

2019

The Correlation Between Manager Work-life Balance and Employee Engagement

Euart Keith Murvin
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Keith Murvin

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Jean Gordon, Committee Chairperson, Management Faculty
Dr. Robert DeYoung, Committee Member, Management Faculty
Dr. Robert Haussmann, University Reviewer, Management Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2019

Abstract

The Correlation Between Manager Work-life Balance and Employee Engagement

by

Keith Murvin

MA, Webster University, 1990

BA, North Carolina Central University, 1987

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Management

Walden University

May 2019

Abstract

Globalization, 24-hour connectivity, and the expectation that members of the organization commit increasingly more time to work are the reality in an ever-changing environment. Research shows, however, that these demands have resulted in a significant work-life imbalance that produces the opposite effect of reducing productivity. The purpose of this study was to examine the correlation between work life balance satisfaction of front-line managers and the engagement of employees whom they supervise. The variables of these study were: work life balance satisfaction of frontline managers measured by Work life Balance and Emotional Support Scale and engagement perception employees measured by Employee Engagement Survey. Survey data from front-line managers and front-line employees from different industries across the United States were analyzed using a Bivariate Pearson Correlation test to understand the strength of the correlation. The study results $r(89) = 0.115$, $p > .01$ showed no statistically significant correlation between managers work life balance satisfaction and employee engagement. Work-life imbalances create a significant internal conflict as the manager tries to cope with the stress and pressure that affect his/her overall ability to effectively lead and manage. Their work behaviors can promote or destroy a positive work environment where employees strive to meet the organization's mission and vision. The organization and front-line managers benefit from understanding the findings because the organization may adopt innovative ways to support manager work-life balance and front-line managers may improve employee engagement. Positive social change is realized in less stress for managers and employees whom interact in an environment that demands more time and flexibility. Considering the amount of time, we spend at work, less stress can improve the overall quality of the work environment and productivity.

The Correlation Between Manager Work-life Balance and Employee Engagement

by

Keith Murvin

MA, Webster University, 1990

BA, North Carolina Central University, 1987

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Management

Walden University

May 2019

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background of the Study	3
Problem Statement	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Question(s) and Hypotheses.....	7
Theoretical Foundation	8
Engagement Theory	8
Work-Life Balance Proposition	9
Engagement Theory Proposition	10
Work-life Balance Relates to the Study	11
Employee Engagement Theory Relates to the Study	11
Nature of the Study.....	12
Definitions.....	15
Assumptions.....	15
Scope and Delimitations	17
Limitations	18
Significance of the Study.....	19
Significance of Theory	19
Significance of Practice	20
Significance of Social Change	21

Summary and Transition.....	21
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	23
Literature Search Strategy.....	24
Theoretical Foundation.....	25
Literature Review.....	31
Work-life Balance Related Studies	31
Employee Engagement Theory Related Studies	33
The Dependent Variable	49
The Independent Variable	50
Summary and Conclusions	53
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	54
Research Design and Rationale	54
Work-Life Balance Discipline	55
Employee Engagement Discipline	56
Methodology.....	57
Population	57
Sampling and Sampling Procedures	58
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection (Primary Data).....	58
Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs	59
Data Analysis Plan.....	61
Threats to Validity	63

External Validity	63
Internal Validity	65
Construct Validity	65
Ethical Procedures	68
Summary	69
Chapter 4: Results	70
Data Collection	71
Study Results	74
Summary	79
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	81
Interpretation of Findings	81
Limitations of the Study.....	93
Recommendations.....	94
Implications.....	95
Conclusions.....	97
References.....	99
Appendix A: Written Permission Valcour Work-life Balance Scale.....	110
Appendix B: Permission Utrecht Engagement Survey.....	111
Appendix C: Consent Forms.....	113

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Globalization has created a demand for the manager's availability and flexibility of the manager's time, and the need to balance work and home life (Gregory, Milner, & Windebank, 2013). The problem is the job strain for managers today is increasingly mental instead of physical, and managers become overwhelmed with work-life balance issues, which leads to ineffective employee engagement in the work environment (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). The study is an analysis of the literature on work-life balance and employee engagement, to understand how manager work-life balance affects employee engagement, which is important because of the increased demand for the manager's time and flexibility and the influences of work-life balance on the manager's behavior in the work environment (Gregory et al., 2013).

Work-life balance is important to the organization, manager, and the individual because the organization shapes the culture, which shapes work-life balance. Work-Life Balance is subjective and based on the individual, and if the balance is in favor of work, it can create work-life stress (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003). Managers are trained to believe they have power and control over the work environment, only in reality they cannot exercise this perceived control, which leads to work-life balance issues (Ford & Collinson, 2011). Active work-life balance strategies drive organizational outcomes (Ceyarra-Leiva, 2012). The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health in the United States (US) reported 40% of American workers described their job as extremely stressful, 25% view their jobs as the number one stressor, 75% of American employees believe they have more stress on the job (Bhui, Dinos, Stansfeld, & White, 2012).

Employee engagement is critical to the organization because the organization shape employee engagement and the manager's behavior is responsible for driving organizational performance. Basic management principles and manager process resulted in improved employee engagement and improved organization performance (Medlin & Green, 2014). Studies show that active employee engagement predicts organizational performance, financial performance, and employee performance (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Saks, 2006; Shuck, Rocco, & Albornoz, 2011; Rana, Ardichvili, & Tkachenko, 2014). Relationships with the immediate supervisor are critical in the effective employee engagement (Shuck, 2010). The extent of the manager's work-life balance fosters a positive employee work-life balance (Kishino, 2015).

Transforming the work environment to a positive climate that supports work-life balance, relationship with supervisor, co-workers and organization support is the contribution to social change (Hawrysz, 2015). Provide managers and organizations with more options for balancing work and family and providing the front-line manager with tools and techniques to be successful that is cost-effective (Ford & Collinson, 2011). Establish work-life balance as part of the organizational strategy and leadership development for managers (Shuck et al., 2010). Provide practitioners with knowledge and insight to encourage a broader work-life balance practice.

The purpose of Chapter 1 is to provide a roadmap for the reader as a guide to understanding the background, problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses, theoretical foundation, nature of the study, definition, assumptions, scope, and delimitations, limitations, and significance of the study. Each of these sections connects each phase of the research.

Background of the Study

The major research themes examined in the study of work-life balance are organizational support, employee perspective, manager perspective, and historical perspective. Several studies highlighted work-life balance response is based on the individual. Kesting and Harris (2009) study using Sen (1995) capability approach and feminist economics to identify and clarify misconceptions about work-life balance complexities and biases. Lautsch and Scully (2007) examined the impact of reduced work time and the issues related to management and employees. Sirajunisa (2004) examined occupational stress in the professional work balance, which involved psychological stress, long work hours, inflexible work hours, and less positive work environment, that result in work-family conflict. Stankiewicz, Bortnowska, and Łychmus (2014) showed the employee perception of work-life balance and the improvement in support needed to improve the organization.

Several studies documented the manager perspective (Kasper, Meyer, & Schmidt, 2005) and discussed various tactics managers use to address the conflict between work and life, in three areas: career importance, the reality of family life, and two-career households. Burchielli, Bartram, and Thanacoody (2008) examined the work-family balance influence of managers based on employee perception and discovered managers have challenges in the employee perception of work-life balance as perceived by employees. Hammond, Cleveland, O'Neill, Stawski, and Jones (2015) examined how leaders influenced work-life management and discovered managerial support for work-life balance had the strongest effect on work-family conflict management. Gilley, Waddell, and Hall (2015) looked at the managerial practice of helping work-life balance by age and discovered that it is important and a challenge for all

leaders. Kerns (2014) explored fostering and managing engagement leadership framework, which showed the adoption of logical engagement steps help foster and maintain employee engagement. The work-life balance of managers, which is not regularly addressed in research, was examined by Ford and Collinson (2011) and found managers are taught to believe they have power and control over the work environment, only in reality they cannot exercise this perceived control which leads to work-life balance issues.

Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) discussed different types of support for work-life balance which has a direct impact on satisfaction and is a moderator for work-life balance support. Cegarra-Leiva, Sánchez-Vidal, and Cegarra-Navarro (2012) examined work-life balance practices on organization outcomes in small and large companies where culture is a decisive factor. Kozjek, Tomazevic, and Stare (2014) examined employee perception of the organization versus the organization's understanding and how to incorporate work-life balance into the strategic planning, both operational and financial. Parkes and Langford (2008) tested the hypothesis that work-life balance is necessary to attract and retain top talent in the organization and discovered that work-life balance in conjunction with other work practices, improve recruitment and retention.

Mishra, Gupta, and Bhatnagar (2014) documented the historical perspective, which explored the work-family theory holistically which originated from an active organization committed to work-to-family enrichment. Van Meel (2011) studied the origin of today's work environment that emanated from the 1960s and 1970s and revealed the work today is much different because it has become more flexible, less structured, and mobile.

Work-life balance has become more prevalent since the 1990s largely because of the shifting demographics of the workers (Gregory et al., 2013). Work-life balance satisfaction and effectiveness are attributed to full organizational support (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). Management has the majority accountability for the success of the organization, 81% of business failure is due to poor management (Gilley, Gilley, Ambort-Clark, & Marion, 2014). The physical and mental health of managers is an assumption for productivity and organization competitiveness (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). The work environment today is more mentally taxing than physical, an imbalance in the managers work-life may create increased stress (Lokke & Madsen, 2014).

The major research themes of employee engagement are self-efficacy, management process and principles, theoretical model, and communication. Shuck et al. (2011) documented self-efficacy, which explored the unique experience of employees engaged in worked and discovered relationship development and attachment, workplace environment, and learning opportunity drive employee engagement. Consiglio, Borgogni, Di Tecco, and Schaufeli (2016) examined the social cognitive theory to explain how self-efficacy predicts employee engagement and the results showed self-efficacy predicts engagement over time. Fearon, McLaughlin, and Morris (2013) explored the multiple levels of efficacy that promote effective work engagement and discovered understanding both individual and organization self-efficacy improve employee engagement.

Liliana (2015) documented the management process and principles, which examined the relationship of the manager's influence on employee engagement, and the results showed that managers changed worker engagement and need to pay close attention to worker motivation and

job match. Medlin and Green (2014) examined the effect of management basics on employee engagement, and the results showed both management principle and management process directly impact employee engagement. Malik and Khalid (2016) examined the impact of the breach of the work contract on work engagement and turnover and concluded the breach of contract results in decline in employee performance. Rana et al. (2014) documented the theoretical model, which links antecedents, outcomes, and moderators of employee engagement. Nutov and Hazzan (2014) presented an organizational engagement model for high school teachers, and the results showed the tool fostered the development and improved communication. Welch (2011) documented the importance of communication in employee engagement.

