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Abstract

Creating a work environment that is inclusive towards diverse cultures is beneficial to employees and organizations. The present study tests the effects of Perceived Cultural Inclusion (PCI) on work-family related outcomes on a sample of Maori N=349 (the indigenous people of New Zealand) employees. Because of the strong links between inclusion and Perceived Organizational Support (POS), PCI has been based on POS; and a direct effects model revealed that PCI was directly related to POS and work-family related outcomes (conflict, enrichment and balance). However, testing different models (direct effects only, partial mediation and full mediation) indicated that a partial mediation model was superior. PCI’s ability to predict POS and also to predict enrichment in both directions (work-family and family-work), and POS’s ability to predict work-family conflict and enrichment, highlights the importance of PCI to enrichment. In addition, the final model revealed that work-family conflict and both directions of enrichment predicted work-life balance. These results emphasize the importance of cultural inclusion to the work-family interface for Maori employees, and the interpretations of, and implications for these findings are discussed in this paper.

Introduction

Work-family policies and practices need to be consistent with, and accommodating of, the core values of employees within an organization (Kossek, 2005; Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998). Kossek (2005) stated that “work is defined and experienced very differently across societies; organizational and societal structures construct what individuals and families perceive as possible for work-life integration” (p. 18). This statement is particularly important for Maori, as they are a collectivistic minority group working within a predominately individualistic European environment (Harrington & Liu, 2002). The cultural differences between these two groups see Maori experience significantly different work-family dynamics and demands compared with the majority of New Zealanders (Haar, Roche, & Taylor, 2011). Given that HR practices (either formal or informal) are often focused toward the majority, we expect that the creation of an organizational climate, which is inclusive of the cultural needs of individuals, will be beneficial to the work-family needs of Maori. This expectation is based on the developing area of inclusion, which suggests that workplaces that are more inclusive of a diverse range of employees tend to benefit both employees and their organizations (Shore et al., 2011).

Consideration of inclusion is important given the high levels of diversity within international (Mor Barak, 2011) and New Zealand workplaces (Houkamau & Boxall, 2011). However, traditional diversity management techniques (e.g., Cox, 1991; Cox & Blake, 1991) have failed to unleash the benefits of diverse workplaces (Pless & Maak, 2004). This might be why the inclusion discourse is expected to gain popularity over the diversity discourse (Oswick & Noon, 2012). However, despite over a decade of research and theory development on inclusion, there is still a lack of empirical testing on the subject (Roberson, 2006) and it is still considered to be a new concept (Shore et al., 2011).

Although there are a limited number of papers revealing inclusion as a promising predictor of job and well-being outcomes (e.g., Findler, Wind, & Mor Barak, 2007), to the best of our knowledge no empirical study has linked inclusion to work-family related outcomes. The present study seeks to measure how PCI influences work-family related outcomes. The following review of literature discusses work-family related theory and how this relates
to Maori. We then build an argument as to how PCI is likely to benefit the work-family interface for Maori employees.

**Previous Research**

**The Work-Family Interface**

It has been nearly 30 years since the introduction of Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) seminal work on work-family conflict (WFC). Significant factors, such as dual earner partnerships, single parents, increasing working demands and shifting of employee values, have made it more difficult for employees to participate in both work and family roles effectively (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). WFC was defined by (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (p. 77). This incompatibility typically occurs via strain-based, time-based, or behavioral-base conflict. This bi-directional construct can occur from work to family domains (i.e., WFC) and also from family to work (i.e., family-work conflict (FWC) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Job stress, work hours, family stress, family support and hours spent with family have been found to have a significant effect on WFC and FWC (Byron, 2005; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007). Furthermore, support from organizations (Allen, 2001; Aryee, Chu, Kim, & Ryu, in press; O’Driscoll et al., 2003) and supervisors (Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011; Lambert, 2000; Lapiere & Allen, 2006) are likely to have a significant effect on WFC (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011), which can influence work-family balance (Haar, in press). Reducing both forms of conflict is important, as meta-analyses have shown this to be a predictor of work related (e.g., job satisfaction), non-work related (e.g., life satisfaction) and stress related outcomes (e.g., burnout and work-related stress) (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Ford et al., 2007; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Overall, both WFC and FWC pose “problems for employees, their families, employers, and for society as a whole” and has “costly effects on individual work life, home life, and general well-being and health” (Allen et al., 2000, p. 301).

