



Work-family conflict: a study of lesbian mothers

Tracy L. Tuten

Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, USA, and

Rachel A. August

*Department of Psychology, California State University, Sacramento,
California, USA*

578

Received August 2005
Revised April 2006
Accepted April 2006

Abstract

Purpose – Among the most consistent predictors of work-family conflict for working parents are the number of hours worked, job role autonomy, and degree of support managers offer parents. Yet, little is known about the unique work experiences of lesbian women in terms of work-family conflict. This paper seeks to identify correlates of work-family conflict, specifically work interference with family (WIF), among lesbian mothers and identifies the role that being “out” at work plays in their experience of WIF.

Design/methodology/approach – A survey of 58 working lesbian mothers engaged in long-term, same-sex relationships that they categorized as a family was used to collect data on constructs related to work-family conflict and related variables. The vast majority of the sample were managers or professionals.

Findings – Analyses indicate that increased job role autonomy, fewer hours worked, and increased managerial support are associated with less overall WIF. Additionally, the extent to which participants are “out” at work is associated with reduced WIF, and explains variance beyond the other constructs examined.

Practical implications – Managers can play an essential role in helping reduce WIF among lesbian women via formal steps including offering written support for non-discrimination policies and benefits for domestic partners. Managers can also take more informal steps such as role modeling acceptance. Finally, managers can modify features of the work environment and jobs themselves.

Originality/value – Being “out” at work can be advantageous for lesbian workers as a strategy for ameliorating WIF. Managers are in a position to make this kind of disclosure possible.

Keywords Family, Work study, Sexual behaviour, Discrimination, Homosexuals, Family friendly organizations

Paper type Research paper

Work-family conflict exists when the demands associated with work are incompatible with demands associated with family and home life (Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1999). A sizable body of literature identifies predictors of work-family conflict among working mothers, in general. Among the most consistent predictors are the number of hours worked per week, job role autonomy, and the degree of support managers offer to help parents meet multiple demands (Bellavia and Frone, 2004). That literature also underscores the notion that managers can play a key role in helping ameliorate work-family conflict by altering the job-related characteristics partially responsible for inducing work-family conflict.

The negative impacts of work-family conflict for employees’ personal outcomes are well-established, and include burnout, stress, and life dissatisfaction (Sulsky and



Smith, 2000). In addition, there are a number of negative outcomes of managerial concern as well, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and absenteeism (Allen *et al.*, 2000). Though work-family conflict and the associated outcomes are not unique to women, some research has indicated that in the long-run, women's career development is disproportionately affected by work-family conflict. For instance, women may self-select into less demanding occupations, thereby freeing up their time and reducing work-family conflict (Parasuraman and Greenhaus, 1993). Drew and Murtagh (2005) have suggested that male managers, more often than female managers, have had the privilege of following a "breadwinner" model, whereby they are able to delegate many family responsibilities to a wife.

Though a growing body of literature describes the work experience of lesbian women, rarely have their experiences of work-family conflict in particular been examined. One exception is Day and Schoenrade's (2000) recent study identifying significant relationships between work-family conflict and disclosure of sexual orientation, top management support, and the anti-discrimination policies held by the employing organization. Though particularly noteworthy for its large sample size, the key variables in that study contained only single-item measures, which (as we discuss later) is particularly problematic in the case of measuring work-family conflict.

Our knowledge of lesbian women's work experiences has typically been built around issues of stereotyping (Hall, 1986), discrimination (Croteau, 1996), and job search or early career development issues (Croteau and Thiel, 1993; Croteau and von Destinon, 1994). Yet, the very nature of work-family conflict, involving the overlap between individual's unique home and work circumstances, suggests that efforts by lesbian women to manage the interface between work and family may be different from those of heterosexual women and are thus deserving of study.

Lesbian women, in particular, who experience work-family conflict seem likely to face threats to career development. They are faced with the double-challenge of managing the work-family interface as well as confronting other barriers more unique to lesbian women's career development, including implementing an "unacceptable" self-concept (House, 2004) and finding a non-discriminatory environment. Despite lobbying efforts by gay and lesbian activist groups in recent years to create anti-discrimination policies for the workplace, no federal legislation in the USA protects against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Currently, only 17 of the 50 USA, as well as the District of Columbia, prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation in public and private workplaces.

Governmental policies have been more proactive in this regard in many European countries. For instance, in Britain, the Civil Partnership Act and the Employment Equality (sexual orientation) Regulations Act help to support the rights of gays and lesbians in the workplace (Ward and Winstanley, 2003; Lyall, 2005). Even among those who work in an environment with a good "diversity reputation," lesbian employees are faced with the presumed normalcy associated with homophobia (Sullivan, 2004). Lindberg (2005) described the "pink ceiling" that may limit the rise of lesbians into upper levels of management.

A Yankelovich Monitor Survey cited by Demian (2006) states that 67 percent of lesbians (as compared to 72 percent of heterosexual women) are parents. According to information from the National Adoption Information Clearinghouse cited in Facts about kids with gay and lesbian parents, 6-14 million children in the USA live with a

gay or lesbian parent. Further, estimates of employment among lesbians based on data from a national survey suggest an employment rate of 91 percent (Morgan and Brown, 1991). Clearly, then, work-family conflict is potentially a concern to a sizable group of lesbian women and their families, much less to their managers and employing organizations who can help amend the problem. The next section offers a brief review of the work-family conflict literature as it relates to lesbian women. Further, the experience of being “out” at work and its potential consequences for lesbian working mothers is discussed.

Work-family conflict and lesbian mothers

Describing the interface between work and family

Work-family conflict has been defined as a form of interrole conflict in which role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respects (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). One of the most common typologies recognizes three forms of conflict: time-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Stephens and Sommer, 1996; Carlson, 1999). Time-based conflict occurs when multiple roles compete for a person’s time, and time spent on activities within one role generally cannot be devoted to activities in another role. Strain-based conflict occurs when strain in one role affects performance in another role, making it difficult to perform that role. Last, behavior-based conflict occurs when the roles one plays at home and work contain opposing behavioral expectations. For example, behaviors men might exhibit at home, such as nurturing children, may not be desirable or considered appropriate at work (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985).

