Using a number of empirical studies of human resource policies in Fortune 500 companies, this article focuses on (a) the major work/family problems faced by employees, (b) how work/family programs affect productivity, (c) what trends are emerging among companies, and (d) how a subsample of leading scientific companies and universities are responding to work/family issues. The seven major issues employees face are examined: child care, elder care, work time and timing, relocation, job demands and autonomy, supervisory relationships, and organizational culture. The major characteristics of Stage 1 and Stage 2 companies are compared, the later companies having more comprehensive and multifaceted programs that are responsive to employee needs. The research indicates that although some of the leading corporations and universities are responsive to work/family problems, many are still not aware of nor responsive to work/family strain and conflict.

The Impact of Human Resource Policies on Employees

Balancing Work/Family Life*

ELLEN GALINSKY
Families and Work Institute, New York City

PETER J. STEIN
William Paterson College

The dramatic increase in the number of dual-earner families and single parents in the labor force indicates that a growing number of workers are also responsible for the care of young children and elderly parents. These changes have an impact on both family and work life.

For families, such changes have meant high levels of work/family stress. For employees, it has meant attracting and retaining qualified workers in an economy experiencing labor shortages. The balancing of work and home life generates stress.

This article examines company policies aimed at improving employees' ability to manage job and family responsibilities. Studies assessing

the outcome of these family-responsive programs show positive results, but there are many obstacles to establishing these programs, and nationwide, few employees are served.

Specifically, we address several questions:

1. What major work/family problems do employees face?
2. How have a sample of leading universities and scientific companies responded to work/family issues?
3. How do work/family programs affect productivity?
4. What trends are emerging among companies?

The data for this article comes from existing studies of American corporations and from a number of studies conducted by the staff of the Families and Work Institute (FWI). The staff of the institute is currently completing a study of the human resource policies among the Fortune 500 companies (Galinsky & Friedman, in press). The results presented in this article are based on interviews with human resource vice-presidents and directors of 71 Fortune 500 corporations.

To understand the dynamics of how programs develop and have an impact on employees, we compare 10 major organizations, five corporations, and five universities, known as leaders in the field of science.

WHAT MAJOR WORK/FAMILY
PROBLEMS DO EMPLOYEES FACE?

Our research has identified seven major issues faced by employees: child care, elder care, work time and timing, relocation, job demands and job autonomy, supervisory relationships, and organizational culture.

CHILD CARE

Child care means the full-time care and education of children under the age of 6 as well as before and after-school care for older children. Our research identifies four sources of stress concerning child care:

Child care is difficult to find and obtain. In a nationally representative sample of 405 dual-earner couples with children 12 years old and under, we found that one of every three parents of infants and toddlers, and one of every four parents of preschoolers had a "difficult" or "very difficult" time finding child care (Galinsky & Hughes, 1987).

Learning about available sources of child care represents only part of this process. Obtaining it is another potentially stressful part. In one needs assessment of a major corporation located in a suburban area of New Jersey, 54% of parents reported that it had been "difficult" or "very difficult" to make their current child-care arrangements and that such difficulty was a major predictor of parents' absenteeism (Galinsky, 1988a).

Some child care arrangements are more satisfactory than others. A recent study has shown a small but significant link between the child care quality, as professionally assessed, and mothers' stress (Shinn, Galinsky, & Gulcor, 1990). Other research on this issue has concentrated on how different types of child care affect parents on the job. For example, one study found that having a latchkey child is significantly linked to higher rates of absenteeism. The average employee misses 7 to 9 days of work per year (Emlen, 1987). When their children are in self-care — at home alone or with siblings — employees miss approximately 13 days of work per year.

Parents are forced to put together a patchwork system of care that tends to fall apart. Research indicates that most employed parents do not make just one child-care arrangement for each child. At Merck & Company, Inc. in Rahway, New Jersey, for example, employees averaged 1.7 arrangements per child and the more arrangements parents had, the more likely these were to break down (Hughes, 1987). In another study, one in four employed fathers and mothers scrambled to make frequent last-minute arrangements because the regular arrangements had broken down. Such breakdowns in child-care arrangements had a direct impact on work. Workers who had to make more last-minute, ad hoc arrangements were more likely to arrive late, leave work early, or to be absent all together. They were more likely to spend unproductive time on the job because they were worried about their children. Such parents were more prone to higher levels of stress, more likely to suffer from tension, and to feel less satisfied as parents (Galinsky, 1988a).

