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Non-family employees are indispensable resources for family firms as they grow. However, despite the recent scholarly attention toward non-family employees, it is still not clear how such important human resources should be managed and/or retained in family firms. To add to the limited body of knowledge on non-family employees working at family firms, this dissertation highlights the role of family-friendly workplace practices in preventing turnover intentions of non-family employees based on conservation of resources theory. Drawing on a sample of 116 dyad data (family business owner – non-family employee), this dissertation shows that family-friendly workplace practices prevent turnover intentions of non-family employees through decreased burnout. Moreover, it is found that family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms are affected by family influence. Thus, this dissertation not only creates avenues for future research on non-family employees, but also provides insight into the critical role of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Non-family employees in family firms have been the object of recent studies in the family business literature (e.g., Vallejo, 2009; Sieger, Bernhard, & Frey, 2011; Ramos, Man, Mustafa, & Ng, 2014; Blumentritt, Keyt, & Astrachan, 2007; Tabor, Chrisman, Madison, & Vardaman, 2018; Kotlar & Sieger, 2019; Chrisman, Chua, & Litz, 2004; Vardaman, Allen, & Rogers, 2018; Vincent Ponroy, Lê, & Pradies, 2019; Fang, Chrisman, Daspit, & Madison, 2021). Non-family employees confront distinctive situations, such as bifurcation bias (Verbeke & Kano, 2012; Daspit, Madison, Barnett, & Long, 2018; Jennings, Dempsey, & James, 2018), perceptions of injustice (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006; Carsrud, 2006; Marler, Barnett, & Vardaman, 2018), and limited opportunities for promotion (Chrisman, Memili, & Misra, 2014). While a small number of studies on non-family employees largely focus on the role, perceptions, behaviors, and cognitions of these individuals, less research pertains to what management practices might be best used with non-family employees (e.g., Kotlar & Sieger, 2019; Harsch & Festing, 2019) and how such management practices might be influenced by unique aspects of family firms, such as family influence. This void in the literature is due partially to the lack of sufficient research on the human resource (HR) practices in family firms (Combs, Jaskiewicz, Shanine, & Balkin, 2018; Marler, Vardaman, & Allen, 2021).

However, considering the value of HR practices identified by prior studies (e.g., Delaney & Huselid, 1996; Wright & Snell, 1998), such as training and motivating employees (including
non-family employees), providing a well-organized workplace environment, reducing turnover intentions and turnover rate of employees (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003), and enhancing organizational level performance (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000), the study of HR practices in family firms may be an essential foundation for explaining competitiveness and heterogeneity of family firms (Sharma, 2004). Particularly, strategic usage of HR practices in family firms for non-family employees may be a critical factor that explains the competitive advantages and heterogeneity of family firms in that non-family employees make up a large portion of human resources in most family firms (Chua et al., 2003; Deloitte & Touche, 1999; Mass Mutual financial group, 2007) and they often confront unique situations due to non-family status. In that regard, the necessity of research regarding strategic implementation of HR practices for managing and retaining quality non-family employees cannot be emphasized enough.

To better understand how HR practices can be a source of competitive advantages and heterogeneity in family firms, this dissertation investigates both a predictor and consequences of family-friendly workplace practices, which have been widely implemented (Batt & Valcour, 2003) but rarely studied in the family firm literature. In particular, to uncover possible outcomes/consequences of family-friendly workplace practices, this study investigates how family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees. Moreover, the impact of family influence, which is one of the idiosyncratic aspects of family firms, on the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices is also examined to have a better understanding of what determines the strategic implementation of HR practices, particularly family-friendly workplace practices in the family firm context.

Conservation of resources (COR) theory (Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014; Hobfoll, 1989) is adopted as a main theoretical framework of this study. COR
theory offers an explanation of why individuals feel depletion from work, such as exhaustion, stress, burnout, and depression (Westman, Hobfoll, Chen, Davidson, & Laski, 2004), through emphasizing the critical role of resources, which are defined as “those objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies that are valued by the individual or that serve as a means for attainment of these objects” (Hobfoll, 1989: 516). According to the COR theory literature, individuals experience being depleted when demands placed on them, which require sustained physical and psychological effort and costs, exceeds resources they possess. Hence, idiosyncratic status and situations non-family employees experience in family firms (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006), such as bifurcation bias (Verbeke & Kano, 2012; Jennings et al., 2018) and lack of career opportunity (Chrisman et al., 2014), may lead to unique demands, such as emotional effort to endure unfair treatments and psychological effort, and the demands may lead to resource depletion of non-family employees. Thus, COR theory can provide theoretical insights into why non-family employees face stressful situations and how they react toward the situation based on the resource perspective.

Using the theoretical concepts of COR theory, this study investigates the value of family-friendly workplace practices in reducing turnover intentions of non-family employees. To uncover the underlying mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees, burnout is examined as a mediator. Considering that non-family employees are more likely to experience burnout syndrome, which may affect employees’ organizational behaviors and performance (Jung & Kim, 2012; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998), research on burnout syndrome of non-family employees may provide better explanations for the distinctiveness of non-family employees. Indeed, extant literature has argued that non-family employees are likely to confront unique situations which may increase the level
of burnout through requiring more job demands. For instance, Mitchell, Morse, and Sharma argued that “family business setting can be seen to be cognitively demanding when viewed from the perspective of the non-family employee” (2003: 535) based on transaction cognitive theory. In a similar vein, Chrisman, Memili, and Misra (2014) argued that non-family employees are likely to confront higher performance expectations even when their capability to meet the higher performance expectation is limited by bounded rationality. Perceived unfairness caused by unfavorable treatment toward non-family employees, such as bifurcation bias (Verbeke & Kano, 2012; Daspit et al., 2018; Jennings et al., 2018) and lack of career opportunity (Matlay, 2002; Chrisman et al., 2014), may also foster the non-family employee’s burnout (Robbins, Ford, & Tetrick, 2012; Howard & Cordes, 2010). Thus, extant literature indirectly suggests that non-family employees are likely to experience resource depletion, or burnout, while working at family firms due to their non-family status. Accordingly, through the lens of COR theory, this dissertation examines how family-friendly workplace practices influence turnover intentions of non-family employees through alleviating the level of burnout, which refers to a depletion of resources.

Furthermore, work-family culture and work-family centrality are examined as moderators to capture how the value of resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices varies contingent on the organizational factors as well as individual factors. In particular, moderating roles of work-family culture (organizational factor) and work-family centrality (individual factor) on the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout level of non-family employees are examined. By incorporating both a mediator and moderators in the research model, this dissertation provides not only prediction but also
explanation of the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on the turnover intentions of non-family employees within a COR framework.

Besides the underlying mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees, a predictor of family-friendly workplace practices is also examined based on COR theory to shed light on the factors that determine the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms. In particular, following the proposition of Barnett and Kellermanns (2006) that HR practices of family firms may be affected by the level of family influence, this dissertation examines how family influence affects strategic implementation of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firm context. By capturing both a predictor and consequences of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firm context, this dissertation provides a holistic view of how family firms can potentially retain quality non-family employees through HR practices.

**Research Background**

According to a Deloitte and Touche study (1999), non-family employees make up a large portion of the labor force in family firms. Indeed, Mass Mutual Financial Group (2007) showed that approximately 80 percent of labor force in family firms are non-family employees. That is, family firms consist of both family employees and non-family employees, with non-family employees making up the majority of the workforce in some family firms (Chua et al., 2003). However, family firms may be less attractive to prospective non-family employees compared to non-family firms (Chrisman et al., 2014) because of their intention to preserve socioemotional wealth (SEW\(^1\): Gómez-Mejía, Haynes, Núñez-Nickel, Jacobson, & Moyano-________

\(^1\) SEW is “the nonfinancial aspects of the firm that meet the family’s affective needs, such as identity, the ability to exercise family influence, and the perpetuation of the family dynasty” (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007: 106).
Fuentes, 2007). Since nepotism may restrict career opportunities for non-family employees, such as promotion and training (Memili, Misra, Chang, & Chrisman, 2013; Neckebrouck, Schulze, & Zellweger, 2018), there is an apparent disadvantage for non-family employees. Based on the notion of insufficient incentives and potential discrimination toward non-family employees (Verbeke & Kano, 2012), the extant literature suggests that family firms are less likely to attract highly qualified non-family employees, and consequently, may have a low-quality applicant pool. Given the crucial role of human resources in an organization, such disadvantages of family firms in attracting high quality prospective non-family employees may be a considerable obstacle for family firms’ success and survival (Allen, Mahto, & Otondo, 2007; Vardaman et al., 2018).

However, while family firms may struggle to attract more and better prospective job seekers compared to non-family firms, they are not precluded from having high quality human resource practices. That is, developing, managing, training, and retaining current employees through effective HR practices are as important as attracting and hiring new high-quality employees. Indeed, Pfeffer (1994) identified seven HR practices of successful organizations\(^2\), and the practices indicate, at least implicitly, that firms can have high quality human resources not only by attracting and hiring high quality employees, but also by managing, developing, and retaining current employees through implementing proper HR practices. Accordingly, despite being less attractive to prospective non-family employees (Chrisman et al., 2014; Colombo, De Massis, Piva, Rossi-Lamastra, & Wright, 2014), family firms can be successful through implementing HR practices that manage, develop, train, and foster performance of non-family employees and retain them in effective ways.

\(^{2}\) (1) employment security, (2) self-managed teams/team, (3) sharing of information, (4) selective hiring, (5) high compensation contingent on organizational performance, (6) extensive training, (7) reduction of status differences.
Despite the important role of HR practices as means of achieving competitive advantage (Pfeffer, 1994; Carlson, Upton, & Seaman, 2006) through generating and retaining high quality human resources, few studies directly investigated HR practices of family firms. In particular, HR practices for non-family employees in family firms and antecedents and consequences of the HR practices are still understudied (Reid, Morrow, Kelly, & McCartan, 2002). Family firms consist of two different groups of employees, which are family employees and non-family employees, and “non-family employees may often face a particularly complex and uncertain situation since they are part of the business but not the family system” (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006: 838). Thus, findings from the HR studies of non-family firms do not necessarily represent family firms (Colombo et al., 2014). In other words, the antecedents and consequences of HR practices in family firms with non-family employees may differ from those of non-family counterparts. For instance, Barnett and Kellermanns (2006) proposed that HR practices of family firms may be affected by the level of family influence. That is, unlike non-family firms, family influence, which is an unique aspect of family firms, is a critical determinant or antecedent of HR practices of family firms.

Moreover, because of the possible idiosyncratic labor force structure of family firms with coexistence of family employees and non-family employees, managing and retaining non-family employees effectively and fostering value-creating behaviors among them are some of the biggest challenges family firms confront (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006) and are two of the major determinants of family firm success (Chrisman, Chua, & Litz, 2003; Chua, Chrisman, & Sharma, 2003). Retaining experienced employees is especially important to family firms, even compared to non-family counterparts, in that experienced employees in the family firm may have accumulated not only general work-related knowledge but also family firm specific tacit
knowledge, including family values and norms. Family firm specific tacit knowledge is critical because it enables employees to align their work with the goals of owner family, including family-centered noneconomic goals, in effective ways (Chrisman, Chua, Pearson, & Barnett, 2012). However, such tacit knowledge cannot be acquired easily through transference in short periods of time. Rather, unlike general knowledge that can be utilized in non-family firms or other family firms, the family firm’s specific tacit knowledge must be accumulated over time through working at the family firm. In that regard, a scarce amount of research regarding HR practices to retain non-family employees in the family firm is an apparent gap in the family business literature, and to bridge the gap, this dissertation focuses on the role of family-friendly workplace practices in preventing turnover intentions of non-family employees. Particularly, this dissertation examines both a predictor and consequences of family-friendly workplace practices in the context of family business.

**Family-Friendly Workplace Practices**

According to the work-family policies literature (Allen, 2001; Poelmans et al., 2003; Yanadori & Kato, 2009; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016), family-friendly workplace practices represent a set of HR practices that are intended to enable employees to manage both work and family demands successfully (Batt & Valcour, 2003), such as flexible work arrangements, dependent care assistance, telecommuting, compressed work weeks, and pregnancy-related policies, in hopes of leading to better outcomes. Following the ideas advanced in strategic HRM

---

3 Even though various terms have been used in the literature to refer to polices offered by employers to help employees to manage both work role and family role effectively, such as work-family human resource bundles (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000), family-friendly employment practices (Breaugh & frye, 2008), family-friendly work practices (Ngo, Foley, & Loi, 2009), work-family benefit (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999) and family-friendly HRM policies (Poelmans et al., 2003), following Bloom, Kretschmer, and Reenen (2011), this study adopts the term ‘family-friendly workplace practices’.
research, this dissertation takes a bundle approach rather than focusing on individual HR practices (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000). The bundle approach is less focused on the impact of any single practice to better capture the broader and higher firm-level effects of HR practices (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). A growing body of literature has adopted a bundle approach (e.g., Goodstein, 1994; Ingram & Simons, 1995). Thus, ‘family-friendly workplace practices’ in this dissertation refers to a ‘bundle of work-family practices’, which is defined as “a group of complementary, highly related and, in some cases, overlapping human resource policies that may help employees manage nonwork roles” (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000: 1107).

Family-friendly workplace practices have been widely implemented in response to the changes in the composition of the workforce (Allen, 2001; Galinsky, Bond, & Sakai, 2008; Poelmans, Chinchilla, & Cardona, 2003), which is mainly caused by recent demographic and social changes, such as aging populations and changes in gender roles (Yanadori & Kato, 2009). Due to these changes, contemporary employees are forced to handle both family roles and work roles simultaneously. To alleviate such pressure due to the dual roles, employers have started to offer family-friendly workplace practices for their employees, and such expansion of family-friendly workplace practices in the field has attracted considerable scholarly attention over the last two decades (Beauregard & Henry, 2009).

Albeit few, some studies have identified antecedents of family-friendly workplace practices. For instance, a higher proportion of female employees (Bloom, Kretschmer, & Van Reenen, 2011), a higher proportion of professionals (Konrad & Mangel, 2000), and tightness of the labor market (Poelmans et al., 2003) are identified as significant antecedents of family-friendly workplace practices. In a similar vein, family ownership has also been examined as an antecedent of family-friendly workplace practice. According to Moshavi and Koch (2005),
family ownership affects firm adoption of family-friendly workplace practices, such that family firms are less likely to implement family-friendly workplace practices due to the family firms’ reluctance to use professional HR practices (de Kok, Uhlaner, & Thurik, 2006). This empirical finding is consistent with the notion that the level of family influence may affect HR practices of family firms (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006). That is, different levels of family influence in family firms may be an explanatory factor of various HR practices, including family-friendly workplace practices, among family firms.

Family influence has long been acknowledged in the family business literature as a root of idiosyncratic aspects of family firms (Chrisman, Chua, Pearson, & Barnett, 2012; Lubatkin, Durand, & Ling, 2007; Habbershon & Williams, 1999), such as succession processes (Davis & Harveston, 1998), internationalization pathways (Graves & Thomas, 2008), and capital structures (Romano, Tanewski, & Smyrnios, 2001). In a similar vein, family influence has also been utilized to explain family firms’ distinctive HR practices (e.g., Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006; Ensley, Pearson, & Sardeshmukh, 2007; Daspit et al., 2018; Cruz, Firfiray, & Gómez-Mejía, 2011). That is, extant literature demonstrates that “family firms’ HR practices related to issues such as staffing, performance appraisal, promotion, compensation, and discipline may vary based on the level of family influence present in family firms” (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006: 838). Indeed, several recent studies have argued that family is an important determinant of HR practices of family firms (e.g., Kidwell, Eddleston, & Kellermanns, 2018; Daspit et al., 2018).

Drawing upon previous studies, this dissertation examines how family influence affects HR practices, particularly family-friendly workplace practices, in the family firm context.
Family-Friendly Workplace Practices and Family Influence

Retaining trained and talented employees is one of the critical challenges for firms as they experience tight labor markets and a shortage of skilled labor (Batt & Valcour, 2003). Indeed, myriad studies have addressed negative consequences of employee turnover, such as replacement costs (Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010), turnover contagion (Felps, Mitchell, Hekman, Lee, & Holtom, 2009), and loss of human capital (Yanadori & Kato, 2009). Moreover, employee turnover is costly not just because of the required reinvestment for the recruiting and training of new employees but also because of loss of human capital (Yanadori & Kato, 2009). Since turnover intentions are one of the best predictors of actual turnover⁴ (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992; Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006), managing employees’ turnover intentions is one of the important tasks organization should successfully complete to grow and survive. Due to their importance, turnover intentions, which can be defined as employees’ intention to leave their current job and look forward to searching for another job in the near future (Mansour & Tremblay, 2016), has long been recognized as one of the important organizational outcomes in various fields and contexts (e.g., Bratt & Balcour, 2003; Khanin, Turel, & Mahto, 2012; Jung & Kim, 2012).

Turnover is one of the most researched topics in the management field, and particularly in the organizational behavior literature (Khanin et al., 2012; Allen, Hancock, Vardaman, & McKee, 2014) due to the considerable negative impact of turnover as well as turnover intentions on the organization (Hancock, Allen, Bosco, McDaniel, & Pierce, 2013). Following the seminal work of March and Simon (1958) that proposed two main antecedents of turnover, which are

---

⁴ According to the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), “some action on the part of the employee is likely to follow self-expressed intention” (Jourdain & Chenevert, 2010: 710).
ease of movement and perception of desirability, studies have examined the antecedents and consequences of turnover and turnover intentions. For example, Mobley (1977) proposed an ‘intermediate linkage model’ of turnover that encompasses the steps between job satisfaction and turnover; while Lee and Mitchell (1994) proposed an ‘unfolding model’ that highlights the possibility of individual’s different paths to turnover as caused by various psychological foci and external shocks. Push theory and pull theory, suggested by Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya (1985), also contribute to the turnover literature by addressing external factors and internal factors that affect employees’ turnover decisions. Based on these early studies, recent work in the turnover literature has investigated various factors that affect employee’s turnover, such as voice (McClean, Burris, & Detert, 2013), corporate social responsibility (Carnahan, Kryscynski, & Olson, 2017), mentoring (Payne & Huffman, 2005), and network centrality (Vardaman, Taylor, Allen, Gondo, & Amis, 2015). Of those various antecedents, family-friendly workplace practices have been one of the widely studied research topics associated with employees’ turnover and turnover intentions (e.g., Grover & Crooker, 1995; Rothausen, 1994; Wood & de Menezes, 2008).

Prior studies show that family-friendly workplace practices are associated with various organizational outcomes (Batt & Valcour, 2003; Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000), such as lower absenteeism (Dalton & Mesch, 1990), less stress (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Breaugh & Frye, 2008), higher job satisfaction (Allen, 2001; Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Neuman, 1999), greater levels of organizational commitment (Scandura & Kankau, 1997; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007), and fewer work-family conflicts (Breaugh & Frye, 2008). In a similar vein, a number of studies have examined the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on the turnover and turnover intentions of employees (Batt & Valcour, 2003; Grover &
Crooker, 1995; Rothausen, 1994; Wood & de Menezes, 2008; Lee & Kim, 2010) to determine if the practices are efficacious in the retention of trained and talented employees.

Despite a considerable number of studies, the findings of prior research are mixed, and the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on employees’ turnover intentions remains unclear. The possible reason for the inconsistent results is that extant literature has focused on the direct relationship between the practices and outcomes but has largely neglected the mediating and or moderating mechanisms that could better explain the relationship (Demerouti, 2006; Ngo, Foley, & Loi, 2009). To bridge this gap in the literature, this dissertation examines how family-friendly workplace practices influence employee turnover intentions through effects on the employees’ psychological states. This approach is consistent with the literature’s notion that the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on the organization may be indirect (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Allen, 2001).

Underlying Mechanisms: Burnout, Work-Family Culture, and Work-Family Centrality

To provide a better understanding of the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employees’ turnover intentions, this dissertation adopts ‘burnout’ as a mediator, which is conceptualized as “a psychological syndrome in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job” (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001: 399). Specifically, the role of family-friendly workplace practices in preventing turnover intentions of non-family employees through mitigating non-family employee burnout level will be examined. Burnout is a likely mediator because it represents a consequence of several organizational aspects as well as antecedent of organizational and/or individual outcomes. (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004). Indeed, employee burnout has been a widely studied topic in the management field because of its
consequential implications for both individuals and organizations (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2002; Wright & Hobfoll, 2004).

Burnout is a process of erosion of emotional resources that may gradually lead to cynical attitudes and feelings toward one’s assigned tasks (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016). Based on the three core aspects of burnout identified by Maslach and Jackson (1981), which are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment, myriad studies have examined antecedents and consequences of job burnout to provide a deeper understanding of the phenomenon (Jung & Kim, 2012). For example, overload, time pressure (Maslach & Leiter, 2008), work environment (Elloy, Terpening & Kohls, 2001), and relationships with peers and supervisors (Leiter & Maslach, 1988) have been identified as antecedents of burnout, whereas organizational commitment (Jung & Kim, 2012), turnover intentions (Mansour & Tremblay, 2016), turnover (Lee & Shin, 2005) and job performance (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998; Bakker et al., 2004) have been identified as consequences of burnout. These identified antecedents and consequences of burnout link work environments and employee outcomes. Accordingly, burnout can be utilized as a mediator that explains the impact of family-friendly workplace practices as a work environment on the turnover intentions of non-family employees, which is a critical employee outcome.

However, the influence of family-friendly workplace practices on employee burnout may be varied contingent on organizational factors, such as organizational climate, because mere availability does not necessarily guarantee the actual utilization of the practices (Kossek & Lobel, 1996). To capture the impact of organizational aspect that may moderate the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employee burnout, work-friendly culture is adopted as a moderator. Work-friendly culture, which is defined as “the shared assumptions,
beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives” (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999: 394), captures employees’ perceptions regarding organizational support for the family. The positive impacts of work-family culture on the organization have been highlighted by several studies (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999; Allen, 2001; Wayne, Randel & Stevens, 2006). According to prior studies, when employees perceive that their employers are supportive, they may experience a lower degree of turnover intentions, work-family conflict, and job burnout, as well as a higher degree of job satisfaction and affective commitment (Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen, 2013). Similarly, Thompson et al. (1999) and Allen (2001) argue that the mere existence of family-friendly workplace practices is not enough to benefit employees because it is not guaranteed that employees actually can participate in the practice without concerns (Kossek & Lobel, 1996). Indeed, a number of studies (Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993; Finkel, Olswang, & She, 1994) found that only a limited number of employees actually participated in the family-friendly workplace practices even when the practices are offered because of such concerns, as fear of negative career consequences (Perlow, 1995). Thus, a work-family culture that enables employees to utilize available family-friendly workplace practices can be a crucial factor in determining the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on employee burnout.