Several important trends have characterized the work-family conflict literature in recent years. Among them are efforts to describe the nature of the interface between work and family. The models of that interface have been summarized by a number of authors (Bellavia and Frone, 2004; Sulsky and Smith, 2005). The various models typically specify that either work and family are independent of one another (the independence model), that people use one domain to compensate for missing factors in the other domain (the compensation model), or that the two domains are essentially inseparable, such that the attitudes held and behaviors performed in one have a direct impact on the other (the spillover model). The latter model has been the view taken by most researchers in recent years, and is the one we ascribe to as well.

A second trend concerns the directionality of work-family conflict. Traditionally, work-family conflict has been construed as a unidirectional construct. That is, researchers typically studied the conflict that occurs when work interferes with an employee’s ability to function at home or did not distinguish the direction of interference (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). However, more recent studies have construed work-family conflict as bi-directional (Carlson and Frone, 2003), with the recognition that circumstances in an employee’s home life can have consequences for functioning at work and vice versa. That research has generally validated the idea that work interference with family (WIF) is conceptually distinct from family interference with work (FIW), and necessitated nomenclature making these distinctions clear as well as clarifying measurement of the constructs so that items delineated those distinctions. We use that nomenclature, and subsequently the associated measurement, here.

While the disclosure of sexual orientation may be consequential for both WIF and FIW, we chose to focus our study on the former construct. More information is known about WIF than about FIW including somewhat more consistent findings in terms of prevalence rates, predictors, and outcomes. As our goal was to identify the role of an additional variable – being “out” at work – into this body of literature, and consider how managers might assist lesbian employees in their efforts to be “out”, we saw it fit to do so first within the context WIF as it has a more clear network of relations associated with it.

Lesbian women’s work lives

The WIF literature has focused almost exclusively on traditional nuclear families and the associated working parent’s (often, mother’s) experience of WIF and FIW (Sulsky and Smith, 2005). Though a growing body of evidence explores lesbian women’s work lives in general, there is very little direct evidence concerning those constructs in particular. However, a review of the workplace experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people (Croteau, 1996) indicates five areas commonly studied, some of which have bearing on the work-family interface. Three of those areas concern discrimination, specifically, its pervasiveness in the workplace, the extent to which that discrimination is formal or informal, and lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees’ fear of discrimination. Day and Schoenrade (2000) offer the additional information that having a formal anti-discrimination policy regarding sexual orientation reduces work-family conflict. The extensive discrimination would seem to make managing the work-family interface particularly difficult for lesbian women. Efforts to make family life a priority when working are difficult in many circumstances; that would seem to be particularly the case when the family is a non-traditional one involving a lesbian partner and/or children. Not only is the employee subject to discrimination, but other family members may also be the target of hatred or fear. More practically, the employee may not be allowed access to employment benefits such as health insurance and family leave due to policies excluding same-sex partners.

The other two areas Croteau (1996) identified as common themes were variability in workplace openness about sexual orientation and correlates of the degree of openness. Lesbian workers, at best, face a choice in exposing their private lives to coworkers, though sometimes are accidentally or intentionally “outed” as well. The research concerning this topic indicates that openness involves a continuum, in which employees range from being “totally open” to “not open at all” (Schneider, 1986) or reporting differences in the number and type of people at work who knew about their sexuality (Levine and Leonard, 1984). Though one study (Day and Schoenrade, 2000) indicates that openness about sexual orientation is related to work-family conflict, that study limits the measurement of openness to identifying the people to whom employees were “out”. Further, there was no distinction between WIF and FIW. Griffith and Hebl (2002) have insightfully pointed out that the dilemma facing gays and lesbians in the workplace is a double-edged sword. They risk facing discrimination if they disclose but are unable to “be themselves” if they remain “in the closet.” If “being oneself” means identifying not only as a lesbian, but as a lesbian mother with a non-traditional family, then certainly the choices about openness and concealment become much more complicated.

In general, then, it is clear that many lesbian women experience substantial workplace discrimination, at least in the USA. Many also make varying degrees of effort to protect their sexual identities at work from some or all coworkers. It may be that lesbian women do so in response to discrimination, and/or in an effort to protect against future discrimination. However, we examine here whether disclosure of sexual orientation can simultaneously result in a positive consequence for the employee, specifically, reductions in WIF.

Predicting work interference with family

The sources of WIF can include individual characteristics, characteristics of the family role environment, and/or characteristics of the work role environment (Bellavia and Frone, 2004). While all three types of influence are important, we focus particularly on work characteristics and openness about sexual orientation, since managers are in a position of being able to prescribe work characteristics that reduce WIF, and also can play an important role in setting a business climate which allows employees to be comfortable disclosing their sexual orientation. Further, as a major goal of management is to enhance productivity and minimize costs, assisting employees in reducing WIF can simultaneously provide strategies and tactics for pursuing those broader organizational goals. In particular, in this study we examine the work characteristics of job role autonomy, number of hours worked, organizational work-family culture, and the presence and use of family-friendly policies. Generally, we anticipate that work characteristics affect WIF for lesbian mothers in much the same way as for heterosexual working parents. We also add the important feature of considering employees' comfort with being open about sexual orientation to the dialog about reducing WIF.

Job role autonomy. Past research suggests that job autonomy has an inverse effect on perceptions of work-family conflict (Aryee, 1992). Individuals with high job autonomy experience lower perceptions of work-family conflict. This is likely due to the increased control one experiences in an autonomous position. This increased control provides employees the opportunity to deal with those potential conflicts between work- and family-life as they arise; thereby resulting in lower perceptions of conflict. We expect this relationship to hold for lesbian working mothers.

H1. Job autonomy will be negatively associated with WIF.

Organizational work-family culture. An organization's work-family culture should also have an effect on perceptions of WIF. Work cultures are composed of many dimensions; among those are the degree to which they encourage a reasonable balance between work and family life. Those that do tend to result in workers experiencing lower levels of work-family conflict (Behson, 2002b; Thompson *et al.*, 1999). Work places considered "family-friendly" may include such things as a supervisor who supports balance between work and family (Anderson *et al.*, 2002; Batt and Valcour, 2003; McManus *et al.*, 2002) or a culture that does not demand that employees bring work home or work overtime (Thompson *et al.*, 1999).