Child care is expensive. Despite the low salaries of child-care workers, the cost of child care strains many family budgets. For families who pay for child care, the cost runs from 10-25% of their family budget. Lower-income families pay a disproportionately higher percentage of their earned income than do middle- or upper-income families — often as much as they pay for housing (Hofferth, 1988).

A NEW AREA OF CONCERN: ELDER CARE

Elder care means providing some type of assistance with the daily living activities for an elderly relative who is chronically frail, ill, or disabled. Our research in one company indicated that one of every four employees responsible for the care of elderly relatives had problems with the cost of services needed and one in five employees worried about the relative while on the job (Lurie, Galinsky, & Staines, 1988).

WORK TIME AND TIMING

Working long hours is problematic. In an earlier survey of employed parents, we found that 37% of the men and 13% of the women worked over 50 hours per week (Galinsky & Hughes, 1987). Employees who worked more hours had higher levels of stress. How work hours mesh with other family members' schedules as well as with when community facilities are open (such as doctors, dentists, banks, schools) is also critically important. The Quality of Employment Survey showed how schedule incompatibility was problematic, especially for women (Pleck, Staines, & Lang, 1980; Staines & Pleck, 1983).

RELOCATION

In one needs assessment study (Rodgers, 1988), it was found that over 20% of the men and nearly 40% of the women with children surveyed turned down jobs that involved relocation. Yet, data indicates that family obligations are more likely to be changed than are work obligations. The inflexibility of many jobs makes balancing work/family demands even more difficult, and women especially may have no choice but to "bend" parenting rather than job responsibility (Rodgers, 1988).

JOB AUTONOMY AND JOB DEMANDS

Factors such as job autonomy and job demands also can have a significant impact on employees. We found that when employees have the power to solve the work problems they face, they are likely to have a lower level of stress and feel that their job causes less interference with their family life (Hughes & Galinsky, 1988).

SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP

Our research indicates that the relationship with the supervisor is one of the most powerful predictors of work/family problems. Supervisory support lowers stress; lack of supervisory support tends to increase stress.

Supervisory work/family support occurs when supervisors (a) feel that handling family issues, especially as they affect the job performance, is a legitimate part of the role, (b) are knowledgeable about company policies that apply to family issues, (c) are flexible when work/family problems arise, and (d) handle employees' work/family problems fairly and without favoritism (Galinsky, 1988b). Supervisory work/family support is linked to employees' perception that they can balance work/family problems. In fact, the National Council of Jewish Women's study (1988) of almost 2,000 employed women before and after childbirth in 80 communities found that having a supportive supervisor was roughly equivalent to having a supportive spouse in its effect on stress. In the Merck study, male employees with supportive supervisors reported lower levels of stress and fewer stress-related health problems, and female employees reported less stress (Hughes & Galinsky, 1988).

SUPPORTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Both quantitative and qualitative data of corporations indicate the importance of a "family-friendly" organizational culture. For example, in one needs assessment at a telecommunication company with nearly 4,000 employees, we found that of all the job conditions assessed, culture was the most significant. It was predictive of stress-related health problems, parents worrying about their children while at work, and the perception that child-care problems impair productivity (Lurie, Galinsky, & Hughes, 1988).

THE DYNAMICS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: HOW HAVE A SAMPLE OF SCIENTIFIC COMPANIES AND LEADING UNIVERSITIES RESPONDED TO WORK/FAMILY ISSUES?