Besides organizational aspects (e.g., work-family culture), individual aspects, such as personal values and personal demographics, can also determine the impact of HR practices on the employee outcomes. To capture individual differences that determine the degree of HR practices’ impact, this dissertation adopts work-family centrality which represents “a value judgement regarding the relative importance of work or family to an individual’s life” (Carr,
Boyar, & Gregory, 2008: 247). According to Rokeach (1973), individuals’ values in life generate the cognitions that direct their attitudes, beliefs, and actions throughout their life. That is, individuals who have stronger work-related values may view work roles as central to their life, whereas individuals who have stronger family-related values may view family roles as central to their life (Carr et al., 2008). Thus, depending on the work-family centrality, individuals’ resource demands to accomplish their priority role may be different. For instance, individuals who have stronger family-related values may need more family-related resources compared to work centered individuals to accomplish their family roles. Given that family-friendly workplace practices provide family role-related resources to enable employees to handle both work duties and family duties successfully, the value of family-friendly workplace practices to employees, including non-family employees, may vary contingent on the relative importance of work and family to the employees.

**Theoretical Framework: Conservation of Resources Theory**

Conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) is used as an overarching theoretical framework of this dissertation. Over the past 30 years, COR theory has been widely applied in the organizational behavior literature (Halbesleben et al., 2014), particularly in the stress literature (Westman, Hobfoll, Chen, Davidson, & Laski, 2004; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016). Based on “the tenet that individuals are motivated to protect their current resources (conservation) and acquire new resources (acquisition)” (Halbesleben et al., 2014: 1335), COR theory highlights a critical role of an individual’s resources to manage stressful events associated with overwhelming demands. Since non-family employees are more likely to experience resource depletion, or burnout, due to their non-family status at family firms, which may require more job demands (Chrisman et al., 2014; Mitchell et al., 2003), using resource-based concepts
proposed by COR theory may provide better explanations for the unique aspects of work relationships between family firms and non-family employees.

According to COR theory, individuals experience burnout when they no longer have sufficient resources to manage or handle the stressors they face (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Social support, autonomy, participation in decision making, and opportunities have been suggested by prior studies as examples of resources (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Moreover, it is also noted that the value of resources may vary among individuals contingent on individuals’ idiosyncratic aspects, such as work-family centrality. For instance, time with family may be perceived as a more valuable resource to family-oriented individuals than to work-oriented individuals (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Even though there are several theoretical frameworks that deal with job resources and demands, such as the job demands-resource model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) and person-environment (P-E) fit model (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982), COR theory is adopted in this dissertation for two reasons. First, unlike job demand-resource model, COR theory deals with family related resources and demands (Barnett, Brennan, Gareis, Ertel, Berkman, & Almeida, 2012). Second, unlike P-E fit model, COR theory provides specific predictions (consequences) regarding what individuals do when they confront stressors (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

Thus, drawing upon COR theory, this dissertation explores the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employee turnover intentions. In particular, the role of family-friendly workplace practices as a resource provider is emphasized to explain how family-friendly workplace practices enable non-family employees to avoid burnout status, a form of resource depletion. Given that employee turnover intentions is one consequence of resource depletion, this approach sheds light on the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on
turnover intentions based on a job resource-based perspective. Furthermore, to examine how the value of resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices may be varied depending on both organizational and individual aspects, work-family culture and work-family centrality are adopted as factors that determine the actual value of resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices. In addition to the consequence of family-friendly workplace practices, which is reduced turnover intentions of non-family employees, an antecedent of the practices in family firms, which is a family influence, is also examined based on COR theory along with SEW perspectives (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007).

**Gaps in the Literature**

There are several notable gaps in the literature that requires further research. First, even though myriad studies in turnover literature have provided fruitful insights into understanding employee turnover in an organization, much work remains. In particular, employee turnover has not been fully explored in the field of family business. The turnover intentions of non-family employees in particular have long been neglected. In recent years, non-family employees have started to receive scholarly attention (e.g., Barnett, Long, & Marler, 2012; Marler & Stanley, 2018; Tabor et al., 2018; Vardaman et al., 2018; Harsch & Festing, 2019; Kotlar & Sieger, 2019; Vincent Ponroy et al., 2019; Fang et al., 2021). However, prior research has not provided enough insights into how to manage and retain non-family employees. Considering that non-family employees who possess family firm specific tacit knowledge are particularly valuable and hard-to-substitute resources for family firms and that non-family employees may often confront a complex situation (Mitchell et al., 2003), more attention toward non-family employees’ turnover intentions is needed.
Second, even though the importance of HR practices as a means of acquiring high-quality human resources and achieving competitive advantages has been widely acknowledged (Delaney & Huselid, 1996; Carson et al., 2006; Wright & Snell, 1998), a limited number of studies have examined the impact of a specific HR practice in the context of family business (Reid et al., 2002; Carson et al., 2006). Particularly, family-friendly workplace practices have been largely neglected in the field of family business. Considering the idiosyncratic natures and aspects of family firms (Chrisman, Sharma, Steier, & Chua, 2013; Gagné, Sharma, & De Massis, 2014), such as coexistence of family and non-family employees, integration of family and business systems, and intention to preserve SEW, previous findings regarding the impact and implementation of family-friendly workplace practices may differ in the case of family firms. For instance, the owner family’s reluctance to use formal HR practices for preserving SEW may impede the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices in family firms (Moshavi & Koch, 2005) compared to non-family firms. Thus, to have a holistic view of family-friendly workplace practices and to maximize practical implications of the family-friendly workplace practices, the impact of family-friendly workplace practices should be examined in the context of family business.

Third, a ‘black box’ problem occurs when the relationship is known but how and why the relationship occurs is obscured. Given that the black box indicates the veiled underlying mechanism or channel through which key variables relate to each other, it is critical to eliminate the black box to have a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between key variables. In that regard, a lack of knowledge about possible mediators and moderators that link family-friendly workplace practices and non-family employees’ turnover intentions based on a solid theoretical foundation is a critical gap in the literature that impedes a better understanding of the
impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employees. Particularly, given the idiosyncratic and complex situations non-family employees may confront at the family firms (Mitchell et al., 2003; Chrisman et al., 2014), investigating the underlying mechanism through which family-friendly workplace practices affect non-family employees seems critical to understand the role of family-friendly workplace practices in family firms.

Fourth, in a similar vein, burnout has not yet been fully studied in the family business context. Burnout literature has examined employees in various industries, such as human service industries (Wright & Bonett, 1997; Wright & Hobfoll, 2004), the newspaper industry (Jung & Kim, 2012), and the transportation industry (Demerouti et al., 2001), to account various work environments that influence the employee burnout phenomenon. However, the burnout phenomenon has not been adequately, especially empirically, examined in employees in family firms, particularly non-family employees. As extant literature argued, non-family employees in family firms may experience distinctive situations that require additional resources to survive in family firms (Astrachan & Kolenko, 1994; Mitchell et al., 2003; Chrisman et al., 2014). Because of such additional resource requirement, non-family employees are likely to experience a resource depletion, which refers to burnout. Despite the possibility of burnout among non-family employees, the issue of non-family employee burnout is not well explored in the burnout literature yet, and it shows the void in the burnout and/or stress literature.

Lastly, the antecedents/predictors of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firm context are not yet fully explored. It is widely recognized that HR practices of family businesses differ from those of their non-family counterparts (Cruz, Firfiray, & Gómez-Mejía, 2015), and this discrepancy has been explained by the unique aspects of family firms, such as family ownership, family involvement, and family management. Despite scholarly efforts to
explain distinctiveness in the HR practices of family firms, (e.g., Reid & Adams, 2001; de Kok, Uhlaner, & Thurik, 2006; Stavrou, Kassinis, & Filotheou, 2006), the determinants of the strategic implementation of HR practices in family firms are still not yet known (Cruz et al., 2015). In particular, how family influence, which is one of the unique aspects of family firms, affects implementation of family-friendly workplace practices, which is one of the most widely adopted HR practices (Allen, 2001; Batt & Valcour, 2003), is still largely veiled. In the following sections, research questions and objectives of this dissertation to fill these gaps will be addressed.

**Research Questions**

This dissertation aims to answer several research questions regarding the family-friendly workplace practices in the family firm context. The questions to be addressed are the following:

1. To what extent does family influence affect the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices?
2. To what extent do the family-friendly workplace practices of family firms influence non-family employees’ turnover intentions?
3. To what extent do the family-friendly workplace practices of family firms influence the burnout level of non-family employees?
4. Are non-family employees’ turnover intentions shaped by their burnout level?
5. To what extent does burnout mediate the influence of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions of non-family employees?
6. Does the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employees’ burnout level vary contingent on the work-family culture and work-family centrality?

Since little research has investigated the turnover intentions of non-family employees in family firms, and even less attention have been given to the HR practices that provide job resources to prevent employee stress associated with turnover intentions, this study contributes to
the field of family business as well as to the field of HRM by addressing these research questions.

**Objectives of the Study**

The specific objectives of the current study are to (1) examine how family influence affects the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices; (2) examine how family-friendly workplace practices of family firms affect the turnover intentions of non-family employees; (3) explore whether non-family employees’ burnout mediates the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employees; and (4) investigate how work-family culture and non-family employees’ work-family centrality moderate the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and non-family employees’ burnout.

This dissertation contributes to the field of family business as well as to the turnover literature and HRM literature in several ways. First, this dissertation highlights a critical role of family-friendly workplace practices in retaining non-family employees. Despite the important role of non-family employees in family firms (Tabor et al., 2018), it is largely unknown how non-family employees should be managed to be retained in family firms. A small number of recent studies have reported that some individual factors, such as justice perceptions (Vazici et al., 2020) and organizational identification (Vardaman et al., 2018), are significantly related to the turnover intentions of non-family employees. However, which aspects of family firms determine the turnover intentions of non-family employees have not yet been fully examined. Thus, by examining family-friendly workplace practices as predictors of non-family employees’ turnover intentions, this study adds to knowledge about the determinants of turnover intentions of non-family employees. Second, this study responds to calls to explore family firm
heterogeneity by empirically examining the impact of family influence on family-friendly workplace practices and the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on the turnover intentions of non-family employees. By exploring one of the predictors of family-friendly workplace practices, which is family influence, and the significant impact of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions of non-family employees, this dissertation empirically demonstrates valid sources of family firm heterogeneity.

Third, this study sheds light on the underlying mechanism of the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employees through adopting burnout as a mediator. Particularly, based on COR theory, this study emphasizes the important role of family-friendly workplace practices as a resource provider that enables non-family employees to avoid burnout, and consequently to decrease turnover intentions. Moreover, by employing both work-family culture and work-family centrality as moderators, this study address that the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout of non-family employees may be varied contingent on how organizational factors and individual factors moderate the value of resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices. Thus, this dissertation empirically demonstrates how family-friendly workplace practices work in the context of family businesses through unveiling the underlying mechanisms. Fourth, the current study expands the boundary of burnout research. Considering the idiosyncratic aspects of family firms, such as integration of family and business systems (Habbershon & Williams, 2003), a combination of family employees and non-family employees, owner’s intentions to preserve SEW, and unique situations non-family employees may confront, examining the burnout phenomenon in the context of family firms, particularly in non-family employee context, sheds light on the veiled area of the burnout literature.
Fifth, this study contributes to the HRM literature by examining the gap between HR practices implemented by business owner and HR practices perceived by employees. According to the research findings, HR practices have a significant impact on employees only when the HR practices are perceived by the employees. By empirically showing that what matters is perceived HR practices rather than implemented HR practices, this study highlights the necessity of distinguishing implemented HR practices and perceived HR practices for the future research. Lastly, this study contributes to COR theory by illustrating how it can be extended to the unique context of family businesses. Despite the fact that COR theory is a widely adopted theoretical framework in the organizational behavior literature (Halbesleben et al., 2014), this theory has long been neglected in the family business literature (See Tabor, Madison, Marler, & Kellerman, 2019. for exception). Thus, this dissertation creates avenues for the broader boundary of COR theory by adopting central tenets of COR theory in the unique context of non-family employees working at family firms.

**Chapter Summary and Research Model Overview**

Retaining high-quality non-family employees is one of the critical challenges family firms confront as they grow (Vardaman et al., 2018). However, few studies explore how and what prevents circumstances leading to turnover intentions of non-family employees in the context of family firm. To fill this gap in the literature, drawing upon COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), this dissertation examines both a predictor and consequences of family-friendly workplace practices in the family business context. To shed light on what determines the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices, family influence is adopted and examined as a predictor. Moreover, to have a better understanding of the consequences of family-friendly workplace practices in family firms, the underlying mechanism through which
family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees is examined. In particular, burnout is adopted as a mediator that explains the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions. Furthermore, to capture both organizational and individual factors that may moderate the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employee burnout, work-family culture and work-family centrality are adopted as moderators.

The conceptual research model of this study is shown in Figure 1.1. First, drawing upon the conceptual model of Barnett and Kellermanns (2006) and the finding of Moshavi and Koch (2005), it is hypothesized that implementation of HR practices, particularly family-friendly workplace practices, is influenced by family influence. Second, family-friendly workplace practices are hypothesized to directly influence turnover intentions of non-family employees. Third, current study hypothesizes the mediating role of burnout that links family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employees. Fourth, the moderating role of work-family culture on the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout is hypothesized to capture the work environment differences. Lastly, the moderating role of work-family centrality on the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout is also hypothesized to capture the individual differences.
Figure 1.1  Conceptual Model
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW, RESEARCH MODEL, AND HYPOTHESES

This chapter begins with a summary of the turnover literature and literature review of family influence, followed by an introduction and review regarding family-friendly workplace practices and the family-friendly workplace practices - turnover literature. Next, literature reviews of burnout and work-family culture and family-work centrality are presented. Then, central aspects of the conservation of resources theory, which is the main theoretical framework of this dissertation, is reviewed. Finally, based on these theoretical backgrounds, the theoretical model of the study is proposed, and hypotheses are developed.

Literature Review

Literature Review of Turnover Model and Turnover Intentions

The origin of research on employee turnover can be traced back to the seminal work of March and Simon (1958). They propose a general theory of organizational equilibrium that emphasizes the balance between employee’s contributions and the organization’s inducements. According to the theory, perception of desirability and perceived ease of movement are two factors that determine the balance of employees. Over time, the perception of desirability has been equated with job satisfaction while ease of movement has been equated with perceived job alternatives (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008), and these two factors are considered the main underpinning theoretical concepts in the turnover literature (Hulin et al., 1985; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Following this study, early studies of turnover were primarily focused on the
attitudinal antecedents of employee turnover, such as job satisfaction and perceived job alternatives. For instance, Porter and Steers (1973) have argued that the main determinant of employees’ turnover decisions is whether employers met their expectation or not.

While these studies and conceptual models focus on the antecedents of withdrawal behaviors, Mobley took a process approach to explore employee turnover. By introducing the intermediate linkages model, which links initial job dissatisfaction to actual employee turnover, he identified a set of cognitive withdrawal steps: (1) evaluation of existing job, (2) experienced job satisfaction-dissatisfaction, (3) thinking of quitting, (4) evaluation of expected utility of search and cost of quitting, (5) intention to search for alternatives, (6) search for alternatives, (7) evaluation of alternatives, (8) comparison of alternatives versus present job, (9) intention to quit or stay, (10) quit or stay (1977: 238). This cognitive model proposed by Mobley has been expanded by later studies through testing various variables, such as coworker satisfaction (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986) and unemployment rates (Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992). Particularly, Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979) expanded the model by adding concepts of employee values, job perceptions, and labor market perceptions in the model, and their work was among the first that identified potential moderators on employee turnover (Holtom et al., 2008). Moreover, based on Mobley’s model, Hom, Griffeth, and Sellaro (1984) proposed an alternative model that suggests two different paths to turnover decisions, which are (1) withdrawal cognitions to withdrawal behaviors and (2) withdrawal cognitions to direct voluntary turnover.

Unlike early studies mentioned above, which focused on attitudinal variables, such as job satisfaction, and distal turnover antecedents, such as individual differences, later studies have examined the impact of broader variables on employee turnover. For instance, macro-level
contextual variables, such as organizational culture (O’Neill, Harrison, Cleveland, Almeida, Stawski, & Crouter, 2009), pay dispersion in organizations (Pfeffer & Davis-Blake, 1992), employee-work environment fit variables, such as person-organization fit (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991), and network centrality (McPherson, Popielarz, & Drobnic, 1992), were examined as antecedents of employee turnover as well as personal conditions, such as emotional exhaustion, stress, and well-being of employees. In a similar vein, Hulin and his colleagues (1985) proposed the pull and push theory. Pull theory predicts that employees leave the organization because of external factors, such as supply and demand of the labor market, whereas push theory focuses on internal factors, such as employees’ perceptions and attitudes toward the job as antecedents of employee turnover. Fresh insights regarding employee turnover are also suggested by Hulin (1991). According to his integrative adaptation and withdrawal model, psychological and behavioral job withdrawal triggered by accumulated job dissatisfaction is a part of adaptive behavior that encompass various reactive behaviors to job dissatisfaction. Based on this model, he argued that actual turnover behavior should be considered as a subset of withdrawal constructs, which include lateness, absenteeism, and retirement, and that all withdrawal constructs should related to each other.

The study of Lee and Mitchell (1994) provided a new theoretical perspective on turnover literature. Drawing upon image theory, they proposed that employee turnover is not always a result of accumulated job dissatisfaction, rather it can be a result of an impulsive turnover decision caused by a shock, which is defined as “a very distinguishable event that jars employees toward deliberate judgements about their jobs” (Lee & Mitchell, 1994: 70). In particular, the unfolding model of turnover they introduced demonstrates five different conceptual decision paths that employees may follow prior to actual turnover, and some of the paths are explained
not by accumulated job dissatisfaction but by external shocks, such as a company merger, spousal relocation, and job offers. They also suggested that when employees confront such shocks, employees make a turnover decision based on their prior experiences. This model provides meaningful insights in the turnover literature in that it highlights a complex and dynamic nature of the turnover process and demonstrates the possible ways people leave their job (Holtom et al., 2008).

In addition to these turnover models, another stream of research has contributed to the turnover literature by addressing an employee’s decision to stay in the organization rather than leave. Even though early studies have treated turnover decisions and stay decisions as inverse, such traditional norms have been challenged by later studies (Cho, Johanson, & Guchait, 2009; Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012) that highlight the distinctive psychological underpinnings between stay decisions and turnover decisions. A representative study of the research stream is the study of Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez (2001) which emphasized job embeddedness factors, which are the factors that influence employees’ decisions to stay. Through introducing job embeddedness theory, Mitchell and her colleagues proposed that (1) *links* with people and community, (2) *fit* with organization and community, and (3) *sacrifices* associated with turnover are the critical factors that determine the employee’s decision to stay. Using these three dimensions, they proposed six sub-dimensions\(^5\) composing job embeddedness, and these concepts have been adopted as a theoretical foundation for later studies. For instance, a subsequent study of Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton, and Holtom (2004) found that off-the-job embeddedness is a significant predictor of employee turnover whereas on-the-job embeddedness is not.

\(^5\) on-the-job links, off-the-job links, on-the-job fit, off-the-job fit, on-the-job sacrifice, off-the-job sacrifice.
Based on these theoretical foundations, recent studies have identified and examined various aspects of turnover. For example, the dynamic nature of the turnover process is explored to incorporate time consideration in the turnover literature (Sturman & Trevor, 2001; Kammeyer-Mueller, Wanberg, Glomb, & Ahlburg, 2005). Moreover, the impacts of individual differences, such as personality (Barrick & Zimmerman, 2005; Thoresen, Kaplan, & Barsky, 2003), change acceptance (Wanberg & Banas, 2000), stresses (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000; Podsakoff, Lepine, & Lepine, 2007), and network centrality (Mossholder, Settoon, & Henagan, 2005; Vardaman et al., 2015) on employee turnover and turnover intentions are further examined. One notable trend in the turnover literature is an increasing attention on macro-level variables and organizational context variables that affect turnover and turnover intentions (Holtom et al., 2008). For instance, organizational level satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002), gender composition (Elvira & Cohen, 2001), organizational climate perceptions (McKay, Avery, Tonidandel, Morris, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2007), pay distribution (Bloom & Michel, 2002), and HR practices (Chang, Wang, & Huang, 2013) have been related to turnover behaviors of employees. In a similar vein, the interface between employees and their environments have been explored by scholars based on the concept of person and organization fit (P-O fit) (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer, & Sablynski, 2007; Arther, Bell, Doverspike, & Villado, 2006). These studies provide critical insights in the turnover literature in that they emphasize the macro-micro linkages in the turnover processes (Holtom et al., 2008).

The theoretical foundations originating from turnover literature have been adopted by family business scholars to examine and explain turnover phenomena in the family firms. Drawing upon the embeddedness perspective, Khanin, Turel, and Hahto (2012) examined the
factors that affect turnover intentions of family employees. According to their study, superior job alternatives (-), family embeddedness (+) and work centrality (+) influence turnover intentions of family employees through effects on their job satisfaction. In a similar vein, Khanin (2013) argued that alignment with the founder’s vision and integrated values of the family and family business reduce turnover intentions of family employees based on the person-job fit perspective and family embeddedness perspective. Unlike these two studies, Tsai, Kuo, and Hung (2009) focused on CEO turnover in family firms and found a significant relationship between diversification level of the firm and CEO turnover. In particular, they found that CEO turnover frequency and sensitivity to poor performance in largely diversified family CEO firms is less than that of small focused non-family CEO firms. Similarly, using 523 Colombian firms, Gonzalez, Guzman, Pombo, and Trujillo (2015) found that family involvement in management and board membership reduces CEO turnover, whereas family ownership increases CEO turnover.