Thompson *et al.* (1999) proposed three dimensions of organizational work-family culture: managerial support, balance with regard to organizational time demands, and freedom from perceived career consequences of using family-friendly policies. Managerial support addresses the extent to which managers are sensitive and

supportive of an employee's family responsibilities. The more managerial support one experiences at work, the less WIF should be perceived. Organizational time demands refer to the extent to which employees are expected to spend long hours at work and bring work home. An organization with fewer time demands promotes the norm that work hours do not become detrimental to one's ability to care for family responsibilities. Here, too, managers play a role, by helping promote that norm. Thus, when employees perceive a norm of a reasonable work-family balance, they should experience less WIF. Perceived consequences of using family-friendly policies involves whether employees believe that their careers may be jeopardized by taking advantage of those policies. Because such policies are explicitly designed to provide employees with the resources necessary to manage responsibilities at both work and home, the perceived freedom to use family-friendly benefits without negative consequences will be related to lower levels of WIF.

H2a. The presence of managerial support will be negatively associated with WIF.

H2b. An organizational norm of balanced time demands will be negatively associated with WIF.

H2c. Perceived freedom to use family-friendly benefits will be negatively associated with WIF.

Family-friendly policies. While the construct of organizational work-family culture described above captures the idea that employees have the psychological feeling that they are free to use those policies without negative consequence, clearly the freedom to do so is insignificant if the policies are not available in the first place. The actual types of family-friendly benefits available and their use is often assumed to help employees balance work and family responsibilities (Lambert, 1990). Thompson *et al.* (1999) showed that people who work for companies with several formal family-friendly policies report lower levels of work-family conflict. McManus *et al.* (2002) found similar results for the effect on family-work conflict. For lesbian families, we would expect the presence of family-friendly policies, as well as their actual use, to be important in managing WIF as well.

H3a. The presence of family-friendly policies will be negatively associated with WIF.

H3b. The use of family-friendly policies will be negatively associated with WIF.

Hours spent working. The most consistent predictor of WIF is the amount of time spent working (Batt and Valcour, 2003; Frone *et al.*, 1997; Fu and Shaffer, 2001; Grzywacz and Marks, 2000; Gutek *et al.*, 1991; Higgins *et al.*, 1992; Madsen, 2003; Mennino and Brayfield, 2002). Higgins *et al.* (2000) found that those who worked 30 or more hours per week reported more work-to-family conflicts, regardless of their job level.

H4. The more hours spent working, the higher one's WIF.

Being "out" at work. Reports vary concerning the degree to which gay and lesbian employees are open about their sexual orientation at work. A 1986 sample of lesbian workers (Schneider, 1986) across a variety of occupations indicate that 39 percent were

mostly or totally open about their sexuality, while a somewhat more recent study of professionals (Croteau and Lark, 1995) indicates that 47 percent of gay and lesbian employees said all or most people at work knew about their sexual orientation. The choice of whether to be “out” at work is one of great consequence. Given the potential for subtle or more overt discrimination, lesbian workers may feel uncomfortable discussing their family life and responsibilities and/or taking advantage of family-friendly policies. The act of hiding one’s personal identity could lead to greater WIF for lesbian employees. For instance, a lesbian woman who needed to leave work early to drive her partner home following oral surgery would likely have more trouble explaining this circumstance to a manager if she were not “out” at work. A similar circumstance could occur if she needed to leave early to pick up her partner’s child from school. If one is not comfortable acknowledging his or her sexual orientation, it is less likely that he or she would pursue the use of family-friendly benefits at work. As Griffith and Hebl (2002) pointed out, lesbians and gays risk facing discrimination if they disclose their sexuality, but may find access to some FFPs restricted if they remain “in the closet.”

H5. Being “out” at work will be negatively associated with WIF.

Method

Recruitment and participants

To qualify for inclusion in the study, participants had to be in a long-term, same-sex relationship that they categorize as a family, and be at least partially responsible for the upbringing of one or more children. Gay and lesbian family support groups listed on the Family Pride Coalition web site were contacted and asked to distribute survey packets to group members. The contact person for each group was asked to assist in the study by distributing packets containing the survey, a pre-addressed, postage-paid return envelope, and a cover letter to his or her group members.

The sample of 58 returned and completed surveys was comprised primarily of Caucasian (87 percent) women. Participants came from a mix of states, including Arizona, California, Georgia, Ohio, Connecticut, New York, and Vermont, as well as the District of Columbia. Ages of the participants ranged from 27 to 57 with 44.3 percent between the ages of 30 and 39 and 42.8 percent between 40 and 49. About 71 percent reported household incomes in excess of \$75,000. While the highest level of education attained ranged from high school to completion of a graduate degree, 27 percent were college graduates and 48 percent held graduate degrees. About 50 percent of the sample reported working in professional fields; 20 percent indicated holding jobs in middle management; 1 percent held jobs in top management; 6 percent were clerical workers. About 16 percent identified their profession as “other” and wrote in occupations. The vast majority indicated occupations that could be categorized as service provider positions (e.g. child care provider, health care provider). About 7 percent did not indicate their occupation. About 57 percent reported working in excess of 45 hours per week with an additional 20 percent working a 40-hour work week. About 40 percent of the participants reported that their partners work in excess of 45 hours per week with an additional 40 percent reporting partners who work a 40-hour work week. Thus, it seems that most of the study participants were in dual-income families. The number of children in the home ranged from one (57 percent) to four children (1 percent); 39 percent of the participants had two children in the home.

About 54 percent indicated that they had total custody of their children; 22 percent shared custody equally with another party. More than 50 percent of participants indicated using a sperm donor to conceive a child.

Measures

The survey included standardized measures commonly used to research the work-family interface and a measure of being “out” at work (Griffith and Hebl, 2002). These measures are discussed below.

The dimensions of work-family conflict were measured following Carlson *et al.* (2000). This measure reflects the bi-directionality of work-family conflict as well as the various forms it can take. The two directions of conflict, WIF and FIW showed α s of 0.83 and 0.85, respectively. The three forms of conflict were also assessed for each direction, though data pertaining to WIF only are reported here, given the purpose of this study: time-based WIF ($\alpha = 0.85$), strain-based WIF ($\alpha = 0.83$), and behavior-based WIF ($\alpha = 0.81$). A sample item from the time-based WIF is “My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.” Strain-based WIF was measured with items such as “When I get home from work, I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities and responsibilities.” A sample item representing behavior-based WIF is “Behavior that is effective and necessary at work would be counterproductive at home.”

Role autonomy ($\alpha = 0.91$) was measured using four items developed by Parasuraman and Alutto (1984) with a five-point response format (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). A sample item is “I have plenty of say in setting my work goals.”

