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**ABSTRACT**

Policies that enable employees to balance their work and life issues are inclusive in the sense that they give the employees the opportunity to participate in the workforce while at the same time they realize their non-work/life roles. These policies complete their aims only when they are transformed into actions and are taken up by the employees.

Despite the abundance of work-life research, the role of upper management and how they affect their subordinates decision in taking up inclusive work-life polices has not received any attention so far (den Dulk and Peper, 2009). In particular, there has been lack of research that examines the role of HR manager in taking up inclusive work-life policies. HR managers are leading the overall implementation of the work-life organizational policies and play a crucial role in the establishment of work-life culture at the workplace. Despite the leading role of HR manager in work-life take ups there has been a notable lack of relevant empirical research. The present research is contributing to the field of work-life by looking at the role of HR manager in employees’ taking up work-life policies that help them realize work and life roles.

At the methodological level, work-life research has been criticized for using cross-sectional, single-source data. The present research is contributing to the methodological level of the field by using multi-level data coming from employees and their HR managers. In particular this research is using two levels of data. The first level of data consists of the answers, to the respective questionnaires, of 329 employees working in 35 organizations. The second level of data consists of the answers, to the respective questionnaires, of the 35 HR managers of those organizations.

The aim of the present research is to investigate the role of HR manager in taking up inclusive work-life practices by employees. In particular, the present study looks at the effect of HR manager as role model, employee champion and change agent in facilitating employees to take up work-life policies that enable them to balance both work and life roles.

The findings suggest that policies that are not compatible with the societal culture but help employees to balance their work and life - such as paternity leave- need the HR manager’s support as role model and employee advocate to be taken up. Policies that are in conflict with both societal and labour culture – such as flexible working hours- need the strong support of the HR manager as change agent.

**INTRODUCTION**

During the last two decades, organizations face new pressures resulting from the increasing competition and the global economy (Casey, 2009). At the same time there has been an ongoing increase in female labor market participation; this has caused a shift in the family typology of the employees – e.g. increase in dual career couples - (Boles, Howard, & Donofrio, 2001) and in the needs of their family members. As a consequence of the dramatic changes in the dynamics of both family and organizational domain, the inter-role conflict between those two domains has received increased attention (Perlow, 1998; Kirchmeyer, 1995). Work-family conflict and family-work conflict create undesirable outcomes to the employees, their families and the organizations (Lockwood, 2003; Frone, Russel, & Barnes, 1996; Googins, 1991).

More specifically, at the organizational level (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2009), the cost of work-family and family-work conflict has grave consequences. Organizations are unable to use productively their talented employees; at the same time, absenteeism and turnover increase causing additional costs for attracting and selecting new employees (Britt, & Dawson, 2005; Mesmer-Magnus, & Viswesvaran, 2005; Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003). In order to reduce these negative outcomes, organizations need to embrace a family supportive behavior and establish inclusive policies which support employees for work and family demands (Thomas, & Ganster, 1995; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992; Greenhaus, & Beutell, 1985). Family supportive organizational policies play a key role in balancing work and family life and in alleviating the conflict between these roles. The work-family policies adopted by organizations have been shown to create a positive impact not only on employees’ and their families’ lives, but also on organizational outcomes (Gonyea, 1993).

However, organizational policies do not guarantee use of these policies by the employees. Organizations have a history in developing HRM systems such as full time work, in order to achieve the homogeneity of the workforce and to weaken diversities; under these systems, it is difficult to promote work-life policies and implement them (Jackson, 1992). Changes in HRM systems that would allow promotion and putting in action work-family/life (W-F/L) policies require an HR manager who can act as a change agent and as an employee champion (Urlich, 1997); this role of HR manager has been neglected in W-F/L research and literature.

This research focuses on the use of W-F/L inclusive policies. We use two levels of data. The individual level (Level 1) focuses on employees’ use of policies; the organizational level (Level 2), focuses on HR managers. Could HR manager’s characteristics influence the use of inclusive W-F/L balance programs? In particular, are the roles of HR managers as change agents and employee champions related to the existence and use of W-F/L policies? Can the HR manager be role model for employees with regard to family/life issues? To what extent aversive organizational culture can influence taking up work-life policies?

The present paper contributes to the research and literature of use of W-F/L policies by focusing on HR manager’s roles as change agents, employee champions and role models; both issues have received scant attention in the relevant field. The data for the study come from organizations in the greater Athens area.

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES**

**W-F/L policies and use**

Family supportive organizational policies play a key role in balancing work and family/life and alleviating the conflict between these roles.  Employees who carry the burden of family responsibilities spend less time and energy at work, resulting in lower performance (ten Brummelhuis and van der Lippe, 2010). Policies for balancing work and family/life function as a catalyst for reducing the intensity of this conflict, providing time savings and recharging of employees’ energy reserves. According to Clark’s (2002) research findings, flexible work arrangements and employers’/managers’ supportive attitude are associated with lower levels of work-family conflict. The W-F/L policies have positive impact on organizational outcomes as well (Gonyea, 1993).

