Work-life interference among working Australian Muslim men: Where religion and culture unite

Adem Sav

School of Public Health Griffith University, Queensland, Australia

Email: a.sav@griffith.edu.au

Dr Neil Harris

School of Public Health Griffith University, Queensland, Australia

Email: n.harris@griffith.edu.au

Dr Bernadette Sebar

School of Public Health Griffith University, Queensland, Australia

Email: b.sebar@griffith.edu.au

1

Work-life interference among working Australian Muslim men: Where religion and culture unite

ABSTRACT

This goal of this study was to expand our understanding of the interference between work and personal life (work-life interference) by collecting survey questionnaires from 301 Australian Muslim men, a significant ethno-religious cultural minority. Australian Muslims have distinct cultural and religious values, which provide ground to suspect that they may have different experiences from the mainstream Australian population. Results indicated that participants experience low levels of interference and the pattern is similar to that found among workers from societies known to uphold collectivistic cultural values. In accordance with workers in such societies, job demands were a stronger predictor of interference than work hours, which raise doubts about the effectiveness of work-life policies such as flexible work options around working hours.

Keywords:
work/life balance, workforce diversity, cross-cultural behaviour, non-English speaking background (NESB) workers, strategic human resource management, spirituality

Research on work-family interference, focusing on its antecedents (causes) and outcomes (consequences) has grown enormously. Yet, a synthesis of the literature indicates that most research has been conducted in Western societies on white, English-speaking Anglo-Saxon populations. While research on the role of cultural values and beliefs has flourished over the past several years, there is still much that needs to be discovered. In light of this, this study examines work-life interference (WLI) among Australian Muslim men, focusing on the antecedents and outcomes of WLI for this population. Our review of the literature indicates that there has been no published research that has examined the antecedents and outcomes of WLI among this unique ethno-religious minority.

In its simplest definition, a Muslim is a person who embraces the religion of Islam, or is born into a Muslim family, and believes in the oneness of God and the finality of the Prophet Muhammad. Australian Muslims have distinct cultural and religious values, which provide ground to suspect that work-life interference may be experienced differently from the mainstream Australian population. By being the first study to focus on work-life interference among Australian Muslims men, the goal of this study is to offer a broader understanding of how different cultural and religious values, beliefs and attitudes inform work-life interference. This is important from a management perspective because work-life interference is perceived to be at the core of issues essential to human resource management (e.g. Grzywacz & Carlson 2007), and has been associated with a number of negative organisational

2

outcomes including decreased productivity, job satisfaction and increased turnover and absenteeism (Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton 2000). Thus, a more complete understanding of Muslim men's experiences may provide insight into the elements of a family supportive work environment that is sensitive to the needs of workers from non-traditional populations.

Work-Family Interference

Work-family interference (WFI) is defined as a form of conflict/interference where the pressure from work and family roles are mutually incompatible causing stress and difficulties (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) suggested three main sources of WFI: time-based, strain-based, and behaviour-based interference. Time-based interference occurs when an individual experiences conflict because the time an individual spends in one role cannot be spent in the other (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). Strain-based interference occurs when the pressures encountered in one role spill over into the other, causing emotional interference. Finally, behaviour-based interference arises because of an incompatibility between the behavioural expectations of the work and family domains. Most research is based on Greenhaus and Beutell's (1985) tripartite classification of work-family interference. However, much of the research is based on time and strain based conflict, mostly because of the difficulties in trying to operationalise behaviour-based interference.

Work-family interference is bidirectional in that work can interfere with family and family can interfere with work (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). It is important to distinguish the direction of influence as the outcomes can be different. For example, work-related antecedents such as work hours have been associated with work-to-family interference while family-related antecedents such as the number of children with family-to-work interference (Byron 2005). This is because work (family) demands compete with family (work) tasks. Furthermore, work negatively influencing family is more prevalent than vice versa, particularly among men (Geurts & Demerouti 2003).