Some 20 years after the introduction of WFC, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) identified a significant gap in the literature and suggested that work and family could be allies. This was known as work-family enrichment (WFE), which was defined “as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 72). This enrichment can occur through either the instrumental path, where “skills, abilities, and values are applied effectively in another role” and/or (2) the affective path where “affect or emotion is carried over from one role to another” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 74). Like conflict, enrichment is bi-directional, where enrichment can occur from work to family (WFE) and family to work (family-work enrichment (FWE)).

Predictors of WFE and FWE also centre on support from work and family domains as well as job and pay satisfaction etcetera. (Carlson, Ferguson, Kaemar, Grzywacz, & Whitten, 2011; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Tang, Siu, & Cheung, 2012; Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006). Although enrichment is still under researched (Kossek et al., 2011) there have been many findings that suggest it is a predictor of satisfaction, performance, health and well-being outcomes (Carlson, Ferguson et al., 2011; Carlson, Hunter, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2011; Carlson, Kaemar, Zivnuska, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2011; Carlson, Kaemar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). Overall, both forms of enrichment have a positive effect on work-family balance (Haar, in press).

Support is a re-occurring trend when trying to reduce WFC (Allen, 2001; Aryee et al., in press; Eby et al., 2005) and increase WFE (Tang et al., 2012; Wayne et al., 2006). Cultural values and differences also have a significant effect on the work-family interface and its outcomes (e.g. Hill, Yang, Hawkins, & Ferris, 2004; Spector et al., 2004; Spector et al., 2007). Although previous studies have compared New Zealand at a country level, they did not investigate within country variations.

New Zealand is an excellent example of a ‘cultural melting pot’, as it is a diverse bi-cultural society (Harrington & Liu, 2002) boasting a diverse range of cultural backgrounds (Khawaja, Boddington, & Didham, 2007). New Zealand’s indigenous people (Maori) comprise 14.6 percent of the population and New Zealand European comprise 67.7 percent of the population (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). Maori have significantly different cultural values and beliefs compared with Europeans (Lo & Houkamau, 2012; Tassell, Flett, & Gavala, 2010). Of considerable importance to this study is Maori’s more collectivistic orientation towards the group and extended family networks (Harrington & Liu, 2002; Hook, 2007). Cultural differences like this are likely to have a significant impact on work family related outcomes generally (Powell, Francesco, & Ling, 2009), and we expect the same to hold true for Maori. The following section discusses conflict and enrichment and how they might relate to individual Maori employee and their families within a New Zealand context.

**Maori and the Work-Family Interface**

Culture is a significant factor to consider when focusing on the work-family interface, and we expect Maori culture to have a significant effect on the way Maori perform in both work and family roles. Durie (1997) discussed many examples of how Maori culture might affect Maori family demands which will have an effect on the individual and their work. For example, Maori place a high emphasis on whānau and whanaungatanga (Durie, 1997) and interacting with their relatively large social network. Europeans are in general more individualistic focusing on self and immediate family (Harrington & Liu, 2002; Hook, 2007). Although there are many definitions of whānau, it is generally defines as a cohesive unit working towards similar goals, a support group / team (Durie, 2003) connected through group solidarity, warm interpersonal interactions and cheerful cooperation.
Inclusion of one’s culture in the workplace could benefit employees. The following section discusses how organizations can be more supportive towards the cultural needs of Maori. These needs are likely to outweigh the negatives if workplaces are more supportive, employees are more likely to fully participate with their families in the way they want to (Haar et al., 2011). Furthermore, practice of whanaungatanga might offer potential negatives or conflicts (e.g., time demands and sacrifice of personal freedom) to Maori (Durie, 1997). For example, work can make it difficult for employees to practice whanaungatanga and see whānau on a regular basis, creating considerable time and strain related demands for Maori. Alternatively, family demands may place strain and time demands on a Maori employee’s ability to work. More recently, Haar et al. (2011) found that both WFC and whānau support had significant effects on turnover intentions.