A categorization of family/life supportive programs has been introduced by Neal, Chapman, Ingersoll-Dayton, and Emlen (1993) and Veiga, Baldridge and Eddelson (2004); according to this classification there are three categories: a) policies, b) benefits and c) services. **Policies** include (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2009), formal and informal rules governing employees’ work and leave programs. A further categorization of policies distinguishes between “flexible policies (targeted at increasing employees’ temporal and spatial flexibility) and care-related policies (aimed at assisting employees in combining work with care giving)” (Peper, Dikkers, Vinkenburg & van Engen, 2011, p. 226). The present paper focuses on the first category that is, flexible and care related **policies** (Peper, Dikkers, Vinkenburg & van Engen, 2011).

Scandura and Lankau (1997) emphasize that the effects of flexible working hours are multiple and may be positive - such as reducing stress, increasing autonomy and lower absenteeism rates - or negative -such as problems with planning and organizing work, difficulties in supervision of work and changes in organizational culture. However, the benefits of flexible working hours exceed the costs (Golembiewski and Proehl, 1978). Kossek, Lautsch and Eaton (2005) argue that flexible work arrangements, especially flextime, contribute to the integration of workers in their roles in the workplace and in their family, while allowing them  to define by themselves how, where and when they will complete their obligations.

The present study focuses on two types of flexible policies: flexible working hours and early departure on special occasions. None of these are statutory rights according to Greek labor legislation. The other category of W-F/L arrangements that this research focuses on are care-related policies; they aim at freeing employees, for a period of time, from their work duties in order to give care to their new-born or young children. The care-related policies we focus on are maternity leave, paternity leave, and child-care leave; all these are statutory policies according to Greek labor law.

**The multiple roles of HR manager in organizational/cultural changes**

Despite the abundance of research on W-F/L issues, the role of middle line managers have just recently received some theoretical (Poelmans and Beham, 2008) and research attention (den Dulk and Peper, 2009). The role of upper management and how their opinions and attitudes affect their subordinates’ attitudes and decision making (den Dulk and Peper, 2009) has not received any attention so far.

During the past decades, the new roles of HR managers have gained attention by the researchers, since a transition has taken place from the traditional personnel specialists to HR manager. More specifically, there has been an effort to detect the role that HR managers play in the significant and complex procedure of organizational change. The HR management has to be able to answer the question *“How do we engage the hearts and minds of everyone in the organization to change?”* (Urlich, 1997, p.12).

Legge (1978) categorized personnel managers according to their role in innovation and cultural change, as conformist innovators and deviant innovators. Conformist innovators are personnel specialists who use their expertise to enable the organization to adopt policies designed to achieve tangible organizational improvements. Deviant innovators are those personnel specialists who use their credibility to encourage and to convince organizations to embrace new ideas, routines, policies and values. Even though Legge’s categorization indicates that personnel managers can play a significant role in the promotion and adoption of cultural change in organizations, the first important link between HR managers and change was made by Storey (1992), as noted by Caldwell (2001). Storey (1992) classified HR managers in four categories: advisers, handmaidens, regulators and change-makers; change-makers focus both on “hard” and “soft” interventions in order to enhance personnel’s motivation and commitment (Story, 1995).

Urlich (1997) proposed a multiple-role model for HR managers that could satisfy the contemporary challenges of the changing nature of human resources. This model consists of four different roles: strategic partner, administrative expert, employee champion and change agent. The present paper focuses on the last two roles. An important role of a contemporary HR manager is the **employee champion; t**he main obligation of the employee champions is **to listen and respond to employees’ needs by providing them the appropriate resources that meet their changing demands.** An employee champion has to **be involved in the day-to-day problems, concerns and needs of the employees** in order to detect the improvements that are demanded (Urlich, 1997). In particular, with regard to W-F/L issues, that HR manager’s relationship with employees can have an important influence on their perception of work-family conflict by providing advice or information, tangible resources or services, concern and empathy (Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1992; House, 1981). In conclusion, HR managers who act as employee champions and provide their employees with informational, instrumental and emotional support regarding work-family/life issues can have a positive influence upon them. They help everyone in an organization to **detach from old routines**, behaviors and practices and adopt a new culture. In this capacity, HR managers have to be able to determine which issues will surface the organization’s agenda (Milliken, Martins, & Morgan, 2008). More specifically, HR managers are the employees’ voice and they have to understand and communicate to the upper levels of organizational hierarchy the needs of the employees for work-life balance. Therefore, work-life policies become part of the organization’s agenda when HR managers act as change agents and relate positive organizational outcomes with these policies and their implementation. Millken, Martins, and Morgan’s (1998) research indicates that the probability for the organization to be responsive in the work-life policies is greater when changes in the structure and demands of families are salient to an HR executive.

**The multiple roles of HR managers in the implementation of work-family/life policies**

It can be derived from the above that HR managers are the protagonists in the cultural change needed for the adoption of work-life policies. In a nutshell, HR specialists have to hearken to the employees’ need for work-life initiatives, transfer those needs to the upper management of the organization, transform those needs into policies, create the appropriate conditions for change, generate a family-friendly culture and finally **implement** (emphasis added) the designed work-life policies. Their roles as employee champions and change agents cannot be complete if employees do not take up these policies. The role of HR managers in the implementation phase of work-life policies is also multidimensional and entails them to act as employee advocates/champions, change agents/champions and role models. First, they act as the employee champions/advocates for the work-family/life balance so that employees can take up these policies.

