

IMPACT OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT ON FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT: A CASE STUDY OF COMMERCIAL PILOTS OF PAKISTAN

DR. MARIYAM MALIK, FOUZIANASIR, AND DR. S. KHURRAM KHAN ALWI

Greenwich University, Karachi, Pakistan

10.5281/zenodo.6553192

ABSTRACT

Purpose - This study has been embarked to discover the impact of supervisor support on family work conflict in commercial pilots of Pakistan. The study was conducted on the commercial pilots of four prominent commercial aviation organizations of Pakistan i.e. public and private organizations.

Design/Methodology/Approach - The data was collected from 255 commercial pilots quantitatively i.e., questionnaire.

Findings - The result concluded that there is no relationship amidst supervisor support and family-work conflicts. This study will guide the relevant authorities in the aviation sector of Pakistan to implement management policies which aid in curbing family-work conflict and simultaneously promote an apt balance between work and home.

Originality/value – Futile research has been done on work-family dynamics in the aviation sector of Pakistan. This study attempted to tap this gap by analyzing the impact of supervisor support on curbing family-work conflict.

Keywords: Supervisor support, family-work conflict, commercial pilots, Pakistan

Paper type Research Paper

INTRODUCTION

This research was premised on analyzing the relationship between family-work conflict and work-family conflict in commercial pilots of Pakistan. This research was focused on commercial sector of aviation focusing on government and private commercial airlines. The commercial pilots of Pakistan have long flight duty time limits which deprives them from spending quality time with their family. Besides inability to meet quality time, they are unable to efficiently fulfill their family responsibilities as well. Due to globalization and its dynamism, workplaces have become demanding causing organizations to render its work policies. The expectations have risen causing a compromise in work and family domain which eventually resulting in life and work conflict. It is this aspect that has garnered a lot of attention in the research world (Esson, 2004). This research is focused on the impact of supervisor support on family-work conflict. Time and energy are diminishing entities. The domain of family and job

demands a lot of energy and time from an employee and therefore an employee needs to invest these diminishing entities wisely. Intrapersonal and interpersonal conflicts arise when there is an imbalance in roles resulting in family-based and work-based conflicts (Rathi & M, 2012). An employee has a high level of job satisfaction when an employee is able to meet its work, family and personal responsibilities as and when it arises (Robbins, 2005). An employee has life satisfaction when an employee is able to fulfill personal and family-based responsibilities (Kim & Ling, 2001).

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Conflicts in work and family domain is a critical issue in modern organizations knowing that family and work lives have started to massively overlap each other resulting in unfulfilled family commitments and work commitments. Organizations are demanding higher investment of efforts and time from the employees in order to be more competitive and more profitable relative to other organizations. Considering the depleting levels of time and energy, fulfillment of roles in one domain impacts the fulfillment of roles in the other domain regardless of the marital status. These conflicts impact an employee's attitude towards life and job.

LITERATURE REVIEW

FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT

Work-life imbalance and hence family-work conflict and work-family conflict level is not confined to one gender (Nasurdin, Ahmad, & Zainal, 2013). Presence of supervisor support acts as a mediator amidst psychological distress and life demands and curbs work-family conflict (Aycan & Eskin, 2005). There is a direct correlation amidst psychological distress and job demands whilst psychological distress is directly related to family-work conflict (Shimazu et al., 2010). Contrasting to WFC, FWC can be termed as a work-family interface that is neglected because of futile research interest as compared to FWC (Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon, & Kiger, 2007). FWC garnered a lot of interest when it was researched by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000), This mode of conflict has been linked with marital dissatisfaction (Geurts, Kompier, Roxburgh, & Houtman, 2006; Hill, 2005), lower job performance (Witt & Carlson, 2006), and high level of absenteeism (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002). Researches in the past 2 decades have also concluded that negative FWC spillover is linked to parental and marital dissatisfaction (Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts, & Pulkkinen, 2006; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998), though the key consequences of FWC in the domain of work, affects not just the job performance but also the job satisfaction levels (Frone, 2003).

SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

Appreciation of employees has been deemed as a source of competitive advantage and simultaneously redirects the organizational scholars' perennial efforts to understand the change in employees' work oriented behaviors and attitude due to motivation (Aryee, Chu, Kim, & Ryu, 2013). Research suggests that interference of work and family demands has adverse outcomes. The adverse outcomes not only

impacts employee performance but also impacts psychological well-being (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Carr, Boyar, & Gregory, 2007; Eby et al., 2005; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Thus, for 20 years, HRM's major emphasis has been in the implementation of family friendly policies to aid employees in effective and efficient work and life balance (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Glass & Finley, 2002; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Kossek & Nichol, 1992; Lambert, 2000; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007). Research has said to show family supportive practices to be contributive towards amending the disadvantages associated with work-family conflict. Most of the practices of family friendly policies such as childcare provision is relatively expensive to contrive mainly because the employees are hesitant that there might be career penalties associated with the utilization of such resources which might incur cost to the organization (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999; Eaton, 2003; Allen, 2001). Consequently, the focus has shifted to informal practices from formal (Allen, 2001; Hammer et al., 2009; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). Supervisor support can be termed as one practice that is extended informally. Supervisor support is said to be a contributive factor that aids socio-emotional support and aids the employees with acquiring an optimum balance of work and non-work-oriented responsibilities, and de-stresses employees (Halbesleben, 2006). Allen (2001) and Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999) conclude that relatively work and life-oriented benefits has a futile impact on experiences and attitude of employees. However, the perception of employee in relation to informal support is sturdily linked to work-family conflict, turnover intentions, affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Moreover, supervisor support has also been deemed as a crucial factor when it comes to family supportive environment (Allen, 2001; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999).

