



Universiteit Utrecht

Master Arbeids- & Organisationspsychologie

New working in the generation Y:

**Are they attracted to it and what do they expect from the increasing overlap
between work and family roles.**

Mark Janssen

3269914

30-06-2011

Supervisor: dr. E. F. Van Steenbergen

Second corrector: dr. M. C. W. Peeters

Abstract (English)

This scenario study was designed to gain more insight in the anticipated effects of new working (NW) on work-family role conflict and facilitation. Moreover the opinion of generation Y students on NW was examined. Results (N =86) did not support the main hypothesis that generation Y students prefer NW over a traditional work place (TW). Other outcomes were that of the four expected types of role facilitation (energy-based, time-based, behavioral, and psychological work-family facilitation) NW only lead to a significantly higher time-based facilitation. Other outcomes were that of the four anticipated types of role conflict (strain-based, time-based, behavioral, and psychological work-family conflict) NW lead to less psychological conflict. However NW also leads, contrary to the predicted decrease, to more behavioral role conflict. Lastly, none of the anticipated moderator effects for gender and intelligence were found.

Abstract (Dutch)

Deze scenario studie was ontworpen om meer inzicht te krijgen in de geanticiperde effecten van Het Nieuwe Werken (HNW) op werk-familie rol conflict en rol facilitatie. Ook de mening van generatie Y studenten over HNW is onderzocht. De primaire uitkomst van dit onderzoek (N = 86) haalt de hypothesis dat generatie Y studenten liever volgens HNW dan volgens het Traditionele Werken (TW) werken onderuit. Een andere uitkomst is dat van de vier verwachte soorten rol facilitatie (energie, tijd, gedrag en psychologische afstand nemen), HNW alleen leidt tot een significant grotere tijdsfacilitatie dan TW. Verdere uitkomsten zijn dat van de vier verwachte soorten rol conflict (tijd, vermoeidheid, gedrag en psychologisch bezig houden) NW alleen leidt tot minder psychologisch rol conflict. NW leidt echter ook, in tegenstelling tot wat er verwacht werd, tot meer gedrags rol conflict. Ten slotte is er in deze studie geen bewijs gevonden dat geslacht en intelligentie modererende variabelen zijn in de bovenstaande relaties.

Index

Abstract (English).....	2
Abstract (Dutch).....	2
Introduction	4
Work and family role spillover.....	5
The effect of NW on work-family role conflict and role facilitation	7
Research opportunities in NW literature	8
Hypotheses	9
Method	12
Procedure.....	12
Scenario's.....	12
Participants	12
Measures.....	13
Results	15
Manipulation check	15
Correlation analysis.....	15
Main analyses.....	17
Moderators and other variables	18
Discussion	21
Implications for practice.....	25
Limitations and directions for future research.....	25
Conclusion.....	27
References	28
Appendix 1: the NW and TW scenario	30

Introduction

Since the invention of the internet and other modern forms of communication it has become easier for employees to do (a part of) their work at home. This trend continued with the introduction of smart phones with remote email possibilities. In the Netherlands this resulted in “Het Nieuwe Werken” or the New Working (NW). NW is characterized by employees having high autonomy on both where and when to work, working in projects, strict deadlines and output driven management (Peters et al., 2008). This differs greatly from a more traditional working situation where employees are physically expected to be around from 9 to 5 and where managers are still very much on top of the hierarchical chain and tell employees what to do on a daily basis (Martin, 2005).

Because of the increased autonomy and the possibility to work hours that suit employees best, NW can decrease negative spillovers (e.g. conflict) that exist between work and family (Cloin and Hermans, 2006). Another reason why organizations might consider NW is “the generation Y”. Young adults born between 1982 and 1995 (Marino, 2006) are, both in popular and in scientific papers, labeled as generation Y. They grew up with technology around them, and are much more likely to use it in every aspect of their lives (McCrinkle, 2003). Moreover, they are supposed to be independent, to love freedom and flexibility, and to hate micromanagement (Martin, 2005). That’s why NW should be especially suited for the newest generation of employees.

However, Kossek et al. (2005) argues that NW decreases the boundaries between work and family. This might lead to increased work stress during non-work hours. Moreover an inquiry by studentalent (2010) among 1800 Dutch students found that 73% of HBO and WO students, which can be demographically labeled as generation Y, prefer to work at the office instead of working at home. When looking for a job generation Y employees look for a good atmosphere, fun colleagues, and possibilities to continue learning. Moreover NW might also, because of the decreasing boundaries between work and family roles, reduce the positive spillovers between work and family roles (Frone, 2003).

Based on above findings it may be concluded that the literature is divided on whether employees want to work in a NW environment and whether NW increases or decreases employee work-family balance. The first aim of this study is to examine whether generation Y students prefer NW over a more traditional working environment. The second aim is to examine whether generation Y students anticipate more or less negative spillover (work-family conflict) between their work and family roles. The last aim is to examine whether generation Y students anticipate more or less positive spillovers between their roles in a NW

environment (work-family facilitation). To answer these questions, a scenario study is conducted among student of the Hogeschool Amsterdam (HVA). In this study the preferences of students and their anticipated role conflict and role facilitation are measured.

The literature study following this introduction describes the most important academic theories and empirical findings on NW in relation to work-family (WF) conflict and facilitation. The first part gives an overview of the literature on WF relations. The second part links NW to reduced/increased experiences of WF conflict and facilitation. Finally, the last part of the literature review deals with the aspects of NW literature that are underexposed and gives reasons for conducting research on WF conflict and facilitation on youngsters.

Work and family role spillover

According to the scarcity theory human energy, time and attention are finite. As a result energy, time or attention spent on one role means that less resources can be spent on another role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Marks, 1977). According to this theory work-family role conflict occurs when role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect (Greenhouse and Beutell, 1985) as a result of which participation in one role (e.g. work) can be made more difficult by virtue of participation in another role (e.g. family).

The scarcity theory leads to two directions of conflict between the work and family roles. According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) Work-to-Family (WF) conflict is a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family role. Family-to-Work (FW) conflict occurs when too much time and energy is spent on the family role, making it more difficult to accomplish all the tasks that one is expected to finish in the working role. Moreover Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identified four different types of conflict. Strain-based conflict exists “when strain produced in one role makes it difficult to fulfill the requirements of another role.” Time-based conflict occurs “when time devoted to one role makes it difficult to fulfill requirements in another role.” Behavioral conflict emerges “when behavior required in one role makes it difficult to fulfill the requirements of another role.” And psychological conflict, which emerges when one is mentally distracted by or preoccupied with one role while physically present in another role (Carlson & Frone, 2003).

The above insights found by Greenhouse and Beutell (1985) are supported by Byron (2005). She expanded this line of research and found that there are factors that correlate with

work-family (WF) interference, factors that correlate with family-work (FW) interference and factors that correlate with both WF and FW interference. The underlying factors are divided into three categories. Work domain variables, non-work domain variables, and individual and demographic variables. Work domain variables concern the effect of job and workplace factors, such as a flexible work schedule and job stress. Non-work domain variables regard the family demands and other non-work factors, such as marital conflict, number of hours spent on housework or childcare, and age of youngest child. Demographic or individual variables include personality, behaviors, and other individual differences, such as gender, income, and coping style. She found that work related stress has the strongest correlation with increased WF conflict, while flexible schedules had the strongest correlation with decreased WF conflict. Family related stress, and the amount of time spend on family, housework, childcare etc had the strongest correlation with increased FW conflict.