*Hypothesis1[[1]](#footnote-2)HR. The more supportive HR managers are of W-F/L policies, the more likely the employees are to use these policies*

Second, they act as change agents/champions. Caldwell (2001) developed a typology of the HR agency roles that take part in the **implementation** of organizational/cultural change. One of the roles that derive from Caldwell’s (2001) model is the **change champion**. Change champions belong to the **upper part** of the hierarchical pyramid of the organization and they have the vision and the power to lead and **implement** the changes of the HR policies (Caldwell, 2001).

*Hypothesis 2HR.The more an HR manager acts as a change agent/champion, of W-F/L policies, the more likely the employees are to use these policies*

*Hypothesis 3HR. The higher the position of the HR manager in the hierarchy of the organization is, the more likely the employees are to use W-F/L policies.*

The third role that the HR manager has to play in the implementation phase is that of the practicing model. The HR managers are entrusted with the mission to communicate properly and adequately the provided W-F/L policies to the employees and have to insure that the usage of work-life policies will not affect employees’ careers. Ryan and Kossek (2008) highlight that the use of W-F/L policies may lead to exclusion, while it is assumed by many coworkers and supervisors that employees who use W-F/L policies receive unfair benefits at the expense of others. Furthermore, Perlow (1995) indicated that there is a positive relationship between long hours worked by an employee and management’s impression of employee’s commitment. Dunn-Jensen and Lipjankic (2009) denote that managerial practice encourages employees to engage in visibility behaviors in order to be promoted or rewarded. Consequently, users of W-F/L policies potentially have negative consequences on their careers (Judiesch, & Lyness, 1999). Budd and Mumford (2005) note that in the UK the vast majority of employees do not take advantage of the available W-F/L policies due to fear of negative appraisals and foregone earnings. Human Resource managers have to ensure that the evaluation of all employees is based on work outcomes and not on “face time”. Therefore, HR managers in cooperation with well-informed line managers (who are the critical link between the design and the practice of policies, McCarthy, Darcy, & Grady, 2010) should elucidate the availability of work-life policies and the absence of negative consequence when these policies are used.

However, as Urlich (1997) underlines *“because employees listen more to what executives do than to what they say, this inconsistency leads to the failure of many change efforts …”* (p.12). Therefore, HR managers have to act as role models for the employees; even if the organization provides and communicates the most well-designed work-life policies, employees will not use them unless they perceive that the upper hierarchy and the HR manager not only support the use of the policies but they use them too. Ajzen (1991) proposed that past experiences related to a particular behavior affect attitudes toward this behavior. Based on this proposal, McCarthy et al. (2010) stated that line managers that either use or have used W-F/L balance programs themselves are more positively disposed to the use of such policies by their subordinates. Similarly, it is expected that HR managers who use the provided W-F/L policies will serve as role models and promote the use of those policies to the employees.

*Hypothesis 4HR. Employees with HR managers who report more frequent care of children are more likely to take up W-F/L policies.*

Besides child-care involvement, the gender of the HR manager is expected to affect the availability and the usage of work-life policies in an organization. Based on the social identity theory (Kanter, 1977), Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) indicate that as the percentage of women –who are still facing family demands more intensely than men do- in managerial work positions rises, it is expected that they will promote work-life issues. Milliken, Martin and Morgan (1998), also note that the organization’s tendency to be family responsive is of greater scale when at least a member of the top management is a woman or has some personal experience with issues such as dual-career parenting, single parenting or elder care. Consequently, it is expected, according to social identity theory that gender of the Human Resource manager play a key role not just in the existence of W-F/L policies provided by the organization but also in the use.

*Hypothesis 5HR. Employees with female HR managers, according to social identity theory, are more likely to take up W-F/L policies.*

Another demographic characteristic that is expected to be related with the use of W-F/L policies by the employees is the age of the HR manager. Kossek, Hammer, Michel, Petty and Yragui (2009) suggest that older managers are seen as less family supportive. Hence, younger HR managers are expected to be more family supportive, while they are more able to understand the W-F/L challenges that employees may face. Furthermore, Greenblatt (2002) emphasizes that older employees tend to conceptualize W-F/L balance as a luxury and expect younger employees to make the same sacrifices as they did and to prioritize work over family or personal life. Moreover, Kossek et al. (2009) indicate that more educated managers are more sympathetic to other employees’ needs.

*Hypothesis 6HR: Employees with older HR managers are less likely to take up W-F/L policies.*

*Hypothesis 7HR: Employees with more educated HR managers are more likely to take up W-F/L policies.*

Although, age and level at the organizational hierarchy are associated to a large extent with the number of years managers are in the organization, we expect that the more years a person has worked in the organization the more positive may be in employees’ usage of W-F/L policies. According to the disruptive hypothesis, usage of W-F/L may make HR manager’s job more difficult. However, the longer the HR manager in his position, the better they grasp the issues involved in take-ups and the less the disruption they may face.

*Hypothesis 8HR. Employees with HR managers who work for more years at this position are more likely to take up W-F/L policies.*

**The organizational support and obstacles in the use of W-F/L policies**

Employees’ practices are influenced by the organizational culture; organization’s norms, procedures and values affect employees’ behavior in general and the use of W-F/L policies. Organizations perceived as more flexible by the HR managers can adjust more easily to employees W-F/L requests and consider them as less disruptive (disruption hypothesis); in this organizational environment employees are more likely to use W-F/L policies.