Despite the occasionally conflicting nature of work and whānau, there are many positives with practicing whanaungatanga. These positives include support/guidance in times of crisis, education and strengthening of cultural identity (Durie, 1997; Tassell et al., 2010) that support at a basic level promotes feelings of inclusion, which would likely benefit FWE. Organizations that demonstrate an understanding of cultural differences by respecting and supporting the cultural needs of Maori, may, in turn, create practices and policies that have a positive effect on both the work and family domains of Maori employees. For example, when an organization understands and supports the cultural needs of Maori it is easier for Maori to interact with family, which promotes WFE. This is known broadly as inclusion, which we consider to be a form of support, and is an antecedent of both WFC and WFE (Allen, 2001; Tang et al., 2012). Support from the organizational level has been shown to improve work-family related outcomes (Aryee et al., in press). We focus specifically on cultural inclusion, which is related to supporting and including one’s cultural needs (detailed below). Overall, the benefits that whānau offer Maori are likely to outweigh the negatives if workplaces can be more supportive towards the culture needs of their employees. The following section discusses how inclusion of one’s culture in the workplace could benefit such work-family outcomes.

**Inclusion**

Inclusion is an evolved form of diversity management (Shore et al., 2011), which is set to overtake traditional diversity management (Oswick & Noon, 2012). Shore (2011) suggested that although diversity made people feel a sense of belongingness, they failed to acknowledge their uniqueness. Although there are many definitions of inclusion, a review of the literature led Shore et al. (2011) to state that inclusion should be defined “as the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the work group through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness” (p. 1265). Although inclusion has existed for over a decade, it is still considered to be a new concept (Shore et al., 2011) for which there have been limited empirical studies (Pless & Maak, 2004; Roberson, 2006).

The few studies that have empirically tested inclusion have shown it to predict job outcomes, such as organizational citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and well-being (Acquavita, Pittman, Gibbons, & Castellanos-Brown, 2009; Findler et al., 2007; Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2001; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002; Nishii & Mayer, 2009). Although several papers discuss inclusion and elements of the work-family interface in a very limited way (e.g., Blilioria, Joy, & Liang, 2008; Lirio, Lee, Williams, Haugen, & Kossek, 2008; Ryan & Kossek, 2008), to the best of our knowledge there are no empirical studies that link work-family related outcomes with inclusion. Ryan and Kossek (2008) suggested that work-family policies and support could predict perceptions of inclusion, which would, in turn, predict employee outcomes. While these hypotheses were not validated empirically, they do support the idea that support at a basic level promotes feelings of inclusion, which can then affect outcomes (Ryan & Kossek, 2008).

The present study focuses specifically on perceptions of cultural inclusion (PCI). We suggest that PCI relates to how employees perceive organizations’ support for their cultural backgrounds, values, and beliefs. Organizations can demonstrate their support by promoting difference and showing understanding, tolerance, and support for individuals’ cultural needs and obligations. We have based PCI on POS because much of the inclusion literature discusses POS and aspects of social exchange theory (Pless & Maak, 2004; Shore et al., 2011; Stamper & Masterson, 2002; Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002). POS is based on social exchange theory and it relates to the way employees perceive that “the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986, p. 501). Social exchange theory and POS have also been the basis for many measurement models. For example, Allen (2001) based family-supportive organization perceptions (FSOP) on POS which in turn predicted WFC. Furthermore, a study by Thompson et al. (1999) developed a measure of work–family culture that related to “the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives” (p. 392). They found that when an environment was more supportive, employees were more likely to utilize work–family benefits, which, in turn, predicted WFC.

Organizational support has also been found to predict WFE (Tang et al., 2012). We expect that if an organization respects its employees’ cultural values and
actively works with employees to meet their cultural needs, a sense of cultural inclusion will be instilled in the employees. We expect this to have a beneficial effect on work-family related outcomes as employees would be able to engage more readily with family. As such, we suggest PCI, like POS, will play a beneficial role on the work-family interface, as it is negatively related to conflict and positively related to enrichment and work-life balance. This leads to our first set of hypotheses.