The manager is accountable for employee engagement and influences subordinate behavior in the work environment (Kishino, 2015). Workforce engagement can drive positive organizational and employee performance (Rana et al., 2014). Recent research has linked managerial practice to influencing happiness and well-being in the work environment (Robertson & Cooper, 2011; Tuckey, Bakker & Dollard, 2012; Kerns, 2014). There is not much research on how the manager's behavior and declarations affect the work environment (Burchielli et al., 2008). This study will focus on the relationship between the manager's work-life balance and employee engagement.

Problem Statement

The general problem is global competition has increased the demand for the employee's time and flexibility (Gregory, Milner, & Windebank, 2013). Work-Life Balance (WLB) creates a conflict for the manager and vastly influence the manager's behavior in the work environment (Kishino, 2015). Employees who do not feel connected to the organization are less likely to

commit their various degrees of self in support of the organization objectives (Kahn, 1990). The specific problem is the job strain for managers today is increasingly mental instead of physical, and managers become overwhelmed with work-life balance issues, which leads to ineffective employee engagement in the work environment (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). The work-life balance experience of managers influences the workplace, and different work characteristics affect the manager's stress (Lokke & Madsen, 2014).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study is to test the theory of Work-Life Balance (Graves, Ohlott, & Rudeman, 2007) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) that relates employee engagement to manager work-life balance, controlling for the managerial level of the manager, and their direct reports from various companies across the United States. The employee's perception of how well the manager's practice influences a positive work environment is an independent variable. The front-line manager's work-life balance is the dependent variable.

Research Question(s) and Hypotheses

Research Q1. What is the correlation of manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement?

H1: There is no correlation between manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement.

H2: There is a correlation between manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement.

Research Q2. What is the correlation of positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement?

H1: There is no correlation between positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement.

H2: There is a correlation between positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical framework for this study is based on Greenhaus' et al. (2003) Work-Life Balance Theory and Kahn's (1990) Theory of Employee Engagement. There has been much interest in work and family integration, which has led to some concepts to explain work-life balance (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Greenhaus et al. (2003) identified work-life balance is different from work-family conflict, consistently measured work-family balance, and the relationship between work-family balance and quality of life. Greenhaus et al. (2003) discussed how the balance work and family are not linked because the conditions are not the same, and real balance spreads across all the roles in each area of life. To be balanced in work and family, one spends equal time, attention, involvement, and commitment in the interconnected roles Greenhaus et al. (2003). Researchers have used different methods to define work-life balance, however; Greenhaus et al. (2003) established a definitive and consistent work-life balance measure. The next paragraph is employee engagement which is the second theory that supports the study.

Engagement Theory

Employee engagement is the extent of involvement in fulfilling the roles people perform in support of the organization, where their experiences and work are impacted (Kahn, 1990). The

differing degrees of how involved people are in their experiences, and how people move into and out of engagement, cognitively, physically, and emotionally characterized employee engagement. Organizational behavior explained the general commitment of individuals based on their job, commitment to the organization and alienation as static. However, Kahn (1990) examined a conceptual framework grounded in theoretical and empirical research, which is the construct of employee engagement. Goffman's (1961) explanation of the nature of rapid interpersonal encounters informed Kahn's (1990) conceptual framework. Kahn (1990) defined the change that people experience in the performance of their role as they move through the various stages of commitment, support, and alienation.

Work-Life Balance Proposition

Greenhaus' et al. (2003) major theoretical proposition is a consistent definition of work-life balance, work-life balance measurement, and the establishment of well-being indicator, which is the quality of work and family balance. The balance between the work and family roles is explained by the understanding how the experiences and conditions in one part are related to the other role (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Balance is spending time and involvement in both work and family roles, with minimal work-conflict. The time, commitment, and participation in both roles are satisfying in work-life balance. The work-life balance quality that has a sufficient amount of time, commitment, and involvement in both work and family is moderated by work-family conflict and stress (Greenhaus et al., 2003)

Greenhaus et al. (2003) held that the quality of work-life balance is high when people spend a substantial amount of time and involvement in their work and family roles. Work-family conflicts mediate the quality of work-life balance time and participation in the work and family

roles. People who are happy with both areas of life experience a higher quality of life (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Individuals who are satisfied with both work and family roles experience a higher quality of life. The quality of life is influenced by the ability to consistently spread time and involvement across both roles, falling short, creates less quality of life (Greenhaus et al., 2003).

Engagement Theory Proposition

Kahn's (1990) major theoretical proposition was that people are always moving in and out of the degrees of cognitive, physical, and emotional experiences in the performance of their roles. Organizational commitment and alienation assume engagement because the person is on the job; however, Kahn's (1990) conceptual framework grounded in theory and empirical data, defined the degree of presence in the job. The employee engagement is characterized by the emotional energy which is the level of commitment regarding engagement. Employees who experience security within their job and the commitment from the organization influences engagement (Kahn, 1990).

Kahn (1990) identified the psychological experience that people experience at work determines their attitude and behavior while at work. How they perform, interact with people at work, and the organization dynamic affects their experience. People use various degrees of cognitive, emotional, and physical selves in the performance of work and support for the organization (Kahn, 1990). People are always moving in and out of the degrees of self in reaction to their experiences with the work and the team (Kahn, 1990). The organization dynamics and the job performed have a level of engagement; however, the ebb and flow of the engagement and disengagement reality are not fully explained. The conceptual idea of varying degree of

engagement supported by theory and empirical data identify the adjustment of self in engagement and disengagement (Kahn, 1990).

Work-life Balance Relates to the Study

The Work-Life Balance Theory relates to the study approach and research questions because the study is about the relationship of the manager's work-life balance on employee engagement. The amount of time and involvement in work and family balance leads to a higher quality of life (Greenhaus et al., 2003). The study is focused on understanding the relationship of the manager's work-life balance on employee engagement and does manager work-life balance positively affect employee engagement. Greenhaus et al. (2003) established the definition of work-family balance, performance metric, and the quality of life indicator which is relevant because the study implies a level of manager work-life balance drives employee engagement. The quality of work-life balance is attributed to how well an individual manages their time and involvement in work-family roles (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and the study assumes the quality of the work-life balance is a factor in the relationship to employee engagement.

Employee Engagement Theory Relates to the Study

The Employee Engagement Theory relates to the study approach and research questions because as described in Kahn (1990) employee engagement is characterized as how the individual moves into and out of engagement in work and the effects the experience has on their behaviors and attitude. Engagement and disengagement are fluid, and the manager's action and behavior contribute to the organization dynamic (Kahn, 1990). Kahn (1990) discussed the different aspects of engaged versus nonengaged individuals based on their experiences, which is related to the manager's impact on the psychological experience of the employee, influenced by

the quality of their work-life balance. The level of trust to show one's self without fear is a determinant of engagement, and the relationship of the manager's work-life balance on engagement is related to active employee engagement. Kahn's (1990) Employee Engagement Theory identify the complex interactions of the individual in their particular role and how the work and organizational dynamics influence their behavior and attitudes; which is relevant to the study because engagement or disengagement will impact the manager's influence on the engagement based on work-life balance.

In summary, this section identified the theories that support the study, the leading propositions and hypotheses for each theory, and how each is related to the study approach. The use of Greenhaus' et al., (2003) Work-Life Balance Theory and Kahn's (1990) Employee Engagement Theory supports the relationships examined in the study. The study will build on Greenhaus' et al., (2003) Work-Life Balance Theory and Kahn's (1990) Employee Engagement Theory by focusing on the manager's work-family balance and the validity of manager work-life balance relevancy in employee engagement. The section described the major theoretical and hypotheses for each theory and the relationship to this study. Chapter 2 will explore both methods in more detail.

Nature of the Study

The nature of this quantitative correlational design study is consistent with understanding the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. Positive work-family culture perceptions originate from an active organizational committed to work-family engagement (Mishra, Gupta, & Bhatnagar, 2013). There is a connection between supportive work-life balance cultures and organization outcomes (Cegarra-Leiva et al., 2012). Relationship

development and attachment, workplace climate, and learning opportunity form the basis for employee engagement (Shuck et al., 2010). The employee's perception of the manager's engagement is the independent variable, the manager work-life balance is the dependent variable, and employee engagement is the interdependent variable. The design is a correlational study to compare the manager's work-life balance with the employee's perception of the manager's commitment to understanding the relationship between these two variables.

Participants will be front-line managers and their direct report employees from various companies across the United States responding to a survey using a standard Valcour Work-Life Balance tool (Valcour, 2007) and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES, Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006) employee engagement tool. The focus is on the frontline manager's work life balance and the effect on employee engagement. The complete set of relevant data is the population according to Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2015). The population for the focus of the research will come from a panel purchased from Qualtrics and include front-line managers and their direct reports. The participants will be selected from all industries in the United States. The requirement is the manager respondents must be a front-line manager that supervise individual contributors. The data will be analyzed with SPSS using a bivariate correlation and Pearson Correlation to determine the relationship between the variables. The data analysis will include reporting on the number and members of the sample. The report includes a detailed review of the independent and dependent variables.

Understanding the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement will provide the foundation to study how manager work-life balance affects employee engagement. Ford and Collins (2011) examined the manager work-life balance from the manager's

perspective, which is not regularly discussed in the literature. This study will build on the relationship between the manager's work-life balance and employee engagement. Manager and organization support are a key factor in balancing work and family life (Cegarra-Leiva et al., 2012). Individuals who spend more time on balancing work and family have a higher quality of life (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Work-Life Balance is the most effective when it is supported by the supervisor and the organization; therefore, organization expectation and control must be clear to managers (Ford & Collinson, 2011). This study will build on the importance of manager and organization support for work-life balance from the manager work-life balance perspective.

Rana et al. (2014) discussed the importance of the manager's relationship with the employee in the employee engagement approach. The study builds on the manager relationship in employee engagement. Medlin and Green (2014) discussed how organizations that adhere to management principles and practices have higher employee engagement. This study is focused on the effect of the manager's work-life balance and employee engagement. Work-Life Balance is the most efficient when supported by the supervisor and the organization; therefore, organization expectation and control must be clear to managers (Ford & Collinson, 2011). This study builds on understanding the manager work-life balance as supported by the organization. Self-efficacy predicts work engagement and employee perception of the work environment, which include supervisor, co-workers, and top management, mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement (Consiglia et al., 2016). This study will focus on the manager's work-life balance perception.

The goal of this quantitative correlational is to understand the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement and whether the relationship positively

affects employee engagement. The results of the data analysis will test the hypotheses that will contribute to the current body of knowledge. The study may contribute to the understanding of the importance of manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The manager and the organization influence work-life balance. The basic management practice and administration process affect work-life balance and work engagement (Kerns, 2014).

Definitions

Direct report: reports directly to the supervisor, have no direct reports.

Front-line supervisor: supervise employees on the frontline of the business operations.

Individual contributor: reports to a supervisor and does not supervise other people.

Leader: A supervisor or manager, who has direct reports.