While work-family interference is considered to be both an issue for men and women (Foley, Yue & Lui 2005), most research has focused on women and the challenges they experience (e.g. Daly, Ashbourne & Hawkins 2008; Russel & Hwang 2004). This is problematic because of the changes in traditional gender roles over the past several decades (Perrone, Wright & Jackson 2009). This study

3

will contribute to our understanding by illuminating the experiences of how men, who are fathers, workers and partners, experience work-life interference.

Antecedents and Outcomes of Work-Family Interference

Examining the antecedents and outcomes of work-family interference has been a key interest among researchers. Work-related antecedents of work-family interference have received a great deal of scholarly attention. A large range of work-related antecedents including negative workplace relationships, long and inflexible working hours, role overload, role ambiguity, job involvement, underutilisation of skills, job insecurity, shiftwork and low control over working conditions have been studied. However, work hours have received the most attention. A positive relationship between working hours and work-to-family interference is strong, suggesting that the more hours people work, the more likely that they will experience interference (Byron 2005; Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark & Baltes 2010). This is because working hours is an important time-based demand where the time an individual spends at work cannot be spent in the non-work role.

Several family-related antecedents of work-family interference have also been explored. Marital status (being married), number of dependants, employment status of spouse, children with a disability, time taken to fulfil family-related roles, and presence of conflict/interference for spouse have all been associated with interference (Michel et al. 2010). The general belief in this area is that spending more time on family-related work such as childcare and household duties increases the risk of interference (Fu & Shaffer 2001).

Research has also expressed large interest on the outcomes or consequences of interference (Allen et al. 2000), focusing mostly on organisational outcomes (Allen et al. 2000; Rantanen, Kinnunen, Feldt & Pulkkinen 2008). Job dissatisfaction has been the most widely studied organisational outcome of interference (Bruck, Allen & Spector 2002). A negative relationship between work-family interference and job satisfaction exists, suggesting that as interference increases, job satisfaction decreases (Allen et al. 2000; Bohle, Quinlan, Kennedy & Williamson 2004; De Cieri, Holmes, Abbott & Pettit 2005). Furthermore, work-to-family interference is more strongly associated

4

with job dissatisfaction than family-to-work interference. This is because workers begin to blame their jobs and workplace when they feel that it interferes with their family and non-work commitments.

Experiences of Australian Muslim Men

Australian Muslims, constitute one of the largest and fastest growing cultural and ethnic minority groups in Australia (ABS 2006). The number of Australians identifying with the religion of Islam was approximately 340,000 according to the 2006 census, suggesting that this figure is currently much higher. Australian Muslims are one of the most ethnically diverse societal groups in Australia (ABS 2006). While it is important to acknowledge this diversity, there are values and beliefs which are common to many Australian Muslims. Most of these values and beliefs are linked to religion and culture. Religiously, Islam provides a framework for living in the world for practising Australian Muslims (Esposito 1994). From a cultural perspective, there is some evidence to suggest that many Australian Muslims trace their ancestry back to collectivistic cultures where the emphasis is on social support and sense of belonging (Khawaja 2007). For example, many Australian Muslims trace their ancestry back to collectivistic cultures such as Turkey, Lebanon, India, Bosnia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Pakistan and Afghanistan (ABS 2006). This suggests Australian Muslims could share similar views with people of collectivistic cultures and experience similar work-family outcomes.

One of the few studies on the experiences of Muslim men was recently published by (Sav, Sebar & Harris 2010). The findings suggested that managing work, family and religious obligations was the defining aspect of their work experiences. Aiming to balance work and non-work commitments had significant implications for the type of occupations or industries they preferred to work in as well as Muslim men's relations with fellow work colleagues and supervisors. This indicates that work-life issues are also prominent among Australian Muslim males and more focus and awareness is needed to understand their experiences.

