

29 Workplace Flexibility: Strategies to Help Organizations Navigate Global Expansion

Rebecca J. Thompson and Ellen Ernst Kossek

Workplace flexibility is a continually expanding practice that enables employees to improve work and nonwork objectives while facilitating the strategic expansion of organizational goals and initiatives. Researchers have defined workplace flexibility as an arrangement between employees and employers in which both parties mutually agree upon when, where, and how employees will conduct their work (Kossek, Hammer, Thompson, & Burke, 2014). More frequently than ever before, employers around the world are implementing some form of workplace flexibility, either as informal practices or formal policies (Chandra, 2012; Raghuram, London, & Larsen, 2001; Stavrou, Casper, & Ierodiakonou, 2015).

Despite the trends of increased availability of flexibility in the workforce, there are still theoretical and practical issues surrounding the implementation and ongoing use of flexible work arrangements for multinational organizations. In particular, there is considerable variability in the extent to which employers, both within Western countries as well as across the globe, offer distinct types of policies and practices. In addition, there are many country-level and cultural variations in interpretations of what workplace flexibility means, differing values surrounding the use of flexibility and the management of work–family boundaries, as well as contextual and legal constraints that pose unique challenges to workplace flexibility. Consequently, the purpose of this chapter is to explore the nuances of global trends in workplace flexibility and examine relevant concerns for multinational organizations.

We begin by defining workplace flexibility and reviewing broad patterns and trends of workplace flexibility, including a discussion of the central types of workplace flexibility studied in the research literature. This is followed by a summary of information on the use of flexibility across major geographic regions. Additionally, we review and discuss research that highlights cultural comparisons and differences that suggest patterns of effects across cultures. Next, the chapter will discuss important strategic outcomes of implementing workplace flexibility as well as key challenges for multiple stakeholders. Finally, the chapter will conclude with strategies for successful implementation of global flexibility and future considerations for research.

Please cite as: Kossek, E. E., DeMarr*, B., Ross K.*, and Kollar, M.* 1993. Assessing employee's elder care needs and reactions to dependent care benefits. *Public Personnel Management Journal*, 24 (4): 617-638.

What is Workplace Flexibility?

The literature surrounding workplace flexibility is quite expansive. Consequently, there are numerous definitions, ranging in scope from individual or task levels to broader, more organizational or procedural level perspectives (Kossek & Thompson, 2016). Some researchers have focused on the extent to which employees have control over some aspect of their work arrangement, such as when work is conducted or career breaks (Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, & Shockley, 2013; Berg, Kossek, Misra, & Belman, 2014; Hill, Grzywacz, Allen, Blanchard, Matz-Costa, Shulkin, & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2008). Alternatively, other scholars have examined how organizations implement policies at a process level, utilizing flexibility to maintain standing in a competitive market (Kossek & Thompson, 2016). Accordingly, workplace flexibility has been defined relative to the research questions and outcomes of interest for researchers.

Consistent with other definitions, the current chapter defines workplace flexibility as a mutually agreed upon arrangement between an employee and employer whereby both parties approve of when, where, or how the employee will conduct his/her work (Kossek et al., 2014). An important component within this definition is the ability of employees to control some aspect of their work, thereby increasing the likelihood of policies leading to positive outcomes for employees (Kossek et al., 2006; Kossek & Thompson, 2016). Similarly, the definition incorporates an agreement between both stakeholders. In other words, we acknowledge that some arrangements have led to implementation gaps, or disparities between the stated goals and objectives of flexibility policies (in theory or practice) and the experiences of those involved in the arrangement (Kossek & Thompson, 2016). Flexible policies and practices must meet organizational needs and goals (e.g., maintaining productivity and scheduling demands). Therefore, considering multiple perspectives when conceptualizing workplace flexibility allows for operationalizations that most benefit each of the various stakeholder groups.

It is important to begin the discussion of types of workplace flexibility by acknowledging that the United States is not the only country with workplace flexibility practices nor is it the most progressive. However, the preponderance of the top-tier research literature, at least in the areas of industrial-organizational psychology and organizational behavior, examines samples from the United States (Myers, 2016). Additionally, many researchers have pointed out that the majority of studies examining work-life issues conducted outside of the United States have been in Western European and Anglo countries (Chandra, 2012; Spector, Cooper, Poelmans, Allen, O'Driscoll, Sanchez, et al., 2004). However, researchers have identified cultural differences in the availability, use, and outcomes associated with flex policies and practices across the world (Raghuram et al., 2001; Stavrou & Kilaniotis, 2010), a discussion of which follows in a subsequent section of this chapter.

Types of Workplace Flexibility

Before diving into cultural differences regarding flexibility, it is important to first discuss the four primary conceptualizations of workplace flexibility: (1) flexibility in time or when work is conducted; (2) flexibility in place or where work is conducted; (3) flexibility in the amount of work or workload; and (4) flexibility in leave periods and career continuity (Kossek & Thompson, 2016).

Flexibility in time. Flexibility in time of work affords employees discretion over how their total work hours are distributed (Kossek et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2015). Several formal work policies and informal practices offer flexibility in time, including flextime, compressed workweeks, flexible shifts, and part-year or seasonal work. These arrangements vary in both the degree to which they offer employee control as well as the span of time over which the flexibility occurs. For instance, flextime arrangements typically require a daily core time around which all employees are expected to work, but allow employees to choose the start/stop times of their individual workday as they see fit (Baltes, Briggs, & Huffcutt, 1999). Compressed workweeks allow employees to condense a typical workweek into fewer than five days each week or fewer than ten days in two weeks, thus affording them an additional day off compared to a standard work schedule (Kossek & Michel, 2011; Kossek et al., 2014). On the other hand, arrangements such as part-year and seasonal work offer employees the option to work during specific times of year, rather than having choice over parts of the day (Kossek & Thompson, 2016). Flexible shiftwork refers to arrangements that differ from traditional work schedules, often by extending organizational hours using work teams. There are many types of shiftwork arrangements, which vary along several dimensions including the length of shifts, continuity of coverage, inclusion of night work, and the nature of shift rotations (Smith, Folkard, Tucker, & Macdonald, 1998).

Time-based flexibility is thought to be desirable to employees because the increased control over work scheduling provides employees with a greater ability to manage their work demands around nonwork demands, therefore increasing resources to meet demands in both roles (Hobfoll, 2001; Voyandoff, 2005). In other words, by allowing some degree of discretion over when employees work, organizations enable employees to expand the times they are available for nonwork demands while still meeting their work demands (Thompson et al., 2015). Research has found that compared to flexibility in place, or where work is done, flexibility in the timing of work has stronger relationships with beneficial employee and employer outcomes (Allen et al., 2013; Thompson et al., 2015). In addition, employers benefit from time-based flexibility through the increased availability to clients (i.e., expanded business hours; Kossek, Thompson, & Lautsch, 2015).