HYPOTHESES:

H1: Supervisor support does have an impact on Family-work conflict.

H0: Supervisor support does not have an impact on Family-work conflict.

figure 1: conceptual framework

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study utilized positivism as a paradigm depicting that there is a cause and an effect of the variables and it is said to be based on truth, reality, and logic. This research dealt with finding out the reality of impact of work-family conflict on family-work conflict and vice versa. This study is quantitatively analyzed 255 commercial pilots of Pakistan utilizing simple random sampling. The study utilized pre-approved inventories of work-family conflict and family-work conflict (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Five items of each variable were used based on 7-point Likert scale.

DATA ANALYSIS

TABLE 1 RELIABILITY OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variables	No. Of Items	Cronbach Alpha Value
Supervisor Support	5	0.927
Family-Work Conflict	5	0.853

The table above shows that the internal consistency through Cronbach Alpha of both the variables; Supervisor support 0.927 and Family-work conflict 0.853; clearly show that there is adequately reliable as the fall above the threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally& Bernstein, 1994; Hair et al., 2010).

TABLE 2 PEARSON CORRELATION

	SS	FWC
Pearson Correlation	1	.035
Sig. (2-tailed)		.573
N	255	255

The table above shows that the P-value for the predictor variable Supervisor support is 0.573 which is greater than 0.05 depicting that there is no significant relationship between the two variables. Therefore, SS does not have an impact on FWC.

Table 3 Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.035 ^a	.001	-.003	6.33800	1.740
a. Predictors: (Constant), SS					
b. Dependent Variable: FWC					

Based on the R value. The model fits by 0.1 percent which means the intensity of the relationship between SS and FWC is low. The Durbin Watson auto correlation value is 1.740 which means the autocorrelation is positive.

TABLE 4ANOVA^A

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	12.798	1	12.798	.319	.573 ^b
	Residual	10163.085	253	40.170		
	Total	10175.882	254			
a. Dependent Variable: FWC						
b. Predictors: (Constant), SS						

The p-value in the table above is greater than 0.05 which shows that the relationship amidst predictor and criterion is insignificant.

Table 5 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Beta	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	23.679	1.062		22.290	.000		
	SS	.032	.057	.035	.564	.573	1.000	1.000
a. Dependent Variable: FWC								

The p-value is greater than 0.05 which indicates that the above alternate hypothesis has **rejected** which further means that SS does not have a relationship with FWC. The VIF is 1 which shows that there is no correlation amidst the independent variables.

RESULT OF HYPOTHESIS

H1: Supervisor support has a significant impact on family–work conflict. **Rejected**

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1 was concerned with the association of SS with FWC. This hypothesis did not receive support. SS support is concerned with supplying resources in terms of time and energy to the employees which tends to aid them in not being affected with draining resources since they have all the ability to have a dense reservoir contained in themselves. Successively, this aids the employees in tackling stresses effectively and efficiently when it comes to FWC. Moreover, there has been a higher level of SS that has been registered when it comes to reducing FWC (Ayman&Antani, 2008). However, when it comes to commercial pilots, it clearly communicates that supervisor support is not present and any form of family-work conflict that occurs is tackled by the

employee regardless of how long it takes and the extent to which it impacts the dynamics and well-being in both the domains.

CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

The research findings are pertinent and relevant for the commercial aviation organizations of Pakistan. The results illustrate absence of extension of support from the chief pilots at departmental level. The job of pilots is characterized by long duty hours, sleep debt, stress, fatigue resulting in job dissatisfaction and life dissatisfaction. Consequently, a commercial pilot's work and life balance state is at stake causing a trigger of conflicts. An imbalance leads to a pilot not only putting his life at stake but also of 200+ passengers on board. When pilots undergo the struggle of managing demands that are rigidly competing from the family and work domain and simultaneously have futile support from the organizations it is then when a pilot undergoes inefficiency and ineffectiveness. The adverse outcomes not only impacts employee performance but also impacts psychological well-being (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2002; Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Eby et al., 2005; Kossek&Ozeki, 1998).

