more concerned about accurate procedures than will those who do not expect any kind of personal impact from the allocation. Additionally, certain kinds of family support programs may arouse greater concern with regard to procedures than others. It is likely that procedures used in selection and implementation of programs that have no significant impact upon the day-to-day functioning of the work unit or upon nonuser resources, will be less critical. Thus, the procedures used in implementing a resource-and-referral system may be of less concern than will the procedures used in implementing extended
maternity leave, leave for sick children, or flexitime.

On the basis of previous research, two potential moderators of the procedural justice relationship will be selected for examination. This research has revealed that procedural fairness is more important to individuals who hold a global proportionality orientation than to those who hold a global egalitarian orientation, and that procedural fairness is more important when the motivational goal is to enhance positive feelings and maximize welfare than when the goal is to maximize productivity. Thus, individual and contextual variables, including global distributive orientation and perceived work-unit cohesiveness, should have an impact upon the relative weight placed on procedural justice. The following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis D2:

Those employees who have adopted a global proportionality orientation toward resource distributions within society as a whole, and those who perceive their work-unit climate to be cooperative and supportive, will be more influenced by fair procedure in their attitudes toward corporate family support programs than will those employees who have adopted a global egalitarian orientation and who perceive their work-unit climate to be non-supportive.

Results. A series of multiple regression analyses were conducted, with the family support programs as criteria. The set of predictors in these models included main effects of global distributive orientation (proportionality and egalitarianism), co-worker support, and perceived procedural fairness, and interaction effects of global distributive orientation and procedural fairness, and co-worker support and procedural fairness. In order to obtain meaningful interaction effects, three levels were determined for each predictor, with each level containing approximately one-third of respondents.

The hypothesis was unsupported by the data. No significant interaction effects between fair procedures and the hypothesized moderators of Proportionality, Egalitarianism and co-worker support were found for favourability toward any of the family support programs. As
discussed in the main results section, it is likely that the nature of the sample and the initial assumptions tied to this hypothesis were in part responsible for the failure of procedural justice to operate here as it has in previous research.
LETTER OF PERMISSION: ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE
(Spence & Helmreich, 1978)

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Students and colleagues frequently request permission to use one of our self-report questionnaires in their research. We have therefore prepared this form letter.

We automatically grant permission to use any of our instruments to colleagues who have a graduate degree in Psychology or a related field and to students working directly under the supervision of such colleagues, with the following provisions. First, anyone who uses the instruments agrees to follow the code of ethics of the American Psychology Association or other similar codes, with particular attention to confidentiality of the results. Second, the instruments are to be used only for research or for educational purposes. They are not to be used for individual diagnosis or treatment. With respect to educational purposes we have no objections to individuals who have taken one of our attitude measures (listed below) as part as a research project or classroom exercise to be informed of their scores if individual respondents so desire. However, because of potential harm, we ask that you not supply respondents to whom you have administered any of our personality instruments with their scores, even if they request the information. Respondents should answer the questionnaires anonymously whenever possible, which automatically means that respondents cannot receive feedback about their own answers.

By this letter we grant you permission to use our measures, provided that you meet the criteria and use them for the purposes described. We also grant permission to students using them in a thesis or dissertation to reproduce a copy in the appendix of their report.

Janet T. Spence
Professor

Robert L. Helmreich
Professor

Attitude Measures

Attitude towards Women Scale (AWS)
Male-Female Relations Questionnaire (MFRQ)
Gender stereotype measures
May 23, 1991

Dear Ms. Macfarlane,

By all means feel free to use the proportionality and egalitarianism scales from my 1987 JESP paper. Please note that acknowledgments should go not only to me but to the sources that were used as an item pool for the scales. These sources are listed in the 1987 paper. Also note that one of the items listed in the table (Q14. Most poor people don't have the ability to get ahead) was dropped from the scale. I suggest you do not use this item with the others.

I have enclosed a recent paper that might interest you. Please let me know whether the scales work in your research, and good luck with your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Kenneth A. Rasinski, Ph.D.
Survey Research Methodologist
### ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS: ORGANIZATION A

(9) If this company was to offer the special employee benefits and programs listed below, which do you think you would use at some time within the next five years?

**PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Use (DU)</th>
<th>Probably Use (PU)</th>
<th>Probably Not Use (PN)</th>
<th>Definitely Not Use (DN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM**

1. A fitness program
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

2. A wellness program (for example, diet, nutrition, stopping smoking)
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

3. A crisis assistance service (providing information, counselling, time off work, to deal with personal problems)
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

4. Eldercare (an information service on community services to care for your elderly relatives)
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

5. Profit-sharing/stock ownership
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

6. Courses on budgeting, money management
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

7. A flexible-spending account (from which you could select those benefits you want, like vision coverage, life insurance, part of child care fees)
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

8. Extra days off to care for sick children
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

9. An information service about community child care services
   - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

10. Parent education courses (covering topics like handling the stress of being a working parent, helping children to learn social skills, how to select quality child care)
    - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

11. A day care centre for employees with children aged 5 and under, located right here or very close by
    - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

12. After-school care, or care during summer holidays or vacations, for children aged 5 through 12 years
    - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

13. Extended maternity leave (6 months instead of 4, with part salary covered by U.I.C. for 4 months as it is now)
    - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

14. Extended maternity leave (6 months instead of 4, if part salary was covered by U.I.C. for 6 months)
    - SCALE: 1 2 3 4

15. Paternity leave (a certain number of days off work for new fathers)
    - SCALE: 1 2 3 4
16. Are there any other benefits and programs the company could offer that you would use? (Please specify)

---

(10) In the past year, about how many times have you: (For each question, please mark your answer with an X on the line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES IN PAST YEAR</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-3 times</th>
<th>4-6 times</th>
<th>7-10 times</th>
<th>More than 10 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Missed a day of work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Been late for work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Left work early?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dealt with family problems while at work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) How many children do you have?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

IF YOU HAVE NO CHILDREN, GO TO QUESTION 22 ON PAGE 8.

(13) How many of your children are 12 years old or younger?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

IF NONE OF YOUR CHILDREN ARE 12 YEARS OLD OR YOUNGER, GO TO QUESTION 22 ON PAGE 8.

(14) Please list the AGES of all your children who are 12 years old or younger, from youngest to oldest below.

1 CHILD 1: AGE _______ (Youngest)
2 CHILD 2: AGE _______
3 CHILD 3: AGE _______
4 CHILD 4: AGE _______

(15) If you are separated or divorced, how much of the time do your children live with you, and not with their other parent? (Please circle)

1. Almost all of the time
2. More than half of the time
3. About half of the time
4. Weekends or holidays only
5. Summer only
6. Almost none of the time
(16) What kind of child care do you USUALLY have while you are at work? (For each of your children, mark your answer with an X on the line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILD CARE</th>
<th>CHILD 1</th>
<th>CHILD 2</th>
<th>CHILD 3</th>
<th>CHILD 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wife/husband/partner</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ex-wife/ex-husband</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Older brother/sister</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child looks after self</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other relative in their home or yours</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Caretaker in your home</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Caretaker in their home</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Day care centre</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(17) About how many hours per week are your children in PAID care?

1  CHILD 1 _________
2  CHILD 2 _________
3  CHILD 3 _________
4  CHILD 4 _________

(18) How much do you pay per week for child care?

1  For CHILD 1 _________
2  For CHILD 2 _________
3  For CHILD 3 _________
4  For CHILD 4 _________

(19) About how much government assistance do you get for your child care costs per week?

________________________________________________________________________

(20) For the child care arrangements you are now using, please indicate how satisfied you are with the following features. (For each feature and for each child, choose a number from the following scale and write it on the line provided.)

**SCALE:**
1 = Very satisfied
2 = Somewhat satisfied
3 = Somewhat dissatisfied
4 = Very dissatisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>CHILD 1</th>
<th>CHILD 2</th>
<th>CHILD 3</th>
<th>CHILD 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cost</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hours available</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Location</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities provided</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dependability</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical surroundings</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall quality of care</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(21) How much of a problem have the following situations been for you in the past year?

**PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Small Problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a Problem</th>
<th>Big Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITUATION**

1. Providing care for sick child
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

2. Attending child's doctor or dentist appointments
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

3. Attending child's school meetings or events
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

4. Sudden loss of child care provider
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

5. Talking to child or child care provider during work hours
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

6. Child care during school vacations or holidays
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

7. Work-related travel
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

8. Child care when working evenings and/or weekends
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

9. Child care to cover sudden changes in work hours
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4

10. Making informal scheduling changes with co-workers and supervisors to accommodate family needs
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4

11. Conflicts with supervisors because of child care problems
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4

12. Other family-related emergencies
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4

(22) Do you plan to have children within the next five years?

1. Yes
2. No

If your answer is no, and you have no children 12 years old or younger now, go to question 25 on page 9.
(23) If a day care centre was set up by the company, either here or very near here, do you think you would place any of your children in this centre?

1 Yes
2 No

IF YOUR ANSWER IS NO, GO TO QUESTION 25 ON PAGE 9.

(24) For each child you would place in this centre, please answer the following questions. (Write your answers on the lines provided.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>CHILD 1</th>
<th>CHILD 2</th>
<th>CHILD 3</th>
<th>CHILD 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What age would the child be when you would enroll him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Which hours of the day would be needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily start time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily end time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which days of the week would be needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What fee would you be willing to pay for a full-day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(8) Do you have any retirement pensions over and above what is provided by (Organization C)? (Answer by circling the category(s) that apply)

1. No retirement pensions other than that provided by the College
2. PRSP
3. Pension(s) from companies other than (Organization C)
4. Pensions other than those listed in the above categories (please specify)

(29) Employee Assistance Programs are programs which are designed to help employees with a variety of personal and family problems, such as financial insecurity, marital and family instability, mental health problems, and drug or alcohol problems. Through such programs, employees can receive referrals to community agencies and professionals for help in dealing with these problems.

The Employee Assistance Program presently at (Organization C) consists of a number of people in the support staff group who have been trained to discuss problems with employees and to make referrals to appropriate agencies in the community. At the present time, certain kinds of professional fees must be paid by the employee.

1. Were you aware that this Employee Assistance Program is available to (Organization C) employees?

1. Yes
2. No

2. Have you ever used the Employee Assistance Program at (Organization C)?

1. Yes
2. No

3. If you have used this program, how satisfied were you with the service provided?

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Very satisfied

4. If a serious personal problem arose in the future, do you think you would use the Employee Assistance Program?

1. Would definitely not use
2. Would probably not use
3. Would probably use
4. Would definitely use
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS: ORGANIZATION C
(Continued)

5. Do you consider any of the following factors to be barriers to your use of the Employee Assistance Program?

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Not at all of a barrier (NA)</th>
<th>Not much of a barrier (NM)</th>
<th>Somewhat of a barrier ($)</th>
<th>Very much of a barrier (VM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BARRIER

Lack of information regarding what is provided by the service.

Concern that others within (Organization C) would know of my personal problems.

Referral agents now are members of support staff only; no similar referral agents in faculty/administration.

Belief that outside counselling might not be of much help.

Unable/unwilling to pay professional fees not covered in the existing benefit plan.

Location of the service; referral agents only located at (Main Site) in Windsor.

Any other barriers? (please specify)

6. If the Employee Assistance Program was expanded at (Organization C), it might take a variety of forms. There are two possibilities described on the following page. The costs of the Employee Assistance Program presently in place at (Organization C) have been minimal, and these costs have been essentially absorbed by (Organization C). Some professional services are free, and some are covered to some extent by the benefit plan, however others involve costs to the employee. The programs described on the next page would require additional funding, so that a wider range of professional services could be either partially or totally covered for the employee. Funding would probably be shared between employees, the unions, and possibly (Organization C). As is the case with the present EAP program, all information provided by the employee to the referral agent in these programs would be kept strictly confidential. Please read the program descriptions on the next page, and answer the questions that follow.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM A: Program A would offer an internal referral service, whereby a trained (Organization C) employee would identify the nature of the problem through discussion with the employee, and then make a referral to an appropriate outside agency or professional. This would be an expanded form of the current program, to which employees from all groups (support staff, faculty, and administration) would have access.
6 (A) To what extent do you feel that you would:

1. Be supportive of PROGRAM A being put in place at (Organization C)?
   
   1. Not at all in support
   2. Not much in support
   3. Somewhat in support
   4. Very much in support

2. Be likely to use PROGRAM A at some time, if a serious personal or family problem arose?
   
   1. Definitely not use
   2. Probably not use
   3. Probably use
   4. Definitely use

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM B: Program B would offer an external referral service, whereby employees could directly contact a designated outside agency or consultant who would identify the nature of the problem through discussion with the employee, and then make a referral to an appropriate agency or professional. The cost for Program B would be greater than it is for Program A, to cover the fees required by the outside referral source.