Work and family issues have become increasingly salient to corporations, primarily because of an increasingly diverse work force and labor shortages. Of the Fortune 500 companies we interviewed, to date, 86% plan to introduce new work/family programs in the next few years (Galinsky & Friedman, in press). The major reasons companies give for

a commitment to work/family issues are to improve recruitment and retention (41%), to increase morale (21%), to reduce stress (18%), and to keep up with the competition (15%). Cited as the greatest obstacles to new programs were cost (40%), lack of information about employees' needs (18%), issues of equity (15%), and lack of evidence of long-term benefits of work/family efforts (13%).

In order to examine the dynamics of program development, we focused on 10 organizations that have developed a number of supportive policies. The five corporations in this sample tend to appear on every list of progressive companies: IBM, Merck, Digital Equipment Company, Johnson & Johnson, and AT&T (Bell Labs). The five universities in the sample compete with the five corporations in the recruitment and retention of top scientists: MIT, Stanford, University of California at Berkeley, Harvard, and University of Texas at Austin. The population of the scientific community both at universities and corporations has changed in past years with more women researchers, scientists, and professors, and their presence has contributed to the rising importance of work/family issues in that setting.

Although more of the focus has been on top scientists, our research indicates that, increasingly, organizations have come to perceive work/family issues as having an impact on the entire work force. There has been a rapid expansion in the attention given to these issues in both the universities and the corporations.

What policies have been developed and how are they supportive of employees?

DEPENDENT CARE POLICIES: CHILD CARE AND ELDER CARE.

Assistance in locating child care. Our research indicates that, generally, most organizations tend to buy into the services of existing agencies to provide child-care resource and referral rather than creating their own. Merck has a contract with Work/Family Directions to provide information and counseling for their employees nationwide. Berkeley has a contract with an agency called Bananas, and MIT uses the Child Care Resource Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Assistance in obtaining child care. Helping employees find child care is not simply a matter of handing an employee list of names. The supply of child care may be inadequate to fill the need. IBM, for example, has increased the supply of child-care providers by 50,000 since the inception of its resource and referral (R&R) service in 1984. The Work/Family

Directions nationwide network of R&R agencies has recruited about 34,000 family day care providers, helped to start over 7,000 day care centers, and recruited about 2,000 in-home providers.

Assistance in improving the quality of child care. Another essential ingredient of R&R is the training of local child-care professionals. For example, MIT's Child Care office both trains and supervises its network of family child-care providers with a special emphasis on providing high quality multicultural environments. Stanford and Berkeley also train and supervise family child-care providers, mostly the wives of graduate students living on campus.

Another way that these organizations deal with the supply and quality of child care is to provide their own. MIT has one on-site child-care center in two separate campus locations. Stanford has three child-care centers on campus, Harvard has seven on-site centers, Berkeley has eight. On-site child-care centers are typically open Monday through Friday during the day, but Stanford's child-care center is also open on Saturdays from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and till 11:30 p.m. during the week.

Although on-site child care is less common in the corporate field than at universities, three of the companies we interviewed offered on- or near-site care. Merck helped a group of parent employees establish their own center by providing seed money. Its employees' Center for Young Children currently services 70 children but has a waiting list of 75 to 100. Thus in 1987-88, Merck provided funds to build a new facility to serve twice as many children. Johnson & Johnson's center for 200 children at company headquarters in New Brunswick opened in May 1990, and there will be a second center in Somerville, New Jersey.

Bell Labs, rather than build their own center, arranged for a local agency, Summit Child Care, to expand their centers and provide preferential admission for Bell Labs employees. In 1989, in negotiations with the Communication Workers of America (CWA), AT&T management agreed to establish a 10-million-dollar fund to be used to address child and elder care issues. Merck also made an arrangement with a local day-care center to serve its West Point, Pennsylvania facility. In addition, Merck works with the city of Rahway to establish a community child-care program. MIT has followed a similar path, helping to establish and staff a center for the community's homeless children.

Organizations have addressed the issue of the frequent breakdown in child care by determining that a frequent cause of this breakdown is children's illness. Johnson & Johnson's center provides care for mildly ill

children at its New Brunswick site. Stanford also recently introduced care for mildly ill children in one of its off-site child-care centers.