Manager: The definition of manager in the research study is limited to frontline managers who manage frontline workers.

Supervisor: Have direct reports, employees are usually involved in the primary work of the organization.

Work-Life Balance: The time and involvement spent in work and family roles.

Assumptions

The assumptions of this study are based on a standard measurement instrument used to measure work-life balance and employee engagement; the sample size will be adequate to generalize to other populations and the rationale for the assumptions. The current research will use work-life balance and employee engagement measurement tools validated by previous research. Work-life balance and employee engagement measurement will support the assumptions of the study and test the hypotheses. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) used work-

life balance scaled developed by Valcour (2007) which measures satisfaction. Cegarra-Leiva et al., (2012) used work-life balance scaled developed by Kofodimos (1995). Parks and Langford (2008) used the Voice of Climate Study to measure work-life balance, which consisted of 31 metrics that measured the organization results and employee performance.

Sampling is used by researchers because the surveying the entire population is not feasible (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, & DeWaard, 2015). Generalization about partial data is the basis for empirical research (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The focus is on the frontline manager's work life balance and the relationship between employee engagement. The complete set of relevant data is the population according to Frankfort-Nachmias et al. (2015). The population for the focus of the research will come from a panel purchased from Qualtrics and include front-line managers and their direct reports. The participants will be selected from all industries in the United States. The two types of sampling are probability and nonprobability. The ability to determine which participants will participate in the sampling is known as probability sampling, and nonprobability is not being able to identify from the population who will be selected to participate (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The sampling strategy is using simple random samples from respondents in the United States workforce screened by Qualtrics.

A validated measurement instrument tests the hypotheses consistently and identifies statistical significance. Using the Valcour (2007) Work-Life Balance measurement and The Utrecht Employee Engagement scale (UWES, Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006) may contribute to the current body of knowledge and address the gap of a lack of focus on the manager work-life balance (Ford & Collinson, 2011). The rationale for sampling contributes to the ability to generalize the results to other populations.

Scope and Delimitations

The research problem addressed in the study is globalization has increased the demand for the employee's time and flexibility (Gregory et al., 2013). The increasingly mental job strain has created overwhelming work-family conflict for managers and results in ineffective employee engagement (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). Driving organization results through people are the responsibility of the manager, and their work-family conflicts influence their behavior in the workplace (Kishino, 2015). The study is focused on understanding the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement, and the effect on positive employee engagement is the focus of the study.

The connection of the problem to current research about support for work-life balance and employee engagement by the supervisor and the organization provides the rationale for the study. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) focused on the importance of work-life balance regarding organization performance, and the effect it has on employee engagement, which drives performance. Karassvidou (2013) and Van Meel (2010) provided insight into how the work domain and managing between work and family impact work-life balance. The strain work-life balance places on the manager is a significant influence on the manager's behavior in the workplace (Ford & Collinson, 2011; Kerns, 2014; Stankiewicz et al., 2014).

Qualtrics was selected to provide the panel because it is widely known among the industry and can attract United States workers across various industries. The population consists of individual contributors who report to a front-line manager. The study focus is on front-line managers versus the higher-level managers, who may have more control over their work life

(Lokke & Madsen, 2014). The list of front-line managers will be randomly selected by ordering the names alphabetically and selecting the number that equals to the G*Power sample size.

Limitations

The goal of the study is to provide a reliable and consistent examination of the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement that is reliable and valid. Reliability refers to the consistency of the analysis and the idea that others can repeat it with similar conditions and produce similar results (Chudleigh, 2015). Validity refers to the strength of the premise in the design and conduct of the study (Chudleigh, 2015). Internal validity occurs during the research process, and external validity occurs during the development and selection of the research method and population focus (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). Statistical analysis such as calculating the sample size and significance of the relationships will anchor the study to increase the validity of the results (Chudleigh, 2015).

The measurement tool for work-life balance was validated by Valcour (2007) and will be used to support employee work-life balance satisfaction and the direct link to organization support (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). The measurement of employee engagement validated by Balducci et al. (2010) was used to longitudinal work engagement Consiglio et al. (2015) and to support work engagement link to mental health and work satisfaction Simbula and Guglielmi (2013). The researcher's ten years of leadership and development of the regional employee wellness function for a healthcare organization influenced the selection of manager work-life balance. Probability sampling will be used to ensure the focus is on the front-line manager, who has the primary contact and influence on employee engagement. The research design and

selection of the subjects, the validated survey instruments, and the focus on the front-line managers will provide reliability and validity.

Significance of the Study

This section will examine the importance of this research on theory, practice and social change. This study will contribute to an understanding of how the manager's work-life balance affects employee engagement and address the manager's work-life balance which is often not examined (Ford & Collinson, 2011). The study is grounded in the theory that supports work-life balance and employee engagement. The study offers ideas for practitioners to advise organizations on effective work-life balance strategy for front-line managers.

Significance of Theory

The study will advance the knowledge of work-life balance by building on the vital link to the individual, organization, and culture. Stankiewicz et al. (2014) explained a need to improve employee perceptions of work-life balance and organization support. Organization support for work-life balance was a huge satisfier for employees as reported by Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011). The study advances the knowledge of the relationship of work-life balance and employee engagement from the individual and organization. People who spent more time balancing work-family roles had a better quality of life (Greenhaus et al., 2003). The manager influences the employee and shapes their impression of the organization and their commitment (Simbula & Guglielmi, 2013).

The study will fill a gap in the literature by addressing manager work-life balance and the relationship to employee engagement. There is no elaboration on how the work-life balance of the manager is critical to achieving positive employee engagement. Work-Life Balance focus on

the employee and the manager is overlooked in the current literature (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). There is research on the work-life balance for employees and employee engagement; however, there is not much research on the relationship between the manager's work-life balance and employee engagement. Hammond et al. (2011), Ford and Collinson (2011), Rana et al. (2014), Hawrysz (2015) researched interpersonal skills of the manager and the effect on well-being. Hammond et al. (2011), Rana et al. (2014) focused on transformational managers and positive employee engagement.

Significance of Practice

The relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement is significant to the field of management and particularly human resources, for three reasons, the first reason is the global competition has increased the demand on the employee's time and flexibility (Gregory et al., 2013). The second reason is work-life balance creates a conflict between the manager and vastly influence the manager's behavior in the work environment (Kishino, 2015). The third reason is employees who experience positive work environments are more apt to use the various degrees of themselves in support of the organization objectives (Kahn, 1990).

The manager plays a critical role in the employee achieving the organizational goals. Productivity upon which the organizations rely on will be impacted, if managers are not effective in engaging employees (Rana et al., 2014). The manager role is a major influence in the work environment. Employees who experience a positive work environment are more willing to work in support of the organization goals. The research will support professional practice of managers in the field by providing insight into the well-being, and self-care of the manager as critical to

positive employee engagement. For better or worse, the manager's behavior dramatically influences the employee's actions in the workplace, and the immediate supervisor's effectiveness is a leading cause of the organization's problems (Gilley et al., 2014). The findings may improve the efficiency of the manager in engaging the workforce to achieve organization objectives.

Significance of Social Change

The goal is to affect positive social change by transforming work environments into sustained positive work environments, considering the amount of time individuals spend at work. The study will provide insight to practitioners by identifying the significant influence of work-life balance on manager well-being. The study will challenge transformational managers to include work-life balance as consideration for improving upon or achieving transformational leadership. The hope is a quality of work-life improvement for both manager and employee from the result of a sustained positive work environment which is characterized by high productivity and less stress for managers and employees.

Summary and Transition

Through an analysis of the literature on work-life balance and employee engagement, I have argued manager work-life balance affects employee engagement, which is important because of the increased demand for the manager's time and flexibility and work-life balance influences the manager's behavior on the work environment. Chapter 1 included an introduction to the study and identified the rationale for conducting the study and the contribution to social change. Work-Life Balance and employee engagement themes were presented in the background section. The general and specific problem was outlined and supported by prevailing research.

The research questions along with the hypotheses were presented to clarify the premise of the study. The theoretical framework and construct of the work-life balance and employee engagement were reviewed and supported by grounded theory. The nature of the study provided a brief rationale for the design and study variables. The definitions of the independent and dependent variables were reviewed to provide clarity regarding the goal of the study. A detailed discussion of reliability and validity supported the key assumptions. Scope and limitations were discussed to give the specifics aspects of the research problem, methodology and participant selection. The significance of the study was parsed to provide the connection to grounded theory, implications for practice and significant social change. Chapter 2 is a review of the previous theories and research that provides further rationale and understanding of the relationship between work-life balance and engagement.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The job of managing in today's world changed from physical demand to mental, which creates anxiety and affects the manager's behavior in the work environment (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). Competition in the global market is keen and requires increased demand on the employee's time and flexibility (Gregory et al., 2013). Work-Life Balance conflict creates stress for the manager which influences their behavior in the work environment (Kishino, 2015). The manager's impact on the workplace affects employee engagement, and staff who do not feel connected to the organization are less likely to commit the various degrees of self in support of the organization (Kahn, 1990).

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study is to use the Work-Life Balance Theory (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) to test the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The front-line manager and their direct reports from various companies across the United States provide their perception of manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The employee's perception of a positive work environment is the independent variable, and the frontline manager's work-life balance is the dependent variable. The current literature is relevant to the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement because the work-life balance research demonstrates the importance of organization support, front-line manager support and the link to organization performance. Managers are accountable to drive organization performance through people, and their behavior influences the work environment.

Literature Search Strategy

The literature search strategy involved the use of the following databases and search engines: ABI/INFORM Collection, Emerald Insight, ProQuest Central, ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Global, SAGE Journal (Formerly SAGE Premier), SAGE Knowledge (Formerly SAGE Encyclopedia), and Google Scholar.

The key work-life balance search terms are, employee engagement and supervisor's influence and disengaged workers cost to the organization; supervisor work-life balance and employee engagement; work-life balance theory; work-life balance from 1986, work-life balance history and chronological history; and quantitative and correlational design. The employee engagement search terms are employee engagement and theory; employee engagement and supervisor's influence, and disengaged workers cost to the organization.

The quest for work-life balance originates from the study of work-family conflict. The search strategy begins with a general search for work-life balance. The scope of the literature review was the origin of the theory up to the present. The work-life balance documentation covers the background of work-life balance and includes research that focuses on the changing work environment, demand on the manager's time and nature of their job, global competition pressure, the manager's work-life balance, employee perception of the manager and organizational support, organizational support, and work-life balance culture. Interest in work-life balance continues to increase, and organizations are exploring initiatives to balance work and family (Ford & Collins, 2011). The face of the workforce includes women, minorities, baby boomers, generation x, and Millennials all with different work-life balance expectations (Gilley

et al., 2015). Front-line management effectiveness plays a key role in influencing the work environment (Hawrysz, 2015).