*Hypothesis 9HR. The more flexible an organization is, the more likely the employees are to use W-F/L policies.*

Similarly, organizations that do not avoid uncertainty may adapt more easily to employees’ W-F/L requests and consider them as less disruptive.

*Hypothesis 10HR. The more an organization avoids uncertainty, the less likely the employees are to use W-F/L policies.*

HR managers face many obstacles in the procedure of implementing those policies. The long tradition of developing HRM systems -such as full time- aiming to achieve homogeneity in the workforce (Jackson, 1992), is in conflict with initiatives that are more personalized (Kossek et al., 2009). Efforts to establish and implement new policies for balancing work and life demands might create conflict with the existing administrative routines, customs, rules and accustomed behaviors (Cyert and March 1963); employees who work in organizations that adhere strictly to administrative routines, customs, rules and accustomed behaviors (we call it bureaucratic organizational culture, ) are discouraged to take up W-F/L policies.

*Hypothesis 11HR. The more bureaucratic an organization is, the less likely the employees are to use W-F/L policies.*

**METHODOLOGY**

**Data collection and samples**

A random sample of one hundred organizations –registered in their association- was contacted in the greater Athens (Greece) area and asked to participate in the survey; 38 organizations responded to the survey. Since the present research is designed as multi-levelled, two samples of respondents were selected, that is the sample of HR managers and the sample of employees and two different questionnaires were distributed. Researchers distributed the appropriate questionnaires to HR managers and employees separately so that influence of one part on the other is avoided. 38 HR managers and 312 employees gave usable data.

***Employees’ sample.***Of the 312 employees who completed usable questionnaires, 125 are males (40%) and 188 females (60%); their age ranges from 22 to 60 years (median=33, mode=28 and mean=34.5 years). Seventy four per cent have higher degree of education. Their tenure in the organization ranges from less than a year to 39 years (median=4, mode=3 and mean=7 years) and they hold the present position for less than a year to 39 years (median=3, mode=1 and mean=4.8 years). They have been working for less than a year to 40 years (median=10, mode=10 and mean=11.5 years). Two percent are in top management, 8% are in upper management, 12% in the middle management and 20% in lower management and 58% are employees without subordinates.

***HR manager’s sample.*** Of the 38 managers, 20 are males (53%) and 18 are females (47%); their age ranges from 25 to 65 (median=41, mode=42 and mean=41). Thirty three (90%) have higher degree of education. Their tenure in the organization ranges from 1 to 29 years (median=7, mode=2 and mean=7.3 years) and they hold the present position for 1 to 20 years (median=3, mode=2 and mean=4.8 years). They have been working for 5 to 39 years (median=18, mode=12 and mean 18.8 years). Twenty two percent are in top management, 40% are in upper management, 17% in the middle management and 21% in lower management.

**Measures: a) Measures for Employees (Level 1)**

***Use of policies (Dependent variables)***. Employees are asked how often (when they need it) they have used the five W-F/L policies included in the present study (maternity leave, paternity leave, child-care leave, flexible working hours, and early departure for special occasions) (1=never, 5=every time I need it); this is the dependent variable.

***Applicability of policies***. Employees are asked whether the five W-F/L policies are applicable to them (for example, for someone without children, child-care leave is not applicable) (yes/no); this is used as control variable in the model.

***Knowledge of the policies****.* Employees are asked if they know whether each of the five policies exists in their organization (yes/no). Then their answers are compared to the answer that HR manager gives to a similar question (yes/no) and a new variable ***employee’s knowledge***is constructed: -1 get those who do not really know whether the policy exists, 0 for those who really know that the policy does not exist and 1 for those who really know that the policy exists.

***Children under 18 and care for children***. Employees are asked a) the number of their children under the age of 18 (this is used as control variable) and b) how often they devote time for the care of their children (1=never 5=every day).

***Work interdependence****.* The construct consists of three items measuring the degree to which the employee’s work is interdependent with other employees’ work (i.e. In order to do my job, I depend heavily on the job of my colleagues, 5=completely agree, 1=completely disagree) (Morris and Stern, 1980) (Alpha=.745).

***Work load.***The construct consist of three items indicating the workload employees feel they have (i.e. the workload in my job is heavy, 5=completely agree, 1=completely disagree) (Kim, 1996) (Alpha=.724)

***Change agent.***The construct consist of 4 items measuring employee’s proactive behaviour (i.e. When I do not like something, I change it, 5=completely agree, 1=completely disagree) (Straub, 2009) (Alpha=.775)

***Perceived supervisor’s support.***The construct consists of 4 itemsmeasuring the degree to which employees feel that they have their supervisors support (i.e. my immediate supervisor is willing to listen to my work-related problems (Kim, 1996) (Alpha=.827).