Theoretical Basis of the Present Study

Our study is informed the theoretical models highlighting the influence of culture on work-family interference. Emerging research indicates that the perceptions and prevalence of work-family

5

interference, its antecedents and outcomes tend to vary across cultures (Aycan & Eskin 2005; Grzywacz et al. 2007; Ling & Poweli, 2001; Powell, Francesco & Ling 2009). For example, work and family roles are perceived to be segmented in individualistic societies (e.g. United States of America [USA]) and integrated in collectivistic societies (e.g. China) (Aycan 2008). Accordingly, integration leads to feelings of enhancement (positive spillover) between work and family roles in China, whereas incompatibility between the work and family roles leads to experiences of interference in the USA (Joplin, Shaffer, Francesco & Lau 2003).

The influence of culture on the relationship between work family interference (WFI) and its antecedents is in a study conducted by Yang, Chen, Choi and Zou (2000). These authors examined the sources of interference in the individualistic USA and collectivistic Chinese societies in two consecutive studies. The first study revealed that similar to the USA population, interference was also experienced by the Chinese workers. However, study two revealed that American employees experienced greater family demands compared to Chinese employees. Furthermore, family demands had a greater impact on interference in the USA than in China, whereas job demands had greater affect on interference in China than in the USA. The authors argued that in a collectivistic Chinese society, sacrificing family time for work is perceived as self-sacrifice for the benefit of the family. However, in an individualistic society, sacrificing family time for work duties is generally viewed as a failure to care for significant others (Yang et al. 2000).

In summary, although research exploring the role of culture on work-family experiences has increased over the past decade, most research has been conducted with Asian samples. So, we appear to know very little about the experiences of workers from other diverse racial and cultural groups. This study will help bridge this gap by systematically examining work-life interference among a sample of employed Australian Muslim males as an ethno-religious cultural minority. It is important to note that our focus is on work-life rather than work-family to incorporate social roles outside work.

On the basis of evidence indicating that men experience higher levels of work-to-life interference than life-to-work interference, we predicted the following:

Hypothesis 1 Participants will experience greater levels of work-to-life interference than life-to-work interference

6

Our hypothesis is based on the traditional gender role expectations in collectivistic cultures, which predict that men spend more time at work and experience more work-to-life interference than women because of their breadwinner role (Aryee, Srinivas & Tan 2005). Although this hypothesis is descriptive, it is important to test whether Muslim men experience higher levels of work-to-life interference than life-to-work interference, in accordance with the traditional gender role attitudes.

Although evidence indicates that job demands are a stronger predictor of work-life interference than work hours in collectivistic cultures, we hypothesised the following:

> *Hypothesis 2 Work hours will be a stronger predictor of work-to-life interference than family demands, religiosity and job demands*

Our hypothesis is made in the context of traditional gender roles which are more common in collectivistic than individualistic cultures. We predict that Muslim men will spend long hours at work because of their breadwinner roles and experience higher levels of work-to-life interference than life-to-work interference. Consequently, we suspect that work hours will have a more significant effect on interference than job demands.

In the context of the role scarcity perspective, which suggests that people have a fixed amount of resources to spend on their role commitments, and involvement in multiple roles exhausts their resources, ultimately limiting or impairing their physical and psychological functioning (Aryee et al. 2005), we predicted the following:

> *Hypothesis 3 Family demands will be a stronger predictor of life-to-work interference than religiosity, work hours and job demands*

Finally, recognising that individuals experience greater levels of dissatisfaction with their jobs when they believe that their work roles interfere with non-work roles, we predicted the following:

> *Hypothesis 4 Work-to-life interference will be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than life-to-work interference among Muslim men*

METHODS[1]

Sample and Procedure

---

[1] *Elements of the approach taken in this research have also been articulated in Brough, Kalliath, O'Driscoll, Maxwell, & Siu's research into work-family balance and operationalised in their project instrument Work-Life Balance: Making work-life work (Brough 2008, personal communication) ARC Discovery Project DP0770109, 2007.*

7

A total of 301 participants were recruited from various Islamic organisations/mosques in South East Queensland (SEQ) to participate in this study. Participants were approached at various mosques and Islamic organisations in SEQ and asked to complete a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. Data was also collected by recruiting participants via the World Wide Web (Internet). The web-based survey was identical to the paper-and-pencil questionnaire in terms of the scales used. This method of data collection provided opportunity to access participants from a wide range of backgrounds. A small-scale pilot study was conducted prior to administering the questionnaire to the chosen population.