Organizational work-family culture (managerial support, freedom from career consequences, and balance regarding organization time demands) was measured using a scale containing three dimensions developed by Thompson *et al.* (1999). Managerial support contained 11 items; the α was 0.86. A sample item is “In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first.” The Cronbach’s α for freedom from career consequences of using family-friendly policies (five items) was 0.80. A sample item is “Employees who use flextime are less likely to advance their careers than employees who do not use flextime.” Freedom from career consequences is scored such that higher scores indicate fewer career consequences, and, consequently, a more supportive organizational work-family culture. The degree of organizational balance regarding time demands was measured with four items; the Cronbach’s α was 0.73. Time demands were measured with statements such as “To get ahead in my organization, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at the workplace or at home.” Higher scores indicate reasonable time demands consistent with an organizational culture that is supportive of an employee’s need to balance work and family lives. Lower scores indicate high, and possibly unreasonable, time demands.

Items were also developed to assess the number of family-friendly policies provided by each respondent’s employer as well as respondent’s use of those policies. The family-friendly policies included were flexible work schedules, job sharing, on or near-site childcare, child care subsidies, child care referrals, after-school child care, child care for sick children, elder care, elder care referrals, paid leave for sick family, personal days off, flexible spending accounts, ability to work from home, psychological

counseling service, and domestic partner benefits (Judge and Colquitt, 2004, p. 399). Respondents were asked to indicate whether the policy was available or not or if they did not know, and if the policy was available, whether they had used it. One point was assigned for each work-family policy offered, and ultimately those responses were summed to derive a measure of number of family friendly policies. Likewise, use of work-family policies was simply the number of policies an individual indicated they had used.

Three items measured the extent to which the respondents were “out” at work (Griffith and Hebl, 2002). A sample item is “I am comfortable acknowledging my sexual orientation at work.” The Cronbach’s α for this scale is 0.76. The number of hours worked was measured with a single item, “In a typical week, how many hours do you work at your job?”

Results

The mean scores for each variable and the correlations are provided in Table I. Correlations marked by an asterisk indicate a significance of 0.01. This analysis shows that job role autonomy is negatively related to overall WIF, strain-based WIF, and behavior-based WIF, though only the relationship to behavior-based WIF is significant ($r = -0.29, p < 0.01$). Significant negative relationships are demonstrated between all components of organizational work-family culture and all types of WIF, with the exception of freedom from career consequences of using FFPs and strain-based WIF. The presence and use of FFPs both showed a positive relationship with perceptions of managerial support (presence of FFPs, $r = 0.25, p < 0.01$; usage of FFPs, $r = 0.43, p < 0.01$), but did not show a significant association with overall WIF. The number of hours worked shows a significant and negative relationship with organizational balance with time demands ($r = -0.51, p < 0.01$) and freedom from career consequences of using FFPs ($r = -0.41, p < 0.01$) and a significant and positive relationship with overall WIF ($r = 0.55, p < 0.01$), time-based WIF ($r = 0.55, p < 0.01$), strain-based WIF ($r = 0.48, p < 0.01$), and role autonomy ($r = 0.41, p < 0.01$). Being “out” at work shows a negative and significant relationship to all types of WIF ($r = -0.44$ for overall WIF; $r = -0.30$ for time-based WIF; $r = -0.30$ for strain-based WIF; $r = -0.34$ for behavior-based WIF; all $p < 0.01$) and to perceptions of managerial support ($r = 0.65, p < 0.01$).

Next, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed, using as predictors the variables identified in prior literature as important for forecasting WIF: number of hours worked, job role autonomy, organizational work-family culture (managerial support, organizational time demands, and freedom from career consequences of using family-friendly policies), and the presence and use of family-friendly policies. Those variables were entered in one step into the regression analyses. Then, the extent to which employees were “out” at work was entered as a second step into the regression analyses, to demonstrate the unique role that being “out” had in explaining WIF.

As shown in Table II, overall WIF was significantly associated with number of hours worked ($\beta = 0.66, p < 0.001$), job role autonomy ($\beta = -0.38, p < 0.01$), and managerial support ($\beta = -0.22, p < 0.05$). Being “out” added a unique and significant ($\beta = -0.22, p < 0.05$) contribution, indicating that the more “out” participants were, the less they experienced WIF. The model explained 61 percent of the variance associated with overall WIF. With the exception of managerial support, the other

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Overall WIF	2.74	0.76									
2. Time-based WIF	3.05	0.98	0.79*								
3. Strain-based WIF	2.66	0.87	0.78*	0.45*							
4. Behavior-based WIF	2.52	0.84	0.68*	0.25*	0.33*						
5. Job role autonomy	3.68	0.99	-0.17	0.05	-0.18	-0.29*					
6. Balance/organizational time demands	3.16	0.76	-0.62*	-0.55*	-0.37*	0.46*	0.04				
7. Freedom from career consequences of using FFPs	3.16	0.88	-0.36*	-0.36*	-0.17	-0.28*	0.16	0.67*			
8. Managerial support	3.29	0.80	-0.52*	-0.27*	-0.39*	-0.52*	0.25*	0.59*	0.40*		
9. Availability of FFPs	5.06	2.26	0.11	0.11	-0.03	0.17	-0.11	-0.06	-0.11	0.25*	
10. Usage of FFPs	3.17	1.65	-0.12	0.05	-0.07	-0.28*	0.13	0.10	0.02	0.43*	0.67*
11. Out at work	3.79	1.06	-0.44*	-0.30*	-0.30*	-0.34*	0.01	0.28*	0.14	0.65*	0.13
12. Hours worked	40.77	16.6	0.55*	0.55*	0.48*	0.18	0.41*	-0.51*	-0.41*	0.26*	0.25*
											-0.11

Table I.
Means, standard
deviations, and
intercorrelations among
study variables

organizational work-family culture variables (time demands and consequences of using family-friendly policies) were not useful in explaining the variance associated with WIF. Further, the presence and use of family-friendly policies were also not significant in explaining overall WIF.

These variables were also examined for time-based WIF. As shown in Table III, time-based WIF was significantly associated with number of hours worked ($\beta = 0.37, p < 0.01$), organizational balance regarding time demands ($\beta = -0.31, p < 0.01$), and being “out” ($\beta = -0.18, p < 0.08$). The model explained 40 percent of the variance associated with time-based WIF. In this case, managerial support and career consequences were not useful in explaining the variance associated with time-based WIF, but an organizational emphasis on a balance between work and home as it relates to time demands was significant. Further, job role autonomy and the presence and use of family-friendly policies were also not significant in explaining time-based WIF.