**Hypotheses: PCI will be negatively related to (1) WFC and (2) FWC.**

**Hypotheses: PCI will be positively related to (3) WFE, (4) FWE, and (5) work-life balance.**

Because PCI is based on POS, both measures are likely to have a strong positive relationship with each other. Thus, employees who have high levels of PCI are likely to have high levels of POS, and the two measures are likely to correlate highly. High correlations between POS and other constructs, such as job satisfaction, have been evidenced within earlier POS research (e.g., Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997). However, measures that have used POS as a basis (e.g., FSOP, Allen, 2001) typically have not tested their new measure in relation to POS. Consequently, we test the relationship between PCI and POS to alleviate this short fall.

**Hypothesis 6: PCI will be positively related to POS.**

We also test whether PCI has a direct or indirect effect on work-family related outcomes when POS is included. Given the potential for PCI and POS to be linked, the potential mediating effects of POS are also tested. Wayne et al., (2002) who showed that POS mediated the influence of inclusion towards commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors. Similarly, Stamper and Masterson (2002) revealed that perceived insider status mediated inclusion towards citizen and deviant behaviors. Based on Wayne et al’s (2002) and Stamper and Masterson’s (2002) research, we offer the next hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 7: POS will mediate the influence of PCI towards outcomes.**

Finally, based on the idea that reducing conflict and increasing enrichment is likely to have a positive effect on work-life balance (Haar, in press), we expect work-family conflict to be detrimental and work-family enrichment beneficial towards work-life balance. This leads to our last hypotheses.

**Hypotheses: (8) work-family conflict will be negatively related to work-life balance, while (9) work-family enrichment will be positively related.**

**Method**

This Purposeful sampling (Coyne, 1997) was used by research assistants familiar with Maori protocol to attract Maori participants. Physical surveys or a link to an online survey were distributed to a wide range of organizations and networks. Online surveys have been utilized before by inclusion researchers (e.g., Acquavita et al., 2009). In total, over 200 organizations throughout New Zealand were approached and the study and its requirements were explained to them. Over 700 surveys were hand distributed or emailed to Maori participants. Survey one contained measures: POS, PCI and demographic variables. Survey two contained the dependent variables: WFC, FWC, WFE, FWE and work-life balance. The study achieved a response rate of 49.8%: 349 out of the 700 surveys distributed were completed and returned. Responses from the physical and online surveys were combined, and with no significant differences were found between the two. On average, respondents were married (66%), 38.9 years old (SD=11.9), worked 40.1 hours per week (SD=9.7 hours), and had a tenure of 5.3 years (SD=6.4 years). The public sector was overrepresented in our sample: 70% were employed in the public sector, 22% in the private sector and 8% in not-for-profit. Respondents were highly educated with 18% holding high school qualifications, 14% technical college qualifications, 44% university degrees and 24% postgraduate qualifications.

**Measures**

POS was measured with a 6-item measure by Eisenberger et al. (1986) coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Questions followed the stem “My organization...” and a sample item was “Takes pride in my accomplishments at work” (α=.84).

PCI was measured with 7-items based on Eisenberger et al. (1986), coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Questions followed the stem “My organization...” and the items were: “Considers my cultural goals and values”, “Takes pride in my cultural accomplishments at work”, “Really cares about my cultural well-being” (α= .95). The psychometric properties of this measure have been validated and established in previous research (see, Haar & Brougham, 2010; Haar & Brougham, 2011a, 2011b).

Strain Based WFC and FWC were measured by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) measures, coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. A sample item for WFC was “I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family” (α=.87) and a FWC sample item was “Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work” (α=.90).

Affective WFE and FWE were measured with the 3-items by Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne and Grzywacz (2006), coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. WFE questions followed the stem “my involvement in my work...” and a sample item was “Makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better family member” (α=.94). FWE questions followed the stem “my involvement in my family...” and a sample item was “Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better worker” (α=.95).

Work life balance was measured with 3-items by Haar (in press) coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. A sample item was “I am satisfied with my work-life balance, enjoying both roles” (α=.88).
Measurement Models

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) confirmed that PCI and POS were separate dimensions. The comparative fit index (CFI >.95), (2) root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA < .08), and (3) standardized root mean residual (SRMR <.10) were utilised to show the goodness-of-fit for the structural model consistent with Williams, Vandenberg and Edwards (2009). The hypothesized measurement model and three alternative models are shown in Table 1.