***Perceived organizational flexibility.*** The construct consists of 4 items measuring employees’ perceived flexibility and adaptability of the organization to changing environments (i.e. my organization can be described as flexible and continually adapting to change, 5=completely agree, 1=completely disagree) (Kitchell, 1995) (Alpha=.788)

***Perceived organizational family/life support.*** The construct consists of 4 items indicating the degree to which employees perceive their organization as family supportive (i.e. my organization provides its employees with useful information they need to balance work and family (Straub, 2009) (Alpha=.896)

**b) Measures for HR Managers (Level 2)**

***Children under 18 and care for children***. HR managers are asked a) the number of their children under the age of 18 (this is used as control variable) and b) how often they devote time for the care of their children (1=never 5=every day)

***Employees’ advocate/champion.*** The construct consists of 4 items indicating the degree to which HR managers work for employees work-life balance - i.e. a) provide their employees with useful information they need to balance work and family b) respect their employees’ desire to balance work and family(Straub, 2009) (Alpha=.914, n=38).

***Change agent.***The construct consist of 4 items measuring HR manager’s attitude and behaviour as a change agent/champion , i.e. a) I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others opposition or b) Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change, c) When I do not like something, I change it (5=completely agree, 1=completely disagree) (Straub, 2009) (Alpha=.634, n=38).

***Organizational flexibility.***The construct consists of 4 items measuring HR managers’ perceived flexibility and adaptability of the organization to changing environments i.e. my organization can be described as flexible and continually adapting to change (5=completely agree, 1=completely disagree) (Kitchell, 1995) (Alpha=.865, n=38).

***Organizational certainty avoidance****.* The construct consists of three items indicating the degree the organization is perceived that avoids ambiguities and uncertainties i.e. in this organization job requirements and instructions are spelled out in detail so employees know what they are expected to do (House et al, 2004) (Alpha=.673, n-38).

***Organizatinal bureaucracy.*** This eight-item construct measures the degree to which an organization is managed through formalized relationships and centralized authority i.e. a) Going through the proper channels in getting the job done is constantly stressed, or b) There is no specific rule manual detailing what employees should do (r). (Moorman and Miner, 1995) (Alpha=.759, n=38)

**Analysis of the Data**

The present paper uses Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) in order to assess the hypothesized impact of HR managers on the use of the five W-F/L policies. Employees’ data are the first level data and HR managers’ data are the second level data. In the model presented in this paper, variables from both levels of data are supposed to have a direct relationship with the dependent variable and no interactions have been modeled. Because in Level 2 analysis (HR manager level) the number of observations is small (38 observations) estimates with the p values equal or less than 0.10 are considered acceptable as statistically significant (Sun, Aryee and Law 2007).

**RESULTS**

Only predictors that are statistically significant are reported in the following tables in order to avoid visual noise for the reader.

***Use of maternity leave*** (Table1). At the employee level (Level 1) data, being a female – naturally- taking frequent care of children, being more years in the organization and knowing the existence of the policy make employees’ use of maternity leave more likely; however, none of the HR manager’s level (Level 2) hypothesized predictors have a significant impact on the use of the policy.

--Table 1 about here---

***Use of paternity leave*** (Table 2) Employees who use paternity leave are –naturally- males , who report more frequent care of their children , are more years in the organization), they believe that they have family support from their organization, and know about the existence of the policy. At the HR manager level (Level 2), HR managers who are employee advocates (H1HR) and take frequent care of their children (H4HR) have significant impact on employees’ use of the policy.

--- Table 2 about here---

***Use of child-care leave*** (Table 3) Employees who use child care leave are more likely to be females, report more frequent care of their children, are at higher levels of organizational hierarchy, they have been more years in the organization – as compared to those who are do not use the policy- and know about the existence of the policy . The HR managers of those employees who are more likely to use the policy are at the higher levels of organizational hierarchy (H3HR), older (H6HR) and report frequent care of their children (H4HR). --- Table 3 about here ---

***Use of flexible hours*** (Table 4). The employees who are more likely to use flexible working hours are females at the higher levels of the organization) and know about the existence of the policy. Their HR managers are change agents (H2HR) and their organizations have low uncertainty avoidance culture (H10HR) and low bureaucracy (H11HR). --- Table 4 about here--

***Use of early departure on special occasions*** (Table 5). The employees who are more likely to use early departure for special occasions are in their organization for more years (H3EMP) and believe that they have their supervisors’ support . Their HR managers are more likely to be males (H5HR) of older age (H6HR) who report frequent care of their children (H4HR).

--- Table 5 about here—

**DISCUSSION**

The HLM analysis revealed an interesting pattern with regard to employees’ behavior at the first level analysis. If the policy is applicable to the employee, **knowledge of the existence of the policy** is a significant predictor of use in four out of the five policies we study (Tables 1- 4). Also, for four out of the five policies, **the number of years employees** have in this position is a significant predictor of use of the policies (Tables 1, 2, 3, and 5). Employees’ frequent **care for children** is significantly related to use of three out of the five policies (Tables 1, 2, and 3). Excluding the two gender specific policies- maternity leave and paternity leave where gender, naturally, is predictor (Tables 1 and 2)- **gender** is also significant predictor of child care and flexible working hours; female employees are more likely to use these two policies (Tables 3 and 4). Hierarchy is significant predictor for childe care and flexible working hours; employees at the higher levels of hierarchy are more likely to use child-care and flexible-hours policies (Tables 3 and 4). Perceived organizational support has a significant impact on male employees’ take up of paternal leave (Table 2) and on employees’ use of early departure for special occasions (Table 5). Finally, perceived supervisor’s support (H10EMP) has a significant impact on employees’ use of early departure for special occasions (Table 5). Work load, work interdependence, the role of the employee as change agent and perceived organizational flexibility were not found to have any significant impact on the use of any policies in this study (Tables 1-5).