From the above literature it has to be concluded that work-family conflict has many possible causes and is likely to occur in our modern societies where both parents tend to have a job and have to navigate between an increasing number of roles. In the last 10 years the percentage of mothers who worked 20 hours or more a week has risen from 58 to 69 percent in the Netherlands (CBS, 2010). This is in line with the conclusion of Carlson (2000). She claims that work–family conflict is a source of stress that many individual experience. Moreover she investigated the outcomes of too much WF and FW conflict. Among her findings were that WF and FW conflict increase psychological distress and job turnover. They also relate to reduced job satisfaction, organization commitment and life satisfaction.

However, the spillover between work and family roles can also be positive. The role expansion theory (Marks, 1977) explains how work and family roles positively influence each other. “Role facilitation occurs when participation in one role is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed in another role” (Frone, 2003). This is also supported by Van Steenbergen (2007), who found that role facilitation was related to increased home performance, job performance and increased job satisfaction.

Greenhaus & Powell (2006) argue that role facilitation has three underlying mechanisms. Firstly participation in different roles can have additive effects for well-being. Secondly participation in one role can have buffering effects from distress in another role. Thirdly participation in one role can produce positive experiences and outcomes in another role. Moreover, just like role conflict, role facilitation has four underlying domains (Marks, 1977; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Van Steenbergen, 2007). Energy based facilitation exists “when after a working day, one feels energized and more like participating in activities at

home.” Time based facilitation occurs when “time individuals spend on parenting tasks (picking up the children on time, etc.) can make it easier for them to set boundaries on and define priorities in the tasks they take on at work and could stimulate them to use their time at work more effectively.” Behavioral based facilitation can for example occur “when female managers felt that raising children or participating in other relationships taught them how to understand, motivate, develop, and direct employees.” Lastly, psychological facilitation occurs “when behaviors and skills learned in one role benefit another role” (Van Steenbergen, 2007). However, despite these theories, the line of research that covers WF and FW facilitation has only recently begun to develop and still much more research is done in the field of WF and FW role conflict than in the field of WF and FW facilitation.

The effect of NW on work-family role conflict and role facilitation

Most of literature to date is about conflict and its negative effects. Because of the supposed negative effect of this role spillover a lot of research has been done on how to decrease work-family conflict. “Because of the flexible schedules, the increased freedom and greater possibilities to make decisions for themselves” Cloin and Hermans (2006) claim that NW is the best solution decrease this conflict.

An important aspect of NW is that employees can choose the place they want to work. This is much like teleworking, where employees can work from their own home. Due to internet technology employers can make arrangements that allow employees and their tasks to be shared across settings away from a central place of business or physical organizational location (Belanger & Collins, 1998). This means that with a remote connection to the office, employees can work from their own home. Gajendran et al. (2007) conducted a meta analysis about the positive and negative consequences of telecommuting. According to this study teleworking has a lot of positive effects. The authors found that telecommuting correlated with higher perceived autonomy, lower work-family conflict, higher (supervisor rated) performance, more job satisfaction and less role stress. However the correlation with reduced role stress was only true for high intensity teleworking (more than 2.5 days a week). The only negative relationship found was the negative correlation between high intensity teleworking and the relationships with coworkers.

Hornung and Glaser (2009) surveyed about 1000 German administrators to get more insight in the impact of telecommuting intensity on job satisfaction and work-family conflict. They found that job satisfaction had a positive correlation with telecommuting. Moreover increased telecommuting corresponded with reduced WF conflict.

Grzywacz and Marks (2000) were one of the first to look into role enhancement (facilitation). Their sample consisted of nearly 2000 respondent. One of their main findings was that WF conflict was mostly caused by work place characteristics like little social support and a low decision latitude. However WF facilitation was increased by a higher decision latitude. FW conflict was mostly caused by family stress and FW facilitation was mostly caused by higher social support at the home front.

However not all studies on teleworking showed positive effects. Thatcher and Zhu (2006) argue that teleworking decreases the amount how much employees identify themselves with the organization. This makes it more difficult for employees to align their interests with those of the organization and thus lead to more work-family role conflict, and subsequently negative work outcomes (Frone, 2003). Moreover Bailey and Kurkland (2002) conducted a study on the effects of teleworking. The main outcomes of this study were that there are two major groups of employees who telework, namely male professionals and female clerks. However, next to the attitude of the managers to the subject, no clear underlying causes for why specific groups telework were found. Moreover the outcomes of teleworking were difficult to specify. They found little evidence of increased productivity, and no evidence that teleworking increased job satisfaction.

Finally, Eizema (2010) investigated the relation between NW and the work family balance. He also found no evidence that NW was positively connected with a positive work family balance. However he did find that working at home regularly is positively correlated with the amount of autonomy that people experience.

Research opportunities in NW literature

As can be concluded from the literature above, most research about NW has been done with working adults as participants. While NW should be fulfilling the specific needs of generation Y employees, little research has systematically examined young adults' expectations regarding the prevalence and type of work-family conflict they might encounter. Barnett et al. (2003) conducted one of the few studies that measured anticipated work life balance problems among students. In this study it was found that students anticipate work-family conflict and in fact do postpone getting a career or children to manage this anticipated conflict. Another outcome of this study was that students who grew up in a household with two working parents were less concerned about work-family conflict than students whose mother was a housewife. However, to our knowledge, no studies were conducted on the relationship between NW and reduced anticipated work family conflict and facilitation in the generation Y.

Another conclusion from the above literature is that most research on WF and FW conflict focused on the negative spillovers between the working role and the family role, while literature about NW mostly looks at the possible positive effects of working place and time independent. Moreover, most previous research did not distinguish between the different types (work-to-family and family-to-work) of WF conflict. Furthermore most preceding research only looked at the correlation between NW and WF conflict. This means that no attention is given to other possible outcomes in different scenarios. This underexposures of negative consequences of NW, different types of conflict, and possible outcomes in different settings distort the world view on NW. However it also gives excellent opportunities for new (scenario study) research.

Moreover the research on flexible working hours (NW) and WF/FW conflict does not give consistent conclusions on whether working flexible hours/working at home positively or negatively correlate with WF/FW conflict (Cloin and Hermans, 2006, Kossek et al., 2005) . Furthermore the total lack of (consistent) literature about generation Y and NW (McCrindle, 2003, studentalent , 2010) underscores the importance of gaining insight into whether NW decreases WF conflict and whether it is suited for the new generation of employees, or whether it is just another new hype. This thesis will contribute to the literature by examining whether generation Y employees would like to work in a NW environment and how it will affect WF conflict and facilitation.