The mean age across the sample was 35.4 years (range = 18-68, SD = 11.25), indicating that participants were concentrated in the more economically productive years of their lives. The majority of participants were employed on a full-time basis (75.7 %), while a small number (16. 6 %) were employed on a part-time or casual basis. A large number of workers (N = 128, 42.5 %) were employed in managerial or professional occupations while 50 (16.6%) in the white-collar occupational field (sales, customer service and clerical). Furthermore, almost 30 % were employed in the blue-collar occupations, which included domestic, tradesman, labourer, and production or transport workers. The overwhelming majority of participants (N = 215, 71.4 %) were married, and 74 (24.6 %) were single never/married. Just more than half (N = 163) were caring for one or more dependent children in their home. As expected, a large number of men (N = 121, 40.2 %) who were married, were in a family relationship where they were the primary income earner and had a spouse who was either primarily responsible for domestic duties or was unemployed. On the other hand, 82 (27.2 %) men reported that their partner was employed outside the home.

A number of demographic items were included in the questionnaire. Participants were asked to specify their age, ethnic background, educational qualifications, occupation, total household income, employment status (part-time or full-time employee), tenure, number and age of dependants, and country of residence between birth and 18 years of age, marital status, and spouse employment status.

Work-life interference was measured using a measure first developed by Fisher (2001) and validated by Hayman (2005) in Australia. Participants were asked to respond to 11 questions asking how often their job interacted negatively with their personal life and how often their personal life

8

impacted negatively on their work on a 5-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree and* 5 = *strongly agree*. Hayman (2005) reported an alpha coefficient of .70 on this measure.

Perceived job demands (PJD) and perceived family demands (PFD) were measured using a 9-item measure developed and validated by Boyar, Carr, Mosley Jr and Carson (2007). A sample item on *PJD* was *'My job requires all of my attention'*. Conversely, a sample item on *PFD* included *'I have a lot of responsibility in my family'*. Each item was assessed on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree, and* 5 = *strongly agree*. Boyar et al. (2007) reported good levels of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for both the PJD (.89) and PFD (.77) scales.

Work hours each week was assessed by a single item, which asked the number of hours participants worked in a typical week.

Religiosity was assessed via a 3-item measure developed and validated by Haj-Yahia (1998). A sample item in this measure was '*In general, to what extent do you consider yourself religious?'* Responses to these items were based on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 *(Not At All) to* 4 *(To a Great Extent)*. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the religiosity scale has been reported to be .88 and .85 (Haj-Yahia 1998).

Job satisfaction was assessed using the 3-item Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman & Jenkins 1979). A sample item included; *'In general I don't like my job'*. Respondents indicated their level of agreement with each item on 5-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree and* 5 = *strongly agree*. Good levels of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the measure have been reported. Coefficient α was .88 by Allen (2001).

RESULTS

Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables. Participants generally reported low levels of work-to-life interference (WTLI) (*M* = 2.88, *SD* = .98, range 1-5) and even lower levels of life-to-work interference (LTWI) (*M* = 2.30, *SD* = .75, range 1-5). The average working hours each week was 38.21 (*SD* = 12.15, range = 5-70). The average reported job demands (*M* = 3.40, *SD* = .87, range = 1-5) was slightly higher than the average family demands reported (*M* = 3.19, *SD* = .84, range = 1-5). There was a significant positive relationship between

9

work hours and job demands ($r = .33$, $p < .01$). As expected, there was no significant relationship between work hours and family demands ($r = .04$, $p > .01$) and a significant positive relationship between job demands and family demands ($r = .24$, $p < .01$). Participants also reported high level of religiosity ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .05$, range = 2-4). Furthermore, religiosity had a moderate positive relationship with job satisfaction ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). The coefficient (Cronbach's) alpha for each scale also maintained acceptable to good levels of reliability. The effect of each variable over and above the previous variable was analysed in each regression analysis.