Flexibility in place. Flexibility in place or the location of work, also known as flexplace, allows employees some degree of choice over where their work is conducted, relative to the central worksite (Kossek et al., 2014). The most frequently studied organizational practice of flexibility in place is telework or telecommuting (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Telework and other flexplace arrangements, such as

remote work and hoteling, vary in the frequency with which employees work away from the central worksite.

While many employees choose to work from home, employees may also work from other locations such as a remote work center or satellite offices. Hoteling refers to when employers allocate temporary or as-needed office space for employees who typically work offsite (Kossek & Thompson, 2016). However, it is important to note that although many employees have the ability to *choose* to work somewhere other than the central worksite, not all flexplace arrangements are discretionary. In other words, organizations often utilize flexplace policies in order to maximize productivity and/or client outcomes. Gajendran and Harrison (2007) argue that control is an essential part of workplace flexibility, including telework, as it enhances employee perceptions of autonomy by presenting employees some degree of choice over the work demands. Thompson et al. (2015) argue that policies and practices that require employees to work offsite or travel to meet clients and are not under the control of the employee are not, in fact, flexible. For example, employers may require employees to work remotely at a client site or at home (in addition to work done at the office) to complete an ongoing project. Therefore, these uses of flexplace arrangements do not offer employees control over where they conduct their work, but rather are designed solely to enhance organizational goals.

Policies and practices involving flexibility in location are considered beneficial to employees as they allow employees to avoid going to the central work site with some predictability. This reduces work and nonwork boundary-spanning obstacles (e.g., commute time, task-appropriate clothing) and therefore enables employees to transition between work and nonwork roles more quickly and easily (Thompson et al., 2015). In addition, by having some amount of predictability over when they will have discretion over their work location, these practices may facilitate employees' ability to take advantage of nonwork opportunities that traditional work arrangements would not permit. For example, employees may prefer to live in locations that are far away from the central worksite while working remotely or apply unused commute time to attend a child's sports event (Kossek et al., 2015).

An additional consideration of flexplace arrangements is that many policies and practices that allow flexibility in location may also offer flexibility in time (e.g., telework); however, these types of flexibility are not necessarily concomitant. Some researchers even suggest that simply offering flexibility in location without also offering flexibility in time provides employees little more flexibility than working from the central worksite (Shockley & Allen, 2007).

Flexibility in the amount of work or workload. Flexibility in amount of work reflects arrangements that alter an employee's workload relative to a traditional assignment in order for the employee to maintain employment while managing nonwork demands. This facilitates employees' abilities to avoid recurring work and nonwork conflicts by changing the workload in a manner that meets the needs of both the employee and organization (Kossek et al., 2014). One type of arrangement is reduced-load work, which refers to working diminished duties relative to a full-time workload including a proportionate decrease in pay (Kossek, & Lee,

2008; Lee, MacDermid, & Buck, 2000). This reflects both the amount of time as well as the number of tasks an employee is expected to complete (Kossek & Lee, 2008). Another type of arrangement is job sharing, which is when two employees working on a part-time basis split the duties of a full-time job (Kossek et al., 2014).

Employees are likely to seek these arrangements when they have ongoing life demands (e.g., school, community, family) that prevent them from taking on or continuing to work a full workload. By working at a reduced or part-time load, employees are able to maintain benefits associated with employment while attending to their outside obligations. In other words, flexibility in workload allows employees to restructure their work around nonwork in a manner that maximizes resources to meet demands in both domains (Hobfoll, 2001). Employers benefit from these arrangements through the ability to hire and/or retain talented employees who may not be able to work on a traditional full workload. Correspondingly, not only can employers hire employees to work a reduced-load arrangement, but they may also allow current full-time employees to transition to a reduced load, thus enabling the employees to maintain employment and the organization to retain valuable organizational members (as well as reduce overall hiring and selection expenses).

Flexibility in leave periods and career continuity. Policies and practices focused on flexibility in continuity provide employees the opportunity to alter their work arrangement and even, at times, the trajectory of their career, in order to attend to temporary challenges or demands outside of work. These can include policies such as sabbaticals, implementation of leave policies, and career flexibility (Kossek et al., 2014). Sabbaticals refer to extended periods of absence taken by employees from employment for reasons varying from family demands, education, to military duties (Kossek et al., 2014). In the United States, the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) entitles many employees to take unpaid, job-protected leave due to family or medical reasons while continuing health insurance coverage (US Department of Labor, 1993).

The benefit of continuity flexibility is that it allows employees to maintain long-term employment or even their career despite temporary or relatively short-term life demands (e.g., illness, death in the family, fluctuating dependent care demands) that have caused them to take advantage of continuity or break policies. In other words, employees who might otherwise have to quit their jobs or find alternative ways to support these important nonwork demands are able to meet their obligations with the assurance that they will be able to return to their workplace once they are able to do so, thus reducing the likelihood of burnout and conflict associated with having to manage multiple roles (Kossek et al., 2014). These policies may be particularly impactful for employees who experience multiple or ongoing life demands. For example, women often face career penalties when they take multiple breaks from work due to pregnancy/childbirth. In a study of US mid-level information technology careers, Simard and colleagues identified that nearly one-third of women reported delaying their career goals in order to have children as well as that women were more likely than their male counterparts to sacrifice traditional family (e.g., marriage/partnership, having children) to achieve career goals (Simard,

Henderson, Gilmartan, Schiebinger, & Whitney, 2008). Thus, flexibility in continuity may provide employees the opportunity to continue their career paths without forgoing or compromising on nonwork roles.

These policies also allow employers to retain employees who might otherwise be forced to leave their positions due to unexpected life events or relatively predictable periods of demand fluctuation due to life changes. This enables employers to preserve the institutional knowledge, relationships between employees and clients, as well as investment in talent.

Formal policies and informal practices. Another important distinction in the workplace flexibility literature is between formal policies, or those officially sanctioned through an organization's human resources area, and informal practices implemented on an ad hoc basis at the discretion of supervisors (Eaton, 2003; Kossek et al., 2014). As such, informal flexibility can be permitted by supervisors on a case-by-case basis and therefore may not be available to all employees. Consequently, not all employees may have equal access to use flexibility and therefore are not eligible for the associated advantages (Eaton, 2003). Additionally, the ability to choose when and who has access to flexibility makes supervisors de facto gatekeepers to these policies. Supervisors may not allow employees to use flexible policies for all types of nonwork commitments (e.g., family obligations, home or car repair, continuing education). This can foster perceptions of unfairness and potential conflict surrounding who is or is not most deserving of the ability to use flexible policies (Kossek et al., 2016).