Financial assistance. All five universities provide flexible spending accounts. Employees may reduce their salaries by up to $5,000 and deposit these pretax dollars into a company account designated to reimburse child-care expenses. Johnson & Johnson and AT&T also established a flexible spending account.

Elder-care consultation and referral. Having children may be a choice, but having parents is not. IBM was a pioneer in developing elder-care consultation and referral when it opened this service in February 1988. Since then, 12,208 employees have used elder-care R&R, often for emergency help (such as locating assistance for a parent or in-law who has become ill). Merck has the same service, and Johnson & Johnson initiated its elder-care R&R in April 1989. None of the universities has developed R&R as a formal service, but there is an increasing awareness in the issues of elder care at all the universities.

TIME POLICIES

Our research indicates that time flexibility was the employees' first choice to improve their ability to balance their job and family responsibilities.

Flextime. All five companies have flextime (flexible starting and ending hours), but it is most widely used at Johnson & Johnson and Merck. Core hours at Johnson & Johnson are 10 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. At IBM, there is an hour's flexibility for arrival and departure time. At all of these companies, the implementation is left up to the supervisors. At all five universities, flextime is also left up to the discretion of the department.

Part-time work. All five universities also have part-time jobs with benefits; employees work a specified amount, ranging from 17.5 to 20 hours or more a week qualify for prorated benefits. These policies are well established at Stanford and widely used at Harvard, MIT, Berkeley, and University of Texas.

There is less use of part-time labor in corporations. Johnson & Johnson, however, unveiled a new program in 1990 for permanent part-time positions with prorated benefits. Experiences at some companies, how-

ever, indicate that women who choose to work part-time may fall into a lower career track.

Parental leave. All five corporations offer an unpaid, job-guaranteed leave beyond the disability period for mothers as well as for fathers and adoptive parents. The maximum leave ranges from 8 weeks at Digital Equipment to 6 months at Merck and a year at AT&T and Johnson & Johnson. IBM has recently inaugurated a 3-year leave plan. During the leave, an employee is entitled to continued health benefits and after 1 year, must work at some time to maintain his or her skills.

All the universities except Texas offer leaves. The maximum leave is 6 months at MIT and Stanford and 1 year at Harvard and Berkeley. At Texas, employees may use accumulated vacation or sick days. These policies vary, however, for different categories of staff, particularly for unionized staff. Digital Equipment and IBM subsidize adoption expenses as does Johnson & Johnson. None of the universities provides this type of financial assistance.

One of the most frequently requested provisions is personal days. Employees dislike being forced to lie when their children are sick; they want these days off to be legitimate days off. Johnson & Johnson has responded by providing a policy of "Family Emergency Absences." Among the universities, Harvard, MIT, and Stanford provide 3 personal days per year, and Stanford adds another 5 days for the care of family members.

AN EMERGENT TREND AMONG
CORPORATIONS IS SUPERVISORY TRAINING

In a nationally representative study of two-parent-working families, respondents were asked what changes would improve employees' quality of family life while maintaining or improving their productivity. The most frequent suggestion was for merit raises, but the second choice was to train supervisors to be more accommodating when family needs arose (Galinsky & Hughes, 1987). Research has clearly demonstrated that work/family policies are ineffectual if supervisors do not support them (Hughes & Galinsky, 1988).

Merck was the first company to add a module on work/family sensitivity to its regular supervisory training. Furthermore, they have included interpersonal skills as a job evaluation category for all supervisors.

IBM and Johnson & Johnson launched supervisory work/family training in 1989. This issue has not been addressed as fully in the universities.

OTHER PROGRAMS

These 10 organizations have developed many other innovative work family programs:

- At AT&T, there are work/family support groups for employed parents.
- All five companies and five universities offer seminars for employees on various aspects of balancing job and family responsibilities, elder care, fathering, and so forth.
- Employee assistance programs (EAPs) programs now include work and family counseling.

— Johnson & Johnson Live for Life program provides a model of a comprehensive program devoted to health promotion, stress reduction, and wellness.