A paired samples t tests was conducted to test H_1. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the scores for WTLI ($M = 2.88$, $SD = .98$, $SE = .06$, range = 1-5) and LTWI ($M = 2.30$, $SD = .75$, $SE = .04$, range = 1-5), $t(290) = 10.32$, $p < .05$, $d = .67$. Based on this result, H_1 was supported.

A hierarchical multiple linear regression was carried out to test H_2. The results indicated that after step 5, with all IVs in the equation, the multiple correlation coefficient $R = .57$, was significantly different from zero, $F(7, 275) = 18.47$ $p < .01$. The beta coefficients (β) presented in Table 2 suggests that job demands was the best predictor of WTLI ($\beta = .40$, $p < .01$), followed by work hours ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$), marital status ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$), followed by family demands and religiosity, which both made a small, yet significant contribution to the prediction of WTLI. Hence, H_2 was not supported.

A hierarchical multiple linear regression was carried out to test H_3. The results indicated that after step 5, with all IVs in the equation, the multiple correlation coefficient $R = .33$, was significantly different from zero, $F(7, 275) = 4.81$ $p < .01$. Table 3 suggests that as predicted, family demands was the best predictor of LTWI ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$). This was followed by religiosity ($\beta = -.17$, $p < .01$), marital status ($\beta = -.17$, $p < .05$). Based on these results, H_3 was supported.

A hierarchical multiple linear regression was carried out to test H_4. The results indicated that after step 3, with all IVs in the equation, the multiple correlation coefficient $R = .46$, was significantly different from zero, $F(5, 281) = 14.88$, $p < .01$. The beta coefficients (β) presented in Table 4 suggest that as predicted, higher levels of WTLI were a stronger predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = -.32$, $p < .01$) than LTWI ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .01$). Hence, H_4 was supported.

10

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study support work-life research in collectivistic cultural oriented societies. For example, we found that Australian Muslim men experienced infrequent (low to moderate) levels of interference, which is consistent with research on Asian samples where work and family roles are seen less interfering (Aycan 2008). In fact, our previous research with Australian Muslim men indicates that possible enrichment between work and non-work roles is experienced more frequently than interference. Nevertheless, work negatively influencing family and personal life was more prevalent than family and personal life negatively influencing work. These findings are consistent with research suggesting that workers from collectivistic cultures experience less interference between work and family, mainly because they perceive these domains to enrich one another (Aryee et al. 2005). Furthermore, given that all of the participants were either born/raised or spent most of their lives in Australia, our findings suggest that cultural and religious beliefs influence work-life experiences long after immigration.

Further evidence that Australian Muslim men's interpretation and experience of work and personal life is consistent with collectivistic cultures is evident in hypothesis 2. Although the hypothesis was not supported, the addition of job demands in step 4 of the regression analysis resulted in the largest improvement in the prediction of interference. Job demands were the best predictor of work-to-life interference compared to work hours, religiosity and family demands. Again, this reflects the notion that work hours are a less significant predictor of work-life interference than perceived work load in collectivistic societies (e.g. Lu, Kao, Chang, Wu & Cooper 2008). Islamic teachings and beliefs about paid employment may provide one possible explanation for why job demands are a stronger predictor of work-to-life interference than work hours. Islam attaches great importance to paid employment, considering it a source of independence and a way of promoting personal growth (Yousef 2000). Given that the participants were moderately to highly religious, spending time at work (long work hours) as time-based demands may have been seen as a positive demand and a necessary element in providing for the family. Our findings also challenge the dominant understanding of work hours being a stronger antecedent of interference than job demands and indicate that greater attention may need to be given to job demands, particularly for workers from non-traditional backgrounds.