However, simply offering policies is not sufficient to facilitate employees' control over their work arrangement. Researchers have found evidence that informal mechanisms of work–family support explain greater variance in employee outcomes than do formal mechanisms alone, suggesting that family-supportive workplace cultures are important components of the effectiveness of work–family initiatives (Behson, 2005; Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999).

Global Trends in Policies and Practices

The desire to balance work and nonwork demands is practically universal. However, individual responses to conflicting work and nonwork demands vary across countries and cultures (Chandra, 2012). Given the vast differences in the types of workplace flexibility, it is not surprising that there are wide-ranging global differences in the availability and use of the various policies and practices. In addition to individual-level factors, multinational organizations have faced a variety of challenges impacting the implementation of workplace flexibility on an international scale. The globalization of business interests, increasing technological advances, and societal changes in family dynamics across the world have all influenced how individuals experience the relationship between work and family, thus affecting the perceptions and utilization of workplace flexibility for today's

employees (Chandra, 2012). Similarly, as corporations continue to expand and compete on international levels, implementing work–family policies such as workplace flexibility in their workforces across the world has become a nuanced challenge.

As researchers have pointed out, the terms surrounding “flexibility” and related policies and practices often refer to a variety of different behaviors and/or theories (Brewster, Mayne, & Tregaskis, 1997). Additionally, the availability and use of workplace flexibility varies across cultures as well as expectations regarding appropriate methods for resolving work–life conflict. Similarly, the meaning of specific flexibility policies and practices differs across countries and geographic regions, as a function of societal norms, laws, and cultural values. Consequently, multinational organizations can face a wide variety of challenges when implementing flexibility practices on a global scale. Therefore, it is critical to have an understanding of these issues when developing policies and practices that transcend geographic regions. Below, we discuss patterns researchers have identified regarding trends in workplace flexibility within and across major geographic regions as well as examples of cultural, legal, and socioeconomic factors that play a role in these trends.

The United States. In a study of organizations in the United States, the 2014 National Study of Employers reported that 81% of employers allow at least some employees to periodically use flextime (Matos & Galinsky, 2014). Similarly, 67% of employers reported allowing employees to work some paid hours from home on an occasional basis. Thirty-six percent of employers reported allowing at least some employees to move from full-time to part-time load while remaining in the same position and 29% allowed at least some employees to share jobs (Matos & Galinsky, 2014). The report points out that employers of fifty or more employees most frequently allowed employees to have some control over when they take breaks (92%) and take time off for important family/personal needs without loss of pay (82%). The authors also note that employers were most likely to allow at least some groups of employees (74%) to return to work gradually after leave due to childbirth or adoption (Matos & Galinsky, 2014). In contrast, job sharing was one of the least frequently implemented workplace flexibility options in the United States, with only 29% of employers offering at least some employees the ability to job share (Matos & Galinsky, 2014).

Supporting ongoing efforts to implement workplace flexibility in the federal government, in 2010 the United States Congress signed the Telework Enhancement Act promoting the use of telework in government agencies (US Office of Personnel Management, 2011). In line with these trends, during the course of the 2012 fiscal year the United States Office of Personnel Management reported that 14% of Federal employees teleworked, a 2% increase from the previous year (US Office of Personnel Management, 2011).

Workplace flexibility has been and continues to be an issue of national interest in the United States. Employees of varying demographic backgrounds in the United States value and are interested in workplace flexibility (Matos & Galinsky, 2012), suggesting there is no specific person that is seeking or is the target of flexibility

policies and practices. Kossek and colleagues (2014) stated that flexibility “is soon expected to become the ‘new normal’ for conducting business” in the United States (p. 2).

The European Union. Findings from recent studies and reports suggest somewhat similar trends in the European Union (EU) to those in the United States regarding the availability and use of workplace flexibility. The Third European Company Survey (ECS; Eurofound, 2015) was conducted in 2013 assessing organizations in all twenty-eight member-states of the EU. In line with the findings from the National Study of Employers in the United States, the ECS found that 66% of employers offered what was described as “flexitime” to at least some employees and 69% allowed at least one employee to utilize part-time work (Eurofound, 2015). Research trends indicate an increase in some forms of workplace flexibility across European countries, with part-time work being the most common, seeing major growth in recent years, in part, as a way for employees to manage work and nonwork demands (Beham, Präg, & Drobnič, 2012; Eurofound, 2011). In a study assessing the timing of work in the twenty-eight EU countries during 2015, the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS; Eurofound, 2016) examined several common types of workplace flexibility policies and practices. The report identified that the majority of workers in the EU engaged in working time arrangements set by their organization with no possibility for change (56%). However, 18% of employees reported they had the ability to adapt their working hours within certain limits and 16% of employees reported they had complete control over the ability to determine the start and stop time of their workdays (Eurofound, 2016).

Despite the similarity to the United States regarding types of available policies, there were noticeable differences across EU regions (Eurofound, 2015; Giannikis, & Mihail, 2011). For instance, mostly western and northern EU countries (e.g., France, the United Kingdom, Denmark) indicated that 50% or more of organizations offered flexitime, with 90% of Denmark’s organizations offering at least some employees some degree of choice over the start and/or stop times of their work days. In contrast, several eastern EU countries (e.g., Croatia, Poland, Greece) had less than 50% of organizations offer at least some employees flexitime in 2013, which was a decrease from previous years’ surveys for some countries such as Bulgaria (Eurofound, 2015). The ECS report also points out that industry plays a large role in the extent to which organizations offer flexitime; as an example, 70% of organizations described as “financial” and 76% described as “other” offering flexitime to at least some employees compared to 56% of “construction” organizations. Despite reports of the rise of part-time work across Europe (Raghuram et al., 2001), the ECS (Eurofound, 2015) found there was stark variability across EU countries in the proportions of organizations offering at least one employee the ability to work part-time. The countries with the highest percentages of organizations offering part-time work in 2013 were again western and northern EU countries. Specifically, 93%, 90%, and 87% of organizations allowed at least one employee to work part-time in the Netherlands, Austria, and Belgium, respectively. However, only 14%, 22%, and 33% of organizations in Croatia, Portugal, and Cypress offered part-time work to at least one employee,

respectively (Eurofound, 2015). Interestingly, while 66% of employees in the EU reported that it was “fairly easy” or “very easy” to take an hour or two off during working time to attend to nonwork demands in 2015, similar to the findings from the ECS, the 2015 EWCS found that there was striking variability across countries. Only 42% of employees in the Czech Republic reported having this flexibility option compared to 85% of employees in the Netherlands (Eurofound, 2016).