Hypotheses

Based on the above literature, three hypotheses about NW and the Generation Y were formulated. The first hypothesis is based on the lack of consistency in the literature about whether generation Y employees would like to work in an NW environment or not (McCrindle, 2003, studentalent, 2010). In this study it is hypothesized that generation Y employees are supposed to be independent, to love freedom and flexibility, and to hate micromanagement (Martin, 2005), which is exactly what NW is all about. Moreover, because of the increased autonomy and the possibility to work hours that suit employees best, NW can decrease expected negative spillovers (e.g. conflict) that exist between work and family (Cloin and Hermans, 2006). Based on the above two reasons, the first hypothesis of this study is:

Hypothesis 1: Generation Y employees prefer NW over companies that offers TW (traditional working).

Frone (2003) stated that Work-to-Family (WF) conflict occurs when too much time and energy spent on work makes it difficult to accomplish all the tasks that the home environment expects one to perform in the family role. Because of flexible schedules and less commuting time, NW correlates with decreased WF conflict. Moreover, he also stated that NW might, because of the decreasing boundaries between work and family roles, increase the positive spillovers between work and family roles. Cloin and Hermans (2006) claim that, because of the flexible schedules, the increased freedom and greater possibilities to make decisions for themselves, NW is the best solution decrease WF and FW conflict.

The above theoretical views are supported by the meta analysis of Gajendran and Harrison (2007), whose outcomes were that employees who telework have less WF conflict than employees who work in a standard working situation. Also Hornung and Glaser (2009) found that increased telecommuting corresponded with reduced WF conflict. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) found that, because NW leads to a higher decision latitude, NW also leads to more WF facilitation. However there were other studies that found that the only pro of NW was a slightly increased productivity (Bailey & Kurkland, 2002). Furthermore there were even studies that found no evidence for a correlation between NW and an increased work-family balance at all (Eizema 2010).

Following the reasoning of Frone (2003) and Grzywacz and Marks (2000) the second hypothesis of this thesis is:

Hypothesis 2: Students in NW condition will anticipate more WF and FW facilitation than students in the TW condition.

And despite the fact that some studies (Eizema, 2010; Bailey & Kurkland, 2002) found no WF and FW conflict reduction, the reasoning behind the third hypothesis follows the meta analysis Gajendran and Harrison (2007) and the empirical results of Hornung and Glaser (2009) and Cloin and Hermans (2006):

Hypothesis 3: Students in NW condition will anticipate less Work Family conflict than in the TW condition.

Not everybody in the generation Y is the same. Just like with every new technology the rate of adoption smart phones follows an S-shaped curve where first the adoption rate is slow, later increasingly fast, and in the end declining again (Pedersen, 2005). This means that not everybody is introduced to the new technology at the same time. Some are at the front of the technological adoption curve while others are at the end. This means that although McCrindle

(2003) claims that the whole generation grew up with technology around them, and that they are much more likely to use it in every aspect of their lives, there are generation Y students who are not that used to new technology. This could account for different preferences among generation Y students. To test for this potential moderating effect “using a smartphone for email” is included in this research. Since students who use a smart phone are at the front of the curve, the fourth hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 4: Students who use a smart phone for email are more likely to prefer a NW working environment over an TW working environment than students who do not use their mobile phone for email.

Harackiewicz et al. (2002) found that getting higher grades in college could be partially explained by the level of independence of the students. The more independent you are, the higher your grades. Therefore it could be argued that students who get higher grades are, because they do not need managers who explain them everything, more willing to work in a NW environment. To check for this potential moderating effect the following hypothesis is formulated:

Hypothesis 5: Students with higher than average grades are more likely to prefer a NW working environment over an TW working environment than students who get lower than average grades.

The last potential moderator variable in this study is gender. Women are generally more dissatisfied with their jobs and men and women experience stress in different ways (Greenberg and Baron, 2003). Moreover women are more likely to choose working part-time over working full-time to spend more time with their kids and at home (CBS, 2010). Because NW allows employees to spend time at home if needed, as long as it is made up for it at other times, it is can be expected that women prefer NW more than men do. This reasoning leads to the last hypothesis of this thesis:

Hypothesis 6: Female students are more likely to prefer a NW working environment over an TW working environment than male students.

Method

Procedure

This scenario study was conducted among 90 students of a Dutch HBO college in Amsterdam. During the break of 2 classes students who were following a course in applied psychology were asked to participate in the study. Prior to handing out the survey, the college instructor informed the students about the background of the study and the procedure of getting data. After the break the completed questionnaires were collected. The reasons for choosing a survey were that surveys are cheap and easy to use for both the researcher and the respondent. When creating a survey guidelines to minimize errors are: to keep the survey short (less than 20 minutes (Bowers, 1999) and to keep the lay-out clear and easy to understand (Read, 1991). In the survey in this study both criteria were met.

Scenario's

On the cover page of the survey a short introduction was provided in which the background of the study was explained once again. Moreover participants were instructed to read the scenario and answer the questions on their own. The second sheet of the survey consisted of either one of the approximately 280 word scenario's (which can both be found in appendix 1). In the introduction of the scenario's the respondents were also asked to imagine working in the described setting and having a partner and children. After reading the scenario the students were asked to complete the survey. In the scenario itself an organization, which was managed in a New Working (or Traditional Working) way, was described. Both scenarios described a working situation in which one was working together with 12 colleagues at the HRM division of an Amsterdam based company called "Fantastisch BV". In the NW version all employees could work at the flexible workspaces at the department using their laptop. They could choose when and where to work and the manager would only look at their output. Due to laptops and smartphones employees also were described to work at home and after office hours. In the TW version all employees had their own desk and everybody had to be at work from 9 to 5. The manager was described to follow the employees more closely and wanted intermittent reports on how the work was going. Finally it was described that normally, after 5 o'clock the work for the day is done.

Participants

Of the 90 respondents 4 had only partially completed the questionnaire, therefore these participants were removed from the analysis. Of the 86 remaining respondents, 50 (58%) were

female and 36 (42%) were male. 42 respondents were in the TW condition and 44 were in the NW condition. The youngest respondent was 19 years old and the and the oldest was 26. The mean age was 21.6 with a standard deviation of 2.2 years. Based on their age (born between 1982 and 1995) all respondents could be labeled as generation Y.

Measures

Manipulation check

The questionnaire itself consisted of four parts. The survey started with a manipulation check. Participants were asked how much they agreed with the statement that employees of “Fantastisch BV” had to be at the office from 9 to 5. The second part of the manipulation check measured autonomy with a scale developed by Karasek (1979). This scale consisted of three statements about how much autonomy the employees experienced ($\alpha = .95$). An sample item of this part of the questionnaire was: “I have the ability to make my own decisions.” All statements of the manipulation check had to be answered on a 7 points scale (1= completely disagree and 7 = completely agree).

Work-family conflict and facilitation

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of 48 items that measured anticipated work-family facilitation and conflict. The conflict questionnaire was developed by Carlson and Frone (2003), while the facilitation questionnaire was developed by Van Steenbergen et al. (2007). All statements in this part of the questionnaire had to be answered on a 7 points scale (1= completely disagree and 7 = completely agree).