— Four of five universities—Stanford, Harvard, Berkeley, and MIT—have EAP programs dealing with work/family issues. Individuals and families are counseled, mostly on a short-term basis. MIT has no limits on the number of sessions; the other three universities provide short-term counseling accompanied with outside referrals. There is no EAP program at Texas as yet, but there is interest in this service.

— MIT and Harvard have sponsored caregiver fairs—forums for local agencies to provide information on work/family services they offer. MIT's program was centered around primary schools and summer camps.

— In order to make the corporation more family friendly, Johnson & Johnson has changed its corporate mission statement and its credo to proclaim the company's commitment to its employees' family and well-being.

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF WORK/FAMILY PROGRAMS ON PRODUCTIVITY?

Although we know a lot about work/family problems, we know little about work/family solutions. A major reason for this discrepancy in knowledge is the lack of interest among corporations in systematic evaluations for their own programs.

Three studies have looked at companies' perception of the benefits of corporate child-care programs. In a study of 58 employers, predominantly hospitals with on-site centers, 88% indicated that the program increased their ability to attract employees, 72% noted lower absenteeism, and 65% felt that it improved employees' attitude toward the employer (Perry, 1982). In another study of 204 companies with child-care programs, employers ranked the top benefits as improved ability to recruit and improved morale, and 85% felt public relations had been more positive.

The most promising new effort to examine this issue is a study conducted by the National Council for Jewish Women (1987) in 80 communities across the country. Close to 2,000 women were interviewed in their last trimester of pregnancy and again in 4 to 7 months later after giving birth. The women were identified in medical and nonmedical settings in more than 80 communities representing the major metropolitan areas of the U.S. Although the sample was not randomly drawn, it was matched with the population of all employed pregnant women with respect to major sociodemographic factors.

Among issues, researchers studied the impact of supportive work environments on productivity. They compiled a scale of eight indicators of an accommodating workplace that included sick leave, disability leave, parental leave, a supportive supervisor, health insurance, flexible scheduling, and some form of child-care assistance. They found that the women who worked for the most accommodating companies (the top 20% of all workplaces) were more satisfied with their jobs, took fewer sick days, were sick less often, worked more on their own time, worked later into their pregnancies, and were more likely to return to work. For example, 73% of women in highly accommodating workplaces (defined as the top quintile of all workplaces) said they were satisfied with their jobs, compared to only 41% of women in unaccommodating workplaces (the bottom quintile of distribution) who said they were very satisfied with their jobs. Similarly, whereas 16% of women in unaccommodating workplaces stopped working before their 7th month of pregnancy, only 2% of women in highly accomodating workplaces did so. Moreover, among women whose prenatal workplaces were highly accomodating of pregnancy, 78% returned to their original place of work, whereas only 52% of women who were employed in unaccommodating workplaces returned to work.

Managers often state that developing formal and informal work/family supports requires a leap of faith that what the company gives, it will get in return. This study provides the first empirical evidence that this leap of faith may well be justified — that when companies are more accommodating, employees are more likely to respond in kind.

EMERGING TRENDS:
STAGE 1 AND STAGE 2 ORGANIZATIONS

There has been a trend among American companies in the 1980s to expand the number of programs responsive to the work/family needs of

employees. In a survey conducted by the American Society for Personnel Administration (1988), 50% of companies surveyed reported planning the development of new programs.

Our data also indicate that a majority of corporations plan to implement some new work/family programs or policies in the near future. There is, however, substantial diversity among companies regarding the extent of work/family policies, initiatives, and commitment to programs (Galinsky & Friedman, in press).

Researchers have differentiated Stage 1 and Stage 2 companies (Galinsky, 1989). A Stage 1 organization is characterized by (a) a growing awareness of work/family issues; (b) an identification of some employees' problems; (c) the establishment of some programs to solve the problems; and (d) an overall piecemeal approach.

A Stage 1 organization is marked by a growing awareness of work/family issues, usually spearheaded by a committed individual or a small group. At one company, for example, a group of parents at one site banded together to promote the issue of child care and were joined by several managers in the personnel department. At the University of Texas, the impetus came from the top: Its president established the President's Ad Hoc Committee on Child Care.