In a study examining the factor analytic structure of what the researchers labeled “working time arrangement bundles” across twenty-one European countries, Chung and Tijdens (2013) identified differences in usage of policies based on regional cluster. Specifically, southern European countries (e.g., Spain, Hungary) indicated low average scores of usage of both employee- and employer-centered work time arrangements. However, the northern European cluster (e.g., Sweden, Denmark, Poland) frequently utilized arrangements that benefitted both employers and employees, such as flexible working hours and part-time work. Finally, continental and Anglo European countries (where weekly working hours are longer; e.g., the United Kingdom, France, Belgium) utilized more employer-centered work time arrangements such as overtime and shift work (Chung & Tijdens, 2013).

In comparison to other types of workplace flexibility, telework has been a relatively new arrangement for employees working in Europe (Raghuram et al., 2001) in comparison to organizations in the United States which have been utilizing telework for several decades (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). However, the results of the 2015 EWCS indicate the gap is closing, with similar patterns in telework usage in the EU to the United States. Specifically the report states that while 70% of employees in EU countries work in a central, regular work location, 30% conduct their work in multiple locations. Although there is at least some degree of work conducted away from the main work site by employees across all EU countries, the largest proportions reported were in the Nordic countries (40%) whereas the lowest were in Turkey (17%; Eurofound, 2016).

It is worth noting that the ECWS definition of employees who work in multiple work locations includes those who are self-employed, work at client sites, work from home, and work from public spaces. Further, the study defines telework as the practice of mainly working from home, excluding individuals who are self-employed who always work from home (Eurofound, 2016). In other words, it is unclear the extent to which the employees in the ECWS have control over their arrangement. As researchers have argued, telework policies that do not include employee control over the arrangement are not truly flexible (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Thompson et al., 2015). This may explain, in part, why the ECWS identified that individuals working from multiple locations were less likely to report that their working hours were a good fit with their family and social commitments (77%) than those who worked at a single main workplace (83%; Eurofound, 2016).

Researchers have identified trends regarding the cultural and regional differences in the availability, use, and outcomes associated with the various types of flex policies and practices across Europe (Raghuram et al., 2001; Stavrou & Kilaniotis, 2010). Raghuram and colleagues (2001) explain that shiftwork use has been

associated with specific cultural values, such as high collectivism, low uncertainty avoidance, and high power distance. Similarly, the authors found associations between part-time work and low power distance as well as individualistic value systems.

Similarly, attitudes toward the amount of weekly work hours may also partially explain the frequency of use of various types of flexibility practices. Countries such as the United Kingdom view longer workweeks as socially acceptable, whereas France, the Netherlands, and Sweden have established more welfare models that have led to shorter workweeks (Eurofound, 2011). These trends have led to the expansion of part-time work as a means of managing work and nonwork demands. A particularly noteworthy reform occurred in France in 2016 when Law no. 2016–1088 was adopted by the French parliament and signed into law, in an effort to define what working time means (Eurofound, 2017). One of the most controversial provisions to the law was the “right to disconnect,” enacted in January 2017. The goal of this amendment was to encourage organizations to respect employees’ nonwork hours by enacting a fine of up to 1% of the employees’ total remuneration for organizations who fail to comply with the requirements surrounding the use of electronic communication after work hours (Boring, 2017).

In addition to cultural distinctions, economic differences throughout the last few decades across European countries have impacted family development patterns, influencing the uptake of various family-related flexibility policies (Robila, 2012). While policies such as maternity leave are very common and often even longer in organizations in Eastern Europe than Western countries (Robila, 2012), other forms of workplace flexibility are less frequently observed. In addition, lack of access to quality and affordable childcare in some countries incentivizes some parents to utilize part-time work arrangements (Eurofound, 2011). Therefore, there seem to be a number of motives underlying the frequency of availability and usage of various policies and practices across the European Union.

Asia Pacific region. In contrast to findings in the United States and the EU, results from reports and studies examining countries in the Asia Pacific region suggest that employees working in these countries are less likely to have access to workplace flexibility policies and practices. In a study of representatives of multinational corporations operating in eleven countries in the Asia Pacific region, the Boston College Center for Work and Family (2007) found that 57% of respondents indicated their company has some sort of formal workplace flexibility policy in their operating country (but not necessarily all countries in which the company is located). Forty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that the workplace flexibility policies were available to all employees while 48% also said that these policies were only available to full-time employees.

The 2016 Hays Asia Salary guide assessed over three thousand employers across Asia on their hiring and salary practices, representing six million employees (Hays Recruitment, 2016). In line with the findings from the Boston College Center for Work and Family, the report found that 57% of employers indicated they allow

flexible work practices. Of the employers offering flexible work practices, the most frequently offered policy was flexible working hours (70%) with the next most common practices being flexplace (49%) and part-time employment (29%). Only 10% of the employers indicated they offer job sharing (Hays Recruitment, 2016).

Although the availability of flexibility policies and practices has been notably lower in organizations operating in Asia Pacific region countries, some notable cultural trends have emerged across reports and research. For example, China's collectivist and paternalistic culture influences specific policy availability and therefore the unique work-life obstacles facing Chinese employees. Specifically, the "one-child policy" has seemingly led to a decrease in childcare demands for married couples, suggesting a potential decrease in need for policies and practices providing employees with greater ability to manage work and life demands. However, both child and elder care duties are still disproportionately placed upon women who also predominately work full-time (Cooke & Jing, 2009). This imbalance in work and nonwork demands may mean that women in China and countries with similar cultures could benefit from increased access to flexibility policies and practices.

In a study of the experiences of 1,834 high-potential employees working in nine Asian countries, Sabattini and Carter (2012) identified that while 67% of men and 62% of women agreed that their organization provided enough flexibility to manage work and personal life demands (gender differences were driven by China, Malaysia, and Thailand), an implementation gap or "mismatch" existed between what employees felt they needed and what was offered by their organizations. Specifically, the authors identified a discrepancy for more than 80% of participants between the workplace flexibility available and their stated work-life needs. Similarly, the researchers found that women were less likely (46%) to aspire to achieve a senior executive role as their ultimate career position compared to men (64%). Both groups cited job pressures, long hours, stress on relationships, and other life priorities as the primary reasons for their decision not to pursue senior leadership (Sabattini & Carter, 2012). These findings may be due in part to expectations for women to perform caregiving roles outside of the workplace. In other words, women in some Asian countries may be less likely to pursue their preferred career trajectories due to gendered cultural expectations as well as a lack of options to help them manage work and life demands. When asked about ways employers could help employees better manage work and life demands, participants indicated concerns of facetime and long hours, suggesting interest in flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting and flextime (Sabattini & Carter, 2012).