Non-family employee’s turnover also has been an object of study. Based on the person-organization fit perspective, Memili and Barnett (2008) proposed that non-family employee’s perceptions of person-organization fit determine both turnover intentions and turnover of non-family employees. Moreover, using a sample of 220 non-family employees, Bernhard and O’Driscoll (2011) found that owner-managers’ leadership style affects turnover intentions of non-family employees through effects on non-family employees’ psychological ownership toward the family firm. In a similar vein, Vardaman and his colleagues (2018) highlighted the important role of organizational identification in non-family employees’ turnover through showing that centrality in both family and non-family friendship network reduces turnover of non-family employees based on the social network perspective. Moreover, using a sample of 301
non-family employees, recent study of Yazici, Memili, and Patel (2020) highlighted that turnover intentions of non-family employees can be affected by their perceived family influence and justice perceptions. Even though these studies have addressed turnover intentions and turnover of various types of employees working at family firms, such as family employees, CEOs, and non-family employees, research regarding turnover issues in family firms is still scarce.

While not all turnover intentions lead to actual turnover due to certain circumstances, such as lack of alternatives, turnover intentions have been a core concept of the general turnover literature (Cho & Lewis, 2012) and a common theme in the field of organizational behavior (Allen et al., 2014). Such emphasis on turnover intentions has been justified by attitude theory which suggests the notion that intentions are one of the best predictors of actual behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992; Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, 1978). Indeed, prior studies have shown the significant relationship between turnover intentions and turnover (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Cho & Lewis, 2012; Lee & Whitford, 2007; Steel & Ovalle, 1984; Harrison et al., 2006), and based on such findings, turnover intentions have been adopted as a proxy for turnover in recent studies (e.g., Kim, 2005; Pitts, Marvel, & Fernandez, 2011). However, despite the plausible relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover, some studies have challenged this widely recognized relationship. For instance, Lee and Mowday (1987) showed that only six percent of turnover variance is explained by turnover intentions, while Kirschenbaum and Weisberg (1990) even found a non-significant relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover. An insignificant relationship is further supported by recent study of Cohen, Blake, and Goodman (2016). Using data from 180 U.S.
federal agencies, they found that turnover intentions and actual turnover are distinctive concepts and have different antecedents.

This dissertation focuses on turnover intentions rather than actual turnover, because employee turnover intentions lend insights into the behaviors of employees (Jung & Kim, 2012), such as absenteeism, even when the intentions cannot be translated into actual turnover due to extraneous factors, such as high unemployment rates.

**Literature Review of Family Influence**

Family influence has long been acknowledged in the field as an essential determinant of the goals, governance, and resources of family firms. For instance, Chrisman and his colleagues (2012) explained family-centered noneconomic (FCNE) goals, which is a unique to family firms, using family involvement and family essence, while Lubatkin, Durand, and Ling (2007) argue that the governance efficiency of family firms can be explained, at least partially, by parental altruism. Moreover, based on the resource-based view (RBV), Habbershon and Williams (1999) proposed that family firms have unique resources, namely familiness, due to the system interaction between family, family members, and the business. Thus, “in family firms, all aspects of the business maybe strongly affected by the presence of the family in the business system” (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006: 841). In other words, family influence is the core aspect of family firms that explains the difference between family firms and non-family firms as well as family firm heterogeneity.

Due to its considerable impact on family firms, family influence has been an object of research for the last several decades. One important research stream related to family influence is

---

6 “Unique bundle of resources a particular firm has because of the systems interaction between the family, its individual members and the business” (Habbershon & Williams, 1999: 11).
on the various dimensions of family influence. According to Astrachan, Klein, and Smyrnois (2002), family influence is a multi-dimensional construct, and the various dimensions of family influence should be considered independently. By providing three core dimensions of family influence, which are power (ownership, governance, management), experience (generation of ownership, generation active in management, generation active on the governance board, number of contributing members), and culture (overlap between family values and business values, family business commitment), as well as a scale measure for each dimension, namely the F-PEC scale, Astrachan and his colleagues provided a solid foundation for research in family influence. The validity and reliability of the F-PEC scale was empirically supported by a follow-up study by Klein, Astrachan, and Smyrnois (2005), and the scale has been further examined and refined by Holt, Rutherfold, and Kuratko (2007). In a similar vein, the recent study by Frank, Kessler, Rusch, Suess-Reyes, and Weismeier-Sammer (2017) highlighted the multi-dimensionality of family influence by proposing a family influence familiness scale (FIFS) comprising six dimensions, which are (1) ownership, management, and control, (2) proficiency level of active family members, (3) sharing of information between active family members, (4) transgenerational orientation, (5) family-employee bond, and (6) family business identity. These extant literatures identify and emphasize various dimensions of family influence in family firms.

Along with the research regarding family influence itself, a considerable amount of studies have also focused on the impact of family influence, particularly family involvement in management, on the family firms. For instance, Ensely and Pearson (2005) compared the behavioral dynamics of top management teams (TMT) in family firms and non-family firms based on family involvement in the TMT, while Romano, Tanewski, and Smyrnios (2001) explained the capital structure of family firms using family control. Moreover, Zahra, Neubaum,
and Larraneta (2007) found that the relationship between knowledge sharing and technological capabilities can be moderated by the number of family generations involved in family firm management. Kellermanns, Eddleston, Sarathy, and Murphy (2012), Lee (2006), and Zattoni, Gnan, and Huse (2015) report the positive impact of family involvement on the firm performance. Family involvement also has been utilized to explain behaviors of family firms. For instance, Ashwin, Krishnan, and George (2015) found that family ownership and family control over TMT positions, particularly the CEO and chairperson positions, have a positive impact on the firms’ R&D investment. Besides R&D investment, various types of strategic behaviors of family firms, such as flexibility of planning systems (Craig, Dibrell, & Garrett, 2014), succession processes (Davis & Harverson, 1998), internationalization (Graves & Thomas, 2008; Sciascia, Mazzola, Astrachan, & Pieper, 2013), knowledge sharing practices (Zahra, Neubaum, & Larraneta, 2007), firm philanthrophy (Campopiano, De Massis, & Chrico, 2014), diversification (Munoz-Bullon, Sanchez-Bueno, & Suarez-Gonzalez, 2018), entrepreneurial behaviors (Kellermanns, Eddleston, Barnett, & Pearson, 2008) and tax aggressiveness (Sanchez-Marin, Portillo-Navarro, & Clavel, 2016), are also explained by family involvement.

Albeit few in number compared to the studies regarding family involvement, several studies have examined the impact of other dimensions of family influence, such as transgenerational intentions/orientation and family business identity. As the definition of family firms suggested by Chua and his colleagues (1999), the transgenerational intentions of family owners is part of the essence of family firms and family influence. In other words, family firms’ idiosyncratic aspects are, at least partially, due to the family owners’ intentions to pass the firm to the next generation. Indeed, several studies adopted transgenerational intentions of family owners to explain various aspects of family firms. For instance, Hoffmann, Jaskiewicz, Wulf,
and Combs (2019) found that the transgenerational control intention of family managers harm family firms’ performance, while Diaz-Moriana, Clinton, Kammerlander, Lumpkin, and Craig (2020) related family firms’ long-term views to the innovation motives and outcomes of the firms. Moreover, Zellweger, Kellermanns, Chrisman, and Chua (2012) reported that transgenerational intention has a positive impact on family firm valuation by family CEOs. It has also been found that transgenerational intention influences strategic behaviors of family firms, such as the succession planning process (Umans, Lybaert, Steijvers, & Voordeckers, 2019) and diversification (Shen, 2018). Moreover, the role of family commitment and family identity in family firms have also been explored. Koropp, Grichnick, and Kellermanns found that family commitment has a significant impact on the financial attitudes of family firms, while Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013) proposed that family identity is positively related to family firm reputation based on social identity perspective.

Besides those studies focusing on the impact of each dimension of family influence on specific aspect of family firms, several studies investigated how each dimension of family influence, such as family involvement, transgenerational intentions, and family commitment, affects each other. For instance, Chrisman and his colleagues (2012) argued that family involvement influences family essence, comprised of transgenerational family control intentions and family commitment. Similarly, recent studies found that each dimension of family influence may affect each other. Campopiano, Calabro, and Basco (2020) found that family involvement has a significant impact on the CEO’s succession intention, while Gimenez-Jimenez, Edelman, Minola, Calabro, and Lucio Cassia (2020) found that there is a significant positive relationship between affective commitment, which is related to family firm identity, and succession intentions. In a similar vein, Mahto, Chen, McDowell, and Ahluwalia (2019) and Mahto,
McDowell, and Davis (2020) explored the relationships between family involvement, family business identity, and transgenerational family control intentions. Overall, the findings from the extant literature shed light on the critical role of family influence in family firms.

Along with the research stream on family influence, number of studies have explored and examined how family influence affects implementation of HR practices in family firms. For instance, Kidwell, Eddleston, and Kellermanns (2018) argued that negative family imprinting may cause informal and easily manipulated HR practices, while Steijvers, Lybaert, and Dekker (2017) found that family firms with a family member CEO are more likely to implement formal HR practices than those managed by a non-family CEO. Moreover, biased HR practices common among family firms as caused by family influence has also been highlighted by previous studies. For instance, Daspit et al. (2018) proposed that family structure, particularly unbalanced family structure, may lead to biased HR practices in family firms; while Jenning, Dempsey, and James (2018) argued that biological discrimination exhibited by family owners may cause bifurcation bias in the HR practices of family firms. Due to biased HR practices in the family firms, it has been found that non-family managers are significantly less satisfied with the fairness of compensation system in family firms (Poza, Alfred, & Maheshwari, 1997); this is aligned with the conceptual model presented by Barnett and Kellermanns (2006) which suggested that family influence affects non-family employees’ perceived justice through HR practices. Overall, despite the recent scholarly attention on the impact of family influence on HR practices of family firms, how family influence determines the implementation of HR practices in family firms has not yet been fully explored and examined. In particular, “little empirical research explores the role of family influence in driving a firm’s adoption of specific strategic human resource practices” (Tsao, Wang, Chen, & Wang, 2019: 223). Thus, this dissertation fills this void in the literature by
empirically examining how family influence affects implementation of family-friendly workplace practice in the context of family firms.

**Literature Review of Family-Friendly Workplace Practices**

The value of HR practices, beyond compliance with regulatory rules, is widely recognized. Extant literature provides both conceptual and empirical insights into why HR practices are adopted by organizations and how these practices impact organizational outcomes. For example, Delaney and Huselid (1996) argued that organizations implement HR practices (1) to enhance employee skills, (2) to motivate employees, and (3) to provide well organized workplace structure to let employees work effectively. Furthermore, both individual level and firm-level outcomes of HR practices got considerable attention from scholars as well (e.g., Bartel, 1994; Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Huselid, Jackson, & Schuler, 1997; Collins & Clark, 2003). In particular, according to the meta-analysis conducted by Boselie, Dietz, and Boon (2005), turnover has been one of the most popular indicators associated with HR practices. Numerous studies have highlighted the impact of HR practices on employee turnover intentions (Vandenberg, Richarson & Eastman, 1999). For instance, Chang et al. (2013) examined the work design-related antecedents of turnover and found that compensation does impact employee turnover intentions, while Luna-Arocas and Camps (2007) and Juhdi, Pawan, and Hansaram (2013) found that high performance HR practices negatively affect turnover intentions through enhancing employee commitment. Moreover, recent study of Aburumman, Salleh, Omar, and Abadi (2020) found that HR practices, particularly compensation, performance appraisal, promotion, and training and development, negatively affect employees’ turnover intentions through enhancing their career satisfaction. Similarly, Lee, Sohn, Kim, Kwon, and Park (2018)
found that perceived HR practices significantly affect affective commitment and turnover intentions.

Among various HR practices, family-friendly workplace practices have been one of the most widely studied HR practices as a means of acquiring and retaining human resources. As defined, family-friendly workplace practices include several HR practices or policies that “provide relief for non-work concerns” (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000: 1108) for employees. Even though various types of family-friendly workplace practices have been addressed in the literature, these practices can be categorized, in general, into two groups (Allen, 2001; Batt & Valcour, 2003); (1) flexible work arrangements and (2) dependent care support. A flexible work arrangement is designed to provide a more flexible work environment for the employees whereas dependent care support is designed to provide care services for the family members of employees. Table 2.1 shows representative practices of each type. According to the study of Thompson et al. (1999: 402), family care leave, part-time work, absence autonomy, flextime, and time off for dependent care are the most commonly provided family-friendly workplace practices. In the following section, a general review regarding the consequences and antecedents of family-friendly workplace practices will be conducted to provide a holistic landscape of the family-friendly workplace practices literature. Then, the literature that examines the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on employee turnover intentions will be reviewed.
Table 2.1 Types of Family-Friendly Workplace Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>- Flextime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Compressed work week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Telecommuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Part-time work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Absence autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Job sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care support</td>
<td>- On-site childcare center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subsidized local childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Childcare information and referral services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Paid maternity leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Paid paternity leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elder care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Time off for dependent care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences and antecedents of family-friendly workplace practices

Consequences of family-friendly workplace practices have been extensively explored in the research due to the expansion of these practices across various industries. Early studies of absenteeism documented a negative relationship between flextime and absenteeism (Kim & Campagna, 1981; McGuire & Liro, 1987). Using data from public service organizations, Dalton and Mesch (1990) found a significantly decreased absenteeism among employees who can use flexible scheduling, while Halpern (2005) found similar results that users of flexible work hours report low levels of absenteeism. Similarly, Anderson, Coffey, and Byerly (2002) showed that schedule flexibility decreases absenteeism through mitigating work-to-family conflict. Moreover,
the negative relationship between childcare arrangements and family supportive supervision and absenteeism is also reported by Goff, Mount, and Jamison (1990). These studies show that both flexible work arrangements and dependent care support reduce absenteeism of employees.

In a similar vein, several studies reported that employees who can utilize flexible scheduling experience higher job satisfaction due to a higher level of control over managing both work and family and fewer work-to-family conflicts (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Scandura & Kankau, 1997; Anderson et al., 2002). These findings are further supported by a meta-analysis of 31 studies of flexible scheduling practices conducted by Baltes et al. (1999). According to their analysis, there are significant positive effects of flexible work arrangements (e.g., flextime, compressed work weeks) on employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction and satisfaction with scheduling. Not only do flexible work arrangements increase job satisfaction, but dependent care support also increases job satisfaction. Using the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, Ko, Hur, and Smith-Walter (2013) found that employee job satisfaction is positively related with both flexible work scheduling and dependent care programs and that the positive relationship can be moderated by managerial support.

Besides absenteeism and job satisfaction, various kinds of organizational outcomes also have been related to family-friendly workplace practices. Breaugh and Frye (2008) and Anderson et al. (2002) found negative impacts of flexible work schedule on work-family conflict and level of stress, respectively. Similarly, according to the study of Allen (2001), available family-friendly benefits reduce the level of work-family conflicts through enhancing family supportive organizational perception. In contrast, positive effects of flexible work arrangements on the employee’s organizational commitment (Grover & Crokker, 1995; Scandura & Kankau, 1997; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007), organizational citizenship behavior (Lambert, 2000), and
performance rating (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006) are found as well. Overall, despite mixed findings, extant literature generally suggests that family-friendly workplace practices have significant positive impacts on organizational outcomes (Batt & Valcour, 2003).

Another stream of research regarding the consequences of family-friendly workplace practices is about the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on firm level performance, such as firm productivity (Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Glass & Finley, 2002), profit rate (Meyer, Mukerjee, & Sestero, 2001), and shareholder value (Arthur & Cook, 2004). For instance, using the bundle approach advanced in the strategic HRM literature, Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) found that family-friendly workplace practices as a bundle positively influence the perceived firm-level performance and that the positive relationship may be positively moderated by firm age and proportion of female employees. Similarly, Ngo et al. (2009) found the positive impact of family-friendly workplace practices on perceived market related performance, such as net profit and new product development. Based on Fortune 500 company data, Arthur and Cook (2004) found that shareholder value (e.g., shareholder return) is increased after the announcement of family-friendly workplace practices implementation.

Even though a large body of literature has focused on and examined consequences of family-friendly workplace practices, some studies have attempted to identify antecedents of the practices. For example, Bloom and his colleagues (2011) found that firms with a higher proportion of skilled employees, a higher proportion of female employees, and good management practices tend to offer more family-friendly workplace practices, while Konrad and Mangel (2000) found similar results that a higher proportion of professionals and female employees were positively related to more extensive family-friendly workplace practices. In a similar vein, Poelmans et al. (2003) found that firm size, percentage of female employees,
presence of a high-commitment work system\(^7\), and the tightness of the labor market are related to the implementation of family-friendly HR practices.

**Family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions**

Family-friendly workplace practices have attracted scholarly attention as a means of retaining high-quality employees. Following the research trend, a considerable amount of study has been conducted to examine the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on employee turnover intentions in various ways. Flexible work arrangements have long been an object of research, and a considerable number of studies examining organizational outcomes associated with flexible work arrangements found significant relationships between flexible work arrangements and organizational outcomes (Batt & Valcour, 2003). In particular, flexible work arrangements have been associated with decreased turnover and turnover intentions of employees (Aryee, Luk, & Stone, 1998; Beauregard & Henry, 2009). According to Rothausen (1994), flexibility in work hours is negatively related to turnover intentions, especially for parent employees. Similarly, Glass and Riley (1998) found that availability of flexible work hours, particularly length of leave available for childbirth and ability to avoid working overtime upon return from childbirth, was associated with decreased turnover of employed pregnant women. The negative relationship between access to flexible work arrangements and turnover intentions is further supported by numerous empirical studies. Drawing on a sample of 557 white-collar employees, Batt and Valcour (2003) found that family-friendly workplace practices, particularly access to flexible scheduling, predicts lowered turnover intentions. They also suggested that the best way of handling turnover of employees is to incorporate family-friendly workplace practices.

---

\(^7\) In a high-commitment work system, “employees are invited to go beyond their strict job description and engage in problem-solving groups, decision making (Osterman, 1988), and self-management” (Poelmans et al., 2003: 135).
with other human resource practices, such as commitment enhancing incentives and autonomy enhancing work design. In a similar vein, Dex, Smith, and Winter (2001) showed that telework, job sharing, and flextime are associated with reduced turnover of employees based on the 1998 workplace employee relations survey (WERS) data.

Several studies have attempted to explain the relationship between flexible work arrangements and turnover intentions through adopting possible mediators. For instance, Anderson and his colleagues (2002) showed the negative impact of schedule flexibility on turnover intentions through highlighting the mediating role of work-to-family conflict. Through conducting a meta-analysis of 46 studies regarding telecommuting, Gajendran and Harrison (2007) emphasized the mediating role of perceived autonomy to explain underlying mechanism of the negative relationship between telecommuting and turnover intentions. In a similar vein, McNall, Masuda, and Nicklin (2010) also showed that flexible work arrangements, particularly flextime and a compressed workweek, reduce turnover intentions through enhancing work-to-family enrichment, even after controlling for individual aspects, such as gender, age, marital status, and education.

Compared to flexible work arrangements, there is a limited number of studies that examine the impact of dependent care support on employee turnover and turnover intentions. According to early studies (Milkovich & Gomez, 1976; Youngblood & Chambers-Cook, 1984), dependent care services, particularly day care services, have a negative effect on turnover rates, at least in the short term. Using the data collected at the Northside Child Development Center in Minneapolis, Milkovich and Gomez (1976) found that day care service decreases employee turnover. Recent studies also found the negative relationship between dependent care support and turnover intentions. Using survey of 120 employees in New York, Baughman, Dinardi, and
Holtz-Eakin (2003) found that childcare assistance provided by organizations decreases employee turnover, while Yanadori and Kato (2009) found that childcare leave and nursing care leave lower the turnover rate, but only in the case of female employees.

Similarly, Lee and Hong (2011) found that among four types of family-friendly workplace practices examined, which are childcare subsidies, paid leave for family care, telework, and alternative work schedules, only childcare subsidies had a significant negative effect on turnover of federal agencies, whereas Lee and Kim (2010) found that dependent care programs enhance organizational performance, such as employee retention, labor productivity, and labor-management relations. Such findings are particularly salient for female employees with children. For instance, drawing upon a sample of 246 employed mothers, Glass and Estes (1996) showed that turnover intentions of employed mothers decrease as the quality of workplace support, particularly childcare support, increases. Hofferth and Collins (2000) found a similar finding that availability of childcare affects the turnover behavior of all employed mothers.

Despite a considerable number of prior studies examining the individual impact of each type of family-friendly workplace practice on employee turnover, recent studies have started to study multiple family-friendly workplace practices together as a bundle and relate them to employee turnover. The study of Bretz, Boudreau, and Judge (1994) found that a lack of available family-friendly workplace practices facilitates employee’s job search behavior, which in turn may lead to actual turnover. Thompson et al. (1999) found that family-friendly workplace practices are positively related to affective commitment and negatively related to work-family conflicts and turnover intentions, while Ngo et al. (2009) using a sample of HR managers in multi-national corporations in Hong Kong showed that family-friendly workplace practices
significantly affect firm-level performance (market-related performance (+), HR-related performance (+), employee turnover(-)) through enhanced organizational climates. Similarly, Kim and Wiggins (2011) found that an available set of family-friendly workplace practices reduce employee’s turnover intentions through enhancing employee’s satisfaction with policies. Using four years of panel data from U.S. federal agencies, Caillier (2016) also found that overall satisfaction with family-friendly workplace practices in general affects employee turnover negatively at the .10 alpha level, while each family-friendly workplace practice has a varied impact on employee turnover.