The conflict scales consisted out of eight three-item scales which examined strain-based, time-based, behavioral, and psychological conflict in the WF and FW direction. Sample items are of this scales are: “Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I get home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy (strain-based WF conflict)”; “I have to miss activities at home due to the amount of time I must spend on work” (time-based WF conflict); “Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work” (behavioral FW conflict); and “When I am at work, I often think about things I need to accomplish at home” (psychological FW conflict). The scale reliabilities ranged from $\alpha = .40$ to $.90$ (with only 2 of the 8 scales scoring below $.80$)

The facilitation questionnaire measured individuals’ energy-based, time-based, behavioral, and psychological WF and FW facilitation experiences in combining their work and family roles. Sample items are: “When I get home from work I often feel emotionally recharged, enabling me to make a better contribution at home” (energy-based WF

facilitation); “The amount of time I spend on my work, stimulates me to undertake enjoyable activities in the time I spend on my home life” (time-based WF facilitation); “Because of the things I learn at home I also function better in social contacts at work” (behavioral FW facilitation); and “Because of my home life, I am more able to put work-related matters into perspective” (psychological FW facilitation). The scale reliabilities ranged from $\alpha = .60$ to 0.88 (with only 1 of 8 scales scoring below .75).

Commitment

In the third part of the survey commitment was measured with five statements. The original affective commitment scale of De Gilder, Van den Heuvel and Ellemers’ 1997 three-components model of commitment ($\alpha = .72$) were used. However, to shorten this part of the questionnaire, it only consisted of the three statements of the original scale with the highest factor loading. A sample item of the commitment scale part of the questionnaire was: “I feel at home at Fantastisch BV”. Next to the affective commitment scale, this part of the questionnaire included a question on how much people would like to work for “Fantastisch BV”. All statements in this part of the questionnaire had to be answered on a 7 points scale (1= completely disagree and 7 = completely agree).

Control variables

The last part of the survey measured the five control variables; gender, year of birth, owning a smart phone, emailing with your phone, and the last three grades obtained.

Results

Manipulation check

The manipulation of message content was successful. Participants who had to imagine working in a NW setting disagreed significantly more ($M_{NW} = 1.88$, $SD = 1.43$) with the statement that employees had to be at the office at fixed times than participants who had to imagine working in the TW situation ($M_{TW} = 6.20$, $SD = 0.79$, $t(86) = -17.39$, $p < 0.001$).

As intended, the second part of the manipulation check involved checking the anticipated autonomy. Participants who had to imagine working in a NW working situation anticipated significantly more autonomy ($M_{NW} = 5.81$, $SD = 1.02$) than participants who had to imagine working at a TW working situation ($M_{TW} = 4.67$, $SD = 1.22$, $t(86) = -4.71$, $p < 0.001$).

After the manipulation check, t-tests were conducted to check whether the participants were randomly divided over the NW and TW categories. The results of these checks showed that both gender ($t(86) = 1.051$, $p < .29$) and age ($t(86) = 1.78$, $p < 0.8$) were randomly distributed.

Correlation analysis

The Pearson R correlation was calculated separately for both the NW and the TW scenario. Table 1 shows the correlations of the NW scenario in the upper right half of the table (above the diagonal and the correlations of the TW scenario in the lower left half (below the diagonal). The descriptive statistics of the correlation analyses are shown in Table 2.

From the correlation analyses it can be concluded that there are many work-family facilitation subscales that are closely related. (e.g. positive behavior spillover and negative energy spillover in the NW analysis and positive and negative behavior spillover in the TW analysis). This parallels previous studies of Van Steenbergen (2007) and Carlson and Frone (2003). Also affective commitment, attractiveness of the job, satisfaction with the job and autonomy closely correlate with one another, just like in Gajendran et al. (2007).

Table 1. Correlations between the subscales in both the TW and the NW scenario

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1 Positive WF (time)		.22	.54**	.03	.16	.20	-.05	-.03	.28	-.04	.33 [†]	.20	.17	.31 [†]	.06	-.20	.67**	.64**	.66**	.52**
2 Positive FW (time)	.05		.12	-.07	.00	.03	-.01	.01	.53**	.69**	.23	-.10	.18	-.16	.62**	.39 [†]	.31 [†]	.27	.18	.07
3 Negative WF (time)	.02	.05		.37*	-.32 [†]	-.11	.10	.06	.23	-.31 [†]	.33 [†]	.20	-.10	.27	.02	-.08	.33 [†]	.22	.36 [†]	.33 [†]
4 Negative FW (time)	.02	-.31 [†]	.32 [†]		.04	-.06	.22	.18	-.16	-.21	.43**	.44**	.19	.14	.27	.05	.08	-.13	-.05	.04
5 Positive WF (energy)	.20	.47**	-.36 [†]	-.09		.37*	-.53**	-.27	-.09	.07	-.13	-.21	.16	-.01	-.16	-.05	-.04	-.06	.05	-.06
6 Positive FW (energy)	.30 [†]	.10	.32 [†]	.52**	.16		-.38*	-.28	.44**	.23	.20	.05	-.18	.26	-.36 [†]	-.01	.14	-.08	.08	.13
7 Negative WF (strain)	-.26	-.22	.55**	.66**	-.42**	.16		.72**	-.10	.01	.30	.51**	.15	-.11	.38 [†]	.14	.25	.20	-.04	.04
8 Negative FW (fatigue)	.15	.15	.34 [†]	.25	-.31 [†]	.35 [†]	.40**		-.15	-.10	.27	.40**	-.12	.12	.46**	.63**	.17	.03	.12	.04
9 Positive WF (behavior)	.43**	.06	.25	.41**	.12	.64**	.15	.49**		.62**	-.10	-.32 [†]	-.07	.28	.13	.11	.46**	.13	.19	.41**
10 Positive FW (behavior)	.32 [†]	.12	-.03	.22	.18	.72**	-.09	-.31 [†]	.69**		-.18	-.30	.36 [†]	.05	.44**	.17	.21	.07	-.08	.15
11 Negative WF (behavior)	.02	.25	.30 [†]	-.09	.03	-.18	-.06	.05	-.32 [†]	-.28		.86**	-.06	-.05	.12	.19	.13	.26	.22	-.01
12 Negative FW (Behavior)	-.18	-.05	.37 [†]	.31 [†]	-.04	.02	.27	.05	-.08	-.24	.54**		.02	-.01	.07	.09	.08	.31 [†]	.23	.13
13 Positive WF (psychological)	.48**	.25	-.03	.13	.21	.57**	.02	.51**	.42**	.64**	-.19	-.09		.23	.14	-.40**	-.01	.31 [†]	-.23	.06
14 Positive FW (psychological)	.49**	.08	-.34 [†]	-.12	.25	.27	-.30	-.06	.34 [†]	.69**	-.22	-.50**	.48**		-.20	.03	.05	-.03	.02	.28
15 Negative WF (psychological)	-.25	.24	-.34 [†]	-.16	.10	-.23	.27	-.16	-.14	-.20	-.01	.10	-.09	-.08		.58**	.42**	.18	.30	.26
16 Negative FW (psychological)	-.10	.13	.00	.32 [†]	-.05	.05	.36 [†]	.41**	.31 [†]	.18	-.02	-.18	.09	.15	.15		.05	-.21	.18	.03
17 Affective Commitment	.19	-.26	-.34 [†]	.26	.36 [†]	.00	.06	-.23	.17	.11	-.38 [†]	-.08	.17	.31 [†]	.31 [†]	.24		.64**	.67**	.56**
18 Attractiveness	.30	-.31 [†]	-.33 [†]	.28	.24	.05	.12	-.06	.24	.22	-.44**	-.10	.25	.26	.26	-.03	.75**		.67**	.46**
19 Satisfaction	.42**	-.22	-.39**	-.04	.16	.05	-.12	-.09	.20	.32 [†]	-.41**	-.37 [†]	.26	.60**	.60**	-.05	.55**	.68**		.68**
20 Autonomy	.57**	.03	-.41**	-.18	.45**	.02	-.32 [†]	-.12	.05	.17	-.17	-.45**	.41**	.63**	.63**	-.05	.54**	.46**	.64**	