Some researchers have pointed out the importance of monetary and material rewards in alleviating work-life conflict issues for Chinese employees (Cooke & Jing, 2009). Employees with higher incomes are able to utilize their resources to offset nonwork demands (e.g., via childcare); conversely employees without the same resources are compelled to work more hours to supplement wages, thus contributing to a culture valuing long working hours (Chandra, 2012). This shift of focus on utilizing monetary resources as a method of work-life boundary management may contribute to a perceived lack of need for workplace policies that support

employees' ability to manage work and life demands. In other words, organizations may not clearly see a need for flexibility policies and practices because many employees are able to address work–life concerns by utilizing monetary resources earned through increased work hours, despite preferences for reduced work hours and increased work–life balance (Sabattini & Carter, 2012).

In response to growing employee work–life conflict, some employers in China offer collective employee bonding opportunities as well as financial mechanisms for relieving these strains, rather than employee control-based work arrangements that are more commonly utilized in Western cultures. Specifically, some employers offer opportunities among and between employees to provide emotional support for one another as well as monetary donations to colleagues undergoing challenging life demands (e.g., sick child or parent; Cooke & Jing, 2009). Willingness and dedication to work in the face of family demands and conflict reflect the Chinese work ethic as well as the strong collectivist culture (Cooke & Jing, 2009). There is a general mindset across many Asian countries that employees should be present in the office (Boston College Center for Work and Family, 2007), which may translate to the infrequent availability and use of certain types of flexibility policies, such as telework arrangements.

Similar trends have developed in other Asian countries, where long work hours are the norm and gender inequality may be the driving mechanism underlying work–life conflict. In contrast to efforts made in Western countries, socialization in Asian countries still primarily reinforces gender-based division of labor (Chandra, 2012). In Japan, 60% of men work forty-three or more hours each week compared to only 30% of women who work the same long hours (Boston College Center for Work & Family, 2000). Organizations and human resource programs view work–life balance as an individual-level issue to be handled by employees, rather than through employer provided policies. Rather than offer policies that support flexibility in managing life demands around long working hours, employers attempt to reduce the negative effects experienced by employees from the long work hours (Chandra, 2012). Although many of the policies do not specifically target work–life balance, some organizations in Asian countries offer more formalized support for women's roles as caregivers. For instance, in Bangladesh mothers (but not fathers) are eligible for three months of paid leave following childbirth (Jesmin & Seward, 2011), a policy that is still not nationally prescribed in the United States. This suggests that providing policies and practices that reinforce stereotypical gender roles is an accepted aspect of work in some Asian countries.

Conceptualizations of “flexible” employment practices may differ cross-culturally such that some organizations focus on flexibility that meets organizational goals, rather than employees' attempts to manage or gain control over their competing work and life demands. For example, MacVaugh and Evans (2012) recently concluded that Japanese organizations have what the authors call “historically flexible employment practices” in comparison to Western organizations, utilizing part-time work, job-sharing, and short-term contracts. However, providing these types of policies may suggest an emphasis on employer-focused needs (e.g., client availability, overtime requirements) rather than a desire to identify a mutually beneficial arrangement to support both the employees and employer. In a multinational study of the impact of workplace flexibility on

employees, Japanese employees reported they only somewhat agreed that flexible work options have a positive impact on work/family balance and job success, the lowest of any country surveyed (Bhate, 2013). Thus, it may be the case that flexibility policies in some organizations have not been viewed as particularly beneficial as they may not have been developed or implemented with the recognition that employee control over work demands is an important component of successful flexibility policies.

Flexibility in Africa. The prevalence of and access to policies offering employee control over when, where, or how work is conducted appear to be much less frequent for employees in African countries compared to Western countries. There has been very little research conducted examining organizational policies and practices in African countries, particularly those designed to facilitate the management of work and life demands. Clear estimates of the frequency of availability and use do not seem to be readily available at a comparable level to the other geographic regions discussed in this chapter. However, some research has been conducted that examines work–life issues in this area and the emerging trends are discussed below.

Managing work and nonwork demands has been conceptualized quite differently in the developing countries in Africa. One potential explanation for this is that the socioeconomic conditions of the labor force as well as ongoing health crises have motivated different policy concerns for working adults in these countries compared to employees working in Western, more industrialized countries (Smit, 2011). As Dancaster and Baird (2016) explain, “not only has HIV/AIDS exacerbated care concerns, but also conditions of poverty, an increase in female labour force participation and minimal state infrastructure for those in need of care have contributed to what has been referred to as a ‘care crisis’ in South Africa” (p. 456). Due to these and other issues, little research has examined the prevalence of human resources policies and practices specifically aimed at improving work–family conflict in African countries. Instead, research has primarily focused on other types of healthcare policies and infrastructure support that organizations may offer.

While policies explicitly targeting work–family conflict are infrequent, formal attempts to support parenthood are prominent. Van der Meulen-Rodgers (1999), states that “maternity leave provisions are just as prevalent among developing countries” as in developed and Western countries (p. 18). Similarly, many of the South African Development Community (SADC) countries provide forms of maternal health protection policies, such as policies in Madagascar and Tanzania that protect women from strenuous work and dangerous working conditions during pregnancy and up to three months following their recovery period (Smit, 2011). Additionally, many SADC countries have legislation protecting pregnant women from working at night as well as the rights of women to breastfeed while at work (Smit, 2011).

Despite the lack of research examining traditionally defined flexibility policies, some researchers have examined these issues by broadening the scope of inquiry. In a study examining the frequency and patterns of what the researchers labeled “work–care arrangements” available in organizations listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange, Dancaster and Baird (2016) found that the overall adoption of arrangements across all categories was low. Interestingly, the study identified that the most frequently adopted

practice was organizationally provided information about HIV/AIDS facilities and programs (81%). The authors suggest this is not surprising given the legal recommendations for organizations in South Africa (Dancaster & Baird, 2016). In addition, the authors also note that nearly 67% of the employers surveyed reported allowing employees to occasionally have flexible starting and finishing work times as well as nearly 45% of organizations reported allowing employees to work from home on an occasional basis. The authors found that both the proportion of females in senior management and the organizational size were characteristics that were associated with the adoption of flexible work arrangements in the surveyed African organizations (Dancaster & Baird, 2016).