Even though those studies have shown significant impacts of family-friendly workplace practices on employee turnover, some studies have provided contradictory findings. For instance, Miller (1984) argued that the impact of employer sponsored childcare on employee turnover is not supported by a reliable experiment, while Dalton and Mesch (1990) found that flexible scheduling programs reduce employee absenteeism but not employee turnover through six years of assessment tests. Such contradictory findings of early studies are further supported by recent studies. For instance, Batt and Valcour (2003) found that dependent care services have no impact on outcomes, such as work-family conflict and turnover intentions, while Yanadori and Kato (2009) found that, unlike the case of female employees, flextime does not have any significant impact on voluntary turnover of male employees in Japan. Lee and Hong (2011) also showed that the impacts of telework, paid leave for family care, and alternative work schedules on employee turnover are not significant. Similarly, drawing upon the Korea Workplace Panel Survey (KWPS) data, Bae and Goodman (2014) and Lee and Kim (2010) found that the number of family-friendly workplace practices offered does not decrease the employee turnover rate and that flexible work scheduling does not reduce employee turnover but negatively affects labor
productivity, respectively. Lastly, Caillier (2016) found that, unlike alternative work schedules and childcare programs, telework and elder care do not have a significant impact on turnover. As such, the findings regarding the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices, regardless of the type practices, and employee turnover remains unclear. The findings of extant literature regarding the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover and turnover intentions are briefly summarized in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2  Summary of Family-Friendly Workplace Practices - Turnover Intentions Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family-Friendly Workplace Practices</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Dalton &amp; Mesch</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Flexible scheduling program reduces employee absenteeism whereas it does not have an impact on employee turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Rothausen</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The negative relationship between satisfaction with flexibility in work hour and turnover intentions is stronger for parent worker than for non-parent worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Glass &amp; Riley</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>In case of pregnant women, availability of flexible work hours, particularly length of leave available for childbirth and availability to avoid working overtime upon return from childbirth, significantly decreases job attrition. Such relationship is stronger for women holding a traditional gender role, such as childcaring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Aryee, Luk, &amp; Stone</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Satisfaction with flexible work schedule and work family support from supervisor are positively related to retention-relevant outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Dex, Smith, &amp; Winter</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Of various types of family-friendly workplace practices, telework, job sharing, and flextime are associated with reduced turnover of employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Anderson, Coffey, &amp; Byerly</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Schedule flexibility negatively affects turnover intentions through mitigating work-to-family conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Batt &amp; Valcour</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Access to flexible scheduling predicts lowered turnover intentions. Such positive relationships are stronger when incorporated with other HRM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Gajendran &amp; Harrison</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>This meta-analysis of 46 studies regarding telecommuting showed the negative relationship between telecommuting and turnover intentions. It also showed that the negative relationship is mediated by perceived autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>McNall, Masuda, &amp; Nicklin</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Flexible work arrangement, particularly flextime and compressed workweek, reduces turnover intentions through enhancing work-to-family enrichment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-Friendly Workplace Practices</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care supports</td>
<td>Milkovich &amp; Gomez</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Day care services decrease employee turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care supports</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>The impact of employer sponsored childcare on employee turnover is not accurately examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care supports</td>
<td>Glass &amp; Estes</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Turnover intentions of employed mothers decrease as the quality of childcare support increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care supports</td>
<td>Hofferth &amp; Collins</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Availability of childcare affects the turnover behavior of all employed mothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care supports</td>
<td>Baughman, Dinardi, &amp; Holtz-Eakin</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Childcare referral services provided by organizations decrease employee turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care supports</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Kim</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dependent care programs enhance organizational performance, such as employee retention, labor productivity, and labor-management relations, whereas flexible work schedule does not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Yandaori &amp; Kato</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>There is a negative relationship between family-friendly workplace practices (flextime, childcare leave, nursing care leave) and employee turnover in Japanese context. However, the relationship applies only to female employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Hong</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Among four types of family-friendly workplace practices, which are childcare subsidies, paid leaver for family care, telework, and alternative work schedules, only childcare subsidies have a significant negative effect on turnover of federal agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>Bretz, Boudreau, &amp; Judge</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Organizational work-family balance policies are negatively related to job search behavior and, in turn, turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>Thompson, Beauvais, &amp; Lyness</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Family-friendly workplace practices are positively related to affective commitment and negatively related to work-family conflicts and turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>Ngo, Foley, &amp; Loi</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Family-friendly workplace practices significantly affect firm-level performances (market-related performance (+), HR-related performance (+), Employee turnover (-)) through enhancing organizational climates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family-Friendly Workplace Practices</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>Kim &amp; Wiggins</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Availability of family-friendly workplace practices reduces employees’ turnover intentions through enhancing employees’ satisfaction with policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bae &amp; Goodman</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The proportion of female workers and unionization of public organizations in Korea decrease the employee turnover rate whereas the number of family-friendly workplace practices offered does not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>Caillier</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Satisfaction with overall family-friendly workplace practices in general affects employee turnover negatively, while each family-friendly workplace practices has a varied impact on employee turnover. For instance, unlike alternative work schedules and childcare programs, telework and elder care do not have a significant impact on turnover.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Overall, in response to the expansion of implementation of family-friendly workplace practices in the field, scholars have paid considerable attention to these practices. In particular, extant literature has mainly explored the consequences and outcomes of family-friendly workplace practices and found a significant impact of family-friendly workplace practices on various types of outcomes, such as organizational commitment, absenteeism, job satisfaction, and organizational performances. It is also shown that employees’ turnover intentions are likely to be affected by family-friendly workplace practices offered by employers. Moreover, antecedents of family-friendly workplace practices, such as proportion of female employees, proportion of skilled employees, age of firm, and competitive labor market, are identified by prior studies as well.
However, as indicated by contradictory findings mentioned above, the findings of extant literature regarding family-friendly workplace practices are still mixed, and the impacts of the practices remain unclear (Ngo et al., 2009). A possible reason for the inconsistent results is that a large portion of extant literature has focused on the direct relationship between practices and outcomes but has largely neglected underlying mechanisms (Demerouti, 2006; Ngo et al., 2009). Considering that focusing on prediction rather than explanation may not produce a strong theoretical explanation, the importance of underlying mechanisms should not be neglected. The importance of underlying mechanism in the family-friendly workplace practice context is illustrated in the conceptual work of Beauregard and Henry (2009), which provides a holistic view of various channels through which family-friendly workplace practices affect organizational performances, including employee turnover. This dissertation adopts burnout as a mediator to shed light on the veiled underlying mechanism through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees.

**Literature Review of Burnout**

The term ‘burnout’ began to appear in the 1970s in the U.S. to indicate the phenomenon of people experiencing extreme fatigue and loss of passion for their job due to the difficulties in relationships they have at work (Maslach et al., 2001). Since then, burnout has been intensively examined by scholars because of its considerable impacts on both organizations and individuals. Indeed, empirical evidence has shown that burnout causes undesirable consequences, such as turnover, absenteeism, and reduced productivity (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Early research on burnout was mainly focused on the professionals working in human services and health care services, where emotional and interpersonal stressors are common, based on qualitative approaches, such as interviews and case studies. However, the limited boundary of research has
been expanded by following systematic empirical studies that focus on all types of occupations based on the idea that burnout can be observed in any type of profession (Burke, Koyuncu, & Fiksenbaum, 2010; Demerouti et al., 2001).

Despite the expansion of the scope of burnout literature, the core dimensions of burnout proposed by early studies (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, 1982), which are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment, are still a core theoretical foundation of recent studies. Exhaustion is a core dimension of burnout (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998) and refers to “feelings of being overextended and depleted of one’s emotional and physical resources” (Maslach et al., 2001: 399) caused by prolonged and intense job demands or job stressors. It also represents a stress dimension of burnout. Depersonalization, also called cynicism or disengagement, refers to “negative, callous, and excessively detached response to various aspects of the job” (Maslach et al., 2001: 399). It also represents the interpersonal dimension of burnout. Lastly, reduced personal accomplishment refers to the feeling that they are no longer capable for their job. It represents the self-evaluation dimension of burnout.

Once these three core dimensions of burnout were identified, several developmental or process models of burnout have been proposed by utilizing these dimensional terms (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Maslach et al., 2001). For instance, according to the early process model of burnout suggested by Maslach (1982), emotional exhaustion comes first as a result of excessive work demand, then disengagement is followed as a “defensive coping strategy” (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993), and, consequently, individuals experience a reduced sense of personal accomplishment. Even though this process model has been supported by several later studies (e.g., Leiter & Meechan, 1986; Leiter & Maslach, 1988), it is also challenged by other studies. For example, Golembiewski and Munzenrider (1988) proposed that depersonalization leads to
reduced personal accomplishment and reduced personal accomplishment in turn causes high levels of exhaustion. Additionally, they proposed eight phases of burnout, which is characterized by a combination of either high or low degree of each dimension, and the eight phases of burnout approach have been used in various occupational contexts, such as police officers (Burke & Deszca, 1986), teachers (Burke & Greenglass, 1989), and middle managers (Cahoon & Rowney, 1989). While these studies attempted to figure out the sequences or causality among each dimension of burnout, Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) argued that these is no fixed sequences among the three components of burnout.

Based on these theoretical foundations, myriad of studies have examined and identified antecedents and consequences of burnout (Jung & Kim, 2012). Even though various types of demands, constraints, and other factors have been identified as antecedents of burnout, the antecedents can be categorized into three groups, which are job characteristics, organizational characteristics, and personal characteristics (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Quantitative job demands, such as workload and time pressure, have been identified as an important aspect of job characteristics that may cause burnout. Indeed, studies shown that there is a consistent and strong relationship between work overload and time pressure with burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2008). Role conflict and role ambiguity also have been identified as job characteristics that cause more job demand and consequently cause burnout (Brookings, Bolton, Brown, & McEvoy, 1985). Occupational characteristics are also important subsets of job characteristics that determine the level of burnout (Maslach et al., 2001) because each occupation may require varying degree of job resources to accomplish the tasks.

Organizational characteristics, such as organizational structure, work environment (Elloy, Terpening, & Kohls, 2001; Jung & Kim, 2012), and policies (Mansour & Tremblay, 2016), have
also been emphasized as important contributors to job burnout. These determinants highlight the importance of the values implicit in organizational processes, structure, and policies on burnout. For instance, employees working at organizations offering flexible work schedule practices are less likely to suffer from stress caused by time pressure (Anderson et al., 2002) compared to employees working at organizations not offering such practices. Moreover, according to the study of Mansour and Tremblay (2016), family-friendly workplace practices reduce the level of burnout caused by work-family conflicts. Such organizational characteristics also shape the emotional and cognitive perception of people, such as fairness and supportiveness, toward their work and organization, which may affect level of burnout.

Lastly, individual characteristics also have been related to burnout to capture internal aspects of individuals that affect their burnout level. Of various individual characteristics, age, sex, and personality have been most widely explored in the burnout literature. For instance, prior studies have found consistent results that younger individuals may experience burnout more than older individuals (Anderson & Iwanicki, 1984; Reinardy, 2006). In contrast, there are mixed findings regarding the relationship between gender and burnout (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Maslach et al., 2001) despite some studies have reported that female employees experience more burnout (Reinardy, 2009). Several personalities have been examined as well to determine which type of people are prone to experience burnout. According to Semmer (2003), people with low levels of hardiness, low self-esteem, and an avoidant coping style are more likely to experience burnout.

To explain the relationship between these antecedents and burnout, several theoretical frameworks have been adopted. The job-person fit (French et al., 1974) model has been widely adopted in the burnout literature. This framework emphasizes the importance of fit between
individual aspects and situational aspects to explain burnout phenomenon rather than considering them separately. For instance, Maslach and Leiter (1997) have explained burnout phenomenon based on the match or mismatch between individuals and six domains of their work environments (workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values). According to the studies using job-person fit model, a greater fit between job and person leads to a decreased likelihood of burnout, whereas the greater mismatch between job and person leads to an increased likelihood of burnout.

Job demands-resources (JD-R) model of burnout (Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003; Demerouti et al., 2001) is also adopted in recent studies (Schaufeli, Bakker, & van Rhene, 2009) to explain burnout based on the concepts of job demands and job resources. According to this framework, development of burnout occurs in two steps (Demerouti et al., 2001): (1) excessive work demands (e.g., work overload) leads to job resource depletion, and (2) lack of job resources disables people to meet job demands which consequently leads to burnout. Thus, this framework explains burnout based on the balance between job demands and job resources. Lastly, the main theoretical framework of this dissertation, COR theory, also has been utilized to explain burnout phenomenon (e.g., Wright & Cropanzano, 1998; Shirom, Melamed, Toker, Berliner, & Shpira, 2005; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016). Because this theory is adopted as an overarching theoretical framework to support my hypotheses and research model, the core aspects of this theory will be discussed in detail in the later chapters.

In addition to antecedents of job burnout, consequences of job burnout have also been an object of research. According to extant literature, job burnout has significant impacts on the organizational outcomes, such as turnover intentions, absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job performance. Such impact of burnout on organizational outcomes justifies considerable
scholarly attention on burnout in the management field. Turnover and turnover intentions are the most commonly studied consequences of burnout (Jung & Kim, 2012; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016). For instance, building on COR theory, Wright and Cropanzano (1998) found a positive relationship between emotional exhaustion and turnover. Interestingly, through showing that the impact of emotional exhaustion on turnover is stronger than that of positive affectivity, their study emphasized significant and strong influences of emotional exhaustion on turnover. In a similar vein, using the survey data of Korean journalists, Jung and Kim (2012) reported that turnover intentions of employees increase while organizational commitment decreases as a result of burnout. Performance has also been considered as an important consequence of burnout. According to the study of Bakker and his colleagues (2004), burnout negatively influences employees’ job performance. In particular, they showed that exhaustion negatively affects in-role performance while disengagement negatively affects extra-role performance based on the JD-R model.

Overall, burnout and its considerable impacts on organizational outcomes have been a widely studied topic in the management field. Based on the three core dimensions of burnout originally suggested by Maslach and Jackson (1981) and several theoretical frameworks, such as job-person fit model, JD-R model, and COR theory, various antecedents and consequences have been examined and identified. These various types of antecedents and consequences show, at least implicitly, the potential mediating roles of burnout in the management literature.

**Literature Review of Moderators: Work-Family Culture, Work-Family Centrality**

*Work-family culture*

To prevent detrimental organizational consequences, such as burnout, caused by the multiple roles employees balance, such as parent and earner, many modern organizations offer
family-friendly workplace practices which provide job resources for their employees (Kossek & Lobel, 1996). Indeed, several studies have empirically shown that such practices alleviate stresses associated with multiple roles (e.g., Thomas & Ganster, 1995). However, at the same time, several studies have pointed out that the impact of mere existence of practices is limited because it is not guaranteed that employees actually can participate in the practice for fear of negative consequences (Kossek & Lobel, 1996). For instance, using the data of 80 major U.S. companies, Galinsky and his colleagues (1993) found that less than two percent of employees actually take advantage of family-friendly workplace practices. In a similar vein, Perlow (1995) reported that engineers of Fortune 100 companies did not want to utilize offered family-friendly workplace practices due to the concerns of negative career consequences. These research findings show that the impact of formal practices and programs designed to support employees’ dual roles may be limited if they are not incorporated with supportive work-family culture (Thompson, Thomas, & Maier, 1992). Based on these findings and the idea that “corporate culture may either advance or thwart development and effectiveness of work-family program” (Starrels, 1992: 261), critical roles of work-family culture in the organization are emphasized by several studies (e.g., Thompson et al., 1999; Mauno, Kinnunen, & Pyykko, 2005; Major, Fletcher, Davis, & Germano, 2008).

Thompson et al. (1999), a notable study regarding work-family culture, defines work-family culture as shared belief regarding the extent to which an organization supports employees’ family responsibility as well as work responsibility. They argued that supportive work-family culture produces norms of respect for employees’ personal and family time, encourages use of family-friendly workplace practices, and ensures that managers are supportive and sensitive to family needs. Moreover, they developed a measure of work-family culture comprised of 21 items
across three dimensions of work-family culture: (1) managerial support, (2) career consequences, and (3) organizational time demands. Managerial support refers to the degree of an organization’s managerial support and sensitivity to employee’s family roles and duties, while career consequences represent perceived negative career consequences associated with utilization of family-friendly workplace practices. Organizational time demands refer to the time expectation that employees place work ahead of family. Based on these concepts, Thompson and his colleagues empirically tested and found that supportive work-family culture significantly affects employee’s organizational attachment, intention to leave, and work-family conflict through enabling actual utilization of family-friendly workplace practices.

The idea that work-family culture affects organizational outcomes is further supported and expanded by following studies. In particular, a number of studies have highlighted considerable impacts of work-family culture on organizational outcomes, such as employee stress, organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intentions, and work-family conflict, through examining and identifying consequences of work-family culture. For instance, using the data from five Finnish organizations representing both public and private organizations, Mauno et al. (2005) found that work-family culture negatively affects self-reported distress. Interestingly, they also reported that work-family culture has both direct and indirect impact on self-reported distress through work-family conflicts in the contexts of social and health care department and paper mill company. Similarly, using web-based survey data obtained from 792 information technology employees, Major and his colleagues (2008) found that work-family culture mitigates a work interference with family, a type of work-family conflict, through enhancing leader-member exchange. Moreover, Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Idovino, and Rosner (2005) reported a positive relationship between work-family culture and organizational
citizenship behavior and organizational commitment by adopting work-family conflict as a mediator. Taken together, these studies demonstrate the important role of work-family culture in the organization.

In addition to the consequences of work-family culture, the various roles of work-family culture in the organization have been explored. For instance, by adopting work-family culture as a mediator, Fiksenbaum (2014) found that availability of family-friendly workplace practices negatively affects employees’ work-family conflict through promoting supportive work-family culture. Unlike the study of Fiksenbaum (2014), Sahibzada, Hammer, Neal, and Kuang (2005) examined work-family culture as a moderator, stating that the level of work-family culture positively moderates the relationship between availability of family-friendly workplace practices and job satisfaction. That is, the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on employees’ job satisfaction is higher in cases of strong work-family culture. Through highlighting possible moderating role of work-family culture, this study emphasized the important role of work-family culture in determining actual impacts of family-friendly workplace practices on organizational outcomes.

In sum, the importance of work-family culture has been widely recognized in the work-family literatures. Given that organizational culture can be conceptualized as “the deep structure of organizations, which is rooted in values, beliefs, and assumptions held by organizational members” (Denison, 1996: 624), organizational culture regarding work-family issues, such as work-family culture, is one of the central determinants of the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on organizational outcomes. Accordingly, to account for such considerable influence of work-family culture, this dissertation adopts work-family culture as a construct that moderates the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on employees’ burnout through
facilitating or amplifying the role of family-friendly workplace practices as a job resource provider.

**Work-family centrality**

Values determine the priority of individual’s life and ultimately one’s attitudes and behaviors (Rokeach, 1973; Posner & Munson, 1979; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Given the importance of values in explaining and predicting individual’s attitudes and behaviors, considerable scholarly attention has been paid to individuals’ value related constructs, such as work-centrality, central life interest (Dublin, Champoux, & Porter, 1975), and life role values (Carlson & Kacmar, 2000). For instance, work-centrality, which is the “belief that individuals have regarding the degree of importance that work plays in their lives” (Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994: 225), has been related to job attitudes (Bal & Kooij, 2011), organizational citizenship behaviors (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002), and work alienation (Hirschfeld & Feild, 2000). However, despite a considerable number of studies that relate individual aspects, such as gender, age, and marital status, to family-friendly workplace practices, individual values have long been neglected in the work-family literatures.

One of few studies that consider individual values is the study of Carr and his colleagues (2008). In their study, they examined the moderating role of work-family centrality, which refers to value judgement of individuals regarding the relative importance of work role and family roles to one’s life. According to the concept of work-family centrality, individuals with high work-family centrality may put work at the center of their life and tend to allocate more of their time and energy to the work domain compared to the family domain. Drawing upon the study of Carlson and Kacmar (2000), which found that work-family conflict can be affected by the value an individual places on family roles or work roles, Carr et al. (2008) found that work-
family centrality significantly moderates the relationship between work family conflict and organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational retention. Specifically, they found significant negative relationships between work-family conflict and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational retention, and also found that the relationships are weakened by work-family centrality with the exception of organizational commitment. By empirically showing that work-family centrality significantly mitigates the negative relationship between work-family conflict and organizational outcomes, their study highlighted a considerable impact of work-family centrality on organizational outcomes.

In addition to organizational outcomes, work-family centrality has been related to individual outcomes. For instance, using the data collected from 533 Chinese dual-earner couples, Xie, Shi, and Ma (2017) examined the relationship between couple’s similarity in work-family centrality and their marital satisfaction. According to their study, similarity in work-family centrality among dual-earner couples is negatively related to marital satisfaction. That is, the marital satisfaction of dual-earner couples gets higher as the variation of work-family centrality of each individual increases. Through reporting the significant impact of work-family centrality on marital satisfaction, this recent study highlights the role of work-family centrality in determining individual outcomes.

Despite the critical role of work-family centrality, there is a dearth of literature that adopts work-family centrality as a main variable in the family-friendly workplace practices literatures. Given that the actual value of resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices may vary contingent on each individual’s work-family centrality, the omission of work-family centrality in the literature seems an apparent obstacle for capturing a true impact of family-friendly workplace practices.
Theoretical Framework: Conservation of Resources Theory

Based on the core tenet that people are motivated to preserve and protect their possessed resources (conservation) and to acquire new resources (acquisition) (Halbesleben et al., 2014), conservation of resources theory has been a leading theoretical framework in the organizational behavior literature (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Specifically, it is widely adopted by stress and burnout related literatures (Westman et al., 2004) with the recognition that it is “an integrative stress theory that considers both environmental and internal processes with relatively equal measure” (Hobfoll, 2001: 338). According to the theory, stress results from (1) actual loss of resources, (2) potential loss of or threat to resources, and (3) inconsistency between resource investment and expected return (Halbesleben, 2006). Through highlighting the critical role of resources, COR theory suggests that burnout is likely to occur when individuals perceive that they do not have enough resources to cope with the prolonged stressors they confront. That is, COR theory explains stress and burnout syndrome based on the resource perspective.