The CFA was re-analyzed, which revealed a combination of alternative models. We followed Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson’s (2010) instructions, and tested comparison models, which showed that the alternative models were all significantly different (all p< .001) and a poorer fit than the hypothesized model.

Analysis

Hypotheses 1-9 were tested using structural equation modeling in AMOS to assess the direct and potential meditational effects of the study variables.

Results

Descriptive statistics for the study variables are shown in Table 2. Table 2 shows that POS and PCI are highly correlated (r=.68, p< .01), but still below the threshold of concept redundancy, which occurs at r >.75 (Morrow, 1983). In addition, the CFA in structural equation modeling revealed that PCI and POS were distinct. Overall, PCI and POS were significantly related to all work-family related outcomes (all p<.01).

Structural Model

A number of alternative structural models were tested, to determine the optimal model based on the data. The number of alternative models tested included:

(1). A direct effects only model, with cultural POS predicting all work-family related outcomes, including POS.

(2). A partial mediation model, with PCI and POS predicting all work-family related outcomes.

(3). A full mediation model, with PCI predicting POS, and, in turn, POS predicting all work-family related outcomes.
Analyses of the three models are presented in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Model Comparisons for Structural Models**

| Model                     | Model Fit Indices | Model Differences |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                           | $z^2$  | df  | CFI  | RMSEA | SRMR | $z^2$  | Adf | p   | Details               |
| 1. Direct Effects Model   | 587.8 | 308 | .96  | .05   | .05  |     |    |    |                      |
| 2. Full Mediation Model   | 574.2 | 308 | .96  | .05   | .05  | 13.6 | 0  | n.s. | Model 1 to 2          |
| 3. Partial Mediation Model| 560.3 | 303 | .96  | .05   | .04  | 27.5 | 5  | .001 | Model 1 to 3          |

Using analyses recommended by Hair et al. (2010) with regards to testing comparison models, we show that all three models are not significantly different from each other. However, when comparing different models, Byrne (2010) suggested the AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) and CAIC (Consistent Akaike Information Criterion) fit indices are most useful. Both the AIC and CAIC values address the issue of parsimony in the assessment of model fit with the data, and the smallest value indicates a better fit of the hypothesized/structural model (Byrne, 2010). Comparisons show that AIC and CAIC are superior for the full mediation model (model 3), compared with models 1 and 2. The structural models, showing the direct effects only (Figure 1), and the full mediation model (Figure 2) are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

![Figure 1. Direct Effects Model](image-url)
Aligned with the recommendations of Grace and Bollen (2005), unstandardized regression coefficients are presented. Figure 2 shows that PCI is significantly linked with POS (path coefficient = .77, p < .001). POS was then significantly linked with WFC (path coefficient = -.39, p < .01), WFE (path coefficient = .36, p < .001). WFC (path coefficient = -.38, p < .001) and WFE (path coefficient = .46, p < .001) were then linked with work-life balance. PCI had direct effects on WFE (path coefficient = .29, p < .01) and WFW (path coefficient = .30, p < .01). Both WFE (path coefficient = .46, p < .001) and WFW (path coefficient = .15, p < .05) linked with work-life balance. WFC was insignificant to the model. Overall, the model for POS (r² = .57) is very large, while small for WFC (r² = .12) and insignificant for WFC (r² = .04). WFE was large (r² = .31) and WFW was small (r² = .08). Overall, work-life balance was very high (r² = .51).

Discussion

This paper, using a sample of Maori employees, highlights the importance of inclusion to the work-family interface. We found that PCI had significant direct and indirect effects on conflict, enrichment, work-life balance and POS. Our findings are promising for both the prediction of work-family outcomes and, more importantly, for the inclusion literature, which has limited empirical papers (Roberson, 2006; Shore et al., 2011). Figure 1 shows and supports our first set of hypotheses: that PCI has direct effects on WFC, WFC, WFE, WFW, work-life balance, and POS. This finding aligns with the limited empirical inclusion literature, which found that inclusion predicted job-related (e.g., job satisfaction) and life-related (e.g., well-being) outcomes (Findler et al., 2007). Furthermore, we view PCI as a form of cultural support, and increasing levels of support can reduce conflict (Allen, 2001) and increase enrichment (Tang et al., 2012). However, the results from SEM revealed that our hypothesized partial mediation model (figure 2) was superior to the direct effects model (figure 1).