Implementing Workplace Flexibility in Organizations to Manage a Multinational Workforce

Having discussed how workplace flexibility practices vary in a number of regions in the previous sections of this chapter, we turn now to issues in implementing workplace flexibility in a multinational work force. In this section, we consider the benefits, challenges, and strategies related to implementing workplace flexibility in global organizations.

Benefits of implementing workplace flexibility in global firms. Workplace flexibility affects global business success by enabling operations to run on a 24/7 basis, from service operations to manufacturing. By expanding the available times employees can work, employers also expand the number of days and hours they are able to meet organizational goals. Specifically, this enhances an organization's ability to produce work around the clock, which fosters efficient use of the workforce. Managing work 24/7 also helps foster the organizational ability to adjust hours to match customer availability. Specifically, companies can have operations running at different times around the world to match global customers' needs. For example, employees in Slovenia can work a second shift to match hours of customers in the United States in addition to providing labor cost savings compared to hiring a similar workforce in the United States (Kossek & Thompson, 2016). Creating shift schedules that provide employees with some degree of choice and control over their schedules may have the added benefit of increasing employee job control.

Workplace flexibility can also be used as part of a global supply chain to locate talent in the country where the skills and markets best match the organizational needs. This may foster the ability to adopt a customized menu of workplace flexibility practices linked to labor market solutions as part of a global workforce strategy. For example, in some countries, research and development (R&D) institutions may be located where particular universities and a highly skilled scientific workforce are available. However, in other countries, expertise may be provided on a cost-effective basis, rather than determined by the location of workers. For example, in order to maximize policy effectiveness, global firms might offer summer

hours or telework in order to attract and retain exclusive R&D talent for their professional workforce on an infrequent basis, rather than relocate an entire facility to a remote location. In contrast, offering policies such as flextime and reduced work hours to support a large group of employees' nonwork demands (e.g., time for family, classes to complete degrees) might be an effective strategy for maximizing workforce productivity of a service workforce located in a less developed country. Consequently, workplace flexibility policies should not only be used to facilitate employee management of work–life demands, but also to enable a firm to match the hours and schedules of employees in various regional labor markets to organizational needs in order to maximize productivity.

Another benefit of leveraging workplace flexibility in a global firm is that it can enhance attraction and retention by offering opportunities for a global career. Expatriates may be more likely to want to work for firms that allow employees to experience different work–life cultures from their home society. For example, the United States and the United Kingdom are known for being more work-centric and having less access to long-term paid family leave with shared care between a father and mother. In these countries, work is seen as the primary duty of a responsible citizen – more so than spending time with raising a family or caring for elders (Patrick, 2012). Thus, offering an expatriate opportunity to work in a country with a more balanced life-centric approach, such as in a Scandinavian subsidiary, may be a way to attract and retain talent as well as cultivate a flexible global workforce.

Challenges of global flexibility. One noteworthy challenge that scholars have identified for multinational organizations seeking to implement flexibility policies is that the link between uses of flexible working arrangements and beneficial outcomes may vary by culture and type of practice. For example, one comparative study found that as flexibility related to what the authors called “unsocial hours” increased (e.g., overtime, shift work, weekend work) in Anglo countries, turnover increased correspondingly (Stavrou & Kilaniotis, 2010). In other words, the practices that may be effective in one country or industry may not be effective in another. Therefore, being able to adopt and manage different scheduling practices across cultures may add to organizational and management complexity and scheduling demands. This and other studies have raised questions about the comparative effectiveness of using similar flexible working arrangements internationally in global firms.

Further, the use of flexible practices may be beneficial for attracting a talented workforce, but organizational support for such policies as a means for managing work–life demands may depend on cultural factors. When used predominantly by women in countries lower in gender equality, flexibility practices may serve as barriers to women's labor force participation rather than facilitators. For example, one study of organizations across eight European countries found that organizations in countries high in gender empowerment were supportive of part-time work options, which corresponded to higher proportions of women employees. However, for organizations in countries that were lower in gender empowerment, the adoption of part-time work only corresponded to a greater proportion of women when there

were labor shortages (Stavrou, Casper, & Ierodiakonou, 2015). The authors contend that some organizations may offer workplace flexibility as a mechanism to support work–life balance, or in contrast, others may simply offer these policies to meet organizational recruitment goals or needs (Stavrou et al., 2015). Although these practices can be successful in attracting women to the labor market, they are likely to simultaneously serve as a barrier to women’s advancement to higher-level leadership positions, as few men use these practices, particularly in cultures that have rigidly prescribed gender roles. Thus, flexible work practices can serve to reinforce gender segregation as well as gendered working-time regimes in occupational groups and therefore limit women’s long-term ability to advance their careers (Kossek, Su, & Wu, 2016).

Another important challenge in managing workplace flexibility globally, compared to the United States, is that there are varying legal restrictions in the implementation of flexibility policies. For example, workplace flexibility is collectively bargained for in some countries, such as Australia. One study (Berg, Kossek, Baird, & Block, 2013) found that unpaid or family and health leave and paid annual vacation leave were much more likely to be in the collective bargaining contract in Australian universities unlike their US counterparts. Employers in global firms headquartered in countries where union contracts do not cover workplace flexibility will need to develop their knowledge in how to implement workplace flexibility as a collective workforce benefit.

A third important challenge for multinational flexibility is the perceived lack of facetime, or reduced benefits from face-to-face interaction (Van Dyne, Kossek, & Lobel, 2007). Managers and colleagues of employees working in other geographic locations may have trouble communicating at a distance through technology. This may lead to perceptions of poor performance due to miscommunication or failure to set expectations and goals. Colleagues may find working cooperatively in a new format using unfamiliar equipment to be an added challenge to the already present communication barriers. Further, additional obstacles may surface for employees working in virtual teams or in remote locations, such as lack of cross-cultural awareness and stigmas surrounding cultural differences.