Note to table 1*** correlation is significant at $p < 0.01$ * correlation is significant at $p < .05$
 All significance levels are tested two sided

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the correlation analysis and analysis of the scores in both the facilitation and conflict subscales in the NW and the TW scenarios

	M_{TW}	SD_{TW}	M_{NW}	SD_{NW}	t -value	p
1 Positive WF (time)	4.6	.75	5.1	1.04	-2.52	.02**
2 Positive FW (time)	3.9	.99	4.2	1.29	1.26	.21
3 Negative WF (time)	3.9	1.07	4.3	1.41	1.33	.19
4 Negative FW (time)	3.6	.95	3.7	.92	.53	.59
5 Positive WF (energy)	4.2	1.06	4.1	1.34	.89	.38
6 Positive FW (energy)	4.8	1.23	4.8	.98	-.029	.98
7 Negative WF (strain)	3.4	1.27	3.5	1.23	.31	.76
8 Negative FW (strain)	3.6	1.23	3.1	1.14	-1.81	.07*
9 Positive WF (behavior)	4.7	.99	5.1	1.02	-1.41	.16
10 Positive FW (behavior)	4.4	1.34	4.6	1.16	-.78	.41
11 Negative WF (behavior)	3.6	.81	4.0	1.03	1.99	.04**
12 Negative FW (Behavior)	3.6	1.04	4.2	1.25	2.72	.01***
13 Positive WF (psychological)	4.0	1.04	4.2	1.05	-1.05	.29
14 Positive FW (psychological)	4.8	1.17	4.6	1.04	.71	.48
15 Negative WF (Psychological)	3.9	1.19	3.6	1.40	-3.13	.06*
16 Negative FW (Psychological)	3.8	.99	3.3	1.42	-1.97	.00***
17 Affective Commitment	4.3	.82	4.8	1.11	1.89	.06*
18 Attractiveness	4.6	1.61	4.9	1.51	1.21	.23
19 Satisfaction	4.7	1.11	5.0	1.34	1.34	.18
20 Autonomy	4.7	1.22	5.8	1.02	-4.71	.00***

Note *** correlation is significant at $p < 0.01$ ** correlation is significant at $p < .05$ * correlation is significant at $p < .10$. All significance levels are tested two sided

Main analyses

The first hypothesis stated that generation Y students prefer to work for NW companies over TW companies. This is tested in multiple ways. First differences between affective commitment and job satisfaction were analyzed. In addition the difference in scores on the question “I would like to work for Fantastisch BV” (the attractiveness of the workplace) were evaluated. Table 2 shows the outcomes of this analysis. Based on the scores, the hypothesis is

only partially supported, and only the affective commitment of the NW workplace could be marked as larger (on a marginally significant 10 % significance level) than the TW workplace. None of the other scales showed a significant difference, so the hypothesis that generation Y students prefer to work for NW companies over TW companies has to be rejected.

The second hypothesis stated that students in the NW condition would anticipate more WF and FW facilitation than students in the TW condition. T-tests were performed to test for differences on these eight positive spillover scales. The results of these tests are found in Table 2. As can be seen from the table, generation Y students in the NW condition ($M = 5.1$, $SD = 1.3$) expect more WF time facilitation than students in the TW condition ($M = 4.6$, $SD = .75$, $t(86) = -2.52$, $p < 0.05$). In all the other fields of work family facilitation no significant differences were found. So, the hypothesis that stated that students in NW condition will anticipate more WF and FW facilitation than students in the TW condition has to be rejected, except for time based WF facilitation.

The third hypotheses stated that students in the NW condition would anticipate less WF and FW conflict than students in the TW condition. T-tests were performed to test for differences on these eight negative spillover scales. The results of these tests are found in Table 2. As can be seen from the table, generation Y students in the NW condition anticipated significantly less FW psychological conflict ($M = 4.8$, $SD = 1.17$ vs. $M = 3.9$, $SD = 1.40$, $t(86) = -3.13$, $p < 0.01$) and (marginally significant) less WF psychological conflict ($M = 3.8$, $SD = 0.99$, vs. $M = 3.3$, $SD = 1.42$, $t(86) = -1.97$, $p < 0.10$). However, next to the above findings supporting the hypothesis, the data analysis also lead to the unexpected findings that students in the NW condition ($M = 4.0$, $SD = 1.03$) expect more WF conflict caused by the spillover of negative behavior than students in the TW condition ($M = 3.6$, $SD = 0.80$, $t(86) = 1.99$, $p < 0.05$). The same goes for FW conflict caused by the spillover of negative behavior ($M = 4.2$, $SD = 1.25$ vs. $M = 3.6$, $SD = 1.04$, $t(86) = 2.72$, $p < 0.01$). Based on the above findings the hypothesis that students in NW condition will experience less anticipated work-family conflict than in the TW condition has to be rejected, except for FW and WF psychological conflict.

Moderators and other variables

In the introduction it was argued that intelligence (which is measured by the proxy: the last three grades), owning a smart phone and using it for email, and gender could also influence the anticipated work family conflict.

Better than average student

To check the hypothesis that being a better than average student positively correlates with preferring the NW company, the samples were divided into two groups based on their grades (below or above the average sample grade of 6.77). An ANOVA was used to test the effect of grades and the TW/NW condition (the independent variables) on affective commitment, job satisfaction and attractiveness of the job. As can be seen from Table 3, the effect was only marginally significant (at a 10% level) for affective commitment ($F(94, 86) = 2.28, p .08$), where smarter than average students preferred the NW environment more than the less intelligent students. Thus, the fourth hypothesis, that stated that smarter than average students are more likely to prefer a NW working environment over a TW working environment than less intelligent students, has to be rejected.

Table 3. Does intelligence moderate the relationship between being a generation Y student and preferring NW over TW

	<i>F-value</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M_{ow&G>6.7}</i>	<i>M_{ow&G<6.7}</i>	<i>M_{ow&G>6.7}</i>	<i>M_{ow&G<6.7}</i>
Affective commitment	2.28	.08*	4.6	4.2	4.9	4.2
Job satisfaction	.76	.52	4.6	4.4	5.1	4.8
Attractiveness	1.10	.35	4.9	4.5	4.9	5.2

* correlation is significant at $p < .10$. All significance levels are tested two sided

Using a smartphone for email

The hypothesis that using a smart phone for e-mail positively correlates with preferring the NW working environment over the TW working environment could unfortunately not be tested. Only 20 (and only 6 in the TW scenario) of the 86 students did not use their mobile phone for e-mail. As a consequence of which the power is too low to achieve significant results.