**HR Manager’s and organizational culture’s influence** (Level 2 Data).

HR managers who act **as role models** (H4HR) facilitate employees to take up three policies; in particular, HR managers’ frequent **care for their children** is associated with employees’ use of paternity leave (Table 2), child-care leave (Table 3) and early departure (Table 5); this is the most frequent Level 2 predictor of use of policies. **Age** is the second frequent predictor of use; HR manager’s age is associated with use of child-care leave (Table 3) and early departure (Table 5). However, the direction of the association is not negative as we have hypothesized (H6HR); contrary to our hypothesis, employees with older HR managers are more likely to take up these policies. HR managers who act as **employee advocates** (H1HR) facilitate male employees to take up paternity leave (Table 2). HR managers who act as **change agents** (H2HR) facilitate their employees to use flexible hours (Table 4). HR managers in higher level of the organizational **hierarchy** (H3HR) facilitate their employees to take up child-care leave (Table 5). The **gender** of HR manager has impact on use of early departure. However, the direction of the association is opposite to our hypothesis (H5HR); employees with male HR managers are more likely to take up early departure policy (Table 5). With regard to organizational characteristics, as perceived and reported by the HR manager, employees in organizations with **low uncertainty avoidance** (H10HR) and **low bureaucracy** (H10HR) are more likely to use flexible working hours (Table 4). HR managers’ education (H7HR,) years in their position (H8HR), and organizational flexibility (H9HR) were not found to have any significant impact in use of any of the policies.

Before we attempt to interpret the pattern of the results, it is necessary to refer to Greek legal and cultural environment of workplace relationships. First, we have to make a legal distinction of the five policies we study, between **statutory** (maternity, paternity, and child care leave) and **non-statutory** (flexible working hours and early departure for special occasions). Second, among the statutory policies, a further cultural distinction has to be made between the established/popular policies -maternity and child care leave- and new/not-so-popular policy of paternity leave.

Employees feel that are entitled to statutory policies; if the policy is applicable to them, they know its existence and have been for long time in the organization, they are more likely to take them up when they need it (Tables 1, 2 and 3). In the case of **maternity leave** (Table1), this is very clear. It is an old statutory and very popular policy in Greece; it is well known and used. So, the role of HR manager or the organizational characteristics is rather nonexistent (Table 1). **Child care** leave (Table 3) is the second most established and popular statutory policy in Greece. So, higher-level female employees with more years in organization who have the care of their children are more likely to use the policy. Older and higher-level HR managers who have the frequent care of their children serve as role models and facilitate the employees to use the policy (Table 3).

The most recent and least known and popular statutory W-F/L policy is **paternity leave** (Table 2). It has a history of about two decades. It can be taken by male employees in case their spouse does use her maternity leave. Since in Greek societal culture traditional gender roles prevail, the father of the family is still the main breadwinner and it is not common for male employees to take paternity leave. So, this policy is incompatible with the prevailing gender roles. Those male employees who really dare to take it need support; and the data show that they have it from their HR manager; HR managers who are employee advocates and act as role models by having the frequent care of their children, facilitate male employees to make the not-so-popular decision and take up their paternity leave.

Among the **non-statutory policies**, **early departure** (Table 5) is rather indifferent policy according to Greek societal and workplace culture. If employees need it and have enough years in the organization are more likely to use it. Knowledge of the existence- or not- does not play any role in the use; it is rather an ad hoc policy and -as such- can be disruptive to an organizations’ work schedule; therefore, employees need to feel they are supported by their supervisors in order to take it. Further support is given by older male HR managers who have the frequent care of their children and, thus, serve as role models (Table 5).

**Working flexible** hours (Table 4) is non-statutory and very unpopular policy in Greece. Labor unions are against the policy of flexible working hours and consider it as the “Trojan horse” used by employers to manipulate employees’ established rights related to full-time work such as job and salary security and higher rates of payment for overtime work; that means that there is a strong culture against flexible working hours. This strong culture cannot be overcome by employees -mostly higher-level females with children under the age of 18- who use this policy. Support is needed by both the HR manager and the organization. In this case, the role of the HR manager as change agent is crucial. Furthermore, an organization with tolerance of uncertainties and low bureaucracy can more easily address issues of disruption coming from changes due to flexible working hours, overcome the existing negative culture and support its employees to use this policy when needed.

***Conclusions*** Summing up the discussion, the following conclusions may come up. Both maternity leave and paternity leave are inclusive policies, that is, they give the opportunity to the child care takers to be part of the labor force and at the same time perform a significant life role. However, in the Greek context they have a significant difference. Maternity leave is well-perceived by both societal and workplace cultures and strongly associated with female employees’ rights; therefore, it is well taken and used without the need for HR manager’s support or organizational support in general. In contrary, paternity leave is not compatible with the societal culture, although it is perceived that it serves the rights of the male employees; therefore, HR manager’s support is needed by male employees who take up this policy; the HR manager who stands by male employees’ side as their advocate and as role model helps them to overcome the societal cultural hurdle and use paternity leave when they need it. Policies that are in conflict with both societal and labor culture –such as flexible working hours- need strong support by both the HR manager and the organization in order to be taken up. HR managers who are change agents can help employees who want to use these policies. Because strong labor culture opposes to flexible working hours, further support by the organization is needed in order this policy to be taken up. Organizations that do not avoid uncertainties, are risk takers and do not rely on bureaucracy are better equipped to face this opposition and more likely to offer support to employees who want to use these policies. Finally, disruptive, ad hoc, policies -such as early departure- which are rather indifferent to societal and labor culture, require older/experienced HR manager who can address unexpected issues coming up from their materialization; it also helps employees to use these policies if the HR manager serves as a role model. Overall, it can be said that inclusive policies that give the employees to perform both work and other life roles need the leading role of HR manager and the organization in order to be taken up.