As shown in Table IV, strain-based WIF was significantly associated with number of hours worked ($\beta = 0.74, p < 0.001$), job role autonomy ($\beta = -0.51, p < 0.001$), availability of FFPs ($\beta = -0.26, p < 0.01$). Being “out” added a unique and significant ($\beta = -0.18, p < 0.05$) contribution, indicating that the more “out” participants were, the less they experienced strain-based WIF. The model explained 48 percent of the variance associated with strain-based WIF. The organizational work-family culture variables (managerial support, balance with regard to time demands and consequences

Table II.
Results of regression analysis explaining overall WIF

	<i>r</i>	Unstandardized β	Standardized β	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>R</i> ² adj
<i>Step 1</i>						
Hours worked	0.55	0.04	0.66	0.55	0.30	0.29
Managerial support	-0.52	-0.19	-0.22	0.72	0.52	0.51
Job role autonomy	-0.17	-0.26	-0.38	0.78	0.61	0.59
<i>Step 2</i>						
Being “out” at work	-0.43	-0.13	-0.22	0.80	0.64	0.61

Table III.
Results of regression analysis explaining time-based WIF

	<i>R</i>	Unstandardized β	Standardized β	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>R</i> ² adj
<i>Step 1</i>						
Balance/time demands	-0.55	-0.40	-0.31	0.55	0.30	0.29
Hours worked	0.55	0.03	0.37	0.63	0.40	0.38
<i>Step 2</i>						
Being “out” at work	-0.30	-0.16	-0.18	0.65	0.43	0.40

Table IV.
Results of regression analysis explaining strain-based WIF

	<i>R</i>	Unstandardized β	Standardized β	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>R</i> ² adj
<i>Step 1</i>						
Hours worked	0.48	0.05	0.74	0.48	0.23	0.22
Job role autonomy	-0.18	-0.45	-0.51	0.64	0.41	0.39
Availability of FFPs	-0.04	-0.10	-0.26	0.70	0.49	0.46
<i>Step 2</i>						
Being “out” at work	-0.30	-0.15	-0.18	0.72	0.52	0.48

of using family-friendly policies) were not useful in explaining the variance associated with strain-based WIF.

As shown in Table V, behavior-based WIF was significantly predicted by managerial support ($\beta = -0.46, p < 0.001$), availability of FFPs ($\beta = 0.64, p < 0.001$), and the number of FFPs used ($\beta = -0.51, p < 0.001$). Being “out” was not a significant variable in explaining the extent of behavior-based WIF. The model explained 47 percent of the variance associated with behavior-based WIF. Hours worked and job role autonomy were not useful in explaining the variance associated with behavior-based WIF.

While job role autonomy was not significant in explaining time-based WIF, it was useful in explaining overall WIF, strain-based WIF, and behavior-based WIF. The regression and correlation analyses consistently show a negative relationship between job autonomy and most measures of WIF. Thus, we conclude that *H1* is supported.

The second hypothesis purported that a positive organizational work-family culture would have a negative influence on WIF. Organizational work-family culture was conceptualized as consisting of three components: managerial support, an organizational norm supporting balance with regard to time demands, and freedom from career consequences associated with the use of FFPs. Managerial support was a significant explanatory variable for both overall WIF and behavior-based WIF, but was not useful in explaining time-based or strain-based WIF. The norm of balanced time demands was useful only in explaining time-based WIF. Freedom from perceived career consequences associated with using FFPs was not a significant variable in any of the regression analyses. The relationships between the components of organizational work-family culture and all types of WIF were in the predicted directions. *H2* thus receives partial support.

H3 proposed that the availability of FFPs and the usage of FFPs would be associated with reduced WIF. The availability of FFPs was useful in explaining strain- and behavior-based WIF but not time-based or overall perceptions of WIF. The reported usage of FFPs was only significant in explaining behavior-based WIF. Thus, *H3* is partially supported.

Hours worked was a significant explanatory variable in overall WIF, time-based WIF, strain-based WIF, but not for behavior-based WIF. Coefficients in the regression and correlation analyses are in the predicted directions. Thus, we conclude that *H4* is supported.

H5 proposed that being “out” at work would be associated with lower perceptions of WIF. Being “out” was a significant variable in explaining overall WIF, time-based WIF, and strain-based WIF, beyond all other variables in the analyses; we conclude that *H5* has strong support.

	<i>R</i>	Unstandardized β	Standardized β	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>R</i> ² adj
<i>Step 1</i>						
Managerial support	-0.52	-0.49	-0.46	0.52	0.27	0.26
Availability of FFPs	0.17	0.24	0.64	0.61	0.37	0.35
Use of FFPs	-0.28	-0.26	-0.51	0.70	0.50	0.47

Table V.
Results of regression
analysis explaining
behavior-based WIF

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that lesbian mothers, as with heterosexual mothers, struggle with work-family conflict, and that the variables useful in explaining WIF for heterosexuals are also applicable to lesbian women. To some degree, hours worked, job role autonomy, elements of the organizational work-family culture, the presence and usage of FFPs are useful in understanding the various types of WIF among lesbian mothers. Further, being “out” at work adds an important and unique contribution to explaining the experience of WIF among lesbian mothers. This was the case for overall WIF, time-based WIF, and strain-based WIF.

Given the assumption of heterosexuality in most workplaces, heterosexual employees are not faced with the dilemma of whether to disclose their sexual identity and face possible consequences. Prior research has noted some of the negative consequences of being “out” at work, including formal as well as informal discrimination (Croteau, 1996; Croteau and von Destinon, 1994). However, this study illustrates a more positive implication of being “out” at work – that doing so is associated with reductions in WIF. At least as far as managing the work-family interface, being “out” seems to be a positive coping strategy. Further, given the connection between WIF and other positive attitudinal and emotional experiences on the job (e.g. job satisfaction, organizational commitment, reduced stress), it may be that being “out” at work has other positive consequences as well. Griffith and Hebl (2002) recently demonstrated such results in a sample of gay and lesbian workers, who experienced higher job satisfaction and lower job anxiety when they disclosed their sexual identity at work.