Theoretical Foundation

Greenhaus' et al. (2003) Work-Life Balance theory and Kahn's (1990) Employee Engagement theory support the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. Greenhaus et al. (2003) pointed out the inconsistency in defining work-life balance, the fact that it was not measured, and unclear about the effect of work-family on individual well-being. Work-Life Balance equals an adequate amount of time and involvement in work and family roles. Greenhaus (2003) tested work-life balance theory on the group of American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) employed in the public sector. The study measured time, involvement, and satisfaction with the work-life balance from the 400 people out of 1000 randomly selected participants. Greenhaus et al. (2003) identified a significant increase in the quality of life when individuals invest an adequate amount of time and involvement in work and family roles. Satisfaction with the amount of time and commitment among the work and family roles results in higher quality of life. Greenhaus et al. (2003) research established the definition and measurement of work-life balance which is used in this study and throughout the upcoming literature review section.

Greenhaus et al. (2003) tested the following hypotheses: a) quality of life is connected to the amount of time people put into work and family roles; b) quality of life is related to amount of involvement in the work and family roles; c) the amount of time spent in work and family roles affects the level of work-family conflict and stress; d) the amount of involvement in work and family roles affect the level of work-family conflict and stress; e) satisfaction with the

amount of time and participation increase the quality of life, and f) individuals who less satisfied with the amount of time and involvement in the roles have decreased the quality of life and increased stress. The lack of time and commitment that creates work-family conflict can be self-imposed or organizational. Greenhaus et al. (2003) discovered that people who are less satisfied or uncommitted to spend time and involvement in work-family roles are not related to the quality of life. When people are happy with the amount of time and participation in their work and family roles, they experience less stress and a higher quality of life (Greenhaus et al., 2003).

Kahn (1990) Employee Engagement theory focused on the idea that individuals engage degrees of self in roles in support of the organization. Kahn (1990) identified the extent of which one involves self in performing the job in support of the organization. Previous researchers such as Katz and Kahn (1978) focused on consign and acceptance; (Merton, 1957) explained the collection of roles; Van Maanen (1976) introduced role socialization; Graen (1976) examined how roles shape the individual. Kahn (1990) focused on the individual role and the degree of emotional and physical involvement in the performance of the job. Kahn (1990) tested the Engagement Theory in two case studies that resulted in empirical data which established the degrees of self in which people physiologically perform their role and support for the organization. Kahn (1990) provided the empirical evidence of the volatile nature of personal engagement, which supports the problem identified in this study.

Kahn (1990) proposed the following: a) people move in and out varying degrees of physical and emotional performance in support of the organization; b) organizations assume people are committed because they show up for the job; c) the psychological experience people have at work influence their attitudes and behaviors; and d) the organization, interactions with

co-workers and manager influence behavior and attitudes at the same time. Kahn (1990) explored how to pinpoint the changing nature of employee psychological commitment to job performance in support of the organization. The organization, manager, interaction with co-workers and others during work, affects the employee involvement. Kahn (1990) explored the conditions that influenced the degree of participation based on individual experiences. Kahn (1990) focused on the experiences that generate the highest level of commitment and create the highest level of performance and support for the organization.

The research has been applied to support work-life balance by the organization, the manager, and team culture. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) examined the different types of support for work-life balance provided by the organization. Social democratic countries had the highest satisfaction with work-life balance and service sector work received the highest-level support (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). Employee reference in work-life balance research usually overlooks the manager and the manager's perspective is not addressed (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). The study relates to the current study because the results show the frontline manager represents the organization and their support for work-life balance affect employee engagement.

Sirajunisa (2004) examined occupational stress of work-life balance on professionals through the relationship of occupational stress and work-life balance for professional women. The professional women participated in a survey that measured occupational stress and work-life balance in the workplace. Long hours, inflexible work schedules, and hostile work environment were identified to affect stress and create work-family conflict (Sirajunisa, 2004). Leisure and work time should be supported with passion by the individual (Sirajunisa, 2004). The focus on

what causes stress in the person and how it affects work-life balance is related to the current study.

Stankiewicz et al., (2014) examined the employee perception of the working conditions support of a balance between work and personal life. The results of the study revealed employee understanding of work-life balance support by the organization needed to be improved. The 196 random participants responded to 42 questions and 12 of the questions related to work-life balance (Stankiewicz et al., 2014). The work schedule received the highest negative correlation and increased work-family conflict (Stankiewicz et al., 2014). The study is relative to the current study because of the manager's support for work-life balance influences employee perceptions of organizational support.

The research has been applied to support employee engagement by the individual and the group. Malik and Khalid (2016) examined the impact of the break of the work contract on work engagement and turnover. Breach of the contract results in a decline in employee performance, and there is evidence that work engagement mediates the relationship between psychological violation and turnover (Malik & Khalid, 2016). The results show that work engagement mediates the breach of contract and improves the chance people will remain with the organization (Malik & Khalid, 2014). Employees who experience adverse violations of the psychological contract are less engaged and are more likely to leave the team (Malik & Khalid, 2014). The study is related to the relationship of how the manager's behavior influences the work environment.

Medlin and Green (2014) examined the effect of management basics on employee engagement. Management principles and processes impact employee engagement (Medlin & Green, 2014). Efficient management process and use of basic management principles are related

to active employee engagement (Medlin & Green, 2014). An organization that has live employee engagement experience increased productivity (Medlin & Green, 2014). This study relates to the current study because the influence of the manager drives organization results.

Consiglio et al., (2015) examined the role of self-efficacy and employee's perception of the organization. Consiglio et al., (2015) conducted a study over a three-year period to understand the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement. The results revealed self-efficacy does predict work engagement and the employees reflect positive changes in the organization over the same period (Consiglio et al., 2015). Self-efficacy significantly contributes to perceptions of social context, even over an extended time and employees with an active social context are more engaged (Consiglio et al., 2015). The study is related to the current study because it demonstrates managers influence how employees perceive their work in a social context.

Gilley et al. (2015) examined the managerial practice of support for work-life balance by age through a quantitative linear regression study where 463 participants completed the administrative survey. The results showed that managers across generations had various degrees of success managing work-life balance issues and no generation was more successful (Gilley et al., 2015). There is a conflict between the organization and employee's perception of work-life balance support, and the actions of the manager is a significant influence on work-life balance. The difference in age changed the manager's approach to work-life balance (Gilley et al., 2015). The study relates to the current study because it shows the relationship of the manager support for work-life balance on employee engagement.

The Work-Life Balance (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) support the premise of the study. The increased demand overwhelms the manager which causes work-life balance issues (Gregory et al., 2013; Kishino, 2015). Work-Life Balance influences the manager's behavior in the workplace (Kishino, 2015). The manager's job in the global economy has become more mental and overwhelmed managers due to work-life balance issues become ineffective engaging their employees (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). Employees who are less or not engaged at all, do not commit their maximum self in the performance of their job (Kahn, 1990). Organization performance can be affected when employees are not engaged (Hansen et al., 2013).

The premise of the current study is the relationship between the manager work-life balance and employee engagement exist and is affected by the manager's work-life balance. Work-Life Balance Theory (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) supports each side of the relationship. The theories provide the context to explore what is the relationship between manager's work-life balance and employee engagement and what is the relationship of the manager's work-life balance on active employee engagement? The answers to these questions are relevant and add to the body of knowledge because previous research demonstrates the manager influences employee engagement and manager's work-life balance issues affect their behavior in the work environment (Gregory et al., 2013; Kahn, 1990; Kishino, 2015; Lokke & Madsen, 2014). Understanding this relationship advances the current body of knowledge because it links manager work-life balance with employee engagement.

Literature Review

Work-life Balance Related Studies

Greenhaus et al. (2003) examined the relationship between work-family balance and the quality of life. Survey of 1000 random public accountants to measure the amount of time and involvement in the work and family roles. The results show that people who spend an adequate amount of time and participation in work and family roles had higher satisfaction and quality of life (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Sirajunisa (2004) examined occupational stress on the work-life balance among women. A group of 150 professional women from Tamil Nadu, participated in a survey that measured occupational stress Srivastava and Singh (1981) and work-life balance Fisher (2001). The results show that increased work pressure created work-life balance issues and a negative work environment (Sirajunisa, 2004). Graves et al. (2007) examined the effect of the manager's attitude and performance on family role commitment. Forty-seven percent of managers attending a management workshop responded to a questionnaire regarding their perception of role commitment, work-family interference, work-family enhancements, and psychological strain. The result shows that family role commitment was a positive impact on outcomes with work-family enhancement (Graves et al., 2007).

Parkes and Langford (2008) examined the relationship between work-life balance support and employee retention. A sample of more than 15,000 Australian workers responded to an organizational climate survey that measured work-life balance satisfaction. The results show that work-life balance was not a factor in employee retention due to the strategic focus of the organization (Parkes & Langford, 2008). Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) examined support for the work balance and the impact of organization support on work-life balance satisfaction among

European countries. The work-life balance satisfaction scale developed by Valcour (2007) showed organization support resulted in higher work-life balance support. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) examined the link between work-life balance and organizational outcomes.

Organizational outcomes and work-life balance were measured based on the responses from the selected metal industry companies in Spain (Cegarra-Leiva et al., 2012). The presence of work-life balance practices has a positive effect on organizational outcomes; however, developing the work-life balance culture increases the highest outcomes (Cegarra-Leiva et al., 2012).

Kozjek et al. (2014) examined the work-life balance organizational support and employee expectations. The multidimensional scaling approach was used to survey Slovenia managers and employees regarding areas of work-life balance. The results show that work-life balance contributes to positive organizational outcomes and organization culture (Kozjek et al., 2014). Stankiewicz et al. (2014) examined the effect of the working environment on work-life balance. A survey that measured work-life balance for 196 randomly selected Lubuskie Voivodeship professional. The results revealed a lack of time off, participation in decision making, and lack of professional development was significantly important in the work environment (Stankiewicz et al., 2014). Gilley et al., (2015) studied graduate students to determined perceptions of managerial support for work-life balance. The longitudinal survey results showed the approach to work-life balanced differed by generation for managers; however, all generation managers struggled in support for work-life balance Gilley et al., (2015). Hammond et al. (2015) examined managers influence subordinate's work life management. Department managers in 37 hotels across the US were asked to rate transformational leadership and work-life balance support characteristics. The results show a link between transformational leadership and work-life balance was positive and

organizational support fostered the positive relationship between transformational leadership and work-life balance (Hammond et al., 2015). Kishino (2015) examined the effect of the supervisor's behavior on the subordinate's work-life balance. Supervisors and employees at a Japanese engineering firm were asked to respond to the survey that measured work-life balance satisfaction, supervisor support, and supervisor role modeling. The results show that supervisor support and role modeling positively impacted employee work-life balance satisfaction (Kishino, 2015).