Resources are the basic and core building blocks of COR theory. According to the COR theory, a resource can be defined as anything that is valued by the individual or that can be utilized as means to achieve these objectives (Balbesleben et al., 2009). For instance, Hobfoll (2001: 342) identified 74 things that satisfy the definition of resources, and the list explicitly shows a broad range of possible resources: free time, a good marriage, personal health, companionship, time with a loved one, adequate food, and a role as a leader. Even though this loose definition of resources in which nearly anything can be considered as a resource has been an object of criticism (Gorgievski, Halbesleben, & Bakker, 2011; Halbesleben et al., 2014), this

---

8 Stress has been defined in terms of “a disruption of the equilibrium of the cognitive-emotional-environmental system by external factors” (Demerouti et al., 2001: 501).
definition has allowed resource perspectives to be applied in various contexts. Indeed, a myriad of entities have been treated as resources in the literatures. Table 2.3 adopted and summarized from the study of Halbesleben et al. (2014) shows that various types of entities have been treated as resources by a considerable number of studies.

### Table 2.3  List of Psychological Resources Reported in the Organizational Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object/Condition</td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>Rewards, Reinforcement, Inducements, Decision autonomy, Skill discretion, Control, Participation in decision making, Opportunities for professional development, Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Social support (supervisor, coworker, organization, spousal, customer, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energies</td>
<td>Work time demanding, Recovery experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Emotional intelligence, Self-esteem, Self-efficacy, Lucas of control, Core self-evaluation, Conscientiousness, Emotional stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro</td>
<td>Family-friendly workplace policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This list is adopted from Halbesleben et al. (2014).

One critical aspect of the resource concept in COR theory is that the value of a resource can be different among individuals depending on their internal aspects or external circumstances (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Hobfoll, 2001). That is, the same resource can be more or less valuable to one person than others. For instance, the value of time with family may vary among individuals contingent on their own idiosyncratic internal aspects, such that the time with family may be perceived as a more valuable resource to family-oriented individuals than to work-oriented individuals (Halbesleben, et al., 2014). Moreover, Hobfoll (2001) also highlighted the importance of culture, which is a part of external environment, in determining the value of
resources. Hobfoll argued that “how resources are ranked and valued is a reflection of what constitutes culture” (2001: 343). For instance, personal time or feeling independent can be a more valuable resource in the individualist society than collectivist society. As such, COR theory recognizes that whatever the resource, the actual value of the resources is determined by the individual characteristics and external environments of the resource holder.

With these basic concepts of resources and the central tenet mentioned above, several principals and corollaries constitute COR theory (cf., Hobfoll, 2001). The first principal of COR theory is the ‘primacy of resource loss’, which means that the psychological impact of losing resources is greater than that of gaining resources even when the actual amount of resources is the same. The salience of losing a resource has been widely recognized and applied in the organizational psychology literature (Hobfoll, 2001). For instance, the idea of primacy of resource loss is consistent with loss aversion, which indicates that people value loss more than gain and is one of the central elements of prospect theory (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). This principal also indicates that resource gain is more valuable in the context of resource loss, such that getting a job is more meaningful to unemployed individuals (Vinokur & Schul, 2002). Moreover, through emphasizing a salience of resource loss, it suggests that individuals will behave in a way that enables them to avoid resource losses (Whitman, Halbesleben, & Holmes, 2014).

The second principal of COR theory is the ‘resource investment’, which means that “people must invest resources in order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain resources” (Hobfoll, 2001: 349). This principal enables COR theory to go beyond mere predictions of stress or burnout by providing theoretical insights into how individual’s resources are invested. That is, a principle of resource investment emphasizes the importance of proactive
coping (Hobfoll, 2001). According to this principal, people invest their resources in response to their situation, such as resource depletion, in a way that is most appropriate to protect, recover, and gain resources (cf. Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007; Halbesleben, Harvey, & Bolino, 2009). Moreover, it is also highlighted that many resource investments can be considered as means of both resource gaining and resource spending (Halbesleben et al., 2014). For instance, according to the study of Ng and Feldman (2012), voice behaviors in the workplace, which is a resource investment, can be a method of gaining new resources (Fuller, Barnett, Hester, Relyea, & Frey, 2007) to enhance employees’ performance as well as depleting possessed resources.

Along with these two principles, four corollaries of COR theory have been suggested (Hobfoll, 1998; Hobfoll, 2001). The first corollary states that people who possess a large resource pool are in a better position for resource investment, whereas people who lack resources may have less chance to invest their resources. The second corollary indicates that loss of a resource may lead to further resource losses, referred to as a ‘resource loss spiral’. The third corollary mirrors the second corollary by stating that gain of resource may lead to further resource gains, referred to as a ‘resource gain spiral’. The last corollary states that as people lose their resources, they become more conservative in resource investment to preserve remaining resources. These corollaries of COR theory address the importance of initial resource status, downstream influence of changes in resources, and individuals’ response to the resource losses. These basic tenets of COR theory mentioned above are summarized in Table 2.4.
Table 2.4 Basic Tenets of COR Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenets</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle 1</td>
<td>Primacy of resource loss: The psychological impact of losing resources is greater than that of gaining resources even when the actual amount of resources is the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2</td>
<td>Resource investment: People must invest resources in order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corollary 1</td>
<td>People who possess a large resource pool are in better position for resource investment, whereas people who lack resources may have less chance to invest their resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corollary 2</td>
<td>Resource loss spiral: Loss of resource may lead to further resource losses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corollary 3</td>
<td>Resource gain spiral: Gain of resource may lead to further resource gains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corollary 4</td>
<td>As people lose their resources, they become more conservative in resource investment to preserve remaining resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These core tenets of COR theory have provided a theoretical foundation for a considerable number of work-family studies (e.g., Allen, 2001; Halbesleben et al., 2009; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016). For instance, Halbesleben and his colleagues (2009) used the concept of resource investment to explain the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. According to their study, as work engagement increases, employees will invest more resources on the work domain, such as more organizational citizenship behavior, rather than on the family domain, and such work-focused resource investment may lead to work interference with family. Moreover, the recent study of Tabor et al. (2019) utilized COR theory in the context of family business. In their study, they adopted spiritual leadership as a resource to enhance organizational commitment and a method to mitigate the negative impact of work-family conflict and found that spiritual leadership has a negative effect on non-family employees suffering from work-family conflict. Following those
extant literature using COR theory, this dissertation adopts basic tenets of COR theory to examine the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout and turnover intention in the context of family firms.

**Theoretical Model and Hypothesis Development**

It is recognized in the family business literature that non-family employees make up a large portion of labor force of family firms (Deloitte & Touche, 1999) and that non-family employees face unique experiences related to the idiosyncratic nature of family firms due to the fact that they are a part of the business but not the family system (Mitchell et al., 2003; Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006; Chrisman et al., 2014). Non-family employees often confront distinctive situations while they work at family firms, including bifurcation bias (Verbeke & Kano, 2012; Jennings et al., 2018), frequent employee evaluation (Astrachan & Kolenko, 1994), higher performance expectation (Chrisman et al., 2014), perceptions of injustice (Carsrud, 2006; Marler et al., 2018), and misalignment of goals with the owner-family (Chua et al., 2003). The uniquely shaped workplace experiences caused by non-family status may shape trust and organizational commitment of non-family employees (e.g., Davis, Allen, & Hayes, 2010; Pearson & Marler, 2010), which are related to the turnover intentions of non-family employees (Jaros, 1997).

Due to the non-family status, which may lead to a higher performance expectation (Chrisman et al., 2014), higher demands on transacting cognition (Mitchell et al., 2003), and frequent job evaluations (Astrachan & Kolenko, 1994), non-family employees are likely to experience more job demands. In turn, the job demands may require more job resources for non-family employees compared to family employees in family firms or employees in non-family firms. For instance, non-family employees often need to figure out what the owner-family desires in order to align their actions with owner-family’s goals, and this process results in a
drain on resources (e.g., time, emotion, and effort). In a similar vein, non-family employees may need to experience a higher demand on transacting cognition to work at the family firms (Mitchell et al., 2003). Moreover, non-family employees may experience unfavorable and unfair treatments caused by bifurcation bias (Verbeke & Kano, 2012) toward them, which may require more and distinctive job resources to withstand it. For instance, non-family employees may be perceived as disloyal employees by owner-family merely because of their non-family status. To overcome such bifurcation bias toward them, non-family employees may need to spend more time at the workplace to show their loyalty and dedication, which drains both physical and psychological resources. Considering that these unique situations often require extra resources, more studies regarding HR practices, which offer a way to bolster employees’ resources and prevent a resource depletion, for non-family employees are needed.

To shed light on managing and retaining non-family employees, this dissertation focuses on the HR practices that have been widely implemented (Batt & Valcour, 2003) but rarely studied in the family firm literature: family-friendly workplace practices. In particular, drawing upon the COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), which explains individuals’ behaviors based on their desire to preserve and acquire resources, the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions of non-family employees is hypothesized and tested. Through showing that implementation of family-friendly workplace practices, which is hypothesized to be determined by the level of family influence, affects turnover intentions of non-family employee, this model demonstrates how HR practices contribute to the heterogeneity of family firms. To provide a theoretical explanation for the underlying mechanism through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions, burnout, which refers to depletion of resources, is adopted as a mediator. Moreover, to account for both individual and organizational factors that may
moderate the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employees’ burnout, work-family centrality, which is an individual level factor, and work-family culture, which is an organizational level factor, are adopted as moderators. The research model of this dissertation can be seen in Figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1  Conceptual Model with Hypotheses
Family Influence and Family-Friendly Workplace Practices in Family Firms

It is widely recognized that HR practices of family firms are substantially different from those of non-family firms as well as from each other (Cruz et al., 2015; Combs et al., 2018). For instance, Gómez-Mejía, Larraza-Kintana, and Makri (2003) found a distinctive compensation system of family firms by showing that family-member CEOs of family firms receive lower total income than non-family member CEOs. Moreover, Block (2010) and Stavrou et al. (2007) found that family firms are less likely to fire employees even during the economic recession compared to non-family counterparts.

To explain such differences in HR practices, several studies have focused on the unique family attributes as antecedents of HR practices in family firms. For instance, Ensley, Pearson, and Sardeshmukh (2007) argued that relationships between family members in TMT influence compensation policies of family firms, while Daspit et al. (2018) argued that unbalanced family structure leads to biased HR practices in family firms using Olsen’s circumplex model (2000). Moreover, de Kok et al (2006) found that family ownership is negatively related to the usage of professional HR practices.

Along with those unique aspects of family firms, family influence has also been emphasized as a predictor of HR practices in family firms. For instance, Cruz and his colleagues (2011) highlighted the important role of family influence on the HR practices of family firms based on the socioemotional wealth (SEW) perspective (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007). Such impacts of family influence on the HR practices in family firms are also conceptually supported by Barnett and Kellermanns (2006). Thus, albeit few, extant literature demonstrates that “family firms’ HR practices related to issues such as staffing, performance appraisal, promotion, compensation, and discipline may vary based on the level of family influence present in family
firms” (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006: 838). That is, family firms are different from non-family firms, as well as from each other, in HR practices due to family influence.

Consistent with the extant literature (e.g., Cruz et al., 2011), I argue that family influence has a substantial impact on the family firms’ development and implementation of HR practices. In particular, drawing upon SEW perspective and COR theory, I contend that family influence negatively affects family firms’ implementation of family-friendly workplace practices. According to the SEW perspective, firms influenced by family, such as family owned and/or managed firms, tend to make strategic decisions under the logic of preserving owning family’s SEW (Cruz et al., 2001). That is, family influence, which determines the importance of SEW preservation, plays a critical role in strategic decision-making process in family firms. Given that HR practices reflect the strategic decisions made by firms (Gómez-Mejía, Balkin, & Cardy, 2012), development and/or implementation of family-friendly workplace practices in family firms may also follow the logic of preserving SEW as the level of family influence increases.

Implementation of family-friendly workplace practices may negatively affect SEW by mitigating the level of the owning family’s discretion over the family firm. The literature suggests that family firms tend to be reluctant to implement formalized HR practices to secure their discretion or control over the family firms, which is one of the core dimensions of SEW (Berrone et al., 2012) (e.g., Aldrich & Langton, 1998; Reid & Adams, 2001; de Kok, Uhlaner, & Thurik, 2006). For instance, family firms tend to avoid using clear criteria in recruitment and rely heavily on informal referrals (Gersick, Davis, Hampton, & Lansberg, 1997) to fill the management positions. In a similar vein, family firms may show reluctance to implement formalized family-friendly workplace practices to secure their discretion related to HR practices. In particular, family firms with a higher level of family influence may show stronger reluctance
to formalize family-friendly workplace practices because they may put more weight on control/discretion preservation than the firms with less family influence. That is, family influence may have a negative impact on the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices.

Since implementation of family-friendly workplace practices may also have a positive affect on SEW by enhancing the image of family firms (Oliver, 1997; Cruz et al., 2011), family influence may have positive effect on implementation of family-friendly workplace practices as well. However, based on the principle of COR theory, particularly ‘primacy of resource loss’, I propose that the net impact of family influence on the implementation of family friendly workplace practices is negative. According to the COR theory, the psychological impact of losing resources is greater than that of gaining resources even when the actual amount of resources is the same (Hobfoll, 2001). Accordingly, the gains of SEW from implementation of family-friendly workplace practices, such as good reputation, may be perceived smaller than the loss of SEW from implementation of family friendly workplace practices, such as losing discretions, even when the exact amount of gains and losses are the same. That is, the net effect of family-friendly workplace practices on the SEW is likely to be perceived as negative by owning family because of the ‘primacy of resource loss’. Given that the level of family influence determines the importance of SEW preservation in the family firms, family firms with a higher level of family influence are less likely to implement family-friendly workplace practices for the purpose of SEW preservation. This is also consistent with the finding of the study of Moshavi and Koch (2005) that family-friendly workplace practices are used less in the firms with a high family ownership. Thus, following these arguments, I hypothesize:

\[ H_{01}: \text{Family influence is negatively related to the implementation of family-friendly workplace practices.} \]
Family-Friendly Workplace Practices and Non-Family Employee Turnover Intentions

A considerable amount of studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions (see Table 2.2). A large amount of extant literature reveals that family-friendly workplace practices, regardless of single practice or set of practices, reduce employees’ turnover intentions (e.g., Thompson et al., 1999; Kim & Wiggins, 2011; McNall et al., 2010). Empirical evidence supports the idea that family-friendly workplace practices provide a better work environment which enables employees to effectively deal with their dual roles, work roles and family roles. Drawing upon these extant literatures and COR theory (Hobfoll, 2001), I theorize that family-friendly workplace practices have significant negative impacts on turnover intentions in the context of non-family employees.

Non-family employees working at family firms often confront unique situations that may foster turnover intentions of non-family employees due to resource depletion. For instance, extant literature argued that non-family employees frequently confront complex cognitive situations (Mitchell et al., 2003) and higher performance expectations (Chrisman et al., 2014), which may deplete more job resources. Moreover, non-family employees’ resources will likely be depleted when they experience altruism toward family employees (Chrisman et al., 2014; Schulze, Lubatkin, Dino, & Buchholtz, 2001) or bifurcation bias toward them (Verbeke & Kano, 2012; Jennings et al., 2018) that may restrict career opportunities, such as promotion and compensation. Such unfavorable treatments toward non-family employees may generate perceptions of injustice among non-family employees (Marler et al., 2018), which drain psychological resources of non-family employees, especially when they are superior performers compared to family employees. According to COR theory, as people loss their resources, they tend to choose more conservative strategies, such as quitting, to preserve their remaining
resources (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Thus, non-family employees working at family firms are at risk of experiencing turnover intentions due to strains on personal resources.

Family-friendly workplace practices can be a powerful tool for family firms to prevent or mitigate non-family employees’ turnover intentions. As the definition of family-friendly workplace practices indicates (Batt & Valcour, 2003), family-friendly workplace practices allow employees to save their resources, such as time, emotion, and efforts, which may be depleted by performing family tasks. That is, employees can be, at least partially, liberated from the resource depletion problem caused by multiple roles, such as work roles and family roles, when they utilize family-friendly workplace practices. For instance, day care service provided by employers enables employees with children to save their physical and psychological resources, which would otherwise be used to take care of their children. Thus, the resource supporting function of family-friendly workplace practices may prevent turnover intentions of employees. As the tenet of COR theory indicates, employees experiencing resource depletion are likely to be conservative in resource reinvestment which may lead to turnover intentions.

The role of family-friendly workplace practices is also relevant, if not more salient, in the context of non-family employees due to the additional resources required because of non-family status. For instance, non-family employees may experience psychological resource loss due to the unfavorable rewards or treatments caused by owner-family’s altruism toward family employees (Schulze et al., 2001). However, the psychological resource loss of non-family employees can be prevented or mitigated by implementing family-friendly workplace practices because offering family-friendly workplace practices signals that the family firm cares not only the owner-family but also the non-family employees’ family. That is, non-family employees who have experienced the owner-family’s concern and supportiveness for non-family employees’
family are less likely to perceive injustice, which may require more psychological resources to deal with, regarding altruism toward family employees. Thus, family-friendly workplace practices can prevent non-family employees’ resource losses caused by unfavorable situations they often face and, consequently, mitigate their turnover intentions. Thus, I hypothesize the following:

_Hypothesis 2. Family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related to non-family employee turnover intentions._

**Family-Friendly Workplace Practices and Non-Family Employee Burnout**

Due to cultural and demographic changes (Galinsky et al., 2008), a large portion of employees in the modern society are forced to handle not only work roles but also family roles. Family roles require a considerable amount of resources, such as time, energy, and emotion, and individuals have a limited amount of resources. Thus, balancing multiple roles may cause a depletion of resources, which leads to burnout. Burnout may be even more salient in the case of non-family employees in that they need to expend more resources to accomplish their work duties in the family firms due to their non-family status in the family firms. However, I theorize that such resource pressures, which may lead to burnout syndrome, can be alleviated by family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms.

By definition, family-friendly workplace practices are the organizational policies offered by employers to support employees in effectively managing their family duties (Batt & Valcour, 2003). That is, family-friendly workplace practices provide resources for employees that can be utilized to accomplish their family responsibilities. For instance, flexible worktime enables employees to use their time, which is a limited resource, more effectively to manage not only work roles but also family roles. Moreover, dependent care support, such as day care service,
allows employees to save their resources that had to be invested for family care duties. Indeed, several studies have argued that family-friendly workplace practices allow employees to manage their work roles without impacting their family roles (e.g., Kossek et al., 2006). Thus, by providing resources, family-friendly workplace practices alleviate or prevent depletion of employees’ resources.

The impact of family-friendly workplace practices on the level of burnout experienced can be explained by COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989). According to COR theory, people who possess more resources are in a better position for resource investment in order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain additional resources. That is, people with a large resource pool are likely to have more resources in the future through resource investment and consequently may not experience resource depletion. Accordingly, employees who are offered more resources, such as flexible time, through family-friendly workplace practices are likely to be in a better position for resource investment for further resource gain or resource preservation. This is also consistent with the idea of “resource gain spiral”, which indicates that the gain of resources may lead to further resource gains. For instance, employees who are offered flexible working time or child day care services may have more resources, such as free time, and these resources can be invested to the work roles. Since the employees can invest more resources into work, they are likely to be successful in their professionals, and such achievement may lead to more resources, such as job satisfaction, compensation, and a sense of accomplishment, which can be reinvested for more future resources. As such, family-friendly workplace practices allow employees to avoid resource depletion.

The impact of this feature of family-friendly workplace practices is particularly salient in the context of non-family employees. As mentioned above, non-family status may require more
resources and the excessive resource demand may put non-family employees into the resource loss spiral. That is, lack or loss of resources caused by unfavorable situations may lead to further resource losses and may ultimately lead to resource depletion of non-family employees. Indeed, “COR theory postulates that an individual who has limited resources may be more vulnerable to subsequent losses and that an initial loss can lead to future losses” (Mansour & Tremblay, 2016: 10). For instance, non-family employees who confront bifurcation bias may expend more resources, such as emotional resources, to endure such situations. Because of the resource expenses, they may have fewer remaining resources to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, or gain resources. However, through utilizing family-friendly workplace practices, non-family employees can, at least partially, escape from a resource loss spiral and eventually develop into resource gain spiral. That is, family-friendly workplace practices may increase future resources as well as prevent resource loss and consequently may prevent burnout of non-family employees. Thus, based on the core tenets of COR theory, I hypothesize as below.

Hypothesis 3. Family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related to non-family employee burnout.

Non-Family Employee Burnout and Non-Family Employee Turnover Intentions

Due to the considerable negative impact of turnover intentions and turnover for the organization (Hancock et al., 2013), a myriad of studies have been conducted to identify antecedents of turnover intentions, such as personality (Barrick & Zimmerman, 2005), network centrality (Vardaman et al., 2015), organizational climate perceptions (McKay et al., 2007), P-O fit (Wheeler et al., 2007), HR practices (Chang et al., 2013), and organizational level satisfaction (Harter et al., 2002). Of these various antecedents, burnout has been one of the widely recognized and well-supported antecedents of turnover and turnover intentions (e.g., Jung &
Kim, 2012; Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998; Swider & Zimmerman, 2010; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016). Indeed, many studies have found that burnout positively affects turnover and turnover intentions of employees.

According to the COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001), as people lose their resources, they become more conservative in resource investment to preserve remaining resources. That is, when people experience loss or depletion of resources, they are likely to select defensive strategies to minimize further loss of resources (Lapointe et al., 2011). Accordingly, when employees have depleted resources and consequently experience burnout in the workplace, they may decide to leave the work environment in order to protect themselves from further damage to their resource status (Lapointe et al., 2011; Swider & Zimmerman, 2010). For instance, employees who must endure excessive work hours to complete their work duties may experience burnout syndrome and in turn may consider quitting to protect the resources they still possess, such as physical health, family harmony, and emotional wellbeing. Thus, COR theory is useful in explaining the positive relationship between burnout and turnover intentions.