***Practical implications*** HR managers should focus on and support the needs of employees who would like to take policies described above as incompatible, against-the societal/labor culture, and disruptive. First, HR managers have to make sure that their employees know the existence of these policies. **This research has shown that employees who know about the existence of policies are more likely to use them.**

Also, depending on the policy, HR managers can play one or more of the multiple roles in order to facilitate the use of the policy. They can be employees’ advocates and just help them use a policy; they can be change agents, go against existing/opposing cultures and facilitate employees who want to use unpopular policies. Finally HR managers can just behave as role models since *employees listen more to what executives do than to what they say, this inconsistency leads to the failure of many change efforts …”* (Urlich (1997, p.12). The contribution of the present research is that it reveals the significance of the multiple leading roles of HR managers in the use of work-family/life policies that give the opportunity to employees to be included both in workforce and in life relations.

***Limitations*** So far the work-family/life literature and research has focused on the role of the immediate supervisor’s allowance of W-F/L policies. The present study focuses on the usage of the policies by employees – rather than allowance by immediate managers- and on the roles of HR manager in this usage. The limitation on the present study is that there is a missing link between HR manager and employees which is the immediate supervisor. Future research design should collect both qualitative and quantitative information from HR managers, immediate supervisors and employees in order to complete the missing link between employees and HR managers.
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**TABLE 1**

1st and 2nd Level Predictors of **Use of Maternity Leave**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee Use of Maternity Leave** | | | | |
|  | **Fixed effects** | | | **Random effects** |
| **Employee level predictors(L 1)** (n=312) | Coeffic | df | p-value |  |
| Age | -0.03 | 284 | 0.05 | Σ2 =. 56, L1 residual |
| Education | -- | 284 | ns |
| Children under 18 | -- | 284 | ns |
| Gender | 0.32(F) | 284 | 0.00 |
| Care for children | 0.24 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Hierarchy | -- | 284 | ns |
| Years at the organization | 0.04 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Work load | -- | 284 | ns |
| Work interdependence | -- | 284 | ns |
| Change agent | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al family support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al flexibility | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived supervisor’s support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Employee Knows the policy | 0.14 | 284 | 0.01 |
| Policy applicable to employee | 0.41 | 284 | 0.01 |
| **HR Manager level predictors (Level 2)** (n-38) |  |  |  |  |
| INTERCEPT | 0.01 | 24 | 0.00 |  |
| **Employee advocate (H1HR)** | -- | 24 | ns | INTERCEPT1 U0  residual variance=.05  df=24  p-value=0.03 |
| **Change agent (H2HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Hierarchy (H3HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Children under 18** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Care for children (H4HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Gender (H5HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Age (H6HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Education (H7HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Years at this position (H8HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Flexibility (H9HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Uncertainty Avoidance (H10HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Bureaucracy (H11HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |

**TABLE 2**

1st and 2nd Level Predictors of **Use of Paternity Leave**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee Use of Paternity Leave** | | | | |
|  | **Fixed effects** | | | **Random effects** |
| **Employee level predictors(L 1)** ) | Coeffic | df | p-value |  |
| Age | -- | 284 | ns | Σ2 =. 15, L1 residual |
| Education | -- | 284 | ns |
| Children under 18 | -- | 284 | ns |
| Gender | -0.30(M) (m | 284 | 0.00 |
| Care for children | 0.92 | 284 | 0.04 |
| Hierarchy | -- | 284 | ns |
| Years at the organization | 0.01 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Work load | -- | 284 | ns |
| Work interdependence | -- | 284 | ns |
| Change agent | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al family support | 0.06 | 284 | 0.05 |
| Perceived org/al flexibility | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived supervisor’s support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Employee Knows the policy | 0.07 | 284 | 0.04 |
| Policy applicable to employee | 0.19 | 284 | 0.05 |
| **HR Manager level predictors (Level 2)**  (n=38) |  |  |  |  |
| INTERCEPT | 1.46 | 24 | 0.00 |  |
| **Employee advocate (H1HR)** | 0.04 | 24 | 0.10 | INTERCEPT1 U0  residual variance=.00  df=24  p-value=ns |
| **Change agent (H2HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Hierarchy (H3HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Children under 18** | 0.08 | 24 | 0.10 |
| **Care for children (H4HR)** | 0.20 | 24 | 0.10 |
| **Gender (H5HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Age (H6HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Education (H7HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Years at this position (H8HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Flexibility (H9HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Uncertainty Avoidance (H10HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Bureaucracy (H11HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |

**TABLE 3**

1st and 2nd Level Predictors of **Use of Child-Care Leave**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee Use of Child-Care Leave** | | | | |
|  | **Fixed effects** | | | **Random effect** |
| **Employee level predictors(L 1)** (n=312) | Coeffic | df | p-value |  |
| Age | -- | 284 | ns | Σ2 =. 48, L1 residual |
| Education | -- | 284 | ns |
| Children under 18 | -- | 284 | ns |
| Gender | 0.21 (F) | 284 | 0.00 |
| Care for children | 0.20 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Hierarchy | 0.10 | 284 | 0.04 |
| Years at the organization | 0.02 | 284 | 0.05 |
| Work load | -- | 284 | ns |
| Work interdependence | -- | 284 | ns |
| Change agent | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al family support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al flexibility | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived supervisor’s support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Employee Knows the policy | 0.14 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Policy applicable to employee | 0.32 | 284 | 0.00 |
| **HR Manager level predictors (Level 2)** (n=38) |  |  |  |  |
| INTERCEPT (B0) | 1.38 | 24 | 0.00 |  |
| **Employee advocate (H1HR)** | -- | 24 | ns | INTERCEPT1 U0  residual variance=.00  df=24  p-value=ns |
| **Change agent (H2HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Hierarchy (H3HR)** | 0.82 | 24 | 0.05 |
| **Children under 18** | 0.13 | 24 | 0.09 |
| **Care for children (H4HR)** | 0.05 | 24 | 0.09 |
| **Gender (H5HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Age (H6HR)** | 0.01 | 24 | 0.06 |
| **Education (H7HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Years at this position (H8HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Flexibility (H9HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Uncertainty Avoidance (H10HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Bureaucracy (H11HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |

**TABLE 4**

1st and 2nd Level Predictors of **Use of Flexible Hours**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee Use of Flexible Hours** | | | | |
|  | **Fixed effects** | | | **Random effect** |
| **Employee level predictors(L 1)** (n=312) | Coeffic | df | p-value |  |
| Age | -- | 284 | ns | Σ2 =. 87, L1 residual |
| Education | -- | 284 | ns |
| Children under 18 | 0.28 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Gender | 0.14(F) | 284 | 0.05 |
| Care for children | -- | 284 | ns |
| Hierarchy | 0.17 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Years at the organization | -- | 284 | ns |
| Work load | -- | 284 | ns |
| Work interdependence | -- | 284 | ns |
| Change agent | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al family support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al flexibility | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived supervisor’s support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Employee Knows the policy | 0.43 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Policy applicable to employee | 0.46 | 284 | 0.00 |
| **HR Manager level predictors (Level 2)** (n=38) |  |  |  |  |
| INTERCEPT | 2.37 | 24 | 0.00 |  |
| **Employee advocate (H1HR)** | -- | 24 | ns | INTERCEPT1 U0  residual variance=.37  df=24  p-value=0.00 |
| **Change agent (H2HR)** | 0.13 | 24 | 0.04 |
| **Hierarchy (H3HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Children under 18** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Care for children (H4HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Gender (H5HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Age (H6HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Education (H7HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Years at this position (H8HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Flexibility (H9HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Uncertainty Avoidance (H10HR)** | -0.26 | 24 | 0.09 |
| **Org/al Bureaucracy (H11HR)** | -0.20 | 24 | 0.09 |

**TABLE 5**

1st and 2nd Level Predictors of **Early Departure for Special Occasions**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee Use of Early Departure** | | | | |
|  | **Fixed effects** | | | **Random effect** |
| **Employee level predictors(L 1)** (n=312) | Coeffic | df | p-value |  |
| Age | -- | 284 | ns | Σ2 =. 65, L1 residual |
| Education | -- | 284 | ns |
| Children under 18 | -- | 284 | ns |
| Gender | -- | 284 | ns |
| Care for children | -- | 284 | ns |
| Hierarchy | -- | 284 | ns |
| Years at the organization | 0.03 | 284 | 0.00 |
| Work load | -- | 284 | ns |
| Work interdependence | -- | 284 | ns |
| Change agent | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al family support | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived org/al flexibility | -- | 284 | ns |
| Perceived supervisor’s support | 0.10 | 284 | 0.04 |
| Employee Knows the policy | **--** | 284 | ns |
| Policy applicable to employee | 0.61 | 284 | 0.00 |
| **HR Manager level predictors (Level 2)** (n=38) |  |  |  |  |
| INTERCEPT | 2.76 | 24 | 0.00 |  |
| **Employee advocate (H1HR)** | -- | 24 | ns | INTERCEPT1 U0  residual variance=.04  df=24  p-value=0.06 |
| **Change agent (H2HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Hierarchy (H3HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Children under 18** | 0.19 | 24 | 0.04 |
| **Care for children (H4HR)** | 0.08 | 24 | 0.05 |
| **Gender (H5HR)** | -0.20(M) | 24 | 0.09 |
| **Age (H6HR)** | 0.01 | 24 | 0.09 |
| **Education (H7HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Years at this position (H8HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Flexibility (H9HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Uncertainty Avoidance (H10HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |
| **Org/al Bureaucracy (H11HR)** | -- | 24 | ns |

1. *HR*  indicates that the hypothesis refers to HR Manager level predictors (Level 2). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)