Gender

The last hypotheses stated that being a woman positively correlates with preferring the NW working environment over the TW working environment. An ANOVA was used to test the effect of gender and the TW/NW condition (the independent variables) on affective commitment, job satisfaction and attractiveness of the job. As can be seen from Table 4, the effect was only marginally significant (at a 10% level) for affective commitment ($F(4, 86) = 2.47, p = .07$), where the male students preferred the NW environment more than the female students. Consequently the fifth hypothesis, that stated that female students are more likely to

prefer a NW working environment over a TW working environment than male students, has to be rejected.

Table 4. Does gender moderate the relationship between being a generation Y student and preferring NW over TW

	<i>F-value</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M_{m&TW}</i>	<i>M_{f&TW}</i>	<i>M_{m&NW}</i>	<i>M_{v&TW}</i>
Affective commitment	2.47	.07*	4.4	4.5	5.3	4.4
Job satisfaction	1.14	.34	4.4	4.6	4.9	4.5
Attractiveness	1.36	.26	4.5	4.9	5.0	5.0

* correlation is significant at $p < .10$. All significance levels are tested two sided

Discussion

The central goal of this research was to gain more insight into the preferences of generation Y students about their future working environment. Moreover the aim of this study was to fill the holes in existing NW and work family conflict and facilitation literature, that mostly focused on older generations or merely looked at work-family conflict. When existing NW literature focused on the generation Y no consequent conclusions were reached (McCrindle, 2003; Studentalent, 2010). Moreover studies that examined the effect of NW on both work-family conflict and facilitation are (to our knowledge) non-existent. By filling these two holes in the literature, this thesis gives a solution to the above debate and gap in the existing literature.

Theoretically this study was based on the role expansion theory (Marks, 1977), work-family conflict and its four forms (Frone, 2003; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985) and work-family facilitation and its four form (Grzywacz, 2002; Van Steenbergen et al., 2007). The implications of NW on a working environment were analyzed with a scenario study using two scenarios. The scenarios in this study were based on the definition of NW by Peters et al. (2007) and the definition of TW by Martin (2005). The scenarios helped the participants to visualize situations they were not familiar with, so they could answer questions about NW while actually still being a student.

Preferring NW over TW

In this study it was first examined whether generation Y students preferred a NW working environment over a TW working environment. It was found that the affective commitment in the NW situation was only marginally significant higher than in the TW situation. No evidence was found for differences in job satisfaction and attractiveness of the employer. These findings are consistent with the study of studentalent (2010), who found that students did not prefer a NW working environment over a TW working environment. These findings are counter intuitive when Martin's (2005) characteristics of the generation Y (who love independence, freedom and flexibility and hate micromanagement) are taken into account.

However, a closer examination of the results show that for all three categories, students in the NW scenario preferred their workplace more than students in the TW scenario. Despite the fact that differences in job satisfaction and attractiveness of the employer are nowhere near significant and only .3 points on a 7 point scale, the difference in the affective commitment scale is even marginally significant and .5 points on a 7 point scale. This means that with a bigger sample, the same difference on affective between the groups would have

lead to significant results and the hypothesis would have been accepted. Therefore it is reasonable to say that the difference in affective commitment between the TW and the NW work situation is present and relevant.

Work-family facilitation

The second hypothesis of this study was that students in NW condition will anticipate more WF and FW facilitation than students in the TW condition. This hypothesis follows Frone (2003) and Grzywacz and Marks (2000), who stated that because of decreased boundaries between work and family roles and a bigger decision latitude, NW would lead to more WF and FW facilitation. However, based on the of this study the hypothesis had to be rejected, except for WF time facilitation.

It could be argued that decreased commuting time is the reason for the larger WF time facilitation in the NW working place. Because employees can decide to work at home and work at flexible times there is less need for them to travel to their job during rush hour. Furthermore NW allows employees to plan their activities, while in TW managers have bigger voice in when things have to be done. This greater freedom forces employees to learn how to manage their time efficiently during work. Because this they will be able to manage their time more efficiently at home too. Even so, because both situations do not differ enough in the family situation to affect work behavior, FW time facilitation (just like all other forms of FW facilitation) does not differ between the TW and NW working place.

A possible reason why NW only leads to a higher expected time based WF facilitation and no other form of expected work-family facilitation can be found when looking into the underlying causes of expected higher positive energy, behavioral and psychological spillovers. Just like in the Job Demands-Resources model (Demerouti et al., 2001), where job resources like social support from colleagues, feedback and participation improve job performance and wellbeing, it can be argued that WF role facilitation is partially caused by these job resources. Because in a NW working environment there is less interaction with colleagues than in a TW working environment, the job resources might also be less present and consequentially NW will not lead to more positive role spillovers on the energy, psychological and behavioral level.

Work-family conflict

Furthermore, in this study it was argued that students in NW condition will anticipate less work-family conflict than in the TW condition. This hypothesis followed the theory of Cloin and Hermans (2006) who claim that because of flexible schedules, increased freedom and

greater possibilities to make decisions for themselves, NW will decrease work-family conflict. This theory was supported by the outcomes of the meta analysis of Gajendran and Harrison (2007). Despite the strong theoretical foundation, the third hypothesis was not fully supported and the outcome of this study was that students only expected less WF and FW psychological conflict in the NW condition. No difference in anticipated conflict was found on the other subscales, except for behavioral WF and FW conflict. In those subscales it was found that students anticipated more behavioral conflict working in a NW working environment than TW environment. This outcome is the exact opposite of what was, based on existing literature, expected at the start of the study. Although at first this outcome seems counter intuitive, there are several good arguments why employees in a NW working situation experience have more problems finding effective behaviors that are acceptable in both situations.

First of all, when you are working at an office, the (negative) behaviors one has during work are somewhat psychologically linked to the working place. Then, when the employee goes home, one enters a new environment. The new environment has new behaviors associated with it (e.g. being nice and supportive). When one works at home, there is no change of environment so the employee has no time to recalibrate their behavior to the family situation. This also works the other way around. When one works at home, and still acts like one is while working, one might not act “hard” enough or be too friendly. At home these behaviors are optimal for the situation, while in a more competitive working environment they might be less suitable.

Secondly, NW means that one does not always work regular hours and that, due to email on mobile phones employees can be reached 24 hours a day. Because of this, the boundaries between work and private life are diminishing. Employees will find it harder to distinguish between work and private time and behaviors from work (family) will more easily spill over to the family (working) environment than in the TW situation where the boundaries between work and family are less permeable.

Thirdly, the difference between the hypothesis (which was based on exiting literature) and the outcome of this study could possibly be explained by the fact that both Cloin and Hermans (2006) and Gajendran and Harrison (2007) expected that conflict in general would be lower in a NW environment than in a TW environment. Neither of them looked into to work-family conflict in such detail that they distinguished between specific types of WF and FW conflict the way this study did.