Employee Engagement Theory Related Studies

Hansen et al. (2012) examined the relationship between interpersonal leadership and employee engagement. Participants from US and Canadian companies responded to a survey that measured characteristics of interpersonal leadership and organizational engagement. The results revealed the more engaged employees felt attached to the organization and the relationship of the manager to subordinates (Hansen et al., 2012). Simbula and Gulielmi (2013) examined the relationship of the manager's influence on employee engagement. The longitudinal survey measured work engagement, mental health problems, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship from a group of teachers over the course of the school year. The result shows that work engagement is negatively affected by positive mental health, job satisfaction, and performance (Simbula & Gulielmi, 2013). Anitha (2014) explored the relationship between employee engagement and employee performance. A survey that measured determinant factors of employee engagement was administered to 383 employees of middle and lower managers in Coimbatore India. The characteristics of employee engagement measured influence the work environment and interpersonal relationships in the organization, which creates a positive work

environment (Anitha, 2014). Medlin and Green (2014) studied the effect of management basics on employee engagement. The survey measured management principles and was administered to 166 full-time employees in the southern US. A partial least square structural equation model is used to evaluate the related variables. Improved employee engagement increased organization performance; achieved through basic management principles and administrative processes (Medlin & Green, 2014).

Consiglio et al. (2015) evaluated the social cognitive theory to explain how self-efficacy predicts employee engagement. Participants of the largest organizations in Italy were surveyed in two waves over a three-year period using structural equation modeling to measure self-efficacy, perceptions of social context, and work engagement. Self-efficacy propels workers to perform their job with persistence, and this effort is favorable over time (Consiglio et al., 2015). Hawrysz (2015) looked at the effect of the manager's influence on employee engagement. A survey of a select group of 1716 employees was conducted over a period of two years, measured supervisor trust and engagement. Supervisor behavior plays a key role in employee engagement and supervisors can improve their engagement effectiveness by consistent awareness of their perceived behavior in the workplace (Hawrysz, 2015). Malik and Khalid (2016) probed the impact of the breach of the work contract on work engagement and turnover. A six-factor instrument was used to gather feedback from the 302 responses from private and public bank workers in Lahore, Pakistan. The outcome indicated a negative relationship exists between psychological contract breach and work engagement; work engagement negatively correlated to turn-over intentions (Malik & Khalid, 2016). Radic (2017) appraised employee engagement on cruise ships. The crew of the Disney Crew ship participated in providing their perceptions of

factors that contribute to active employee engagement during the cruise. Communication and progress, capacity to engage and engaged behavior had the most importance (Radic, 2017).

The four themes in the work-life balance studies are the organization, manager, organization outcome, and social context. Most of the studies originated outside of the US, and all were conducted using surveys. The themes of the employee engagement studies are the organization, manager, and individual. Most of the studies originated from outside of the US, and all were conducted using surveys.

The work-life balance studies that focused on the organization explored satisfaction and work environment. Greenhaus et al. (2003) provided the consistent definition of work-life balance. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) and Parkes and Langford (2008) developed the work-life balance satisfaction with their work on understanding what factors are required to support work-life balance. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) used the Voice of Climate Survey produced by the Voice Project at Macquarie University. Parkes and Langford (2008) used Work-Life Balance scaled by Valcour (2007) and Emotional Support Scale by (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lynes, 1999) to develop satisfaction measurement.

The other side of the organization theme is a focus on the work environment demonstrated by Kozjek et al. (2014) and Stankiewicz et al. (2014) which identified factors that foster an active work-life balance culture. The manager themes were studied with the focus on the importance of the manager's support for work-life balance as evidenced by Hammond (2015) and Kishino (2015). Gilley et al. (2015) went a step further with identifying no difference in generational manager's approach to work-life balance. Graves et al. (2007) expanded on manager support for work-life balance by identifying how work-life balance affects their attitude

and performance. Sirajunisa (2004) contributed to the social context of in the study of the effect of work-life balance on women professional workers. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) explained the impact of strategic work-life balance in driving organizational outcomes.

Anitha (2014) and Radic (2017) focused on the organization factors that build effective employee engagement. Well-being which consists of engaged behavior, co-worker relationships, supervisor trust, and organizational support foster employee engagement (Anitha, 2014, Radic, 2017). Hansen (2012), Hawrysz (2015), and Medlin and Green (2014) focused on manager support for engagement. Manager behavior drives employee engagement through the consistent practice of caring, trust, and support creates engagement that reciprocates over time (Hansen, 2012, Hawrysz, 2015, and Medlin & Green, 2014). Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) expanded on manager support by role modeling behavior to drive engagement. Consiglio et al. (2015) and Malik and Khalid (2016) explained participation from an individual perspective. The employee is the most valuable company asset and expects to be engaged by the organization, which contributes to their overall well-being (Consiglio et al., 2015, & Malik & Khalid, 2016).

The survey was administered once in most of the work-life balance research. The authors took great pain to ensure the integrity of the data as evidenced by the results. Greenhaus et al. (2003) collected data from the case study and empirical evidence that support the premise. Parkes and Langford (2008) used six waves of surveying from 2002 through 2006 to analyze the results.

The general issue is the increased demand for the employee's time and flexibility (Gregory et al., 2013). The job strain for managers into the work environment today is mental instead of physical, which overwhelms the manager's work-life balance, and impacts employee

engagement in the workplace (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). The themes of work-life balance approaches to the problem are increasing demand for time and flexibility and the mental job strain, manager work-life balance conflict, and the influence of the manager on the work environment. The themes of employee engagement are the employee, manager, and the organization.

Increased Demand for Time and Flexibility

Sirajunisa (2004) examined the occupational stress on work-life balance. Psychological stress, long work hours, inflexible work hours and less positive work environment can contribute to work-family conflict. The individual stress and impact of work-life balance vary, and the organization relies on the manager to accomplish the goals (Sirajunisa, 2004). Occupational stress is personal for each and solved within oneself. The way in which occupational stress affects the work-life balance impacts employee engagement (Sirajunisa, 2004). Kasper et al. (2005) examined how managers deal with work-family conflict by determining what causes the manager to be overwhelmed. Managers move between the career professional and committed family member balancing the needs of the career and family. Couples, where both are employed, can have additional stress from work and family life.

Ford and Collinson (2011) examined the work-life balance of managers, usually not addressed in research. The focus is on understanding the challenges of work-life balance from the manager's perspective. The themes that emerged from the manager's description of their experience and expectations are prioritizing work, addiction to work and rebalancing work-life. Managers can become overwhelmed with work-life balance issues when there are no explicit support, process, flexibility, or organizational support (Ford & Collinson, 2011). The manager

believes they have power and control over the work and the work environment, only in reality they cannot exercise the *perceived* control which leads to work-life balance issues (Ford & Collinson, 2011).

Manager Work-Life Balance Conflict

Greenhaus et al. (2003) examined work-life balance and identified the amount of time and involvement spent in the work and family roles that satisfy the individual increases the quality of life. Greenhaus et al. (2003) explain the complex nature of work-life balance and how it affects manager work-life balance. Graves et al. (2007) examined how managers handle the commitment to family roles. Professional workers are committed to working and family, and one role does not suffer because of the other role. People can manage both roles, and the outcome of their work or commitment to the family does not suffer (Graves et al., 2007). Graves et al. (2007) established there is no negative impact of family role commitment on performance. However, the focus of the study did not include front-line managers, who may not have the authority to control the family work time because of the workload.

Kesting and Harris (2009) examined work-life balance from the women in the workplace lens. The ability to freely choose one's on functioning or combination of work and family activity based on choice. You can achieve a high level of well-being because you want to (Kesting & Harris, 2009). Work-Life Balance is considering the needs of the workers in addition to filling the workforce, and the family balance of women requires additional consideration because of their relationship to family (Kesting & Harris, 200). The mention of women in work-life balance analysis is a strength in the approach. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) made a strong argument for organization support for work-life balance by examining the different work-

life balance support on satisfaction by testing how the employer, government, and family contribute to work-life balance. Work-life balance support is critical to employee satisfaction, and joy mitigates the level of organization support (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). The strength of the approach is focused on the key components that foster positive work-life balance. However, the study was conducted outside of the United States. Karassvidou and Glaveli (2013) examined work-life balance using the work-family border theory to understand the organizational and individual factors that determine work-life balance. Border theory conceptualizes work and family as separate components. Border and bridges must be maintained and managed to obtain balance (Karassvidou & Glaveli, 2013). Understanding work domain and the characteristics of crossing the border and keeping the work realm provides insight into work-life balance (Karassvidou & Glaveli, 2013). Notwithstanding the approach did not consider the distance between work and the manager's personality.

Gregory et al. (2013) examined work-life balance considering the vast recession of 2008 in the US. The approach of work-life balance varies from by country and the consistency of the change (Gregory et al., 2013). The constantly changing work environment and unstable work environment drive the work-family conflict which creates a need to measure work-life balance across nationality and geography (Gregory et al., 2013). Examining work-life balance practices in violating working conditions in different national context is important; however, the conditions must be similarly measured to understand (Gregory et al., 2013). Stankiewicz et al. (2014) examined the employee's perception of the relationship of the work environment in support of work and personal life. Not having adequate time off, no voice in decisions affecting the work environment, and opportunity for development were the top three negative perceptions

of the employees regarding work-life balance support (Stankiewicz et al., 2014). Managers face constant strain on demand for time and flexibility which impacts work-life balance. Work-life balance issues affect the manager engagement (Stankiewicz et al., 2014).

Manager Engagement and Work Place Influence

Lautsch and Scully (2007) examined work-life balance relative to reduce hours and curtailing overtime for working-class workers. The effect of reducing the number of work hours is different for hourly and professional workers. Judging hours work impact on work-life balance difference for hourly employee versus professional employees is significant; however, the cultural difference must be considered to fully evaluate the impact (Lautsch and Scully, 2007).

Poelmans et al. (2008) used a different approach which is a conversation regarding the theoretical and practical implications of work-life balance. The major themes of work-life balance are characterized by harmonization. Work-life balance strategy must be embedded in the policies, organization culture, and the strategic plan (Poelmans et al., 2008). The strength of the approach is it provides work-life balance theory and practices for organizations to consider in developing work-life balance policies and practices; however, it must be practiced and measured to determine effectiveness (Poelmans et al., 2008).

Burchieli et al. (2008) examined the work-family balance from qualitative data collected from Australian workers which showed managers have more control of work-life balance than employees. The participants rejected the notion the organization supported them in work-life balance. The managers did not support work-life balance because the organization did not support the frontline managers (Burchieli et al., 2008). The source demonstrates there are organizational challenges to work-life balance perceptions in the management ranks that may not

be positive (Burchieli et al., 2008). Parkes and Langford (2008) approached work-life balance from the prism of retaining top talent as one of the dimensions of the organizational climate. The results show work-life balance is not relevant to retention of employees because it is not included in the strategic plan (Parkes and Langford, 2008). Work-Life Balance, employee involvement, and employee development should be considered simultaneously (Parkes and Langford, 2008). Hammond et al. (2011) examined how managers influence subordinate work-life management. The relationship between transformational leadership and work-family conflict positively impacted the support for work-life balance. Managerial support for work-life balance had the strongest effect on work-family enhancement and work-family-conflict (Hammond et al., 2011). The approach is a direct link between how managers lead subordinates and the effect of work-life balance in the work environment (Hammond et al., 2011).