In terms of the other variables helpful in explaining WIF, job role autonomy was significant in explaining overall WIF, strain-based WIF, and behavior-based WIF, but not time-based WIF. It is possible that individuals with high levels of job role autonomy may find that more work responsibilities and time obligations accompany the privilege of autonomy. Thus, while autonomy provides them with more control over their schedule, it does not actually provide more time to meet their work or family obligations.

The organizational work-family culture components were somewhat varied in their associations with WIF. Managerial support was a significant explanatory variable for both overall WIF and behavior-based WIF, but was not useful in explaining time-based or strain-based WIF. While managers can support or encourage parallel behaviors between work and home (e.g. nurturing relationships), their ability to support an employee’s experience of time-based WIF may be limited by work deadline pressures or other important organizational demands. Further, their influence is likely somewhat removed from an employee’s actual psychological experience of strain in meeting conflicting obligations. An organizational emphasis on a norm of work-family balance was useful only in explaining time-based WIF. In retrospect, the clear association with time-based WIF is the most likely association for the organizational norm of balancing work and family time, as more reasonable time demands should ameliorate time-based WIF.

The actual usage of FFPs was only significant in explaining behavior-based WIF. When employees used more FFPs, they reported less behavior-based WIF. Our analyses did not allow us to identify the direction of causation for the reported relationships; however, for this relationship, it seems likely that the causal path begins

with the experience of behavior-based WIF. That is, it may be that employees who are already more comfortable demonstrating consistent behaviors in their work and home lives (i.e. low behavior-based WIF) would be less fearful of any stigma associated with the use of FFPs, and thus more comfortable pursuing their use.

Further, the availability of FFPs was positively associated with behavior-based WIF, but negatively associated with strain-based WIF. Again, the possible causal direction of these relationships must be considered. It may be that employees who are comfortable demonstrating consistent work and home behaviors seek out organizations which offer extensive FFPs, given the value such employees likely place on home-life matters. Consequently, they might feel reduced strain-based WIF given that those FFPs are offered to them.

Along with being “out” at work, the number of hours worked demonstrated the most consistency in being associated with WIF. It was a significant explanatory variable in overall WIF, time-based WIF, and strain-based WIF. The consistency of this association parallels earlier findings by a number of authors (Batt and Valcour, 2003; Frone *et al.*, 1997; Fu and Shaffer, 2001; Grzywacz and Marks, 2000; Gutek *et al.*, 1991; Higgins *et al.*, 1992; Madsen, 2003; Mennino and Brayfield, 2002). Number of hours worked was not associated with behavior-based WIF. It seems reasonable that though working fewer hours would help reduce time conflicts and feelings of strain associated with work-family interference, it would not directly impact the consistency in behaviors employees demonstrate between home and work.

One general issue highlighted by the findings in this study is Carlson *et al.*'s (2000) contention that the various forms of WIF have, at least to some extent, distinctive antecedents. This was clearly the case in the present study. We echo their call for future researchers to incorporate constructs thought to be uniquely related to the different dimensions of work-family conflict. Further, the role that being “out” plays in the various forms of FIW should be explored. It may well be that being “out” is associated with only some types of FIW, and not others.

The conclusions drawn in this study should be viewed in light of a number of limitations. The sample size was relatively small and non-random, though as Croteau's (1996) review of lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees' work experiences indicates, relatively small, non-random samples are not unusual for studies in this topic area. Further, while previous studies focused on gay and lesbian employees, this study focused on a topic necessitating information from lesbian families, specifically employed lesbians in long-term partnerships with children in the household. Not only is the target population smaller than the heterosexual working population, but also fears about potential retribution for identifying oneself as “out” at work make actually reaching a willing, target population challenging. We attempted to combat that fear by accessing the population via gay and lesbian support groups, rather than specific workplaces. However, our sample was still somewhat small, possibly owing to fears about broader societal discrimination that could result from participating in such a study.

Another, somewhat related, limitation was the lack of causal conclusions that can be drawn from this study. Ideally, the relationships described in this study would be tested using structural equation modeling in an effort to identify causality. However, the relatively small sample prevented us from engaging in such analyses. We offer

only suggestions about causality, and believe they should be tested more directly with larger samples in the future.

Finally, given the household incomes, education level, and professions typically held by participants, the sample was a largely upper-middle class one. It may be that employees in such a sample have unique circumstances pertaining to the work-family interface. For instance, given the relatively high incomes, they may have more options regarding child care or elder care choices. And, given their professions, they are more likely to work for salaried rather than hourly wages, and thus are less likely to “clock in” and “clock out” at work. Both circumstances may allow them more choice in handling situations where work and family overlap. Future research on the work-family interface among lesbian women would benefit from a sample with more diversity in terms of socio-economic status. Because European countries have been more proactive in addressing diversity management issues related to sexual orientation, the legal and normative pressure to hide one’s sexual identity may differ in other countries. This issue will benefit from research pursued from a global perspective, as well.

Nonetheless, this study is unique in its efforts toward more adequate measures of the various constructs for this population. The need for accuracy in describing and adequately measuring the various types and directions of work-family conflict has been made clear (Bellavia and Frone, 2004; Carlson and Frone, 2003; Carlson *et al.*, 2000) and we have followed those recommendations here. Further, this study offers a psychologically-based assessment on participants’ comfort with disclosing sexual orientation, given the context of their particular work climate. This is different than the method often employed in other studies (Mohr and Fassinger, 2003; Rostosky and Riggle, 2002; Day and Schoenrade, 2000), whereby disclosure is assessed with the extent to which a given employee is out to a list of various coworkers. We believe our method is more useful as it does not depend on the base rate of employees, and assesses attitudes with explicit reference to employees’ unique work environment.

Work interference with family: what can managers do?

This study illustrates the importance of self-identification as a lesbian in one’s working environment as an important condition for minimizing conflict between work and family. To the extent that one feels uncomfortable expressing her identity as a lesbian, work and family life may both suffer. Further, the role of a number of organizational variables – job role autonomy, number of hours worked, organizational work-family culture and its components, and the availability and use of family-friendly policies – in explaining the various forms of WIF was identified.