11

As predicted, family demands explained greater variance in the prediction of life-to-work interference (H_3) than job demands, work hours and religiosity. Also, marital status was also significantly associated with life-to-work interference and married participants experienced higher levels of life-to-work interference than those who were single or never married. Our findings support the role scarcity perspective of work-life interference indicating that family-related demands such as childcare and household duties all increase the risk of life-to-work interference (Byron 2005; Fu & Shaffer, 2001; Michel et al. 2010).

Religiosity also explained small, yet significant variance in the prediction of both life-to-work interference and work-to-life interference. As expected, a negative beta weight between religiosity and life-to-work interference, as well as religiosity and work-to-life interference indicated that being religious was related to higher levels of both directions of interference. Our findings clearly show that if workplaces fail to consider religious roles and their implication for how religious workers devote time and energy to work commitments, they may fail to create a work environment that is sensitive to non-work roles.

Finally, the addition of work-to-life interference in the final step resulted in the largest increase in the prediction of job satisfaction (H_4). Hence, work-to-life interference was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than life-to-work interference. This is expected because workers who perceive their work to interfere with their family are likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs. This is consistent with research in both collectivist and individualistic cultures, indicating that work-to-family interference is more strongly associated with job satisfaction than family-to-work interference (Allen et al. 2000).

Conclusion

Research has mostly focused on white, middle class and educated Anglo-Saxon populations. Much less research is available on the work-life experiences of cultural and ethnic minorities. This study considerably contributes to bridging this gap by focusing on a largely neglected group of men from a wide range of occupations, ages, cultural and ethnic backgrounds and family circumstances.

12

The findings confirm theoretical models and empirical research on workers of Asian backgrounds known to be more collectivistic in cultural orientation. While research on collectivistic cultures and work-life interference has generally been conducted with Asian samples, the findings of this research suggest that the theoretical models are also applicable to an ethno-religious minority group residing in a predominantly individualistic society such as Australia. Furthermore, the tendency to view work and family as integrated may be even stronger in Australian Muslim men because of their religious beliefs. Such beliefs usually encourage distinct gender roles, where the man's role is usually to work and financially support his wife and family (Dhami & Sheikh 2000). The addition of religion into our conception of work-life interference as presented in this study forces us to think about religion and other life roles, not commonly considered within the work-life literature.

Our findings have an important implication for public policy. They question the suitability of certain family-friendly policies for Australian Muslim men and others upholding collectivistic cultural values. Because work hours were a less significant predictor of interference than job demands, it is highly possible that flexible work options around working hours may not reduce interference among Muslim men where long working hours are seen as a way of supporting the family. Instead, flexible work options around work demands may be more important. This is critical in promoting a workplace culture supportive of workers with unique and diverse needs and responsibilities.

Several limitations are associated with this study. The study relied on cross-sectional self-report data to examine participant's experiences. However, because of the lack of conceptual knowledge on this study's focus of interest, developing an initial understanding was more appropriate and hence, self-report data was used. Furthermore, our study did not use a random sample. However, drawing a random sample of Australian Muslims is extremely difficult as there are no reliable listings of names.

Despite these limitations, this study significantly increases our understanding of the experiences of an under-researched ethno-religious cultural minority, positively contributing to the body of work-family knowledge. Our findings suggest that we need to re-think the effectiveness of policies designed to facilitate work-life balance among workers who have different cultural and religious beliefs than the mainstream population.

13

REFERENCES

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006) *Year Book Australia 2006*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

Allen TD (2001) Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 58(3): 414-435.

Allen TD, Herst DEL, Bruck CS & Sutton M (2000) Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 5: 278-308.

Aryee S, Srinivas ES & Tan HH (2005) Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(1): 132-146.

Aycan Z (2008) Cross-cultural approaches to work-family conflict, in Korabik K, Lero DS and Whitehead DL (Eds), *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory and best practices*, pp353-370, Academic Press, Amsterdam.

Aycan Z & Eskin M (2005) Relative contributions of childcare, spousal support, and organizational support in reducing work-family conflict for men and women: The case of Turkey, *Sex Roles* 53(7/8): 453-471.