Strategies for successful global flexibility. Organizations seeking to successfully implement workplace flexibility with a global strategic view should first recognize and understand variation in regional and cultural values. However, an important consideration for global firms is that while there are many comparative studies on workplace flexibility at the country level assessing the availability of different types of flexibility across nations, there is very little international work on workplace flexibility using organizational-level data (Chung & Tijdens, 2013). One useful tool for employers seeking to develop nuanced strategies across the EU is the European Establishment Survey on Working Time and Work–Life Balance (ESWT), which examines the different types of workplace flexibility practices used within a firm to foster functional skill, job, or headcount flexibility while simultaneously considering employees’ work preferences for managing work and

personal life demands. Another important consideration is Chung and Tijdens' (2013) three clusters of flexibility regimes: 1) a southern European cluster with Hungary and Slovenia where most employers do not commonly offer workplace flexibility policies to serve either employer or employee interests; 2) a northern European country cluster that includes the Czech Republic and Poland, where workplace flexibility practices are frequently used by both employees and employers; and 3) a third cluster involving the main European continent countries as well as Anglo-Saxon countries, where flexibility is used mainly to meet employer needs with some moderate attention to employee preferences. Organizations in the third cluster typically offer more flexibility options than the first (the southern European countries) but less than the highly employee-centric, labor market-responsive Northern countries of the second cluster. Multinational organizations seeking to implement global workplace flexibility policies should identify how regional differences in preferences for and availability of workplace flexibility can influence the success of specific policies across sites. Utilizing knowledge of regional differences can help in the successful design and implementation of cross-national policies and practices within a single organization.

A second strategy organizations may consider is to design global flexibility policies that allow for customization across geographic locations (as laws, customs, and cultural values differ quite a bit depending on area). This approach may vary by level and nature of the global workforce. For example, large multinationals (e.g., IBM, Facebook) might adopt a global calendar with commonly utilized workdays and similar telework policies for the professional and manager workforce. However, for workers at the middle and lower levels, organizations might adopt the holiday calendar of the local country as the hours and working time may vary greatly across nations.

A third useful strategy might be to adopt employee training for employees on how to work with other employees across global time zones. Here, employees and managers might be trained in how to work and communicate with employees working at a distance via technology as well as how to overcome barriers that can cause remote employees to be viewed as less effective than face-to-face colleagues due to lack of facetime and communication issues. Training in cultural intelligence to show patience and understanding of accents and learning to speak slowly when on a conference call may be useful for enabling a virtual global workforce. Additionally, training in managing boundaries when working across time zones to allow employees to feel more in control of their working time (Kossek & Thomson, 2016) may be useful for global teams to be able to respect the flexible working hours of colleagues in another time zone. Here the teams might also engage in role play to discuss how to respect the national holidays, leisure time, and sleep hours of remote colleagues as well as agree to core global working hours so that some employees in one country are not always expected to take 2 a.m. calls when working with colleagues or customers across time zones. Finally, setting clear expectations among team members about communication patterns and task deadlines can facilitate positive work experiences.

Areas for Future Research

Given the vast differences in the amount of research assessing workplace flexibility across geographic regions, there is a clear need for additional research assessing both availability and use of common forms of flexibility in areas where little research has been conducted. For example, little research to date has adequately examined the frequency of availability and use of major types of flexible policies and practices in African countries, South American countries, or Australia. Similarly, little research has compared policies usage and effectiveness within multinational organizations located in meaningfully different geographic regions.

Additionally, future research is needed to understand how specific and unique cultural differences relate to flexibility availability and use, particularly in regards to relatively understudied or geographically specific cultural values. For example, Ashforth and colleagues (2000) maintain that the need for segmentation of work and life roles may differ as a function of cultures. Therefore, organizations in countries whose cultures value separation between work and life demands may be less likely to offer flexibility policies such as telework.

Finally, an important avenue for future research is the relationship between policies and societal and labor force outcomes. Specifically, many organizations offer workplace flexibility policies so that employees can more easily manage work and non-work demands. However, as previously discussed, some organizations (and cultures) do not view this as the goal of these policies, but rather flexibility is a means to meet organizational goals (e.g., attracting a sufficient labor force). Differences in gender roles and expectations of the demographics of the workforce across countries may reveal interesting patterns relative to the prevalence of flexibility policies as societal values shift. Relatedly, as multinational organizations continue to grow in number, their expansion may correspond with cultural shifts in expectations of the workforce.

Conclusions

Implementing successful global workplace flexibility initiatives requires considerable theoretical knowledge and cultural awareness as the meaning and application of flexibility differs vastly both within and across countries. It is critical for multinational organizations wishing to utilize flexibility to meet their own needs and expand practices to take time to become familiar with the interests of the various stakeholder groups when designing and executing new approaches to flexibility.

Research suggests that flexibility is increasing in availability and use across the world. As cultural values and norms shift, so too will organizational practices designed to meet the demands of the workforce. As a part of a new, results-driven work culture, many organizations have begun to embrace the benefits that flexible options can provide to meet client, employee, and organizational goals. However, in order to remain competitive in a global marketplace, companies must also recognize the nuanced nature of implementing international business strategies.

References

- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology, 66*, 345–376.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management review, 25*(3), 472–491.
- Baltes, B. B., Briggs, T. E., Huff, J. W., Wright, J. A., & Neuman, G. A. (1999). Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria.
- Beham, B., Präg, P., & Drobnič, S. (2012). Who's got the balance? A study of satisfaction with the work–family balance among part-time service sector employees in five western European countries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23* (18), 3725–3741. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.654808
- Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work–family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(3), 487–500.
- Berg, P., Kossek, E. E., Baird, M., & Block, R. N. (2013). Collective bargaining and public policy: Pathways to work-family policy adoption in Australia and the United States. *European Management Journal, 31*(5), 495–504.
- Berg, P., Kossek, E., Misra, K., & Belman, D. (2014). Do unions matter for work-life flexibility policy access and use? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 67*(1), 111–136.
- Boston College Center for Work and Families. (2007). *What companies are doing, why they are doing it and what lies ahead*. A report prepared for the members of the global workforce roundtable.
- Boston College Center for Work and Families (2010). *Work and family issues in Japan and the Republic of Korea: Expanding our understanding of work and family experiences in North Asia*. Wallace E. Carroll School of Management.
- Bhate, R. (2013). Flexibility at work: Employee perceptions. The Sloan Center on Aging & Work at Boston College.
- Boring, N. (2017, Jan). France: Right to disconnect takes effect. *Global Legal Monitor*. The Library of Congress: United States. Retrieved from: www.loc.gov/law/foreign-news/article/france-right-to-disconnect-takes-effect
- Brewster, C., Mayne, L., & Tregaskis, O. (1997). Flexible working in Europe. *Journal of World Business, 32*(2), 133–151. doi:10.1016/S1090-9516(97)90004-3
- Chandra, V. (2012). Work–life balance: Eastern and Western perspectives. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23*(5), 1040–1056. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.651339
- Chung, H., & Tijdens, K. (2013). Working time flexibility components and working time regimes in Europe: using company-level data across 21 countries. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(7), 1418–1434.
- Cooke, F. L., & Jing, X. (2009). Work–life balance in China: Sources of conflicts and coping strategies. *NHRD Network Journal, 2*(3), 18–28.
- Dancaster, L., & Baird, M. (2016). Predictors of the adoption of work–care arrangements: a study of South African firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(4), 456–475.
- Eaton, S. C. (2003). If you can use them: Flexibility policies, organizational commitment, and perceived performance. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society, 42* (2), 145–167.