Acknowledging that lesbian workers are likely to experience less WIF if they are able to be open at work is only the first step in making such disclosure possible. Managers face a unique consideration in determining exactly how they can assist lesbian workers in feeling more comfortable coming “out” at work, and by association, reducing their WIF. Key actions managers might take would seem to be promoting diversity, in general, among employees. Though the incidence of US organizations having policies which prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation is unknown, estimates based on reports by gay and lesbian employees indicate that at least 55 percent of the organizations they work for have no such policy (Day and Schoenrade, 2000). This number is likely an underestimate, as many gay and lesbian employees avoid working

for certain organizations, in part because of their lack of supportive policies. Managers might make formal, visible efforts to support lesbian employees, such as offering written support for such explicit non-discrimination policies in the organization's bylaws, as well as written support for family-friendly health and benefit policies to domestic partners. Though some state laws may prevent this latter policy, organizational leaders could engage in political lobbying for change in that area.

Other formal actions managers could take would be providing sponsorship and resources for an employee network group for lesbian (and potentially gay, bisexual, and transgender) employees. Such groups, sometimes referred to as affinity groups, are recommended by the Human Rights Campaign (www.hrc.org) and Stonewall (www.stonewall.org.uk), two groups that give voice to issues of sexual orientation in the workplace and in other institutions. Finally, as Griffith and Hebl (2002) have suggested, managers should offer, and attend themselves, diversity training to all employees which specifically addresses issues of sexual orientation. Too often, sexual orientation is overlooked in diversity training. Managers, who have the advantage of holding powerful voices in organizations, must make clear the import of including sexual orientation. Such training would help promote a climate in which lesbian employees felt more comfortable making their sexual orientation known at work. Importantly, organizations which develop managerial policies designed to improve acceptance in the workplace are able to build a "diversity reputation" (Avery and McKay, 2006). Diversity reputation can be achieved, at least in part, by participation in diversity assessments like Stonewall's Workplace Equality Index, which are based on workplace policies and programs. Avery and McKay (2006) point out that a strong diversity reputation is a critical recruitment tool for organizations seeking to recruit minorities.

Managers also have informal means of support at their disposal. By virtue of their day to day contact with employees, they can be essential in role modeling the norms of respect and acceptance to all employees. They can also informally educate their workgroups and supervisors on the advantages of positive treatment of all employees and the benefits diversity brings, including increased problem solving capabilities and better abilities to make strategic business shifts in competitive markets (Hays-Thomas, 2004). An accepting work environment is vital to preserving morale, and maintaining employee productivity in the long-run (Lubensky *et al.*, 2004), and managers can constantly endorse that information.

Aside from these direct efforts to help manage work-family conflict by promoting a climate of openness, managers have more general job-related concerns to contend with as well. They would be well-advised to consider how requiring or expecting employees to work excessive hours and/or work in jobs with little autonomy negatively impact employees' work-family balance; jobs could be redesigned accordingly with managerial input. Further, this study underscores the importance of the organizational culture, itself, in creating an atmosphere which allows employees to balance work and family. Successful changes in organizational culture are contingent on the abilities and sophistication of top-level executives and managers (Michela and Burke, 2000). Those key members of organizations would need to take a lead role in reforming cultures to be more family-friendly. Managers and leaders might issue statements of direct support for not compromising family life in the face of work demands, institute a wide range family-friendly policies in employee benefit packages, and model work-family balance themselves. Considering the documented benefits of

reductions in work-family conflict (e.g. increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment, reduced absenteeism), organizations could benefit from efforts to do so.

These kinds of actions would likely benefit not only lesbian workers, but also the organizations themselves. Ultimately, organizations having such supportive policies and cultures would likely be more attractive to lesbian job candidates (Griffith and Hebl, 2002) and would likely provide a supportive environment for ongoing career growth. Such actions would ultimately provide those organizations with the more competitive edge a well-managed diverse workforce typically brings.

References

- Allen, T.D., Herst, D.E.L., Bruck, C.S. and Sutton, M. (2000), "Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: a review and agenda for future research", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 5, pp. 278-308.
- Anderson, S.E., Coffey, B. and Byerly, R. (2002), "Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 28 No. 6, pp. 787-810.
- Aryee, S. (1992), "Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among married professional women: evidence from Singapore", *Human Relations*, Vol. 45, pp. 813-37.
- Avery, D. and McKay, P. (2006), "Target practice: an organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 59 No. 1, pp. 157-76.
- Batt, R. and Valcour, P.M. (2003), "Human resources practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 189-220.
- Behson, S.J. (2002), "Which dominates? The relative importance of work-family organizational support and general context on employee outcomes", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 61, pp. 53-72.
- Bellavia, G. and Frone, M. (2004), "Work-family conflict", in Barling, J., Kelloway, E.K. and Frone, M.R. (Eds), *Handbook of Work Stress*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Carlson, D. (1999), "Personality and role variables as predictors of three forms of work-family conflict", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 55, pp. 236-53.
- Carlson, D.S. and Frone, M.R. (2003), "Relation of behavioral and psychological involvement to a new four-factor conceptualization of work-family interference", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 17, pp. 515-35.
- Carlson, D., Kacmar, M. and Williams, L.J. (2000), "Construction and initial validation of a multi-dimensional measure of work-family conflict", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 56, pp. 249-76.
- Croteau, J.M. (1996), "Research on the work experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: an integrative review of methodology and content", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 48, pp. 195-209.
- Croteau, J.M. and Lark, J.S. (1995), "On being lesbian, gay, or bisexual in student affairs: A national survey of experiences on the job", *NASPA Journal*, Vol. 32, pp. 189-97.
- Croteau, J.M. and Thiel, M.J. (1993), "Integrating sexual orientation in career counseling: acting to end a form of the personal-career dichotomy", *Career Development Quarterly*, Vol. 42, pp. 174-9.
- Croteau, J.M. and von Destinon, M. (1994), "A national survey of job search experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual student affairs professionals", *Journal of College Student Development*, Vol. 35, pp. 40-5.