6 (B) To what extent do you feel that you would:

1. Be supportive of PROGRAM B being put in place at (Organization C)?
   
   1. Not at all in support
   2. Not much in support
   3. Somewhat in support
   4. Very much in support

2. Be likely to use PROGRAM B at some time, if a serious personal or family problem arose?
   
   1. Definitely not use
   2. Probably not use
   3. Probably use
   4. Definitely use

7. Do you have any other comments on the existing Employee Assistance Program, or on possible modifications for the future?
(30) Job-sharing involves splitting one full-time job between two people. Job duties, salary, and benefits of the full-time job are divided evenly between two people who choose to job-share. Seniority is prorated, so that it accumulates at half the rate of a full-time job.

1. Were you aware that job-sharing is available to (Organization C) employees?
   1 Yes
   2 No

2. Have you ever used job-sharing at (Organization C)?
   1 Yes
   2 No

3. What barriers, if any, are there to your use of job-sharing?

(31) Flexible scheduling, or flextime, involves a certain degree of employee control over the scheduling of work hours. Under flexible scheduling, employees choose which hours to work, but not how many. In other words, they are still required to put in the full-time requirement for number of hours worked per week, but they have some variability in terms of when to start and leave each day.

1. Were you aware that flexible scheduling is available to (Organization C) employees?
   1 Yes
   2 No

2. Have you ever used flexible scheduling at (Organization C)?
   1 Yes
   2 No

3. What barriers, if any, are there to your use of flexible scheduling?

(32) Some employees have dependent family members. Here, a dependent is considered a family member in any age category (i.e., a child, aged parent, spouse, etc.) for whom you assume partial or total responsibility.

1. Do you have any dependent family members at the present time?
   1 Yes
   2 No

IF YOU HAVE NO DEPENDENT FAMILY MEMBERS AT THE PRESENT TIME, GO TO THE LAST QUESTION ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE: QUESTION (35), PAGE 27.
2. What do you now use when a dependent is ill? (circle all that apply)
   1 My own sick days
   2 Vacation days
   3 Unpaid leave
   4 Paid personal leave
   5 Informal rescheduling arrangements, whereby time taken off work is made up later
   6 Care is not a problem: it is handled by another family member or through paid care
   7 Other (please specify) ________________________________

3. How satisfied are you with the options available to you for time off work when a dependent is ill?
   1 Very dissatisfied
   2 Somewhat dissatisfied
   3 Somewhat satisfied
   4 Very satisfied

4. Do you consider any of the following factors to be barriers to getting time off work when a dependent is ill?
   PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

   | Not at all of a barrier (NA) | Not much of a barrier (NM) | Somewhat of a barrier (S) | Very much of a barrier (VM) |
---|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
Lack of information on the options available to me. | 1 2 3 4 |
Lack of support from my supervisor for time off when a dependent is ill. | 1 2 3 4 |
Lack of support from co-workers for time off when a dependent is ill. | 1 2 3 4 |
Restrictions on certain kinds of policies/leaves. (for example, number of days in a row, advance notice, formal application, and so on) (PLEASE SPECIFY) ________________________________ | 1 2 3 4 |

Any other barriers? (please specify)

______________________________
5. If a certain number of days off per year were designated as paid personal leave days to use when a dependent was ill, how likely would you be to use these days?

1. Not at all likely
2. Not very likely
3. Somewhat likely
4. Very likely

(33) TO BE ANSWERED BY EMPLOYEES WITH CHILDREN ONLY. ALL OTHERS GO TO QUESTION (34), PAGE 25.

1. In the past years, how much of a problem have the following situations been for you as a result of your combined work and parental responsibilities?

PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Small Problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a Problem</th>
<th>Big Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITUATION

Providing care for sick child

Attending child’s doctor or dentist appointments

Attending child’s school meetings or events

Sudden loss of child care provider

Talking to child or child care provider during work hours

Child care during school vacations or holidays

Work-related travel

Child care when working evenings and/or weekends

Child care to cover sudden changes in work hours

Making informal scheduling changes with co-workers and supervisors to accommodate family needs

Conflicts with supervisors because of child care problems

Other family-related emergencies
2. Were you aware that On-Site Child Care is available to (Organization C) employees?
   1  Yes
   2  No

3. Have you ever used the On-Site Child Care Program at (Organization C)?
   1  Yes
   2  No

4. If you have used this program, how satisfied were you with the service provided?
   1  Very dissatisfied
   2  Somewhat dissatisfied
   3  Somewhat satisfied
   4  Very satisfied

5. Do you consider any of the following factors to be barriers to your use of this program?

   PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

   BARRIER

   The age range of children accepted into the program.
   Not at all  Not much  Somewhat  Very much
   (NA)       (NM)       (S)       (VM)
   The location of the day care program.
   Lack of information about the day care program.
   The cost of the program.
   The waiting list/lack of space available.
   The turnover of student-trainees in the program.
   The hours of operation do not fit with my work schedule.
   I prefer other kinds of care (e.g., in-home care) to day care for my children.

   Any other barriers? (please specify) ____________________________
(34) Many employees have aged parents or other aged relatives (e.g., spouse) who require periodic or full-time care.

1. Do you have this kind of responsibility at the present time?

   1. Yes
   2. No

   IF YOU DO NOT NOW HAVE THIS RESPONSIBILITY, GO TO QUESTION (35).
   PAGE 27.

2. Sometimes employees with aged parents or other aged relatives find it difficult to meet the time demands of their work and family responsibilities, or simply feel overwhelmed a lot of the time. How often do you experience these kinds of difficulties?

   1. Never
   2. Rarely
   3. Sometimes
   4. Frequently

3. In the past years, how much of a problem have the following situations been for you as a result of your combined work responsibility and responsibility for aged parents/relatives?

   PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Small Problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a Problem</th>
<th>Big Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding and providing appropriate care for aged parents/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending meetings, doctor's appointments for aged parents/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheduled during work hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to aged parent/relative or their caretaker during work hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related travel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging care when working evenings or week-ends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging care when sudden changes are made in work hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making informal scheduling changes with co-workers and supervisors to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodate family needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS: ORGANIZATION C
(Continued)

**PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Small Problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a Problem</th>
<th>Big Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SMALL</th>
<th>SOMewhat</th>
<th>BIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts with supervisors because of problems arising from responsibility for aged parents/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family-related emergencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other related problems? (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. A number of organizations have considered implementing "Eldercare" programs at the workplace to provide assistance to employees with responsibility for aged parents. Eldercare may take a variety of forms. Below, five options are listed. If this organization was to offer these options, which do you think you would use?

**PLEASE ANSWER USING THIS SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definately Not Use</th>
<th>Probably Not Use</th>
<th>Probably Use</th>
<th>Definately Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(DN) 1</td>
<td>(PN) 2</td>
<td>(PU) 3</td>
<td>(DU) 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>DN</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>PU</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminars on caring for aged parents/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A referral service providing information on community services for aged parents/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-site activities and programs for aged parents/relatives to attend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some subsidy for costs paid to care for aged parents/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some set number of days per year which are designated as paid days off to care for aged parents/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS: ORGANIZATION C
(Continued)

(35) In the past year, about how many times have you: (For each question, please mark your answer with an X on the line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES IN PAST YEAR</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-3 times</th>
<th>4-6 times</th>
<th>7-10 times</th>
<th>More than 10 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Missed a day of work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Been late for work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Left work early?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dealt with family problems while at work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vita Auctoris

Victoria Macfarlane was born in Shawinigan Falls, Quebec, on November 23, 1955, to Marjorie and Eric Macfarlane. She received a high school diploma from Beaconsfield High School in 1972. In 1978 she received a Bachelor of Science degree (Psychology) from McGill University, and in 1985 she received a Master of Arts degree (Applied Social Psychology) from the University of Windsor.