Bohle P, Quinlan M, Kennedy D & Williamson A (2004) Working hours, work-life conflict and health in precarious and "permanent" employment, *Revista de Saúde Pública* 38: 19-25.

Boyar SL, Carr J, Mosley Jr, D & Carson C (2007) The development and validation of scores n perceived work and family demand scales, *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 67: 100-115.

Brough, P., Kallitah, T., O'Dricoll, M., Maxwell, J. P., & Siu, O. L. (2007-2010). *An international evaluation of work-family balance: Validation of the work-family balance measure and theoretical model*. Australian Research Council Discovery Project (DP0770109).

Bruck CS, Allen TD & Spector PE (2002) The relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A finer grained analysis, *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 60(3): 336-353.

Byron K (2005) A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* 67(2): 169-198.

Cammann C, Fichman M & Jenkins DKJ (1979) *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Daly K, Ashbourne L & Hawkins L (2008) Work-life issues for fathers, in Korabik K, Lero DS and Whitehead DL(Eds), *Handbook of work-family integration: research, theory and best practices*, pp249-264, Academic Press, Amsterdam.

De Cieri H, Holmes B, Abbott J & Pettit T (2005) Achievements and challenges for work/life balance strategies inAustralian organizations, *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 16: 90-103.

Dhami S & Sheikh A (2000) The Muslim family: Predicament and promise, *Western Journal of Medicine* 173(5): 352-356.

Esposito JL (1994) *Islam: The straight path,* Oxford University Press, New York.

Fisher GG (2001) *Work/Personal Life Balance: A construct development study,* PhD, Bowling Green State University, Ohio.

Foley S, Yue NH & Lui S (2005) The effects of work stressors, perceived organizational support, and gender on work-family conflict in Hong Kong, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 22: 237-256.

Fu CK & Shaffer MA (2001) The tug of work and family. Direct and indirect domain-specific determinants of work--family conflict, *Personnel Review* 30: 502-522.

Geurts SAE & Demerouti E (2003) Work/non-work interface: A review of theories and findings, in Schabracq M, Winnubst J and Cooper CL (Eds), *The Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*, pp279-312, Wiley, Chichester.

Greenhaus JH & Beutell N (1985) Sources of conflict between work and family roles, *Academy of Management Review* 10: 76-88.

Grzywacz JG, Arcury TA, Marin A, Carrillo L, Burke B, Coates ML et al. (2007) Work-family conflict: Experiences and health implications among immigrant Latinos, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(4): 1119-1130.

14

Grzywacz JG & Carlson D (2007) Conceptualising work-family balance: Implications for paractice and research, *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 9(4): 455-471.

Haj-Yahia MM (1998) Beliefs about wife beating among Palestinian women, *Violence Against Women 4*(5): 533-558.

Hayman J (2005) Psychometric assessment of an instrument designed to measure work-life balance, *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management* 13: 85-91.

Joplin JRW, Shaffer MA, Francesco AM & Lau T (2003) The macro-environment and work-family conflict: Development of a cross cultural comparative framework, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 3(3): 305-328.

Khawaja NG (2007) An investigation of the psychological distress of Muslim migrants in Australia, *Journal of Muslim Mental Health* 2(1): 39-56.

Ling Y & Poweli GN (2001) Work-family conflict in contemporary China: Beyond an American-based model, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 1(3): 357-373.

Lu L, Kao SF, Chang TT, Wu HP & Cooper CL (2008) Work/family demands, work flexibility, work/family conflict and their consequences at work: A national probability sample in Taiwan, *International Journal of Stress Management* 15(1): 1-21.

Michel JS, Kotrba LM, Mitchelson JK, Clark MA & Baltes BB (2010) Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 67(2): 169-198.

Perrone KM, Wright SL & Jackson ZV (2009) Traditional and nontraditional gender roles and work-family interface for men and women, *Journal of Career Development* 36(1): 8-24.

Powell G, Francesco A & Ling Y (2009) Toward culture-sensitive theories of the work-family interface, *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 30(5): 597-616.