Van Meel (2011) examined the origin of today's work environment that originated from the 1960's and 1970's. The way we work today is not new, the concept of mobile office, video conference, and flexible workplace was born in the 1960s and 1970s; the concepts back then were even more liberal. The work environment is always evolving, and organizations need to prepare to embrace it and benefit from it (Van Meel, 2011). Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) examine work-life balance practices on organization outcome in small and large companies where the culture was a decisive factor. The availability of work-life balance practices affects the organizational outcomes, even if employees do not use them. The organization culture contributes to the effect of work-life balance practices on organizational performance (Cegarra-Leiva et al., 2012).

Koubova and Buchko (2013) examined the effect of emotional intelligence on work and family balance satisfaction. Life experiences develop emotional intelligence which helps one balance work and family. The level of emotional intelligence is crucial in managing the balance between work and personal life (Koubova & Buchko, 2013). Mishra et al. (2013) explored the work-family theory holistically. Work-family culture perceptions originate from a strong organizational commitment to work-family enrichment. The outcome of enriched work-family approach is psychological capital (Mishra et al., 2013). (Kozjek et al. (2014) examined the role of the key constituents in work-life balance practice. The approach clarified the perceptions of actual work-life balance among employees and managers to improve the practice. The organization must pay more attention to the work-life balance needs of the workers to improve employee satisfaction (Kozjek et al., 2014). Incorporating work-life balance into the strategic and business operations plan can improve business and employee outcomes (Kozjek et al., 2014).

Gilley et al. (2015) examined the managerial practice of supporting work-life balance by age. The study revealed a conflict between the employee perceptions of support for work-life balance. Managers across generations had varying degrees of success managing work-life balance issues, and no generation was more successful (Gilley et al., 2015). Managers have a tremendous influence on the support of work-life balance which is a positive impact on employee engagement (Gilley et al., 2015). Kishino (2015) examined the effect of supervisor's behavior on subordinate's work-life balance. The impact of the manager's behavior in the workplace drives the perception of the employee regarding the organizational support for work-life balance. Supervisor support and role modeling positively impact employee work-life balance (Kishino, 2015).

Employee Perspective of Engagement Employee

Kahn (1990) established the foundation of employee engagement with the study that focused on measuring the degree to which people commit their self emotionally and physically in support of the job performance and the organization. There are multiple levels of influence involved in how people move in and out of a commitment to the job, co-workers, supervisor and the organization (Kahn, 1990). Kahn (1990) approach to employee engagement is focused on the individual case study and empirical data. Fearon et al. (2012) explored multiple levels of efficacy that promote efficient work engagement. The understanding of both individual and organizational self-efficacy interactions improve employee engagement. Organizations must continue to use new communication to improve employee engagement based on the changing demands of the job and work environment (Fearon et al., 2013). The approach focused on how positive influence from the manager drives positive employee engagement (Fearon et al., 2013). Medlin and Green (2014) evaluated the effect of management principles on employee engagement. Organizations that adhere to management principles have higher engagement. Empirical evidence shows that improving the management principles and processes issues increase engagement (Medlin & Green, 2014). Sambrook et al. (2014) examined employee engagement using the autoethnography approach, being and studying the self. The authors explored employee engagement in a cultural context from an interpretive and ethnographic angle (Sambrook et al., 2014). The approach is a new qualitative method of research where the research relies on their personal experience to extend the sociological perspective (Sambrook et al., 2014).

Consiglio et al. (2015) explored the social cognitive theory to explain how self-efficacy predicts employee engagement. Self-efficacy predicts work engagement over a three-year interval; employee perception of the work environment which include supervisor, colleagues, and top management mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement (Consiglio et al., 2015). Self-efficacy type employees pursue their career goals with effort and persistence, have a more favorable view of the work environment, and act to improve the work environment (Consiglio et al., 2015). Malik and Khalid (2016) evaluated the breach of the employment contract on work engagement and turnover through an empirical study using psychological contract theory to examine the impact of engagement and retention. Work engagement mediates the relationship between psychological breach and turnover (Malik & Khalid, 2016).

Manager Perspective of Employee Engagement

Hansen et al. (2012) evaluated interpersonal leadership effect on employee engagement. Engagement perception was positive with interpersonal leadership and identification with the organization. Employees are attached to the organization under leadership that is caring and focuses on the employee (Hansen et al., 2012). Kerns (2014) evaluated a framework for fostering and managing engagement for managers. Managers can improve engagement by identifying and clarify engagement profile, affirm the profile, develop specific examples, develop an engagement plan, develop performance measures, and connect with the culture. The adoption of logical engagement steps will foster and maintain engagement (Kerns, 2014). Engagement begins with leadership, the cycle supports engagement, and there is value in developing engagement (Kerns, 2014). Hawrysz (2015) examined the relationship of the manager's influence on employee

engagement. Organization engagement theory centers on the relationship of the worker as loyal to the employer, trust supervisor, and co-workers, and is not interested in leaving the company. Managers influence worker engagement, and they need to pay close attention to worker motivation to perform a complex task and the worker's competence in case of work division (Hawrysz, 2015). Managers receive a stronger more positive reception from employees by displaying consistent positive behavior and declarations. The manager's behavior has a tremendous impact on worker trust in their supervisor and co-worker (Hawrysz, 2015).

Organization perspective of Employee Engagement.

Shuck et al. (2010) explored the unique experience of employees engaged at work. The study of the best place highlighted relationship development and attachment, workplace climate, and learning opportunities are traits of companies with high engagement cultures. The direct manager plays a major role in shaping culture, and the learning focus in effective engagement cultures (Shuck et al., 2010). The relationships and connections in the organization are critical. Manager's influence on engagement affects the work environment (Shuck et al., 2010). Simbula and Gulielmi (2013) examined the reciprocal relationship between work engagement and consequences. When employees are engaged, they feel safe and go the extra mile. Work engagement predicts mental health problems, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship. Mental health problems were negatively associated with work engagement, and job satisfaction and organizational citizenship were positive (Simbula & Gulielmi, 2013). Work engagement factors worked together over time and will be reciprocated over time. The manager spends the most time with the employee and shapes their impression of the organization over time (Simbula & Gulielmi, 2013). Anitha (2014) focused on determinants of employee engagement and the

impact on performance. The work environment and relationships with supervisor and co-worker had the strongest predictors of work engagement. The organization focus is on an inviting work environment that supports the employee and encourages communication, support, and trust which increase the worker engagement and performance (Anitha, 2014).

Rana et al. (2013) explored Dubin (1978) model that links antecedents, outcomes, and moderators of employee engagement. Job design, supervisor and co-worker relationships, work environment, and human resources policies are significant antecedents of employee engagement. Job demand and individual characteristics moderate relationship between job design, supervisor and co-worker relationships, work environment, and employee engagement (Rana et al., 2013). The next step is to test the model in a case study or observation. The work provides a framework for managers to understand and improve employee engagement (Rana et al., 2013). Nutov and Hazzan (2012) developed an organizational engagement model for high school teachers in Israel. The approach focused on the personal needs and organizational culture to develop an engagement model for the school teachers. The model used the personal elements expressed by the teachers and the organizational culture elements to design the engagement, which improves engagement and well-being (Nutov & Hazzan, 2012).

Sushil (2014) focused on job design as the determinant of employee engagement considering the competition organizations faces for talent and products, because of globalization. The focus is on employee satisfaction to drive commitment to the organization and job satisfaction to keep top talent. The employees are the organizations greatest asset and understanding their motivation and talents to improve engagement improves the organization (Sushil, 2014). Castellano et al. (2016) examined management methods that can increase

employee engagement. The focus is developing an effective approach to employee engagement considering the cost of unengaged workers in the organization. Worker engagement has a significant influence on customer satisfaction, productivity, and employee morale (Castellano et al., 2016). Focusing on the organization as a sum of parts and each part has specific needs for the entire system to function. Employee engagement must be embedded into the organization culture to maintain effective employee engagement and managers drive the culture (Castellano et al., 2015).

Mehrzi and Singh (2016) examined competing through employee engagement to improve the organization competitive edge. The focus is on motivating employees through engagement to drive sustainability. Organizational support, supervisor and team relationships are mediated by employee motivation (Mehrzi & Singh, 2016). Radic (2017) examined employee engagement determinants on a cruise ship. The study measured communication and progress, capacity to engage, engaged behavior, trust and feeling of freedom. Communication and progress and capacity to engage had the most significant increase relative to determining engagement (Radic, 2017).

The weakness in the approach by the researchers is most of the studies were conducted outside the United States, and the research would need to be duplicated in the United States. Stankiewicz et al. (2014) weakness are the study did not measure the impact of the front-line manager on the employee's opinion. Karassvidou and Glaveli (2013) did not include distance from work and the manager's personality in the study. Greenhaus et al. (2003) did not specify the work-family time; for example, the family life could be spent with a spouse or for self-development. Poelmans et al. (2008) is a conversation with one expert of many on work-life

balance. Burchielli et al. (2008) sample size only included women from the workplace. Gilley's et al. (2015) reliance on self-reported data and the unspecified behavior measures regarding the characteristics of the supervisor.

Shuck's et al. (2010) employee engagement has many aspects other than those presented in the study. Fearon's et al. (2012) study is based review of one case from a review of the literature, to build on the approach, a more involved case study would be needed. Kerns' (2014) study is a review of literature; another industry could be the focus of future research. Nutov and Hazzan (2014) is one case study in Israel, duplicate the study in a western country is a way to build on the research. Rana et al. (2013) is a theoretical model; testing the theory is the next step in further research. Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) the focus is on school teachers and the results are not generalizable. Medlin and Green (2014), Malik and Khalid (2016) sample size is a convenient sample, not a random sample, which limits the generalizability of the study.

This correlational study is to test the theory of Work-Life Balance (Graves et al., 2007) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) that is related to the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The dependent variable is manager work-life balance, and the independent variable is the employee perception of how well the manager's practice influences a positive work environment. We have learned the themes of the work-life balance from the literature are the organization, manager, organization outcome, and social context and employee engagement themes are the organization, manager, and individual. This section describes the literature that supports the variables in the study.