The last possible explanation for the different findings of Gajendran and Harrison

(2007) (who found that NW lead to less work-family conflict) and this thesis (that found that NW increases behavioral WF conflict), is that Gajendran and Harrison (2007) performed a correlation study, while this thesis is a scenario study. In a scenario study, the scenarios help the participants to visualize situations they were not familiar with, so they could answer questions about a situation while they have actually never been in that situations. This might lead to less than accurate answers. The correlation study of Gajendran and Harrison (2007) was performed on employees who were, mostly, born before 1982, which makes them unfit to answer questions about the feelings of the generation Y. Furthermore a correlations analysis only looks at the dependency between two variables while not paying attention to what actually caused the correlation between (in this case) NW and work-family conflict.

Intelligence and gender

The last three hypotheses of this study concerned moderation effects. The first moderator (smartphone use) could not be checked for because of the low number of non-smartphone users in the sample. The second possible moderator (intelligence) did not have an effect on the preference of NW over TW in generation Y students. A possible reason why this moderator did not affect the outcome of the study is that, despite the findings of Harackiewicz et al (2002) that higher grades partially correlate with independence, intelligence is not a very good proxy for independence.

The last moderator that was checked for is gender. Of the three measures of preferring NW over TW, gender only influenced the level of affective commitment, where female students scored marginally higher than their male counterparts. Most literature suggested that women would prefer NW over TW because of their preference for working part-time and the way they experience stress (CBS, 2010; Greenberg and Baron, 2003). A possible explanation for why this was not found in this study is that women started answering the questions with the premise that, in the scenario, they were already working part time. Another explanation for not finding women preferring the NW situation over the TW situation is that in the generation Y gender differences are less apparent than in previous generations and that the time men and women expect to spend on their family is pretty much the same.

A further possible explanation for the similar scores of the male and female participants is that the data was obtained with a scenario study. Such a study allows people to visualize situations they are not familiar with, so they could answer questions it. However, a weakness of this kind of study is that, because the participants have no experience with combining working and family roles, their expectations are not in line with reality.

Implications for practice

Although this small study is only a small part in the (still relatively new) research field of the work-family interface and NW, the present research provides insights that can be useful for organizations. To begin with, the main point that organizations can learn from this study is that, opposed to popular belief, they do not need to introduce NW just to attract generation Y workers. In general, students, independent of gender and intelligence level, showed no special preference for the NW scenario over the TW scenario.

However, the fact that the generation Y does not show a clear preference for NW over TW, does not mean that NW has no upsides. Firstly generation Y students in the NW scenario scored marginally higher on affective commitment than in the TW scenario. Another outcome of this study was that that working for a NW company will help employees to plan their family time more efficient.

However, next to the previously mentioned positive outcomes, an outcome that managers have to take into account when introducing NW is that it can lead to more work-family behavioral conflict. Students expect that in the NW situation, problem solving behavior that is effective at work, will be counter effective in the family role (and vice versa). Because family and work roles are more difficult to keep apart for NW employees than for TW employees, it is likely that NW employees will encounter more problems at home. Another con of the diminishing borders between work and family roles and the increasing accessibility due to smart phones, is that employees will be less able to let go of work (family) problems during free (work) time. So, according to the results of this study NW will lead to more psychological conflict than a traditional working situation. Therefore, to counter both problems, it is advisable for managers to train employees in keeping their work and family roles separated before introducing NW.

In conclusion, despite the fact that NW has many positive points, it is not the holy grail for organizations. By introducing it, it is not likely that companies will attract a lot of extra generation Y employees. Moreover, when the positive sides of NW leads companies to introducing NW, they have to give their employees special training to prevent them from experiencing the possible negative effects of this new way of working.

Limitations and directions for future research

Despite the many strengths of this research, there are also a few weaknesses. The most important one is that the sample sizes in this study were relatively small, and I had to rely on self-reports on what students would expect rather than actual reports from people who

actually work in the two different conditions. Therefore the outcomes have to be interpreted as expectations rather than differences that actually occur.

Moreover several respondents stated that they found it hard to continue focusing during the 10 to 15 minutes it took to fill in the questionnaire. Other respondents claimed that, because the statements in the survey were grouped, they felt an inclination to give the same answer to all the questions in the same category. Both facts might have led to the answers slightly differing from the actual opinions and feelings of the respondents and thus slightly distorted outcomes. Finally, because many items had to be measured with a survey of limited length, items (like attractiveness of the workplace) were measured with only a few questions. The use of more items would perhaps have given a more reliable outcome.

However, despite the limitations of this study, it has contributed to existing theory about generation Y, NW and role facilitation by being the first study that investigated anticipated role facilitation in the NW working environment in generation Y students. Since it is the first study in this area, additional research should assess the robustness of the present findings. When conducting this future research, researchers should aim to avoid the imperfections of this study. An ideal study would use multiple shorter surveys that only measure one aspect (e.g. facilitation or attractiveness of the NW workplace) and, like in Grzywacz and Marks (2000), question participants that are already working, rather than questioning students that have to imagine working in a scenario. Moreover, an ideal study would use a bigger sample and it would longitudinally follow employees during a transition of their company from TW to NW. With a larger sample, the power of the calculations would be bigger. And by following employees during a transition, the real effects of a change from TW to NW can be mapped.

Furthermore, as the present research was carried out in the Netherlands, it would be interesting to conduct comparative studies between countries (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) that differ in attitudes to work. The Netherlands scores, on a world scale, relatively high on individualism (Hofstede, 2011). Moreover Ashforth et al. (2000) claim that in collectivist societies role integration is more promoted than in individualistic societies. Therefore it might be interesting to explore if in a more collectivist society like Japan (Hofstede, 2011), NW role facilitation would be higher. However, since NW also reduces the contact with colleagues it would also be interesting to explore whether more collectivistic cultures would reject NW to a greater extent than the more individualistic Netherlands.

In addition this study found that students expected more WF and FW psychological role conflict in the NW condition than in the TW condition. This can be explained by the

human tendency to attach feelings to (work/home) surroundings. However since this outcome is not in line with previous literature, future research should be carried out to confirm the result that employees in a NW working environment really experience more psychological role conflict than employees in a TW working environment.

Conclusion

This research contributed to the NW literature in several ways. First, an important contribution is made by finding out that, contrary to popular press, NW is in general, not preferred over TW by the generation Y. Moreover the still young research field of work-family facilitation is expanded by adding expected role facilitation in the NW environment to studies that focused on TW working environments. Thirdly this study also looked into the negative effects of NW. One (unexpected) outcome of this study was that NW can lead to behavioral role conflict. All previous findings show that, contrary to popular belief, NW has quite a few downsides and companies should carefully consider the pros and cons before introducing NW on the work floor.