I theorize that the positive relationship between burnout and turnover intentions is valid in the context of non-family employees. Similar to the others, such as family employees in family firms or employees in non-family firms, non-family employees may consider leaving family firms when they experience a resource depletion to protect their remaining resources. However, given the unfavorable situations often faced by non-family employees (Davis et al., 2010; Pearson & Marler, 2010), such as fewer opportunities for promotion and bifurcation bias toward them, the positive relationship between burnout and turnover intentions can be even more apparent. For instance, when non-family employees feel resource depletion, they may easily consider leaving the family firm instead of investing more resources to overcome such burnout
phenomenon because they know that their investment (e.g., effort) is less likely to lead to more resources (e.g., promotion, compensation) due to their non-family status. According to COR theory, people invest their resources in order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain resources. Since resource investment to stay in the family firm may not lead to corresponding resource gains, non-family employees may consider leaving family firms to invest their resources to find an alternative job. That is, non-family employees may have a lower threshold for turnover intentions regarding resource preservation.

Moreover, as the study of Davis and his colleagues (2010) showed, non-family employees are different from family employees in terms of trust\(^9\) and value commitment\(^10\). Specifically, they found that these stewardship related perceptions of non-family employees are weaker than those of family employees because “family members are tied to both the business and the family, while nonfamily employees are tied only to the business” (Davis et al., 2010: 1098). Given that such perceptions strengthen an employee’s attachment to the firm, non-family employees with weaker trust and value commitment may easily consider leaving the family firm when they experience resource losses. In other words, lack of trust and value commitment induce non-family employees to choose more conservative strategies to preserve remaining resources in the resource loss situations, such as burnout. Thus, the positive impact of burnout on turnover intentions is salient in the case of non-family employees due to their distinctive nature.

In sum, based on the basic tenets of COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001), which states that individuals are motivated to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain

\(^{9}\) “Willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995: 712).

\(^{10}\) “Identification and alignment with the business, specifically with the beliefs and values that it represents” (Davis, Allen, & Hayes, 2010: 1096).
resources, I argue that burnout syndrome renders employees, especially non-family employees, at risk of turnover intentions. Following these reasonings, I hypothesize:

_Hypothesis 4: Non-family employee burnout is positively related to non-family employee turnover intentions._

Overall, based on the idea that family-friendly workplace practices provide resources for non-family employees that prevent resource depletion (hypothesis 2), which may cause turnover intentions (hypothesis 3), I hypothesize that family-friendly workplace practices influence non-family employees’ turnover intentions through affecting non-family employees’ burnout level. That is, burnout level of non-family employees explains the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employees’ turnover intentions. Thus, I propose following hypothesis:

_Hypothesis 5: Non-family employee burnout mediates the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employees, such that family-friendly workplace practices reduce non-family employee turnover intentions through decreased burnout._

**The Moderating Role of Work-Family Culture**

As several studies have pointed out, work-family culture, which refers to the perception of employees regarding organizational supportiveness for work-family lives (Thompson et al., 1999), is one of the most critical determinants of the impact of family-friendly workplace practices (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999; Allen, 2001; Wayne et al., 2006). According to these studies, the mere existence of family-friendly workplace practices is not enough to support employees’ family role because it is not guaranteed that employees actually participate in the practices (Thompson et al., 1999; Allen, 2001). That is, the extent to which a function of family-friendly workplace practices as a resource supplier is actualized is dependent
on the work-family culture. If the employees cannot utilize the practices due to a low level/degree of work-family culture, which is not a family friendly culture, employees will not be able to acquire resources through family-friendly workplace practices even when the practices are offered by the employer.

Accordingly, the mitigating impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employee burnout (hypothesis 2) can be moderated by work-family culture. In particular, the negative impact of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employee burnout may be mitigated when the level of work-family culture is low. Family-friendly workplace practices mitigate the level of burnout by providing resources, such as time and energy, for employees’ family role. However, if employees cannot fully utilize the practices without constraints due to the family-unfriendly culture in the firm, it means that employees draw upon extra resources when they utilize the practices. For instance, in the organization with a low level of work-family culture, employees may need to worry about unfavorable consequences of utilizing family-friendly workplace practices, such as upsetting reactions from their boss or colleagues, and such concerns may force employees to loss emotional resources.

According to the primacy of resource loss, the psychological impact of losing resources is greater than that of gaining resources even when the actual amount of resources is the same. Accordingly, in the case when employees lose a certain amount of resource to utilize family-friendly workplace practices, they may perceive the resource loss greater than the resource gain from family-friendly workplace practices, even when the actual resource gain is greater than the resource loss. Thus, primacy of resource loss amplifies the role of work-family culture on the relationship between family-friendly workplaces practices and burnout. Since extra resource losses caused by a low level of work-family culture and primacy of resource loss may weaken
the function of family-friendly workplace practices as a resource supplier, the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout may be mitigated in a firm with a low level of work-family culture.

The role of work-family culture may be even more salient in the case of non-family employees because of their non-family status which makes non-family employees more vulnerable to a hostile organizational atmosphere. That is, non-family employees may need to endure additional resource losses to utilize family-friendly workplace practices especially when they work at a family firm with a low level of work-family culture. For instance, to utilize flexible scheduling at a family firm with a low degree of work-family culture, non-family employees may need to endure more resource losses, such as efforts to justify usage of flexible scheduling, as compared to family employees because of the bifurcation bias toward them. In a similar vein, non-family employees may need to endure higher risks of job loss or detrimental consequences in their career, which causes more psychological or emotional resource losses, to utilize paid maternity leave at the family firms with a low degree of work-family culture due to a loosen connection with the family firm. Thus, the moderating effect of work-family culture on the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout may be even more apparent in the case of non-family employees. Thus, I propose:

*Hypothesis 6: Work-family culture moderates the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and non-family employee burnout, such that the relationship strengthens as the level of work-family culture increases.*

**The Moderating Role of Work-Family Centrality**

According to COR theory, a resource can be anything that is valued by an individual (Halbesleben et al., 2009). Moreover, one of the critical aspects of a resource in the COR theory
is that the value of the resource can be inconsistent among individuals (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Hobfoll, 2001). That is, the value of a resource is not determined by the resource itself but by the individuals who use or evaluate it. Accordingly, the value of resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices may vary contingent on the user’s internal values, particularly work-family centrality, which is a value judgement of individuals regarding the relative importance of work role and family roles to one’s life (Carr et al., 2008). For instance, the resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices, such as time with family, help with childcare, family stability, and intimacy with family members, may be more valuable to the employees with low work-family centrality, who put family at the center of their life and tend to allocate more of their resource to the family domain compared to the work domain. It is because the resources may be more beneficial and suitable to accomplish family roles, which is a central goal of employees with low work-family centrality.

Since the perceived value of resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices may vary contingent on individual’s work-family centrality, the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout may be moderated by work-family centrality. As hypothesized above (hypothesis 2), family-friendly workplace practices may mitigate the level of non-family employees’ burnout through providing family role related resources. However, given that employees with high work-family centrality care more about their work role than family role, they may consider work role related resources more valuable than family role related resources, making family role related resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices perceived as less valuable resources. In other words, benefits from family-friendly workplace practices are less likely to be valuable resources for the employees with high work-family centrality, whereas they can be useful resources for the employees with low work-family centrality.
Moreover, given that a gain of resource may lead to further resource gains (resource gain spiral), the amount of resources employees gain from family-friendly workplace practices determines not only present resources but also future resources. That is, employees with low work-family centrality may acquire more resources from family-friendly workplace practices than employees with high work-family centrality, and such differences in resource gain may lead to an increased variance in resource status in the future between employees with different work-family centrality. Thus, the extent to which family-friendly workplace practices influence employees’ burnout level may vary depending on employee’s work-family centrality, such that the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout weakens as employees value more than family.

The moderating effect of work-family centrality on the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout is valid in the context of non-family employees as well because the value of the resources provided by family-friendly workplace practices for non-family employees is, at least partially, determined by work-family centrality of non-family employees. Thus, the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout level of non-family employees may be mitigated in the case of non-family employees with high work-family centrality. Following these reasonings, I hypothesize as below:

*Hypothesis 7: Work-family centrality moderates the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and non-family employee burnout, such that the relationship weakens as non-family employees value work more than family.*
Summary

Overall, to investigate (1) the impact of family influence on family-friendly workplace practices, (2) the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employees, and (3) the underlying mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees, this dissertation draws on COR theory to propose several hypotheses regarding family-friendly workplace practices in the family business context. In particular, a negative relationship between family influence and implementation of family-friendly workplace practices is hypothesized. Then, a negative relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and non-family employees’ turnover intentions is also hypothesized. To shed light on this negative direct relationship, several hypotheses regarding the underlying mechanism through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees are proposed. The hypotheses are listed in Table 2.5 below.
Table 2.5  List of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>  Family influence is negatively related to the implementation of</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family-friendly workplace practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>  Family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related to</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-family employee turnover intentions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong>  Family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related to</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-family employee burnout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong>  Non-family employee burnout is positively related to non-family</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee turnover intentions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong>  Non-family employee burnout mediates the relationship between</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family employees, such that family-friendly workplace practices reduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-family employee turnover intentions through decreased burnout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong>  Work-family culture moderates the relationship between family-</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly workplace practices and non-family employee burnout, such that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the relationship strengthens as the level of work-family culture increases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7</strong>  Work-family centrality moderates the relationship between family-</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly workplace practices and non-family employee burnout, such that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the relationship weakens as non-family employees value work more than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

In order to empirically test the proposed research model and hypotheses addressed in chapter two, a quantitative study research design is employed. In this chapter, the research design, sample, and measurement of this dissertation are addressed. First, this chapter begins with the discussion of the research design and procedures. Then, the simple statistics of the sample used in this dissertation is outlined. Finally, a review and discussion regarding measurement items for the variables of interest is followed.

**Research Design and Sample**

To examine proposed hypotheses regarding a predictor and consequences of family-friendly workplace practices in the family business context, primary data collected from family firms is used. In particular, for the purpose of wider investigation of family firms, a dyad data set is collected from both family firm leaders/owners and non-family employees working at the family firm using an online survey platform provided by Qualtrics\(^1\). Family leaders/owners are primarily asked about family influence and family-friendly workplace practices offered by family firms, while non-family employees are mainly asked about their perceptions regarding the family firm and their psychological status.

\(^1\) Qualtrics is an American experience management company, which provides an online survey platform for the research.
To be consistent with extant literature (Anderson & Reeb, 2003, Chrisman & Patel, 2012), family firms are defined based on the family ownership and family involvement in governance and management (Kellermanns & Eddleston, 2006). Specifically, I defined family firms as those with at least 40 percent family ownership and at least two family members employed in the firm. Extant literature has suggested 5 percent (Anderson & Reeb, 2003), 10 percent (Gómez-Mejía, Marki, & Kintana, 2010), and 20 percent (La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, & Shleifer, 1999) of family ownership as a cutoff ownership level to be considered as family firms. However, since the target of this study is small- to medium-sized family firms with less than 250 employees (Tzabbar, Tzafrir, & Baruch, 2017), I used 40 percent of ownership instead to define family firms. It is because owners of small and medium sized firms may need an increased ownership share to have control over the firms compared to the owners of large firms due to the less dispersed ownership of the firms. I focused on small- and medium- sized family firms to accurately measure the research model. In the case of large firms, the types and a number of family-friendly workplace practices can be varied among divisions or departments. That is, employees may be offered different family-friendly workplace practices even when they work at the same firm. Thus, to minimize such variances in family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms, this dissertation focuses on small- and medium-sized family firms.

To collect data for this dissertation, surveys for both family firm leaders/owners and non-family employees working at the family firms were conducted. The samples for the survey were obtained through a student-recruited sampling technique (Wheeler, Shanine, Leon, & Whitman, 2014). This sampling technique has been increasingly used in the organizational research (e.g., Kluemper, McLarty, & Bing, 2015; McLarty, Vardaman, & Barnett, 2019) because of its numerous benefits: (1) ease of obtaining, (2) quick survey of samples, and (3) relative low
expense compared to probabilistic methods (Semann, Lauby, & Liebman, 2002). Student-recruited sampling is similar to the widely used snowball sampling technique, but it does not rely on student samples. Instead, the students recruit other targeted individuals to participate in the survey. Thus, in this dissertation, students were used as a first source of contact for the survey targets, which are family business leaders/owners and non-family employees. College students in the United States are asked to nominate a full-time family business leader/owner who is willing to participate in the survey. Through a simple online survey (Survey 1), student nominators provided name and e-mail address of family business leaders/owners, and they earned course extra credits in return.

Using the contact information of family business leaders/owners obtained from the students, I emailed each family business leader/owner an online survey link (Survey 2) with an explanatory cover letter and collected information regarding demographics, various aspects of the firm, including level of family influence and family-friendly workplace practices, and the name and contact information of non-family employee working at the firm. Drawing on the contact information of non-family employee obtained from the family business leaders/owners participated in survey 2, I emailed another survey link (Survey 3) to the non-family employees and collected information about their demographics, perceptions toward the family firm, such as organizational culture, and psychological status, such as burnout and turnover intentions. To avoid common method bias problems, data is collected at different time periods (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Moreover, the surveys were designed in ways to increase the response rate to overcome a low response rate of survey targeting small- and medium-sized firms (Eddleston & Kellermanns, 2007). For instance, by adopting Dillman’s total design method technique (Dillman, 1991), the surveys (1) clearly addressed the purpose and importance of the
survey, (2) assured the confidentiality of the survey, and (3) had small sized fonts to minimize the perception of lengthiness. Follow-up reminder emails were also sent to the survey targets to obtain more responses. As an incentive for the participated family business leaders/owners and non-family employees, I conducted a raffle for 10 gift cards worth $30.

In total, 404 students participated in survey 1 and nominated 385 family business leaders/owners\textsuperscript{12}. Of these 385 nominated family business leaders/owners, 278 completed survey 2. Of the 278 family business leader/owner respondents from survey 2, 230 nominated non-family employees working at their family firm. Of the 230 nominated non-family employees, 182 responded and completed survey 3. After matching observations from the surveys, I could obtain 178 family business leader/owner – non-family employee dyads from 178 family firms. However, 62 dyads were removed from the final sample due to the missing data, careless responses (e.g., non-family employee surveys completed by family employees), and not meeting the criteria (e.g., responses from non-family firms). Thus, the final sample for this dissertation represents 232 respondents matched within 116 family firms, and the overall response rate was 30%.

A broad range of individuals from family firms participated in the surveys. Of the 116 family business leader/owner respondents, 57% were male and 43% were female. The average age of them were 48 and 66% of them were the founder of family business. On average, they have been working at the family firm for about 14 years. Regarding ethnicity, 81% were Caucasian, 11% African American, 6% Asian, and 2% other. Their marital status includes married (78%), divorced (4%), separated (3%), and never married (15%). Of the non-family employee respondents, 38% were male and 62% were female. Their average age was 40 and

\textsuperscript{12} Students were allowed to nominate multiple family businesses if they are willing to.
87% of them had at least one dependent (e.g., children). On average, they have been working at the family firm for about 6 years. Regarding ethnicity, 78% were Caucasian, 12% African American, 7% Asian, and 3% other. Their marital status includes married (41%), divorced (13%), widowed (3%), separated (1%), and never married (42%). Their position at the family firms includes employee (64%), manager (27%), and company officer (9%). An average size (number of employees) of the firms was 19, and average age of the firms was 22 years. Family firms were in various industries, such as service (44%), retail (25%), manufacturing (3%), others (28%). Moreover, a large portion of these family firms are multigenerational, with 59% employing more than one generation of the owner family.

Measures

To examine the direct and indirect effects of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions of non-family employees and the impact of family influence on family-friendly workplace practices, this dissertation adopted six variables: family-friendly workplace practices, turnover intentions, family influence, burnout, work-family culture, and work-family centrality. The following section begins with a discussion of the dependent variables, followed by independent variable, mediating variable, moderating variables, antecedent variable of family-friendly workplace practices, and control variables. A 5-point Likert-type scale was used to measure all the main variables in the research model (e.g., (1) strongly disagree, (2) somewhat disagree, (3) neither disagree nor agree, (4) somewhat agree, (5) strongly agree), except the variables for turnover intentions and family-friendly workplace practices. The items of all the original scales used to measure the main constructs specified in the research model are listed in the appendix. Table 3.1 provides a summary of the original scales used in this study. The original scales were slightly modified for this study depending on the reliability and the factor loadings.
Reliability of the scale, which can be defined as the “assessment of the degree of consistency between multiple measurements of a variable” (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010: 125), was measured by Cronbach’s alpha (1951) for each measure using SPSS. According to Nunnally (1978), the values of Cronbach’s alpha above .70 are acceptable and indicate that there is an internal consistency among items of each variable.

Table 3.1 Summary of Variables and Original Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
<td>3 - item measure (Hom &amp; Griffeth, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFWP</td>
<td>Index of 8 distinctive practices (Perry-Smith &amp; Blum, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>16 - item measure (Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI), (Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, &amp; Kantas, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family culture</td>
<td>14 - item measure (Mauno, Kinnunen, &amp; Pyykkö (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family centrality</td>
<td>5 - item measure (Carr, Boyar, &amp; Gregory, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antecedent of FFWP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family influence</td>
<td>20 - item measure (Frank, Kessler, Rusch, Suess-Reyes, &amp; Wismeier-Sammer, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family employee’s demographic characteristics</td>
<td>age, gender, race, marital status, organizational position, number of dependents (e.g., children),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm characteristics</td>
<td>firm size, firm age, industry, family generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FFWP refers to family-friendly workplace practices
Dependent Variable: Turnover Intentions

To measure turnover intentions of non-family employees, I utilized a validated 3-item scale adopted from the study of Hom and Griffeth (1991). This scale is commonly used in the turnover literature (e.g., Allen, Weeks, & Moffitt, 2005; Vardaman et al., 2015) to capture the extent to which employees are willing to quit their job. According to these studies, this 3-item scale has demonstrated a high level of reliability (e.g., $\alpha = .89$ in Allen et al., 2005). Similar to the previous studies, the Cronbach’s alpha of the scale in this study showed a high reliability ($\alpha = .94$). Items were averaged to capture the overall level of turnover intentions of non-family employees working at family firms.

Independent Variable: Family-Friendly Workplace Practices

Following the study of Perry-Smith and Blum (2000), eight distinct family-friendly workplace practices were included in the composite family-friendly workplace practices index to measure extensiveness of an organization’s family-friendly workplace practices. Even though these eight practices are not exhaustive, they represent the common dimensions of family-friendly workplace practices. The family-friendly workplace practices included in the family-friendly workplace practices index were (1) On-site day care, (2) Help with day care costs, (3) Elder care assistance, (4) Information on community day care, (5) Paid parental leave, (6) Unpaid parental leave, (7) Maternity or paternity leave with reemployment, and (8) Flexible scheduling. To measure the level of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms, non-family employees were asked if they are offered those eight family-friendly workplace practices in the index while they are working at the family firms. Since eight distinctive practices are included in the index, the potential range of this summated measure was 0 to 8.
Mediator: Burnout

To measure burnout of non-family employees, the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) is adopted (Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, & Kantas, 2003; Demerouti, Mostert, & Bakker, 2010; Demerouti et al., 2001). This scale was chosen over the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI, Maslach & Jackson, 1981), which is a widely used instrument for the measurement of burnout because MBI is limited to human service occupations. Even though the MBI-General Survey (MBI-GS) (Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996) was developed to overcome the limitation of original MBI and has been widely used to study burnout phenomenon in non-human service occupations (e.g., Jung & Kim, 2012; Schaufeli et al., 2009), MBI-GS did not overcome the inherent psychometric shortcoming of the original MBI, which is that the items in each subscale are framed in same direction (Demerouti & Bakker, 2008). Thus, this dissertation adopted the OLBI, which includes both positively and negatively framed items, to measure core dimensions of burnout. The OLBI measures two core dimensions of burnout, which are exhaustion and disengagement. While professional efficacy is included in the MBI as a core dimension of burnout, it is not included in the OLBI because number of extant studies have found that it is not a core dimension of burnout (e.g., Bakker et al., 2004; Green, Walkey, & Tayler, 1991).

Even though the original OLBI consists of 16 items capturing two dimensions of burnout (8 items representing exhaustion and 8 items representing disengagement), I eliminated some of the items from each dimension because of the low factor loadings. The final scale used consists of 12 items represent two dimensions of burnout, which are exhaustion (6 items, $\alpha = .82$) and disengagement (6 items, $\alpha = .75$). Even though OLBI originally uses 4-point Likert scale, this dissertation used 5-point Likert scale for the purpose of consistency. Items were
averaged to capture the overall level of burnout of non-family employees working at family firms. The modified scale can be found in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Modified Burnout Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>1. It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I find my work to be a positive challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I feel more and more engaged in my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>7. There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. During my work, I often feel emotionally drained. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. When I work, I usually feel energized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* (R) means reversed item when the scores should be such that higher scores indicate more burnout.

**Moderators**

**Work-family culture**

Work-family culture was measured using the 14-item scale adopted from the study of Mauno, Kinnunen, and Pyykkö (2005). Following the suggestion of Allen (2001), Mauno and his colleagues have shortened the original scale of Thompson et al. (1999) including 20 items. This scale measures respondents' perceptions regarding overall supportiveness of their organization to balance employees’ work and family responsibilities. Moreover, similar to the original scale developed by Thompson et al. (1999), it consists of three dimensions of work-family culture,
which are (1) managerial support, (2) career consequences, and (3) organizational time demands. Of 14 items in the original scale, two items were removed due to the low factor loadings. In particular, the item “Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees’ childcare responsibilities” from managerial support dimension and the item “Many employees are resentful when men in this organization take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children (R).” from career consequences dimension were removed from the scale. Thus, the final scale used in this study includes 12 items (managerial support (4 items, $\alpha = .77$); career consequences (4 items, $\alpha = .79$); organizational time demand (4 items, $\alpha = .79$)) as shown in Table 3.3. Moreover, even though Mauno et al. (2005) uses 7-point Likert scale, this dissertation used 5-point Likert scale for the purpose of consistency. Items in these three dimensions were averaged to capture non-family employees’ perceived work-family culture of family firms.
Table 3.3  Modified Work-Family Culture Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial support</td>
<td>1. In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of family-related needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Higher management in this organization encourages supervisors to be sensitive to employees’ family and personal concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees’ elder care responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career consequences</td>
<td>5. Many employees are resentful when women in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. In this organization employees who participate in available work–family programs (e.g., job sharing, part-time work) are viewed as less serious about their careers than those who do not participate in these programs. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. To turn down a promotion or transfer for family-related reasons will seriously hurt one’s career progress in this organization. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. In this organization employees who use flextime are less likely to advance their careers than those who do not use flextime. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational time demands</td>
<td>9. To get ahead at this organization, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at the workplace or at home. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their families. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. To be viewed favorably by top management, employees in this organization must constantly put their jobs ahead of their families or personal lives. (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (R) indicates a reversed code.