Rantanen J, Kinnunen U, Feldt T & Pulkkinen L (2008) Work-family conflict and psychological well-being: Stability and cross-lagged relations within one- and six-year follow-ups, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 73(1): 37-51.

Russel G & Hwang CP (2004) The impact of workplace practices on father involvement, in Lamb ME (Ed), *The role of the father in child development*, pp182-195, John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey.

Sav A, Sebar B & Harris N (2010) Experiences of Australian Muslim men in the workplace: A field study of employment choices and consequences, *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 30(3): 409-423.

Yang N (2005) Individualism-collectivism and work-family interface: A Sino-US comparison, in Poelmans S (Ed), *Work and family: An international research perspective*, pp287-319, Lawrence Erlbaum, London.

Yang N, Chen C, Choi J & Zou Y (2000) Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work and family demands, *Academy of Management Journal* 43(1): 113-124.

Yousef DA (2000) Organizational commitment as a mediator of the relationship between Islamic work ethic and attitudes toward organizational change, *Human Relations* 53(4): 513-537.

15

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among Study Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*a*	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 WLI	2.88	.98	.84						
2 LWI	2.30	.75	.81	.41**					
3 Religiosity	4.26	1.10	.90	-.18**	-.18**				
4 Work-hours	38.21	12.15		.33**	-.03	-.07			
5 Job-demands	3.40	.87	.90	.49**	.14*	-.13*	33**		
6 Family-demands	3.19	.84	.85	.20**	.19**	.09	.04	24**	
7 Job-satisfaction	3.57	.96	.84	-.38**	-.33**	35**	-.02	-.05	-.11

Note: * *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01

M = Median, *SD* = Standard Deviation, *a* = Cronbach Alpha

Table 2

Summary of Hierarchical Regression on the Prediction of Work-to-Life interference

Steps	Variables	Work-to-life interference Step 5 (*β*)	*R²*	Δ*R²*
Step 1	Marital stat	-.14*		
	Dependents	.07		
	Job type	-.08	.04**	.04**
Step 2	Family-demand	.13**	.09**	.05**
Step 3	Religiosity	-.13**	.13**	.04**
Step 4	Job-demands	.40**	.29**	.16**
Step 5	Work hours	.24**	.32**	.03**

Note: *β* = standardised beta coefficients; Job type was dummy coded into 0 = casual or part-time employee and 1= full-time employee; Marital status was dummy coded into 0 = single/never married and 1 = married; Dependents was dummy coded into 0 = no dependent children and 1 = presence of dependent children. *= *p* < .05; **= *p* < .01

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression on the Prediction of Life-to-Work Interference

Steps	Variables	Life-to-work interference Step 5 (*β*)	*R²*	Δ*R²*
Step 1	Marital stat	-.17*		
	Dependents	.03		
	Job type	-.04	.02	.02
Step 2	Religiosity	-.17**	.05**	.03**
Step 3	Work hours	-.03	.05	0
Step 4	Job-demands	.09	.07*	.02*
Step 5	Family-demand	.21**	.11**	.04**

Note: *β* = standardised beta coefficients; Job type was dummy coded into 0 = casual or part-time employee and 1= full-time employee; Marital status was dummy coded into 0 = single/never married and 1 = married; Dependents was dummy coded into 0 = no dependent children and 1 = presence of dependent children. *= *p* < .05; **= *p* < .01

16

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression on the Prediction of Job Satisfaction

		Job satisfaction		
Steps	Variables	Step 3 (β)	R²	ΔR²
Step 1	Marital stat	.05		
	Dependents	.03		
	Job type	.06	.01	.01
Step 2	LTWI	-.21**	.13**	.12**
Step 3	WTLI	-.32**	.21**	.80**

Note: β = standardised beta coefficients; Job type was dummy coded into 0 = casual or part-time employee and 1= full-time employee; Marital status was dummy coded into 0 = single/never married and 1 = married; Dependents was dummy coded into 0 = no dependent children and 1 = presence of dependent children. *= $p < .05$; **= $p < .01$