Research has said to show family supportive practices to be contributive towards amending the disadvantages associated with family-work conflict. The informal support of the supervisor is crucial to a commercial pilot. Extension of support from the chief pilot i.e. in terms of ensuring that pilots wellbeing is being spoken off on a regular basis will give the pilots a sense of belongingness and care. Implementation of authoritative and empathetic mode of leadership will motivate commercial pilots to be more vocal of the struggles they undergo. Its not just the chief pilot's duty but a moral obligation of the experienced pilots to discuss what pressures they are undergoing and thereby enhancing the balance amidst work and life. Simultaneously, chief pilots and captains can guide the commercial pilots in acquiring job satisfaction by extension of formal and informal intangible support when it comes to organizational commitment, life satisfaction, job satisfaction to better their performance levels. Hiring an HR counselor will aid in analyzing aspects of job that impact emotions, aids in stress management, and performance management of the commercial pilots and develop their rosters and flight duty time limitations accordingly. HR counselor is a dire need considering the results show that there is zilch support from the supervisor when it comes to knowing the state of family-work disequilibrium, let alone solving it.

Another recommendation is the implementation of CAP371 policy. CAP371 policy imposes a fixed number of hours for a commercial pilot to fly. Currently, the number of flying hours are not fixed and the pilots fly based on the seasons need or their own personal need i.e. if they want to earn extra. Regardless of the reason from the two stated, lives of the cockpit and the cabin crew along with hundreds of passengers are jeopardized.

References

1. Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organisational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 414-435.
2. Allen, T. D., Herst, D., Bruck, C., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278-308.
3. Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 787-810.
4. Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 787-810.
5. Aryee, S., Fields, D., & Luk, V. (1999). A cross-cultural test of a model of the workfamily interface. *Journal of Management*, 25(4), 491-511.
6. Aryee, S., Chu, C. W. L., Kim, T., & Ryu, S. (2013). Family-supportive work environment and employee work behaviors: An investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Management*, 39(3), 792-813.
7. Aycan, Z., & Eskin, M. (2005). Relative contributions of childcare, spousal support, and organizational support in reducing work-family conflict for men and women: the case of Turkey. *Sex Roles*.
8. Ayman, R., & Antani, A. (2008). Social support and work-family conflict. In K. Korabik, D. S. Lero, & D. L. Whitehead (Eds.), *The handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory and best practices* (pp. 287-304). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
9. Boyar, S. L., Carr, J. C., Mosley, D. C., & Carson, C. M. (2007). The development and validation of scores on perceived work and family demand scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 67, 100-115.
10. Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249-276.
11. Eaton, S. C. (2003). If you can use them: Flexibility policies, organizational commitment, and perceived performance. *Industrial Relations*, 42(2), 145-167.
12. Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 66, 124-197.
13. Esson, P. L. (2004). Consequences of work-family conflict: testing a new model of work-related, non-work related and stress-related outcomes (msc thesis). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA.
14. Frone, M. (2003). Work-family balance. In J.C. Quick & L.E. Tetrick (Eds.) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 143-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

15. Geurts, S. A., Kompier, M. A., Roxburgh, S., & Houtman, I. L. (2003). Does workhome interference mediate the relationship between workload and wellbeing? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 532-559.
16. Glass, J. L., & Finley, A. (2002). Coverage and effectiveness of family-responsive workplace policies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 313-337.
17. Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciates family-responsive humanresource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 271-287.
18. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
19. Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 35(4), 837-856.
20. Hill, E. J. (2005). Work-family facilitation and conflict, working fathers and mothers, work-family stresses and support. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 793-819.
21. Kinnunen, U., & Mauno, S. (1998). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among employed women and men in Finland. *Human Relations*, 51(2), 157-177.
22. Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Geurts, S., & Pulkkinen, L. (2006). Types of work-family interface: well-being correlates of negative and positive spillover between work and family. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 47, 149-162.
23. Kossek, E. E., & Nichol, V. (1992). The effects of on-site child care on employee attitudes and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 5, 485-509.
24. Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behaviour-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139-149.
25. Lambert, S. (2000). Added benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 801-815.
26. Nasurdin, a. M., ahmad, n. H., & zainal, s. R. (2013). Comparing work-family conflict and facilitation among male and female entrepreneurs in malaysia. *International journal of business and society*, 14(1), 149-162.
27. Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.
28. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
29. Rathi, n., & m, b. (2012). Work-family conflict and job and family satisfaction: moderating effect of social support among police personnel.

30. Robbins, s. P. (2005). *Organizational behaviour*.Parencic hall.
31. Shimazu, a., bakker, a. B., demerouti, e., &peeters, m. C. (2010). Work-family conflict in japan: how job and home demands affect psychological distress. *Industrial health*, 766-774.
32. Stevens, D. P., Minnotte, K. L., Mannon, S. E., & Kiger, G. (2007). Examining the‘neglected side of the work-family interface’: Antecedents of positive and negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(2), 242-262.
33. Sultana, a. M. (2012).A study on stress and work family conflict among married women in their families.*Advances in natural and applied sciences*, 6(8), 1319-1324.
34. Thomas, L. T., &Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work–family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6-15.
35. Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., &Lyness, K. S. (1999).When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 392-415.
36. Trout, r. C. (2012). Putting family back in work-family conflict: the moderating effect of family life stage on the work-family interface (unpublished ma thesis). Graduate faculty of Louisiana state university and agricultural and mechanical college.
37. Wang, P., &Walumbwa, F. O. (2007). Family-friendly programs, organizational commitment, and work withdrawal: The moderating role of transformational leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 397-427.