**Work-family centrality**

To measure non-family employee’s relative sense of the importance of work versus family in one’s life, I adopted Carr and his colleagues’ (2008) 5-item scale. The responses to these items are scored such that higher scores represent the individual considering work more important than family. Similar to the study of Carr et al. (2008), the measure had a high reliability (α = .84). The items in this measure were averaged to capture non-family employees’ work-family centrality.
Antecedent of Family-Friendly Workplace Practices: Family Influence

To measure family influence, family influence familiness scale (FIFS) developed by Frank, Kessler, Rusch, Suess-Reyes, and Weismeier-Sammer (2016) was adopted. This scale is comprised of six dimensions, which are ownership, management, and control (4 items) proficiency level of active family members (2 items), sharing of information between active family members (2 items), transgenerational orientation (3 items), family-employee bond (5 items), and family business identity (4 items). By capturing these six dimensions, this scale measures the “family influence on the business via decision premises that express familiness” (Frank et al., 2016: 709). Of the 20 items in the original scale, three items were removed from the scale due to the low factor loadings. In particular, three items of the family-employee bond measure were removed due to the low reliability and low factor loadings. Thus, modified scale includes dimensions of ownership, management, and control (4 items, $\alpha = .82$), proficiency level of active family members (2 items, $\alpha = .70$), sharing of information between active family members (2 items, $\alpha = .50$), transgenerational orientation (3 items; $\alpha = .84$), family-employee bond (2 items, $\alpha = .62$), and family business identity (4 items, $\alpha = .82$). Even though the reliability of some measures is below the threshold criteria (.70), I kept the measures to capture all the dimensions of family influence. The items in modified scale were averaged to capture the overall level of family influence in the family firms.
Table 3.4 Modified Family Influence Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership, management, and control</td>
<td>In our family business we take great care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. ... that only family members are owners of the firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ... that the firm’s management consists exclusively of family members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ... that several family members are involved in the firm’s management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ... that family control and independence are maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency level of active family members</td>
<td>5. ... that family members working in the company have at least the same qualifications as nonfamily employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. ... that family members working in the company show at least the same performance as nonfamily employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of information between active family members</td>
<td>7. ... that family members working in the company know about important events in the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. ... that all family members working in the company are also able to make use of informal communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgenerational orientation</td>
<td>9. ... to think in generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. ... to avoid selling the company to nonfamily members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. ... that the company can be passed on to the next generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family employee bond</td>
<td>12. ... to secure our employees’ jobs also in times of crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. ... to safeguard furthering and developing our employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family business identity</td>
<td>14. ... that the family gives a face to the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. ... that our family business is socially active in the community/region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. ... to always market our family business as such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. ... to convey the history of our company to our employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control Variables**

Several control variables were adopted to control for the possibility of variables outside of the model affecting the hypothesized relationships in the research model. In particular, the demographics of non-family employee and family firm characteristics that may influence the variables in the research model were controlled. These variables were selected based on the prior
evidence of influence on the family influence, family-friendly workplace practices, and employee turnover intentions (Carr et al., 2008; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000).

**Non-family employee’s demographic characteristics**

Non-family employee’s demographic characteristics and family status were controlled because the demographic characteristics and family status may have significant impacts on the impact of family-friendly workplace practices, burnout level, work-family centrality, and turnover intentions: (1) age, (2) gender, (3) marital status, (4) organizational position, (5) race, and (6) number of dependents (e.g., children). Age was measured in years. Gender was measured by binary variable, with 0 indicating female and 1 indicating male. The marital status was captured by five dummies representing different marital statuses, which are married, widowed, divorced, separated, and never married. Similarly, organizational position was captured by three dummies representing different organizational positions at family firms, including employee, manager, and officer. The number of dependents was captured by one question asking a number of their dependents. Lastly, the race of non-family employees was also controlled using six dummies representing different races, which are White, Black or African American, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and others.

**Firm characteristics**

In addition to the individual level control variables, four firm level variables were controlled for the analysis of the relationship between family influence and family-friendly workplace practices because firm characteristics may influence both family influence and implementation of family-friendly workplace practices: (1) firm size, (2) firm age, (3) industry, and (4) family generation. Firm size was controlled because it is a critical contingency that may
influence the relationship between SEW and family firms’ decision making (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2011). According to the study of Fang, Randolph, Memili, and Chrisman (2016), the substantial influence of firm size is also valid in the context of family firm. Firm size was measured by the number of employees in the firm. Moreover, following previous studies (Chrisman, Chua, & Litz, 2004; Schulze, Lubatkin, Dino, & Buchholtz, 2001; Fang et al., 2016), firm age and industry were controlled as well. Firm age was measured by the number of years since the firm was found to consider firms’ experiences in HRM practices as well as other organizational policies. The industry was controlled using four dummies representing four industries, which are service, manufacturing, retail, and others, because the demand for family-friendly workplace practices may vary by industry. Lastly, family generation is also controlled to deal with possible impacts of multiple generations in the family firms. The number of family generations in the family firms is measured by a question “how many generations of your family currently work in this business?”.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

In this chapter, the hypothesized relationships in the research model are empirically examined, and the results of the analyses are presented. Prior to the empirical examinations of the hypotheses, an assessment of measurement model and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) are conducted to assess how well the measurement model fits the sample data as a whole and to confirm the uni-dimensionality of the scale items. Along with those assessments, I used a method suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981) to assess both convergent and discriminant validity for the further assurance. Then, using the confirmed measures, I empirically examined each hypothesized relationship between main variables in the research model and reported the results/findings of the analyses. A series of regression analyses using SPSS is conducted for the hypothesis testing.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

As a first step of examining hypothesized relationships in the research model, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is conducted by IBM® SPSS Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) version 24 to confirm the uni-dimensionality of the scale items. In other words, CFA is performed to see how well the measured variables represent target latent constructs in the research model. Using the CFA, model fit, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the main constructs, which are family influence, burnout, turnover intentions, work-family centrality, and work-family culture, were assessed.
First, an assessment of the measurement model was performed to confirm that the observed covariance matrix and researcher’s theorized model (estimated covariance matrix) fit well. In particular, model fit of full measurement model, as well as each of latent construct included in the research model, was examined. The extent to which the measurement model fits the sample data was assessed by several fit indices, such as Chi-Square ($\chi^2$), degree of freedom\(^{13}\) ($df$), comparative fit index (CFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA).

Chi-Square ($\chi^2$) test is one of the commonly used fit index to evaluate the fit between observed model and theorized model (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Thus, to have a good model fit, it is better to have a low $\chi^2$ value. However, it is also widely acknowledged that $\chi^2$ test is not without limitation, such as (1) it is very sensitive to sample size and (2) it is sensitive to violations of multivariate normality assumption. Thus, some researchers suggest using “relative chi-square”, which is the value of $\chi^2$ divided by $df$, because it makes the model less dependent on the sample size. Even though the value of relative chi-square ($\chi^2/df$) under 3 is acceptable (Kline, 1998), some scholars suggest that the values as high as 5 are acceptable (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004).

Comparative fit index (CFI) and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) are ones of the most primary fit indices (Byrne, 2010). CFI test compares the predicted covariance matrix of researcher’s model to the observed covariance matrix of the null model. The value of CFI varies from 0.00 to 1.00 and the values above 0.90 indicate a good fit (Bentler, 1992). CFI is a commonly recommended fit statistic, at least partially, because it is not affected by sample size. RMSEA is a “badness of fit” test that can be calculated by $\sqrt{(\chi^2 - df)/df (N - 1)}$. Since this

\(^{13}\) The difference between the total number of observations in a covariance matrix and the number of parameters to be estimated in the research model.
test evaluates the errors of approximation, the values close to 0 indicate a good model fit. In
general, the values of RMSEA less than .05 indicate a good model fit. However, the values
under .08 also can be considered as an adequate fit (Bryne, 2010). Since each index has its
strength and weakness, those indexes were simultaneously incorporated to evaluate an overall
model fit. According to the measurement model assessment, the full measurement model
including all the main variables mentioned above meets measurement model fit criteria
acceptably well. $\chi^2$ was 906.98 and $df$ was 647. Thus, the value of $\chi^2/df$ was 1.40, which
confirms a good model fit. Moreover, the values of CFI (.88) and RMSEA (.05) further
confirmed an acceptable model fit.

To access the convergent and discriminant validity of the measures, I adopted a method
suggested by Fornell and Larker (1981) because assessing the convergent and discriminant
validity of measures using factor loading is not an ideal way to determine the validity (Collier,
2020). To assess convergent validity, average variance extracted (AVE)$^{14}$ was used. Convergent
validity tests whether measurement items are converged to the overall construct. According to
their method, if the values of the AVE for each measure are higher than .50, then the items
adequately converge on the appropriate constructs. According to the AVE calculation, calculated
AVEs for all measures meet the criteria of .50, except the case of the exhaustion measure (AVE =
0.44), disengagement measure (AVE = .42), and sharing of information between active family
members measure (AVE = .41). Even though AVEs of some of the measures were little below the
threshold (AVE .50), I decided to keep those measures for the further analysis after scrutinizing
the measures to capture all dimensions of each construct. Beside those exceptions, all the items
converged on their construct well. That is, the measures appeared to demonstrate convergent
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$^{14}$ AVE can be calculated by sum of squared multiple correlation of each item divided by total number of items.
validity to a sufficient degree.

Moreover, to assess discriminant validity, shared variances, which refers to squared value of correlation between constructs, were used. Discriminant validity assesses whether constructs that are believed unrelated, in fact, are unrelated. According to Fornell and Larker (1981), if there is no shared variance between constructs that exceed the AVE for each construct, then there is an evidence of discriminant validity. The value of shared variance was calculated by correlations between constructs. The squared values of the largest correlation of all other constructs, except the correlation between disengagement and exhaustion, were lower than their value of AVE. Thus, the results show that the constructs demonstrate evidence of discriminant validity. However, a high correlation between disengagement and exhaustion shows that the measures for these two dimensions of burnout do not satisfy discriminant validity. Despite the violation of discriminant validity, I kept measures of both dimensions of burnout for the further analysis to capture all dimensions of burnout. Thus, they are averaged out to measure burnout together.

**Hypotheses Testing**

Following the CFA, hypotheses of this dissertation were evaluated by series multiple regression analyses. In this dissertation, I contended that the extent to which family firms implement family-friendly workplace practices will be affected by family influence and will influence turnover intentions of non-family employees. Moreover, to have a better understanding of the underlying mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees, several variables were adopted and examined as a mediator (burnout) and moderators (work-family centrality, work-family culture). Particularly, I proposed that family-friendly workplace practices will mitigate turnover intentions of non-family
employees by reducing the burnout level of non-family employees. Moreover, I argued that the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout will be positively moderated by work-family culture, whereas it will be negatively moderated by work-family centrality.

To empirically test the hypotheses regarding direct relationships (hypothesis 1, 2, 3, and 4), ordinary least square (OLS) regression analyses were conducted using SPSS. To examine the mediation and moderation effects (hypothesis 5, 6, and 7), I employed the PROCESS Macro for SPSS (Haynes, 2013). In particular, model 4 and model 1 of PROCESS Macro were employed to test a mediation effect and moderation effects, respectively. Indeed, PROCESS Macro approach has been adopted by several studies to test mediation model, moderation model, and moderated mediation model (e.g., Maynard & Parfyonova, 2013; Wilson & Perepelkin, 2020). Following the recommendation of Hayes (2017) and the previous studies using PROCESS Macro (e.g., Farmer, Breazeale, Stevens, & Waites, 2017), 5000 rounds of bootstrapping was used. All these multiple regression models utilized standardized values (z-scores) of raw scores to confirm the normality of the variables. The variance inflation factor (VIF) values of individual variables were below 5, and the mean VIF was below 2.0 for all models. Thus, multicollinearity was not a concern. Lastly, to address autocorrelation issues, I conducted Durbin-Watson tests using SPSS. The test statistic values were in the range of 1.5 to 2.5 for all the research models, indicating that autocorrelation problems are not a concern. In Table 4.1, the descriptive statistics of main variables, including means and standard deviations, and the correlation matrix of the variables are presented.

---

15 The computer-based method of resampling in which the sample is treated as a pseudo-population. This method chooses random samples from the original sample to repopulate.
The Direct Relationship Between Family Influence and Implementation of Family-Friendly Workplace Practices (Hypothesis 1)

Hypothesis 1 predicts that family influence and implementation of family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related. Table 4.2 presents OLS regression model examining the direct relationship between family influence and implementation of family-friendly workplace practices in family firms. The result of regression analysis shows that there is not a significant negative relationship between family influence and implementation of family-friendly workplace practices (β = .098, p = n.s.). That is, the level of family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees is not significantly affected by family influence. Thus, hypothesis 1 is not supported.

The Direct Relationship Between Family-Friendly Workplace Practices and Turnover Intentions of Non-Family Employees (Hypothesis 2)

Hypothesis 2 submits that family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employee are negatively related. To test the hypothesized relationship, OLS regression analysis is used. As shown in Table 4.3, family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees have a marginally significant and negative relationship with turnover intentions of non-family employees (β = -.169, p < .1). This result indicates that turnover intentions of non-family employees decrease as the level/number of family-friendly workplace practices recognized by non-family employees increases. Thus, hypothesis 2 is marginally supported.

The Mediating Role of Burnout (Hypothesis 3, 4, 5)

To test mediating effect of burnout, I first examined both direct relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout (Hypothesis 3) and direct relationship between
burnout and turnover intentions of non-family employees (Hypothesis 4). Hypothesis 3 predicts that family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees are negatively related to burnout of non-family employees. As shown in Table 4.3, there is a significant negative relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout of non-family employees ($\beta = -.198$, $p < .05$). As expected, this result shows that non-family employees’ perceived family-friendly workplace practices mitigate the burnout of non-family employees. Thus, hypothesis 3 is strongly supported. Hypothesis 4 submits that there is a positive relationship between burnout and turnover intentions of non-family employees. As table 4.3 shows, as expected, there is a significant positive relationship between burnout and turnover intentions of non-family employees ($\beta = .251$, $p < .01$). That is, as non-family employees experience more burnout, their turnover intentions also increase. Thus, this result strongly supports hypothesis 4. In addition to those direct effects, indirect effect of burnout is also tested using PROCESS Macro approach (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 2013) to examine the mediating effect of burnout on the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employees (Hypothesis 5). Table 4.4 offers findings for the mediation effect of burnout. The results show that total effect ($\beta = -.170$, $se = .087$, $p < .1$, $LL = -.314$, $UL = -.027$) and indirect effect ($\beta = -.046$, $se = .035$, $p < .1$, $LL = -.112$, $UL = -.000$) are significant while direct effect ($\beta = -.125$, $se = .090$, n.s, $LL = -.275$, $UL = .025$) is not significant at the 90% confident interval. Since only indirect effect is significant, the results suggest that burnout fully mediates the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions. Thus, hypothesis 5 is marginally supported.
The Moderating Role of Work-Family Culture and Work-Family Centrality (Hypothesis 6, 7)

Along with the direct effects and mediation effect, the moderating effects of work-family culture and work-family centrality were also examined. Table 4.5 presents the results of the moderation analyses, which test whether the direct relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout is moderated by work-family culture (model 1) and/or work-family centrality (model 2). Similar to the mediation analysis, I used PROCESS Macro approach (Hayes, 2013; Hayes, 2015). Results show that both work-family culture and work-family centrality do not significantly moderate the direct relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout of non-family employees: work-family culture (interaction: $\beta = -.029$, $p = \text{n.s.}$), work-family centrality (interaction: $\beta = -.069$, $p = \text{n.s.}$). Thus, hypothesis 6 and hypothesis 7 are not supported, indicating that the direct relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and burnout does not vary contingent on the level of work-family culture and work-family centrality.

Robustness Test

Different Impacts of Perceived and Implemented Family-Friendly Workplace Practices

In the main study, I adopted family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees to measure the extensiveness of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms because burnout (mediator) and turnover intentions (dependent variable) are perception-based measures. However, family-friendly workplace practices perceived by employees (perceived measure) and family-friendly workplace practices actually implemented by employers (objective measure) may be different because of several reasons, such as miscommunication and different perceptions between employers and employees. For instance,
non-family employees may recognize only two family-friendly workplace practices even when family business owner actually implemented five family-friendly workplace practices for his/her non-family employees. Thus, to address for such possibilities, I analyzed all the multiple regression models again using family-friendly workplace practices implemented by employers. Interestingly, according to the analysis (see Table 4.2), there was a significant negative relationship between family influence and family-friendly workplace practices implemented by employers ($\beta = -0.197$, $p = .05$), which was not the case for the family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees. This result indicates that family influence has a significant negative impact on the family owner’s willingness to implement family-friendly workplace practices but not on the family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees. Thus, hypothesis 1 is supported when family-friendly workplace practices implemented by employers is adopted to capture the level of family-friendly workplace practices. That is, firms are more likely to show reluctance to implement family-friendly workplace practices as family influence increases. This finding is well aligned with the findings of previous studies that family firms have a reluctance to implement professional HR practices (Aldrich & Langton, 1998; Reid & Adams, 2001; de Kok et al., 2006). In contrast, it is found that family-friendly workplace practices implemented by employers does not have any significant impact on the burnout and turnover intentions of non-family employees, indicating that what matters is perceived family-friendly workplace practices but not implemented family-friendly workplace practices. In other words, implemented family-friendly workplace practices do not have any significant impact on non-family employees if they are not perceived/recognized

---

16 ‘Family-friendly workplace practices implemented by employers’ is measured by survey responses from the family business owners to the question “how many family-friendly workplace practices among these eight practices in the list are implemented in your family firm?”.
by non-family employees. These findings from this robustness test highlight varied impacts of implemented and perceived family-friendly workplace practices.

**Rigorous Criteria for Family Firm Classification**

Following the extant literature, in the main study, I used two criteria to distinguish family firms from non-family firms: (1) family ownership and (2) family involvement. This operational definition of family firms has been widely adopted in the family business literature because it is useful and easy to classify family firms. However, this operational definition does not capture an essential aspect of family firms, which is transgenerational intentions of owner family (James, 1999; Chua et al., 1999). As the definition of family firms proposed by Chua and his colleagues (1999) suggests, the transgenerational intentions of owner family is one of the distinguishing factors of family firms. Thus, to capture the essential aspect of family firms, I classified family firms using not only family ownership and family involvement but also family owners’ transgenerational intentions. That is, only firms that are owned and managed by family with transgenerational intentions are included in the robustness test. The transgenerational intentions of family owners is captured by the question, “Do you wish(expect) that the future successor or president of your business will be a family member?”. Including this criterion is especially relevant for this dissertation because transgenerational intentions is likely to be related to the treatment of non-family employees and family influence. Thus, using 96 dyad family firm samples that satisfy the more strict criteria, which include family ownership, family involvement, and transgenerational intentions, I examined all the hypothesized relationships in the research model again to see if the results from the main study are still valid with the more strict criteria of family firm classification, and found that the results are largely consistent with the main findings.

As shown in Table 4.6, family influence and family-friendly workplace practices have a
significant negative relationship (β = -0.227, p < .05) only when family-friendly workplace practices are captured by family-friendly workplace practices implemented by employers, which is consistent with the prior findings. Moreover, Table 4.7 shows that all the direct relationships between non-family employees’ perceived family-friendly workplace practices, burnout, and turnover intentions found from the main study are further confirmed by the results from the robustness test: (1) family-friendly workplace practices – turnover intentions (β = -0.192, p < .1), (2) family-friendly workplace practices – burnout (β = -0.239, p < .05), and (3) burnout – turnover intentions (β = 0.249, p < .05). As Table 4.8 shows, the mediating effect of burnout was also valid (β = -0.054, se = 0.045, LL = -0.140, UL = 0.000) at 90% confidence interval. Furthermore, similar to the results of main study, as shown by Table 4.9, the moderating effects of work-family culture and work-family centrality were not significant: work-family culture (interaction: β = -0.063, p = n.s.), work-family centrality (interaction: β = 0.085, p = n.s.). Taken together, the results of this robustness test using rigorous family firm classification largely confirm the findings of main study.
Table 4.1  Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family influence</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family-friendly workplace practices</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burnout</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover intentions</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work-family culture</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.212*</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.540**</td>
<td>-.219*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work-family centrality</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.363**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Firm age</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Firm size</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Industry</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Family generation</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.216*</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.251**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. NFE age</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.218*</td>
<td>-.297**</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. NFE gender</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.231*</td>
<td>.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. NFE race</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.305**</td>
<td>.202*</td>
<td>-.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. NFE organizational position</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. NFE marital status</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.297**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NFE number of dependents</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.214*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: NFE refers to non-family employees.
Table 4.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family-friendly workplace practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work-family culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work-family centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Firm age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Firm size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Industry</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Family generation</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. NFE age</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. NFE gender</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. NFE race</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. NFE organizational position</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. NFE marital status</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.544**</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>-.319**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NFE number of dependents</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.211*</td>
<td>-.277**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: NFE refers to non-family employees.
Table 4.2  OLS Regression Analyses for the Direct Effect (Hypothesis 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Family-friendly workplace practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm age</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm size</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family generation</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family influence</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>115</th>
<th>115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>1.946†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Note: Family-friendly workplace practices perceived refers to the family-friendly workplace practices recognized by non-family employees to be offered.