- Eurofound. (2011). *Part-Time Work in Europe*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Retrieved from: www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/pubdocs/2010/86/en/3/EF1086EN.pdf
- Eurofound. (2015). *Workplace practices: Patterns, performance and well-being*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Retrieved: <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1448&context=intl>
- Eurofound. (2016). *Sixth European Working Conditions Survey – Overview report*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Retrieved from: www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/report/2016/working-conditions/sixth-european-working-conditions-survey-overview-report
- Eurofound. (2017). *France: New rules on working time enter into force*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Retrieved from: www.eurofound.europa.eu/observatories/eurwork/articles/france-new-rules-on-working-time-enter-into-force
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1524.
- Giannikis, S. K., & Mihail, D. M. (2011). Flexible work arrangements in Greece: A study of employee perceptions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22* (2), 417–432. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.540163
- Hays Recruitment. (2016). *2016 Hays Salary Guide – Asia*. Retrieved from: www.hays.cn/cs/groups/hays_common/@cn/@content/documents/digitalasset/hays_314891.pdf
- Hill, J., Grzywacz, J., Allen, S., Blanchard, V., Matz-Costa, C., Shulkin, S., & Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (2008). Defining and conceptualizing workplace flexibility. *Community, Work and Family, 11*, 149–163.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied psychology, 50*(3), 337–421.
- Jesmin, S. S., & Seward, R. R. (2011). Parental leave and fathers' involvement with children in Bangladesh: A comparison with United States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 42*(1), 95–112.
- Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Thompson, R. J., & Burke, L. B. (2014). Leveraging workplace flexibility: Fostering engagement and productivity. *SHRM Foundation's Effective Practice Guidelines Series*. Alexandria, VA: SHRM Foundation.
- Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work–family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(2), 347–367.
- Kossek, E. E., Thompson, R. J., & Lautsch, B. A. (2015). Balanced Workplace Flexibility. *California Management Review, 57*(4), 5–25.
- Kossek, E. E., & Lee, M. (2008). Implementing a reduced-workload arrangement to retain high talent: A case study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11*, 49–64.
- Kossek, E. E., & Michel, J. (2011). Flexible work scheduling. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial-Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 535–572). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work–family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work–family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(2), 289–313.

- Kossek, E. E., & Thompson, R. J. (2016). Workplace flexibility: Integrating employer and employee perspectives to close the research–practice implementation gap. In T. Allen & L. Eby (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*, 255.
- Kossek, E. E., Su, R., & Wu, L. (2016). “Opting out” or “pushed out”? Integrating perspectives on women’s career equality for gender inclusion and interventions. *Journal of Management*, 43, 228–254.
- Lee, M. D., MacDermid, S. M., & Buck, M. L. (2000). Organizational paradigms of reduced-load work: Accommodation, elaboration, and transformation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1211–1226.
- MacVaugh, J., & Evans, J. (2012). A re-examination of flexible employment practices in Japan. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(6), 1245–1258. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.561237
- Matos, K., & Galinsky, E. (2014). *2014 National Study of Employers*. Families and Work Institute.
- Myers, C. G. (2016). Where in the world are the workers? Cultural underrepresentation in IO research. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(01), 144–152.
- Patrick, R. (2012). Work as the primary ‘duty’ of the responsible citizen: a critique of this work-centric approach. *People, Place & Policy Online*, 6(1).
- Raghuram, S., London, M., & Larsen, H. H. (2001). Flexible employment practices in Europe: Country versus culture. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(5), 738–753. doi:10.1080/09585190110047811
- Robila, M. (2012). Family policies in Eastern Europe: A focus on parental leave. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 21(1), 32–41. doi:10.1007/s10826-010-9421-4
- Sabattini, L., & Carter, N. M. (2012). Expanding work–life perspectives: Talent management in Asia. New York, NY: Catalyst.
- Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2007). When flexibility helps: Another look at the availability of flexible work arrangements and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71, 479–493. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.006
- Simard, C., Henderson, A. D., Gilmartin, S. K., Schiebinger, L., & Whitney, T. (2008). *Climbing the technical ladder: Obstacles and solutions for mid-level women in technology*. Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research, Stanford University, Anita Borg Institute for Women and Technology.
- Smit, R. (2011). Family-related policies in Southern African countries: Are working parents reaping any benefits? *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 42(1), 15–36.
- Smith, L., Folkard, S., Tucker, P., & Macdonald, I. (1998). Work shift duration: a review comparing eight hour and 12 hour shift systems. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 55(4), 217–229.
- Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., Poelmans, S., Allen, T. D., O’Driscoll, M., Sanchez, J. I., . . . & Lu, L. (2004). A cross-national comparative study of work-family stressors, working hours, and well-being: China and Latin America versus the Anglo world. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 119–142.
- Stavrou, E. T., Casper, W. J., & Ierodiakonou, C. (2015). Support for part-time work as a channel to female employment: the moderating effects of national gender empowerment and labour market conditions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(6), 688–706.
- Stavrou, E., & Kilaniotis, C. (2010). Flexible work and turnover: An empirical investigation across cultures. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2), 541–554.

- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*(3), 392–415.
- Thompson, R. J., Payne, S. C., & Taylor, A. B. (2015). Applicant attraction to flexible work arrangements: Separating the influence of flextime and flexplace. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88*(4), 726–749
- US Department of Labor (1993). Wage and Hour Division. Family and Medical Leave Act. Retrieved from www.dol.gov/whd/fmla
- US Office of Personnel Management (2011). *Guide to telework in the federal government*. Retrieved from: www.telework.gov/guidance-legislation/telework-guidance/telework-guide/guide-to-telework-in-the-federal-government.pdf
- Van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (1999). *Protecting women and promoting equality in the labor market: Theory and evidence*. World Bank, Development Research Group, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network.
- Van Dyne, L., Kossek, E., & Lobel, S. (2007). Less need to be there: Cross-level effects of work practices that support work–life flexibility and enhance group processes and group-level OCB. *Human Relations, 60*(8), 1123–1154.
- Voyandoff, P. (2005). Consequences of boundary-spanning demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and perceived stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 491–503. DOI: 10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.491