In Stage 1 organizations, the major task is to identify the problem to be solved. The ad hoc committee at the University Texas will conduct a survey; other organizations use focus groups. When an issue or a range of issues has been agreed on, they are usually prioritized and one or more are slated for a response.

The next step is to decide on a solution. This process involves knowing the resources available in the community, one's own culture, and the type of solution deemed appropriate. Finally, it involves knowing what competitors are doing and knowing the advantages and disadvantages of the options under consideration. Some companies, for example, commission a competitive analysis of other exemplary and competitor companies. In addition, staff from the personnel department visit several work/family programs run by other companies.

A Stage 1 organization may have one or more work/family initiatives, but these are separate efforts—often housed in different divisions or departments and administered separately. For instance, the provision of a benefit such as a flexible spending account is unconnected to the establishment of an employee seminar on choosing child care. Several of the universities interviewed have noted an overlapping of child-care services and a lack of coordination among programs offered. Additionally, benefits available to some sectors of the work force are not available to others.

By comparison, Stage 2 companies have comprehensive and multifaceted programs that are responsive to employee needs. Galinsky estimates that of the 5,400 U.S. corporations with programs to assist employees with child care, only about 30 companies have entered Stage 2, where "work and family issues are is not seen as merely care." Such companies have leave policies, dependent care plans, flexible schedules, health and wellness plans, EAPs, supervisor training, and parenting seminars at the workplace (Bureau of National Affairs [BNA], 1989).

The following two statistics dramatize the scarcity of responsive companies: In 1988, of the 1.2 million companies that employ at least 10 persons, only 2% offered employer-sponsored child care; and more than 50% of employed mothers are not covered by any maternity leave policy. Clearly, American companies have a long way to go.

FEATURES OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT ARE RESPONSIVE TO EMPLOYEES' WORK/FAMILY NEEDS

Although quite preliminary at this stage, several factors emerge indicating features of organizations that are more responsive to work/family issues. To date, eight separate, though overlapping, features have been identified in our research:

1. *Work/family is a legitimate issue of the organization, relevant to its mission.* When discussing a whole new series of work/family initiatives, a Johnson & Johnson executive asserted that these efforts are critical for business reasons. Likewise, Merck and Company Inc. states that "Merck considers responsiveness to work and family issues to be good business."

2. *Work/family efforts have the support of the President or CEO or a powerful "champion."* An individual or a group must actively push for supportive policies. For example, Dr. P. Roy Vagelos, chairman and chief executive officer of Merck noted:

> A company's success is largely dependent on its ability to adapt to change in many areas. Much change has taken place in the lifestyles of our work force as evidenced by the growing number of working women, dual-career couples, single parents, and women with young children. Responsiveness to the needs of this changed population, we feel, is key in our ability to attract and keep good people. (personal communication, 1988)

3. *Someone is in charge.* At Merck, Arthur Strohmer, executive director of Human Resources Staffing and Development, is responsible for the

work/family programs, not on an ad hoc basis, but as a legitimate part of his job. At MIT, Rae Goodell has been named coordinator of Parents Programs within the existing Child Care Office headed by Kathy Simons.

4. *Different functional areas are considered together.* In a Stage 2 organization, the benefits, personnel policies, health, and training are seen as a whole, each contributing to the overall work/family effort.

5. *Work/family policies are assessed and reviewed regularly.* Johnson & Johnson has just completed a long review process, during which they established six task forces whose mandates include work design and schedule, employment transitions, dependent care and benefits. These task forces, meeting together, recommended numerous exciting policy and program changes, including the establishment of an on-site child-care center.

6. *There is an emphasis on flexibility.* As a typical Stage 1 company, IBM initially tackled the issue of child care by establishing child-care resource and referral in 1984. Its efforts, however, did not stop there. It added elder care consultation and referral and then, as representative of companies in Stage 2, moved on to address the more complex problems of providing greater schedule flexibility. The result was the recent announcement of expanded flextime, an hour's flexibility for arrival and departure. There is a growing trend toward work flexibility and redefining of the traditional work day. With flexibility, companies judge employees by what they produce, not the hours they put in. Employees juggling work/family demands need greater control over their work environments and time (BNA, 1989).