The Dependent Variable

Greenhaus et al. (2003) illustrate how the demand for time and flexibility of the manager can affect work-life balance, which affects work-life stress. Sirajunisa (2004) managers will experience stress in the workplace differently, and work-life balance issues affect employee engagement. Burchielli et al. (2013) based on the nature of the manager's role manager work-life balance requires further research to improve manager engagement. Poelmans et al. (2008) explain the importance of work-life balance to the individual and organization. Shuck et al. (2010) highlight the work environment, the relationship, and connectivity between the manager and the employee, the manager's influence on organization culture, all of which the manager has tremendous power. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) focused on the organizational support for work-life balance should include the front-line manager because the research often only focuses on the employee. Ford and Collinson (2011) illustrate how managers influence the work environment based on their work-life balance expectations and experience. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) demonstrate the importance of work-life balance regarding organization performance and the effect work-life balance has on manager's engagement with employees, which drive organizational performance.

Karassvidou and Glaveli (2013) provided insight into how work domain and managing crossing between work and family can influence work-life balance. Mishra et al. (2013) illustrated how work-family culture affects the business and the demand for employee's time and flexibility creates a need to understand to enrich professional work-life balance. Stankiewicz et al. (2014) provided managers are facing constant job strain on the demand for time and flexibility which affects work-life balance and issues develop; it will impact employee

engagement. Gilley et al. (2015) provided the example of how generational leadership influences work-life balance support. Consiglio et al. (2016) held that managers are part of the positive social context and have a significant influence on the work environment. Hawrysz (2015) focused on the amount of influence the manager exercises in the workplace.

The Independent Variable

Hammond et al. (2011) illustrate the importance of managerial support for work-life balance to be effective in the organization. Welch (2011) provides the importance of communication in the engagement approach, which can be a tool to coach managers. Fearon et al. (2012) illustrate the importance of employee engagement and positive influence from the manager drives engagement. Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) explained the context of engagement over time, and the manager has the greatest influence on the work environment; characterized by not enough time and competing interests the manager must control. Kerns (2014) explained the impact of how the manager's influence and work-life balance are perceived in the workplace. Medlin and Green (2014) discussed the importance of employee engagement and the manager's influence is paramount to successful engagement. Nutov and Hazzan (2014) provided a case study on how managers can improve engagement and well-being. Rana et al. (2014) described the employee engagement approach and the importance of the supervisory relationship. Malik and Khalid (2016) explained the negative correlation between engagement and retention. Van Meel (2017) described work-life balance affects the current state of the work environment.

The literature describes current knowledge about work-life balance and employee engagement. Poelmans et al. (2008), Kerns (2014), Medlin & Green (2014), Nutov and Hazzan (2014), and Rana et al. (2014) provide the perspective from the organization and manager

regarding work-life balance and engagement. The information is well documented in the body of knowledge, but it is what we already know. A leading expert on work-life balance responds to theoretical and practical issues related to work-life balance (Poelmans et al., 2008). Focus on management practices and processes to understand the role of management in supporting and developing work-life balance and employee engagement (Poelmans et al., 2008; Kerns, 2014; Medlin & Green, 2014); Nutov & Hazzan, 2014; Rana et al., 2014). Fearon et al. (2012) and Consiglio et al. (2015) discussed self-efficacy in employee and work engagement. Use of self-efficacy in developing and engaging workers is key to building successful engagement cultures (Fearon et al., 2012; Consiglio et al., 2015). Stankiewicz et al. (2014) and Malik and Khalid (2016) focused on the individual employee and how they equate in the employee engagement. The poor relationship between the manager and the worker does not foster effective engagement. Managers and organizations need to understand the importance of the relationship between the manager and the employee (Stankiewicz et al., 2014; Malik & Khalid, 2016). Welch (2011) explained the importance of communication in developing effective engagement.

The literature describes current research that contributes to the body of knowledge and builds upon current knowledge about work-life balance and employee engagement. The research explained the impact of stress on work-life balance and employee engagement from the manager perspective (Greenhaus, 2003; Sirajunisa, 2004; Burchielli et al., 2008; Ford & Collinson, 2011). Focus on work-life balance and stress-related issues of managers is unusual in the current research and managers to handle stress and work-life balance differently, which is important for the organization. Technology transformed the workplace, and the adjustment required to keep pace with the future builds upon the current body of knowledge (Simbula, 2013; Van Meel,

2017). Shuck (2010) and Mishra et al. (2013) build upon the current body of knowledge by testing theoretical concepts in case studies. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) and Hawrysz (2015) contributed a new understanding of employee satisfaction with work-life balance and driving employee engagement. Hammond et al. (2011); Karassvidou and Glaveli (2013) provided the link between leadership and work-life balance, and the significance of the manager influence on the work environment.

What is the relationship between a manager's work-life balance and employee engagement and what is the relationship of the manager's work-life balance on positive employee engagement? The literature supports the relationship between the manager's work-life balance and employee engagement. Greenhaus et al. (2003); Sirajunisa (2004); and Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) addressed the impact of work stress and work-life balance on the manager which supports the research questions. Burchielli et al. (2008); Hammond et al. (2011); Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012); and Mishra et al. (2013) identified the importance of culture and the support of the organization in supporting managers in work-life balance and engagement.

The literature supports the relationship of the manager's work-life balance on positive employee relations. The relationship of the manager's work-life balance is born out from Stankiewicz et al. (2014), and Gilley et al. (2015) addressed the strain on managers which impacts work-life balance and the impact perceived work-life balance has on employees. Nutov and Hazzan (2014) and Rana et al. (2014) introduced theoretical models to test employee engagement, which furthers the link between the manager and engagement. Medlin and Green (2014) and Hawrysz (2015) provided the effect of the manager's behavior in active employee engagement. Fearon et al. (2012); Simbula and Guglielmi (2013); Consiglio et al. (2015); Malik

and Khalid (2016) provided employee engagement techniques for managers and organizations to develop and maintain effective engagement which creates the link between the manager and driving engagement.

Summary and Conclusions

The major themes in the literature review are work-life balance and employee engagement. The work-life balance themes are the organization, manager, organizational outcomes and culture. The themes of employee engagement studies are the organization, manager, and individual context. The research approach themes of work-life balance are increased demand for time and flexibility and the mental job strain, manager work-life balance conflict, and the influence of the manager on the work environment. The research approach themes of the employee engagement are the employees, manager, and organization. The approach weakness was reviewed and summarized. The literature rationale to support the variables and the research questions was explored. A review of the current knowledge and the research that builds on the current knowledge was explored. The study addresses a gap in the literature because of the focus on manager work-life balance and the relationship to employee engagement. Current research reviews the work-life balance and employee engagement, however; it does not address the relationship between the manager's work-life balance and employee engagement. This chapter sets up chapter 3 by providing a review of the current body of knowledge and rationale and support for problem and research questions. Chapter 3 describes the research model, methodology, data analysis, and threats to validity. It is a discussion of how the problem and research question from this chapter will be developed and tested.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The quantitative correlational study to test the theory of Work-Life Balance (Graves et al., 2007) and Employee Engagement (Kahn, 1990) that relates employee engagement to manager work-life balance, controlling for the managerial level of the manager, and their direct reports from various industries across the US. The employee's perception of how well the manager's practice influences a positive work environment is an independent variable. The front-line manager's work-life balance is the dependent variable. This chapter will describe the research design and rationale, methodology, sampling and sampling procedures, data analysis, and threats to external validity.

Research Design and Rationale

The research design is a quantitative correlational design to understand the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The purpose of the study is to test the theories of Work-Life Balance (Greenhaus, 2003) and Employee Engagement (Kahn, 1990). The demand for the employee's time and flexibility based on global competition has created a need to understand the impact of work-life balance on managers (Gregory et al., 2013). The specific problem of job strain on managers is increasingly mental instead of physical, which leads to ineffective engagement in the work environment (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). Manager work-life balance experience affects employee engagement in the work environment (Lokke & Madsen, 2014). The correlational design is based on the model of proof where researchers obtain data from random samples of the population (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The research design uses several samples from the population that can be contrast-groups, planned variation, panels, time-series, and control-series designs (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The study

design is Control-series which involve data collection of from participants that is the time from nonequivalent comparison group (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). The research questions are constructed to explain the relationship between the variables and supports the research problem (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The research question for this study is what are the relationship between organizational support for manager work-life balance and employee engagement; and what are the relationship of the manager's work-life balance and positive employee engagement? The hypotheses will test the research questions.

The time and resources consistent with the design choice is the time it takes to determine the sample size, survey instrument, select the panel, collect the data, and analyze the data. The study requires time to submit the questionnaire to Qualtrics and resources are required for the panel. The statistical significance of the sample data is important to the value of the research and Walden University Institutional Review Board which means the number of participants in the panel can increase the time and constrain the resources. The sample size, power, and correlation test identified the appropriate number of respondents for statistical significance and reliability. The survey instrument should be valid and tested by previous researchers. The survey instrument for this study is the Valcour (2007) Work-Life Balance scale and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). Researchers used the Utrecht Scale Work Engagement Scale (UWES, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006, Consiglio et al., 2015, Simbula & Gulielmi, 2015), and the Work-Life Balance Scale (Valcour, 2007, Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011).

Work-Life Balance Discipline

The design choice is consistent with research design needed to advance knowledge in the discipline. In the work-life balance discipline, Greenhaus et al. (2003) conducted a random

sample of accountants to promote the Work-Life Balance Theory. Sirajunisa (2004) used a questionnaire to measure occupational stress and work-life balance among professional workers. Graves et al. (2007) tested family role commitment to determine what happens to manager perceived work-life balance issues. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) studied the work-life balance satisfaction among European workers. Hammond et al. (2011) surveyed department managers in the hotel industry to determine manager's influence on subordinate work-life management. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) studied companies in the metal industry to determine work-life balance practices on organization outcomes in small and large businesses. Lokke and Madsen (2013) surveyed managers to identify perceptions of work-related stress in the public sector. Kozjek, et al., (2014) studied perceived employee and manager expectation of work-life balance. Stankiewicz et al., (2014) sampled employees to determine the perceived opinion of working conditions. Gilley et al. (2015) examined the managerial practices of supporting work-life balance based on employee perception. Kishino (2015) surveyed subordinates to determine the effect of supervisor support and work-life balance modeling.

Employee Engagement Discipline

Kahn (1990) conducted empirical study international firm to determine the effect of interpersonal leadership on employee engagement. Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) surveyed school teachers to examine the reciprocal relationship between work engagement and consequences. Anitha (2014) conducted a study of middle and lower management to determine employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. Medlin and Green (2014) surveyed full-time employees in Southern US to determine the effects of management basics on employee engagement. Consiglia et al. (2015) studied the largest companies in Italy to examine

self-efficacy predicts employee engagement. Hawrysz (2015) investigated the relationship of the manager's influence on employee engagement. Malik and Khalid (2016) examined the impact of the breach of the work contract on work engagement and turnover through sampling data from private and public banking sector. Radic (2017) collected empirical data from the crew of a cruise ship to determine employee engagement during the voyage.

Methodology

This study will examine the relationship between manager work-life balance on employee engagement. The quantitative correlation design is consistent with understanding manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The work-family culture impacts business and the demand for employee's time and flexibility, which creates a need to know how to enrich work-life balance (Mishra et al., 2013). Manager engagement and positive influence are critical to understanding employee engagement (Fearon et al., 2012). The design is a correlation to test the manager work-life balance and employee engagement hypotheses.