Testing POS within a model that uses a measure of PCI, which using POS as the foundation, was a methodological improvement on existing approaches, such as FSOP (Allen, 2000). We expected POS to have a significant effect on our overall model, based on similar effects shown in the literature (e.g., Stamper & Masterson, 2002; Wayne et al., 2002). Although Stamper and Masterson (2002) and Wayne et al. (2002) tested POS as a mediator within the inclusion literature, our findings offer a unique picture within the inclusion literature, as we measured something different from these authors. The following sections discuss the partial mediation model effects in more detail.

Figure 2 shows that PCI still has direct effects on WFE and POS. PCI has a direct positive influence on work-family enrichment, as well as an indirectly effect, through enhancing POS, which, in turn, predicts three of the four work-family variables. This finding shows the importance of PCI over POS for work-family enrichment. Those organizations that support culture also support the dynamic and complex family needs of Maori. Furthermore, our findings add a deeper insight into the predictors of enrichment, which are still under explored (Wayne et al., 2006). In addition, PCI, working through POS, reduced WFC. This shows the importance of POS for the work-family interface, which is consistent with Aryee et al., (in press). Looking at Figure 2 as a whole, we can see that when conflict is reduced and enrichment is heightened which both benefit work-life balance. This aligns with Haar (in press). We expect POS to be highly
beneficial to Maori given their complex family/whānau structure, which can see them experiencing difficulties with balancing their work and family obligations (Durie, 1997, 2003). However, the benefits of whānau might not be accessible unless Maori employees are able to fully fulfill their duties to, and spend ‘adequate’ time with, their families. As such, PCI might signal to Maori employees that it is acceptable for them participate in cultural events and support their families. This will in turn enrich the family lives of Maori employees, and their families will then reciprocate this support to them. This can only be achieved if organizations realize the importance of inclusion and the support of culture in the workplace.

Implications for Managers

Our findings reflect the importance that managers supporting and including employees’ cultural values has on the employees’ work and family lives. Research has shown that being from a different culture from one’s manager often has a negative effect on levels of support (Foley, Linnehan, Greenhaus, & Weer, 2006) and inclusion (Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999) employees receive, and can also affect job outcomes (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990), life satisfaction and overall well-being (Verkuyten, 2008). Foley et al. (2006) found that “supervisors provided more family support to subordinates who were similar in either gender or race than to those subordinates who were dissimilar” (p. 420). Masuda et al. (2011) highlighted the importance of supporting collectivistic employees by providing flexible work arrangements and other forms of support to “help them build social ties and spend time with their family” (p. 24).

Training managers to understand cultural differences is highly important. It has been suggested that informal support, such as managers getting to know about employees’ cultures and cultural needs, might be the best way to support (Wayne et al., 2006) and include culture in the workplace. This type of support shows that the organization/supervisor is acknowledging the importance of culture in the workplace. Taking steps to support the cultural needs of individual employees, such as flex-time, which may enable employees to meet their cultural obligations, will increase PCI. It is also important for managers to view cultures as dynamic, and consider employees, and their cultural needs, on a case by case basis.

Limitations and Future Research

Our research has several limitations. Firstly, data was self-reported and not collected longitudinally, which increased the risk of common method variance. However, structural equation modeling has the potential to mitigate this slightly. Secondly, data only included Maori employees, and future researchers might want to include a diverse range of employees, such as New Zealand’s European, Pacifica and Asian populations (Khawaja et al., 2007). In addition, the Maori within the sample were highly educated, with a large proportion working within the public sector; this is not representative of Maori as a whole. Future studies may need to consider attracting employees from more diverse educational backgrounds as well as more private sector employees. Despite these limitations, we still interpret the findings as significant. Overall, supporting and including the cultural needs of Maori employees is likely to have a highly beneficial effect on work-family related outcomes and work-life balance. These benefits will, in turn, benefit both employees and organizations.
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