References

- 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, 472–491
- Bailey, D. E., and Kirkland, N. B. (2002) A review of telework research: findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of organizational behavior*. 23, 383-400
- Barnett, R. C, Garies, K. C , James, J., Sc Steele, J. (2003). Planning ahead: College seniors' concerns about career-marriage conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62, 305-319
- Belanger, F., & Collins, R. W. (1998). Distributed work arrangements: A research framework. *Information Society*, 14, 137–152
- Bowers, D. K. (1999). FAQ on online research. *Marketing Research*, 10, 45–49
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work–family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 67, 169-198
- Campbell Clark, S. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53, 747-770
- Carlson, D.S. Et al (2000) Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Work–Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249–276
- Carlson, D. S. & Frone, M. R. (2003) Relation of behavioral and psychological involvement to a new four-factor conceptualization of work-family interference. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17-4, 514-535
- Cinamon, R. G. (2006). Anticipated work-family conflict: Effects of gender, self-efficacy, and family background. *Career Development Quarterly*, 54, 202–214
- Cloïn, M. & Hermans, B. (2006). Onbetaalde arbeid en de combinatie van arbeid en zorg. In W. Portegijs, B. Hermans & V. Lalta (red.). *Emancipatiemonitor 2006*. Den Haag: SCP
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F. and Schaufeli, W.B. (2001a), “The job demands-resources model of burnout”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 499-512
- Eizema, E. (2010) Het Nieuwe Werken ontleedt: De invloed van thuiswerken op de werk-prive balans, autonomie, en het contact met kantoor
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65–78
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gajendran, R. S. 7 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, 1524-1541
- Greenberg, J. & Barron R.A. (2003) Behaviour in organizations. 10th edition. Pearson education p 131 and 150
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76–88
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 72–92.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 111-126
- Gutek, B. A. Et al. (1991) Rational versus gender role explanation for work-family conflict. *Journal of applied psychology*, 76, 560-568.
- Harackiewicz, J.M., Barron, K. E., Tauer, J.M., Elliot, A.J. (2002) Predicting Success in College: A Longitudinal Study of Achievement Goals and Ability Measures as Predictors of Interest and Performance From Freshman Year Through Graduation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 94,

Hofstede, G. (2005). Netherlands. Retrieved June the 14th, 2011, from http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_netherlands.shtml

Hofstede, G. (2005). Japan. Retrieved June the 14th, 2011, from http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_japan.shtml

Hornung, S. & Glaser, J. Home-based telecommuting and quality of life: further evidence on an employee oriented human resource practice. *Psychological Reports*, 104, 395-402

Kossek, E.E., Lautsch, B.A. & Eaton, S.C. (2005). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 347-367

Loon, M. (2010) Het nieuwe werken niet populair onder studenten en starters. Obtained on March 28, 2011, via <http://www.nu.nl/werk-en-privé/2476279/nieuwe-werken-niet-populair-studenten-en-starters.html>

Marks, S. P. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921-936

Martin, C.A. (2005) From high maintenance to high productivity: What managers need to know about Generation Y. *Industrial and commercial training*, 37, 39-44

McCrinkle, M. (2003) Understanding generation Y. (Published by the Australian leadership foundation)

NN, (2010) CBS Cijfers werkende moeders. Obtained on May 8, 2011 via <http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/arbeid-sociale-zekerheid/cijfers/extra/werkende-moeders.htm>

Pedersen, P.E. (2005) Adoption of Mobile Internet Services: An Exploratory Study of Mobile Commerce Early Adopters. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*. Vol. 15 (3), 203-222

Peters, P., Dulk, L., Lippe, T., (2008) Effecten van tijd-ruimtelijke flexibiliteit op de balans tussen werk en privé. *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken* 24 (4), 341-362

Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N. & Mooijaart, A. (2007) How Work and Family Can Facilitate Each Other: Distinct Types of Work-Family Facilitation and Outcomes for Women and Men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12 (3), 279-300

Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2009). Combining work and family: How family supportive work environments and work supportive home environments can reduce work-family conflict and enhance facilitation. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families and work*. University Press of America.

Appendix 1: the NW and TW scenario

The TW scenario:

Je werkt bij Fantastisch BV. Het bedrijf is gevestigd in Amsterdam en er werken 50 mensen op 3 afdelingen. Zelf werk je op de afdeling Human Resource Management. Je werkt hier met 12 collega's en het is de sfeer is goed: er wordt goed gewerkt en tegelijk ook lol gemaakt. Je collega's zijn aardig en omdat je allemaal in de zelfde gang zit, kan je elkaar makkelijk aanspreken als je iets van elkaar nodig hebt, of gewoon voor de gezelligheid. Vaak wordt er iedere dag wel even koffie gedronken met zijn allen en ook de lunch wordt samen in de kantine genuttigd. In het kantoor iedereen heeft zijn eigen werkplek met een vaste pc en telefoon. Je manager verwacht dat je elke dag van ongeveer 9 tot 5 op kantoor bent. Tijdens je werkuren kan je je eigen tijd inplannen. Bij de invulling van je werk geeft je manager je duidelijkheid over de taken die de komende tijd af moeten komen. Dit betekent dat je bijna altijd weet wat welke werkzaamheden je per dag in moet plannen en uitvoeren. Bij complexe opdrachten kan je je collega's of manager altijd wel om hulp vragen. Je hebt regelmatig contact met je manager en omdat je tussenrapportages oplevert weet hij in grote lijnen waar je mee bezig bent. Hierdoor ziet je manager direct als er iets fout dreigt te lopen en kan hij je bijsturen. Als je om 5 uur de deur uitloopt en klaar bent voor de dag hoeft je meestal niet meer met je werk bezig te zijn.

The NW Scenario

Je werkt bij Fantastisch BV. Het bedrijf is gevestigd in Amsterdam en er werken 50 mensen op 3 afdelingen. Zelf werk je op de afdeling HRM. Je werkt hier met 12 collega's maar vaak is niet iedereen tegelijk aanwezig. Dit komt omdat jij en je collega's zelf mogen bepalen waar, wanneer en hoe je werkt. Wanneer je wel op kantoor bent is de sfeer altijd goed. Het is gezellig en er wordt hard gewerkt. Je collega's zijn aardig en je hebt allemaal een laptop en smartphone zodat je overal in de afdelingsruimte kan gaan zitten werken. Ook kan je er dankzij draadloos internet voor kiezen om thuis te werken en je kan je eigen tijd indelen. Als je bijvoorbeeld om 2 uur een uurtje naar de kapper wilt, kan dat. Al moet je die tijd natuurlijk wel ergens anders inhalen. Met deze manier van werken heb je geen eigen werkplek. Wanneer je de hulp van een collega nodig hebt, moet je hem of haar meestal bellen of mailen. Je manager houdt geen direct toezicht op wat je doet, maar in samenspraak met hem krijg je een aantal opdrachten in projectvorm. Het maakt je leidinggevende niet uit hoe je je werk uitvoert; het enige wat je leidinggevende belangrijk vindt is dat je werk voor de deadline af is. Met je smartphone ben je de hele dag bereikbaar en kan je altijd mailen. Ook kan er van je verwacht worden dat je na 5 uur ook nog even terugbelt of mailt als een collega of een belangrijke klant een vraag heeft. Omdat mensen zelf hun tijd flexibel indelen zijn de meeste mensen 's avonds of in het weekend ook vaak aan het werk.