-
- Day, N.E. and Schoenrade, P. (2000), "The relationship among reported disclosure of sexual orientation, anti-discrimination policies, top management support and work attitudes of gay and lesbian employees", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 29, pp. 346-64.
- Demian (2006), "Parenting options for same-sex couples in the US: adoption, foster care, donor insemination, surrogating, custody", available at: www.buddybuddy.com/parent.html (accessed April 21, 2006).
- Drew, E. and Murtagh, E.M. (2005), "Work/life balance: senior management champions or laggards?", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 262-78.
- Frone, M.R., Yardley, J.K. and Markel, K.S. (1997), "Developing and testing an integrative model of work-family interface", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 50, pp. 145-67.
- Fu, C.K. and Shaffer, M.A. (2001), "The tug of work and family", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp. 502-22.
- Greenhaus, J.H. and Beutell, N.J. (1985), "Sources of conflict between work and family roles", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 10, pp. 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J.H. and Parasuraman, S. (1999), "Research on work, family, and gender", in Powell, G.N. (Ed.), *Handbook of Gender and Work*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 391-412.
- Griffith, K.H. and Hebl, M.R. (2002), "The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: 'coming out' at work", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 6, pp. 1191-9.
- Grzywacz, J.G. and Marks, N.F. (2000), "Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: an ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family", *Journal of Occupational and Health Psychology*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 111-26.
- Gutek, B., Searle, S. and Klepa, L. (1991), "Rational versus gender-role expectations for work-family conflict", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 560-8.
- Hall, M. (1986), "The lesbian corporate experience", *Journal of Homosexuality*, Vol. 12, pp. 59-75.
- Hays-Thomas, R. (2004), "Why now? The contemporary focus on managing diversity", in Stockdale, M.S. and Crosby, F.J. (Eds), *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity*, Blackwell, Malden, MA, pp. 3-30.
- Higgins, C.A., Duxbury, L.E. and Irving, R.H. (1992), "Work-family conflict in the dual career family", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 51, pp. 51-75.
- House, C.J.C. (2004), "Integrating barriers to Caucasian lesbians' career development and super's life-span, life-space approach", *The Career Development Quarterly*, Vol. 52, pp. 246-55.
- Judge, T.A. and Colquitt, J.A. (2004), "Organizational justice and stress: the mediating role of work-family conflict", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 3, pp. 395-404.
- Levine, M.P. and Leonard, R. (1984), "Discrimination against lesbians in the work force", *Signs: Journal of women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 9, pp. 700-10.
- Lindberg, A. (2005), "Sex discrimination and harassment", Highlight Report, Human Resource Institute, University of Tampa, available at: www.hrrinstitute.org (accessed April 18, 2006).
- Lubensky, M.E., Holland, S.L., Wiethoff, C. and Crosby, F.J. (2004), "Diversity and sexual orientation: including and valuing sexual minorities in the workplace", in Stockdale, M.S. and Crosby, F.J. (Eds), *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity*, Blackwell, Malden, MA, pp. 206-23.
- Lyall, S. (2005), "New course by Royal Navy: a campaign to recruit gays", *New York Times*, February 22.

- McManus, K., Korabik, K., Rosin, H.M. and Kellowy, E.K. (2002), "Employed mothers and the work-family interface: does family structure matter?", *Human Relations*, Vol. 55 No. 11, pp. 1-30.
- Madsen, S.R. (2003), "The effects of home-based teleworking on work-family conflict", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 35-58.
- Mennino, S.F. and Brayfield, A. (2002), "Job-family trade-offs", *Work and Occupations*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 226-56.
- Michela, J.L. and Burke, W.W. (2000), "Organizational culture and climate in transformations for quality and innovation", in Ashkanasy, N.M., Wildermon, C.P.M. and Peterson, M.F. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 225-44.
- Mohr, J.J. and Fassinger, R.E. (2003), "Self acceptance and self-disclosure of sexual orientation in lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults: an attachment perspective", *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 50, pp. 482-95.
- Morgan, K.S. and Brown, L.S. (1991), "Lesbian career development, work behavior, and vocational counseling", *The Counseling Psychologist*, Vol. 19, pp. 273-91.
- Parasuraman, S. and Alutto, J.A. (1984), "Sources and outcomes of stress in organizational settings: toward the development of a structural model", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 27, pp. 330-50.
- Parasuraman, S. and Greenhaus, J.H. (1993), "Personal portrait: the life style of the woman manager", in Fagenson, E.A. (Ed.), *Women in Management: Trends Issues and Challenges in Managerial Diversity*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 186-211.
- Rostosky, S.S. and Riggle, E.D.B. (2002), "'Out' at work: the relation of actor and partner workplace policy and internalized homophobia to disclosure status", *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 49, pp. 411-9.
- Schneider, B.E. (1986), "Coming out at work: bridging the private/public gap", *Work and Occupations*, Vol. 13, pp. 463-87.
- Sulsky, L. and Smith, C. (2005), *Work Stress*, Thomson Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.
- Thompson, C.A., Beauvais, L.L. and Lyness, K.S. (1999), "When work-family benefits are not enough: the influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 54, pp. 392-415.
- Ward, J. and Winstanley, D. (2003), "The absent presence: negative space within discourse and the construction of minority sexual identity in the workplace", *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, pp. 1255-80.

Further reading

- Facts about kids with gay and lesbian parents (2006), *Fact Sheet about Gay and Lesbian Parenting*, Colgate, available at: www.colage.org/resources/facts.htm (accessed April 21, 2006).
- Frone, M.R., Russell, M. and Cooper, M.L. (1992), "Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 77, pp. 65-78.

About the authors

Tracy L. Tuten, PhD is an Associate Professor at Virginia Commonwealth University. Her current research interests include consumer and organizational behavior issues, particularly as they relate to gays and lesbians, and web-based survey methods. Her publications have appeared in such journals as *Women in Management Review*, *Psychology & Marketing*, the *Journal of Business Research*, and *Social Science Computer Review* among others. Dr Tuten has consulted or

taught several times in Korea, Germany, and France. In 2001, she served as Fulbright scholar to Korea where she taught International Marketing and Marketing in Cyber-trade at the Graduate School of International Studies at Korea University. Following that experience, she partnered with Korea University to develop Samsung Electronics Chief Marketing Officer course and taught in the program for three years. Dr Tuten has won two national awards for teaching excellence (Association of Business Administration and Society for Marketing Advances) and a university-wide award during her tenure at Longwood University. Tracy L. Tuten is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: ttryan@vcu.edu

Rachel A. August, PhD is an Associate Professor of Psychology at California State University, Sacramento. Her current research interests include women's career development, in particular the work-family interface and transitions into and out of the workforce. Her publications have appeared in such journals as *Women in Management Review*, *Journal of Employment Counseling*, and *Psychological Science*. She teaches in the area of industrial and organizational psychology, and consults to local government and other non-profit agencies, including educational institutions, organizations serving the developmentally disabled, and Native American tribal agencies. E-mail: raugust@csus.edu