7. *The organizational culture is recognized as central to work/family solutions.* In a Stage 1 organization, the emphasis is on changing policy or developing a new program. A Stage 2 organization recognizes that how policies and programs are administered (such as the supervisor's sensitivity and support and the overall environment of the company) is crucial to the success of the implementations. For this reason, companies like Merck, IBM, and Johnson & Johnson have or are establishing work/family training as a feature of management training.

8. *Supportive policies are seen as essential in the recruitment and retention of employees.* Stage 2 organizations see the link between supportive human resource policies and their ability to recruit and retain and

motivate employees. This is often driven by the supply of needed workers—our study indicates that organizations seeking employees having skills that are in short supply are more likely to develop and offer supportive policies. Workforce 2000 (Johnston, 1987) indicates that many companies are experiencing labor shortages or are expected to do so within the decade.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that some of the leading corporations and universities are aware of the dramatic changes in the family, the work force, and the economy, and have developed supportive human resource policies. At this time, the measures of productivity, the structures of work, and the culture of the organizations are undergoing increasing scrutiny and change. But too many companies and too many managers are still not aware nor responsive to work/family problems. If human resource policies are not made more responsive, employees at all levels will continue to bear the major brunt of work/family strain and conflict.

REFERENCES

American Society for Personnel Administration. (1988). *Employers and child care: The human resource professional's view* [Executive summary]. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Bureau of National Affairs. (1989). *Corporate work and family programs for the 1990s: Five case studies*. Washington, DC: Author

Emlen, A. (1987, August). *Panel on child care, work, and family*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Galinsky, E. (1988a, April). *Child care and productivity*. Paper presented at the Child Care Action Campaign Conference, Child Care: The Bottom Line, New York.

Galinsky, E. (1988b, August). *The impact of supervisors' attitudes and company culture on work family adjustment*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Galinsky, E. (1989). *Labor force participation of dual-earner couples and single parents* (PO No. 99-9-4757-75-009-04). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Commission on Workforce Quality and Labor Market Efficiency.

Galinsky, E. & Friedman, D. E. (in press). *Corporate reference guide to work family programs*. Families and Work Institute, New York.

Galinsky, E., & Hughes, D. (1987, August). *The Fortune magazine child care Study*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Hofferth, S. L. (1988). Child care in the United States. In *American families in tomorrow's economy* (Hearing before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, July 1, 1987, (p. 181). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Hughes, D. (1987, August). *Child care and working parents.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Hughes, D., & Galinsky, E. (1988). Balancing work and family life: Research and corporate application. In A. E. Gottfried & A. W. Gottfried (Eds.), *Maternal employment and children's development: Longitudinal research* (pp. 233-268). New York: Plenum.

Johnston, W. B. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century.* Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Lurie, R., Galinsky, E., & Hughes, D. (1988). [Resources for child care management (RCCM), Bank Street College of Education needs assessments]. Unpublished raw data.

Lurie, R., Galinsky, E., & Staines, G. (1988). [Resources for child care management (RCCM), Bank Street College of Education needs assessments]. Unpublished data.

National Council for Jewish Women. (1987, November). *Accommodating pregnancy in the workplace* (NCJW Center for the Child Report). New York: Author.

National Council for Jewish Women. (1988, August). *Employer support for child care* (NCJW Center for the Child Report). New York: Author.

Perry, K. (1982). *Employers and child care: Establishing services through the workplace.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau.

Pleck, J., Staines, G., & Lang, L. (1980). Conflicts between work and family life. *Monthly Labor Review, 103* (March), 29-32.

Rodgers, F. (1988). Presentation to the Arden House Conference sponsored by The Conference Board. Unpublished manuscript.

Shinn, M., Galinsky, E., & Gulcor, L. (1990). [The parent/teacher]. Unpublished data.

Staines, G. L., & Pleck, J. H. (1983). *The impact of work schedules on the family.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan, Institute of Social Research.