Note: Family-friendly workplace practices implemented refers to the family-friendly workplace practices actually implemented by family business owners for non-family employees.
Table 4.3  OLS Regression Analyses for the Direct Effects (Hypothesis 2, 3, 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Path1</th>
<th>Path 2</th>
<th>Path3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE age</td>
<td>-.290*</td>
<td>-.237*</td>
<td>-.208†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE gender</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE race</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE marital status</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE org position</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE number of dependents</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-friendly workplace practices</td>
<td>-.169†</td>
<td>-.198*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>2.258*</td>
<td>1.680†</td>
<td>2.948**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: NFE refers to non-family employees.
Table 4.4  Mediation Analysis (Hypothesis 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Family-friendly workplace practices → Burnout → Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>-0.170†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-0.046†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Table 4.5  Moderation Analyses (Hypothesis 6, 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE age</td>
<td>-.185†</td>
<td>-.249*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE gender</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE race</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE marital status</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE org position</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE number of dependents</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFWP</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.165†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family culture</td>
<td>-.609***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFWP x Work-family culture</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFWP x Work-family centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>5.027***</td>
<td>2.792**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: FFWP refers to family-friendly workplace practices.
Note: NFE refers to non-family employees.
Table 4.6 Robustness Test for the Direct Effect (Hypothesis 1) with a Rigorous Family Firm Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Family-friendly workplace practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm age</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm size</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family generation</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family influence</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: Family-friendly workplace practices perceived refers to the family-friendly workplace practices recognized by non-family employees to be offered.
Note: Family-friendly workplace practices implemented refers to the family-friendly workplace practices actually implemented by family business owners for non-family employees.
Table 4.7 Robustness Test for the Direct Effect (Hypothesis 2, 3, 4) with a Rigorous Family Firm Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Path1</th>
<th>Path 2</th>
<th>Path3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE age</td>
<td>-.304*</td>
<td>-.230†</td>
<td>-.227†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE gender</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE race</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.190†</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE marital status</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE org position</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE number of dependents</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-friendly workplace practices</td>
<td>-.192†</td>
<td>-.239*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>1.804†</td>
<td>2.044†</td>
<td>2.173*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: NFE refers to non-family employees.
Table 4.8  Robustness Test for the Mediation Effect (Hypothesis 5) with a Rigorous Family Firm Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Family-friendly workplace practices → Burnout → Turnover intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>-.200*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-.054†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Table 4.9  Robustness Test for the Moderation Effect (Hypothesis 6, 7) with a Rigorous Family Firm Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE age</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-.240†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE gender</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE race</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE marital status</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE org position</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE number of dependents</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFWP</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.220*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family culture</td>
<td>-.588***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFWP x Work-family culture</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family centrality</td>
<td>.276*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFWP x Work-family centrality</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>4.798***</td>
<td>2.165*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .1, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Note: FFWP refers to family-friendly workplace practices.
Note: NFE refers to non-family employees
Chapter Summary

Through series multiple regression analyses, this dissertation examined the hypothesized relationships between family influence, family-friendly workplace practices, burnout, turnover intentions, work-family culture, and work-family centrality. According to the findings, family influence and non-family employees’ perceived family-friendly workplace practices do not have a significant relationship. However, the relationship between family influence and family-friendly workplace practices was negative and significant when family-friendly workplace practices were measured by family-friendly workplace practices implemented by family business owners. Moreover, it is also found that non-family employees’ perceived family-friendly workplace practices prevent the turnover intentions of non-family employees through mitigating their burnout level. However, hypothesized moderating effects of work-family culture and work-family centrality were not empirically supported. Table 4.10 outlines the results of hypotheses test.
### Table 4.10  Results of Hypotheses Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong> Family influence is negatively related to the implementation of</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family-friendly workplace practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong> Family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related to</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-family employee turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong> Family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related to</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-family employee burnout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong> Non-family employee burnout is positively related to non-family</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee turnover intentions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family employee burnout mediates the relationship between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-family employees, such that family-friendly workplace practices</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce turnover non-family employee turnover intentions through</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreased burnout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong> Work-family culture moderates the relationship between family-</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly workplace practices and non-family employee burnout, such that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the relationship strengthens as the level of work-family culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family centrality moderates the relationship between family-</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly workplace practices and non-family employee burnout, such that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the relationship weakens as non-family employees value work more than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATION, FUTURE WORK, AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

In this dissertation, I hypothesized and examined family influence as an antecedent of family-friendly workplace practices and consequences in the context of family business based on COR theory to shed light on the critical roles of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms. In particular, using a family firm dataset comprised of 116 dyads, the relationships between family influence, family-friendly workplace practices, burnout, turnover intentions, work-family culture, and work-family centrality are empirically tested.

According to the findings, family influence has a significant and negative impact on the family-friendly workplace practices implemented by family business owners. This finding confirms a significant relationship between family influence and HR practices in family firms, which has been conceptually proposed by Barnett and Kellermanns (2006). It is also well aligned with the extant findings that family business owners are less likely to implement professionalized HR practices to preserve their SEW (de Kok et al., 2006). Thus, this finding further supports the notion that family firms with stronger family influence are less likely to implement professional HR practices, including family-friendly workplace practices. However, interestingly, family influence does not have any significant impact on the family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees. That is, family influence affects the extensiveness of implemented family-friendly workplace practices by family business owner but not
extensiveness of perceived family-friendly workplace practices by non-family employees. These findings indicate that there is a gap between HR practices implemented by business owners and HR practices perceived by employees. The gap is further confirmed by the following analyses regarding the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on the perception/status of non-family employees. According to the findings, which I will discuss more in detail below, what determines the perception/status of non-family employees, including burnout and turnover intentions, is not family-friendly workplace practices implemented by family business owners but family-friendly workplace practices perceived by non-family employees. Thus, these findings show that there is an apparent gap between implemented HR practices and perceived HR practices and that mere implementation of HR practices is not enough to affect perception/status of employees.

Moreover, it is also found that family-friendly workplace practices are negatively related to turnover intentions of non-family employees. This finding is meaningful in that it shows the effectiveness of family-friendly workplace practices in retaining non-family employees in the family business context. However, according to the findings, implemented family-friendly workplace practices do not have any significant influence on turnover intentions of non-family employees if the practices are not perceived/recognized by non-family employees. In other words, family-friendly workplace practices are effective in retaining non-family employees only when the practices are perceived by non-family employees because family-friendly workplace practices cannot prevent non-family employees’ resource depletion if the practices are not perceived by non-family employees. Thus, these findings provide practical implications for family business owners by suggesting how family firms can retain their important human resources, non-family employees. Given that non-family employees are critical partners of
family owners as family firms grow but are likely to experience resource depletion due to their non-family status, practical implications will enable family business owners to grow and sustain their family business. This finding is also well aligned with the previous findings that family-friendly workplace practices, regardless of whether a single practice or set of practices, reduce employees’ turnover intentions (e.g., Thompson et al., 1999; McNall et al., 2010) by providing a better environment which enables employees to effectively manage their dual roles, work roles and family roles.

Along with those direct relationships between family influence, family-friendly workplace practices, and turnover intentions of non-family employees, I also examined and unveiled the underlying mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees based on the COR framework. In particular, I examined burnout, work-family culture, and work-family centrality to better understand the relationship between family-friendly workplace practices and turnover intentions of non-family employees.

First, I found that family-friendly workplace practices mitigate turnover intentions of non-family employees by decreasing burnout level of non-family employees. This finding supports my COR theory-based arguments that (1) family-friendly workplace practices provide useful resources to non-family employees that enable them to overcome resource depletion caused by non-family status, and that (2) as the level of resource depletion or burnout increases, the level of turnover intentions of non-family employee also increases, because individuals are motivated to protect against resource loss/depletion (Hobfoll, 2001). Through this finding, I empirically uncovered one of the underlying paths through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees. Moreover, it is also highlighted
that family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees not only in direct way but also in indirect way through providing resources which prevent resource depletion. But again, all these significant effects of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout and turnover intentions of non-family employees are valid only when perceptions of non-family employees are assessed. These findings further highlight that family-friendly workplace practices serve as supporting resources only when they are recognized by non-family employees. That is, the basic tenets of COR theory utilized in this dissertation, such as resource loss spiral, are valid when perceived/recognized resources are considered. Thus, the influence of resources captured and addressed in COR theory as well as in this dissertation may not be realized by the resources themselves but by the perception of resource holders.

Second, to provide fresh insights into how the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout of non-family employees can vary contingent on other factors, I examined the moderating effects of work-family culture and work-family centrality. However, in contrast to the direct effects and mediating effect, I did not find any significant moderating effects of work-family culture or work-family centrality. According to the results (see Table 4.5), work-family culture has a significant negative effect on burnout of non-family employees ($\beta = -0.609$, $p < .001$). That is, family-friendly organizational culture mitigates the burnout level of non-family employees. However, the culture does not moderate the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout of non-family employees. Similarly, it is found that work-family centrality has a significant positive effect on burnout of non-family employees ($\beta = 0.326$, $p < .01$). That is, non-family employees who put more weight on work than family are more likely to experience burnout than others who care more about family than work. However, again, the centrality does not moderate the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on burnout of non-family
employees. Thus, unlike my predictions, the findings show that both moderators had direct
effects on burnout of non-family employees rather than moderating effect.

Based on those empirical findings, this dissertation contributes to the literature of family
business, turnover, and HRM in several ways. First, this dissertation provides a deeper insight
into the critical role of family-friendly workplace practices in preventing turnover intentions of
non-family employees who may be especially at risk of burnout due to their non-family status.
Despite the important role of non-family employees in family firms’ growth and survival and the
recent scholarly attention on non-family employees (e.g., Tabor et al., 2018, Daspit et al, 2018;
Yazici et al., 2020; Azouz, Antheaume, & Charles-Pauvers, 2021; Fang et al., 2021), unique
issues related to non-family employees are still largely veiled. In particular, little is known about
determinants of the turnover intentions of non-family employees. Limited recent studies have
found that perceptions of non-family employees, such as justice perceptions (Vazici et al., 2020)
and organizational identification (Vardaman et al., 2018), are significantly related to turnover
intentions of non-family employees. However, how non-family employees should be managed to
mitigate their turnover intentions has not yet been fully explored. This is an apparent void in the
literature in that turnover intentions of non-family employees may not be determined solely by
individual factors, such as demographics, but also by organizational factors, such as HR
practices. Thus, by examining family-friendly workplace practices as an preventor of turnover
intentions of non-family employees, this study empirically shows that HR practices may also be
critical determinants of the turnover intentions of non-family employees.

Second, the current study helps to address calls to explore heterogeneity among family
firms by empirically examining the impact of family influence on HR practices, particularly the
that the level of family influence affects implementation of HR practices of family firms. Since HR practices are related to various outcomes (e.g., Bartel, 1994; Collins & Clark, 2003; Boselie et al., 2005; Carvenale & Hatak, 2020), including turnover intentions of employees (e.g., Luna-Arocas & Camps, 2007; Lee et al., 2018; Aburumman et al., 2020), their model implicitly indicates that different levels of family influence may lead to different organizational outcomes for family firms through different types or levels of HR practices. Thus, whether family firms implement family-friendly workplace practices or not, which may be at least partially determined by the level of family influence (Barnett & Kellermanns, 2006), explains differences in non-family employee retention among family firms. Given that many family firms rely on non-family employees (Vazici et al., 2020; Fang et al., 2021), different level of non-family employee retention is directly related to the various aspects of family firms. Thus, by considering family-friendly workplace practices as a resource which prevents resource depletion, and consequently, turnover intentions of non-family employees, this dissertation empirically demonstrates valid sources of family firm heterogeneity.

Third, drawing upon COR theory, this study sheds light on the underlying mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees. In particular, this study emphasizes a critical role of family-friendly workplace practices as a resource provider that enables non-family employees to avoid resource depletion or burnout, and consequently to decrease turnover intentions. That is, this study demonstrates not only direct effect but also indirect effect of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions of non-family employees. This finding is meaningful in that it implicitly shows that there may be various channels, including controlling burnout, through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions. By unveiling one of the underlying mechanisms,
this dissertation empirically demonstrates how family-friendly workplace practices work in the context of family business, which has not yet fully explored.

Fourth, current study expands the boundary of burnout research, which is limited to exploring employees in different industries but not employees in different types of organizations (e.g., family firms), through applying the concept to the case of non-family employees working at family firms. Considering idiosyncratic aspects of family firms, such as the integration of family and business system (Habbershon, Williams, & MacMillan, 2003), the combination of family employees and non-family employees, owner family’s intention to preserve SEW (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2007), and the unique situations non-family employees may confront in family firms due to their non-family status, non-family employees may experience the burnout phenomenon due to family firm specific reasons. Thus, by examining burnout phenomenon of non-family employees in the family firms based on COR framework, this study broadens the boundary of burnout research and sheds light on this veiled area of the burnout literature.

Fifth, this study contributes to the HRM literature by showing the gap between HR practices implemented by employers and HR practices perceived by employees. According to the findings, HR practices have a significant impact on employees only when the HR practices are perceived by the employees. That is, mere implementation of HR practices is not necessarily impactful. By empirically showing that what matters is perceived HR practices rather than implemented HR practices, this study highlights the necessity of distinguishing implemented HR practices and perceived HR practices for the future research.

Lastly, the current dissertation contributes to COR theory by illustrating how it can be extended to the unique family business context. Indeed, COR theory has been one of the most widely adopted theoretical frameworks in the organizational behavior literature (Halbesleben et
al., 2014). However, this theoretical framework has long been neglected by family business scholars, with the exception of the study by Tabor and his colleagues (2019). Given that family firms have unique goals, governance, and resources (Chrisman, Sharma, Steier, & Chua, 2013), non-family employees may face additional drains on resources. By demonstrating how family-friendly workplace practices prevent resource depletion as well as turnover intentions of non-family employees based on the COR theory, this dissertation shows the suitability of the theory in the family business literature. Thus, this dissertation creates avenues for the broader boundary of COR theory by adopting central tenets of COR theory in the unique context, non-family employees working at family firms.

**Limitations and Future Research Direction**

As with any study, my dissertation is not without limitations which should be considered and overcome by future research. First, this dissertation adopts a mediator (burnout) and moderators (work-family culture and work-family centrality) to uncover the underlying mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees. However, those variables may not be the only relationships that explain the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions. For instance, family-friendly workplace practices may affect turnover intentions through family relationships, such that family-friendly workplace practices lead to better family relationships, and consequently decrease turnover intentions. Moreover, the moderators examined in this study do not have significant moderating effects. However, given that both moderators had a significant direct effect on burnout, there might be veiled relationships between variables that may better explain the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions. Thus, more possible mediators and/or moderators, regardless of the level of variables (individual level or business
level), need to be considered and examined to deepen our understanding of the underlying mechanism through which family-friendly workplace practices affect turnover intentions of non-family employees.

Second, drawing upon the conceptual relationship between family influence and HR practices suggested by Barnett and Kellermanns (2006), this dissertation examined how family influence affects family-friendly workplace practices. However, given that family-friendly workplace practices are just one type of a myriad of HR practices (e.g., compensation, appraisal, recruitment), further research is needed to form a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between family influence and HR practices. That is, various types of HR practices should be considered because different types of HR practices may have different aspects and implications, and the distinctiveness of each HR practice may result in different relationships with family influence. For instance, family influence may have a positive relationship with compensation systems but not with appraisal systems. Thus, it would be fruitful to examine how family influence affects different types of HR practices differently. Since family influence is a distinctive aspect of family firms (Chrisman et al., 2007), such research will provide a solid foundation for research in the HR practices of family businesses.

Third, this study uses a cross-sectional survey data set to test hypothesized relationships. However, given that cross-section survey data has inherent weaknesses (Woodside, 2011), such as reverse causality and potential biases (e.g., social acceptability bias and responder bias), there is a possibility that the results of this research are not capturing the actual relationships among main variables. Thus, following the extant literature that highlights the limitations of cross-sectional data (e.g., Bowen & Wiersema, 1999; Woodside, 2011), I recommend using alternative methods and adopting different types of data sets, such as time-lagged data or longitudinal data,
to overcome such limitations inherent in cross-sectional survey data. I believe adopting alternative methods and data types could more clearly estimate the casual relationships between main variables in the research model.

Lastly, some boundary conditions limit the generalizability of the findings of this study. For instance, despite the fact that there are a multitude of large family businesses all around the world (e.g., Walmart, Samsung, and Hyundai) and that the nature of big companies and that of SMEs are different from each other, this dissertation focuses on small- and medium-sized family businesses. Moreover, this study uses survey data targeted to family firms in the U.S. That is, this dissertation does not consider family firms in different countries. Given that family firms in different countries may have their own distinctive aspects (Fang, Singh, Kim, Marler, & Chrisman, 2021) and that people in different countries may have different values, generalizability to other cultural contexts could be limited. For instance, the impact of family influence on family-friendly workplace practices may vary across countries due to institutional differences, such as values and culture. Thus, using data from various countries is strongly recommended. Taken together, future research needs to overcome such boundary conditions to further support the findings of this study and to enhance the generalizability.

**Practical Implications**

The findings of this dissertation have several implications for practitioners, such as family business owners. First, this study provides a viable HR practice option for family firm owners to manage and to retain non-family employees effectively through demonstrating the impact of family-friendly workplace practices on turnover intentions of non-family employees. As widely recognized, non-family employees are critical resources that are directly related to the growth and survival of family firms (Allen et al., 2007; Vardaman et al., 2018, Fang et al., 2021).
However, it is still not fully known how family firms can manage and retain quality non-family employees. Thus, by providing strong evidence of the effectiveness of family-friendly workplace practices on non-family employee retention, this dissertation suggests family firms actively utilize family-friendly workplace practices to retain non-family employees.

Second, by showing that there is a gap between HR practices implemented by employers and HR practices perceived by employees and that only perceived HR practices have a significant impact on employees’ perceptions, this dissertation suggests that business owners need to make HR practices, including family-friendly workplace practices, to be perceived by employees to maximize the impact of HR practices. That is, the findings of this dissertation clearly demonstrate that the role of business owner is not only to implement HR practices but also to make the HR practices to be perceived by employees. Thus, this dissertation suggests business owners to minimize the gap between HR practices implemented by employers and HR practices perceived by employees through various ways, such as an active communication with employees and clear HR policies. Overall, the findings of this dissertation may be beneficial not only to academia but also may offer practical implications relevant to the management practices of family firms.

**Conclusion**

Non-family employees are indispensable resources for family firms as they grow. However, despite the recent scholarly attention toward non-family employees (e.g., Sieger et al., 2011; Ramos et al., 2014; Tabor et al., 2018; Kotlar & Sieger, 2019; Vardaman et al., 2018; Vincent et al., 2019; Fang et al., 2021), it is still not clear how such important human resources should be managed and/or retained in family firms. To add to the limited body of knowledge on non-family employees working at family firms, this dissertation highlights the role of family-
friendly workplace practices in preventing turnover intentions of non-family employees working at the family firms. In particular, by hypothesizing and examining the antecedent and consequences of family-friendly workplace practices in the family business context, this study demonstrates how non-family employee burnout and turnover intentions can be minimized in family firms through HR practices, particularly family-friendly workplace practices. Thus, this dissertation not only creates avenues for future research on non-family employees, but also provides insight into the critical role of family-friendly workplace practices in the family firms.
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APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL MEASURE ITEMS
### Turnover Intentions Scale (Hom & Friffeth, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the chances that you will leave the organization during the next 12 months?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I intend to leave the organization during the next 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I intend to quit my present job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Family-Friendly Workplace Practices (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offered Family-Friendly Workplace Practices</th>
<th>Binary scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On-site day care</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Help with day care costs</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elder care assistance</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information on community day care</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paid parental leave</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unpaid Parental leave</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maternity or paternity leave with reemployment</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Flexible scheduling</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Burnout Scale (Oldenburg Burnout Inventory; Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, & Kantas, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>1. I always find new and interesting aspects in my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I find my work to be a positive challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I feel more and more engaged in my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>9. There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. During my work, I often feel emotionally drained. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. When I work, I usually feel energized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* (R) means reversed item when the scores should be such that higher scores indicate more burnout.

### Work-Family Centrality Scale (Carr, Boyar, & Gregory, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In my view, an individual's personal life goals should be work-oriented rather than family-oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work rather than family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most important things that happen to me involve my work rather than family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work should be considered central to life rather than family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall, I consider work to be more central to my existence than family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work-Family Culture Scale (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Pyykkö, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial support</strong></td>
<td>1. In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of family-related needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Higher management in this organization encourages supervisors to be sensitive to employees’ family and personal concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees’ childcare responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees’ elder care responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career consequences</strong></td>
<td>6. Many employees are resentful when men in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Many employees are resentful when women in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. In this organization employees who participate in available work–family programs (e.g., job sharing, part-time work) are viewed as less serious about their careers than those who do not participate in these programs. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. To turn down a promotion or transfer for family-related reasons will seriously hurt one’s career progress in this organization. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. In this organization employees who use flextime are less likely to advance their careers than those who do not use flextime. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational time demands</strong></td>
<td>11. To get ahead at this organization, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at the workplace or at home. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their families. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. To be viewed favorably by top management, employees in this organization must constantly put their jobs ahead of their families or personal lives. (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (R) indicates reversed code.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ownership, management and control | 1. ... that only family members are owners of the firm.  
2. ... that the firm’s management consists exclusively of family members.  
3. ... that several family members are involved in the firm’s management.  
4. ... that family control and independence are maintained. |
| Proficiency level of active family members | 5. ... that family members working in the company have at least the same qualifications as nonfamily employees.  
6. ... that family members working in the company show at least the same performance as nonfamily employees. |
| Sharing of information between active family members | 7. ... that family members working in the company know about important events in the company.  
8. ... that all family members working in the company are also able to make use of informal communication. |
| Transgenerational orientation | 9. ... to think in generations.  
10. ... to avoid selling the company to nonfamily members.  
11. ... that the company can be passed on to the next generation. |
| Family-employee bond           | 12. ... that family members working in the company are confidants for the employees.  
13. ... to have a reliable permanent staff.  
14. ... to secure our employees’ jobs also in times of crisis.  
15. ... to safeguard furthering and developing our employees.  
16. ... that the family members working in the company have a lively exchange with nonfamily employees. |
| Family business identity       | 17. ... that the family gives a face to the company.  
18. ... that our family business is socially active in the community/region.  
19. ... to always market our family business as such.  
20. ... to convey the history of our company to our employees. |