Population

The population will consist of the US workers and frontline managers. The US worker population comes from all professional industries. The survey will consist of standard work-life balance and the employee engagement tool. Front-line supervisors who have direct reports and the employees of front-line managers are the survey respondents. The study draws an inference from the entire population through sampling (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The focus is on the front-line manager and their direct reports.

Sampling and Sampling Procedures

Power and sample size for a Test 1 Mean 1-Sample, 2-Sided Equality was conducted using the University of California at San Francisco Clinical and Translational Science Institute sample size calculator (Sample Size for Bivariate Correlation, Pearson Correlation, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation, 2017). The expected correlation is .10, the power is .80, and the alpha is 0.05 which means the sample size should be 85 supervisors and employees. The bivariate test is performed to understand the relationship between two variables (Sample Size for Bivariate Correlation, Pearson Correlation, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation, 2017). Performing the sample test for the bivariate correlation provides the number from the population needed to be statistically significant, which is usually 0.05, which is a type I level error. The power ensures the test is significant even if the results are not significant, which is a type II level error. The effect size denotes with r measures the strength of the relationship. The Bivariate and Pearson correlations are 0.10 for small effect size, 0.30 for medium effect, and 0.50 for large effect size (Sample Size for Bivariate Correlation, Pearson Correlation, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation, 2017). These numbers are used in 98% of the clinical research at the masters and Ph.D. Level. Therefore, the sample size, using the Bivariate correlation and Pearson correlation is 85 participants to avoid type I and type II errors and have a stable relationship.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection (Primary Data)

The participant panel will be obtained through Qualtrics research technology company. Qualtrics is recognized throughout the world as a manager in providing research data for business schools and global enterprises. The research arm of the organizations specializes in customer satisfaction, research and development, segmentation and strategy, and marketing and

brand research. They will provide a panel of front-line managers from the general industry and front-line employees to participate in the work-life balance and employee engagement questionnaire. The participants will respond to their perception of work-life balance such as how well you divide your time between work and family (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). The participants will provide their perception of the work engagement such as strength, dedication, and involvement in work the environment (Consiglio et al., 2015).

Qualtrics screens the participants and their personal information such as name, email address, physical address, or phone number are not revealed to the researcher. The participants will come from the general industry, directly supervise front-line employees or are front-line employees. All respondents will be from the US. Qualtrics will conduct the survey using state of the art technology, security, and data confidentiality. Qualtrics provides the most trusted enterprise research platform in the world with over 8,500 brands and 99 of the top 100 business schools using Qualtrics to make the most critical decisions (Sophisticated research made simple, 2017).

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

The Work-Life Balance scale satisfaction scale was developed by Valcour (2007). Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) used the scale to test the hypotheses the higher the national support for work-life balance the higher the level of work-life balance satisfaction; and support at the national levels moderate the relationship between family and work. The study focuses on 7867 service sector workers in eight European countries (Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011). Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) tested the buffering effect and various support types with a hierarchical regression analysis. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) created seven models to

examine the variables that produced significant interaction effects investigating the buffering effect on the significant negative support demands. Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) used the Utrecht Scale to measure work engagement to study 394 teachers from five different school systems. Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) used the scale to test hypotheses work engagement have a negative cross-lagged effects on mental-health problems, mental health problems have a negative cross-lagged effects on work engagement; work engagement have a positive cross-lagged effects on job satisfaction, job satisfaction has a positive cross-lagged effects on work engagement; work engagement have a positive cross-lagged effects on organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational citizenship behaviors have a positive cross-lagged effects on work engagement.

Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) tested the hypotheses with cross-lagged structural equation modeling (SEM). Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) performed the means of item level confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) compared the competing models regarding the causal relationships between the variables. The first model was the stability model and contained synchronous autocorrelation correlations (Simbula & Guglielmi, 2013). Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) compared the stability model with the other models that were the closest to the hypothetical structure. All models were compared by using the Chi-square test, the Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) and the Root Mean Square-Error of Approximation (RMSEA). Consiglio et al. (2015) used the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale to measure work engagement in a study that focused on 741 communication service company employees. Consiglio et al. (2015) tested the three-factor model which included colleagues, immediate supervisor, and management. Consiglio et al. (2015) examined the model fit of two alternative models; then they

tested configural, metric and scalar variance. Consiglio et al. (2015) examined the theoretical model by including the hypothesized structure using the Maximum Likelihood estimation method. Consiglio et al. (2015) examined the mediation hypotheses using the bootstrapping method.

Data Analysis Plan

The software that will be used to conduct the analyses of the hypotheses is Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Qualtrics will provide the data that will be tested and analyzed using SPSS. An independent samples t-test to compare two unique groups on some measure. The goal is to compare the results from front-line managers with those from front-line employees, the independent t-test is appropriate. The study is a quantitative correlation design to examine the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. Research question number one what is the correlation of manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement?

H1. There is no correlation between manger work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement.

H2: There is a correlation between manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement.

The second research question what is the correlation of positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement?

H1: There is no correlation between positive manger work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement.

H2: There is a correlation between positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement.

The Bivariate Person Correlation test will be used to measure the correlations among the pair of variables and the correlation within and between the set of variables. The bivariate correlation only reveals associations among a continuous set of variables. This statistical test will be used to analyze the statistical difference between the means of two groups (Fields, 2018). The two samples mean data will be collected, and the sample means may differ slightly or significantly. We will compare the mean results with that of what we would expect based on the null hypothesis. The standard error will be used to measure the variability between the two means. A small standard error indicates most samples have similar means and sizeable standard error indicates a significant difference in the sample means. The test will be the observed differences between the means minus the expected difference between the population means divided by the estimate of the standard error between the difference of the two means (Fields, 2018).

Manager work-life balance is the dependent variable, and employee engagement is the independent variable. The data will be analyzed in SPSS using a Bivariate Correlation test of association. Once the appropriate table has been selected in SPSS, the results tables will be generated (Wagner, 2017). The results sections will be group statistics and the correlation test. The Group Statistic table will provide summary data from the experimental groups such as the number of participants, mean, standard deviation, standard error mean, and bootstrap report. Bootstrapping is a feature of SPSS and allows the user to estimate the sampling distribution by adjusting the confidence intervals (Wagner, 2017). The correlation test will consist of the

strength of the r denotes the strength of the relationship between the two variables. The bivariate Pearson correlation produces sample coefficient which measures the strength and direction of the linear relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The results of the correlation are statistically significant if the linear relationship exists between the two continuous variables, the strength of the relationship being as close to a straight line, and the direction of the linear relationship is increasing or decreasing. The value of the correlation ranges is from -1 to 1, and the sign of the correlation indicates the direction of the correlation. The strength of the relationship is expressed as small or weak correlation, medium or moderate, and large or strong correlation. The p value indicates the significance level and whether the line is due to chance. The sample size is listed as n , and the R squared is the coefficient of determination which shows how much of the variance is unexplained.

Threats to Validity

External Validity

It is not feasible to survey the entire population; therefore, the researcher selects a sample from the population and use the statistical results to generalize across the population based on similar conditions and results (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Qualtrics will randomly select participants from the population of front-line managers and employees who report to the front-line manager using convenience sampling. The participants will be incented to participate by Qualtrics base on convenience and will be drawn from population of front-line managers and their direct reports. The results are generalized based on the sample of the target audience (Ferguson, 2004). External validity is based on the researcher and the research design; generalizability is the process of applying the results of the target population to the entire

population (Ferguson, 2004). Responsible research is deliberate on using the results to infer causation (Ferguson, 2004). The details of the research and design need to be specific and communicated by the researcher (Ferguson, 2004). There are four critical aspects to threats of external validity: a) testing reactivity, b) interaction effects of selection and experimental variables, c) specificity of variables, and d) reactive effects of experimental arrangements, and multiple-treatment interference (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015).

The participants in the study will be randomly selected to participate in the survey which means it will be offered to the population of front-line managers and their employee across the US from various industry. Qualtrics uses scientific research standards to sample the population of front-line managers and their direct reports. Qualtrics is a national research company with access to consumers all over the US. Qualtrics will administer the survey to consumers from the targeted audience. The interaction effects of selection and experimental variables or treatment environment refers to varying the sites of the participants. The participants in the study will come from different disciplines and backgrounds. This form of external threat is reduced with the use of participants from multiple backgrounds and industries (Ferguson, 2004).

The specificity of variables refers to the historical treatment of the variables, which is the idea that one single event is not dictating the results. The study is testing variables that have been in the discipline for a long time, work-life balance and employee engagement, and provide enough variance to avoid the external threat to validity. The reactive effects of experimental arrangements and multiple-treatment interference refer to the causal relationship of the result to the target population. The expected correlation between the two variables is statistically

significant based on the sample size testing, which reduces this threat. The direction of the causal relationship is constant and therefore allows the relationship to be generalized (Ferguson, 2004).

Internal Validity

Internal validity refers to the experimental treatment effect and control for variables during the experiment design (Ferguson, 2004). The internal validity is addressed by ensuring the research measures what was intended to measure (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). Pretest and posttest can guard against internal validity (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Grounding the research in theoretical framework reduces internal validity threat (Ferguson, 2004). Validity is obtaining the highest possible truth in the research including the probability of generalizing the results to other settings (Ferguson, 2004).

The study is grounded in Work-Life Balance Theory (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990). The hypothesis states there is a positive relationship between organizational support for manager work-life balance and employee engagement, which is derived from the research question regarding the relationship between organizational support for manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The hypothesis states there is a positive relationship between manager's work-life balance and positive employee engagement, which is derived from the research question regarding the relationship of the manager's work-life balance on positive employee engagement. The research cited in the study to support the theoretical framework is related to work-life balance and employee engagement.

Construct Validity

Construct validity refers to construct or statistical conclusion validity. The survey instrument is grounded in theory and measures what it is intended to measure (Frankfort-

Nachmias et al., 2015). The research design must be connected to the theoretical construct to reduce the threat of validity (Ferguson, 2014). How eager participants are, the expected outcome of the experiment and novelty disruptions can affect validity (Ferguson, 2014). Relating the study measurement to the theoretical construct makes the results generalizable across the target population in different settings and context (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015).

The study instrument is grounded in Work-life Balance Theory (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990). The manager work-life balance variable will be tested using the Work-Life Balance scaled developed by Valcour (2007). The employee engagement variable will be tested using the Utrecht Scale (UWES, Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006, Simbula & Guglielmi, 2013). The Utrecht Scale measure three areas: vigor, dedication, and absorption (Simbula & Guglielmi, 2013). The measurement instruments in the study are reliable and reduce the threat of validity.

The work-life balance scale developed by Valcour (2007) was validated and reliable from the study of the relationship of work hours, job complexity, and control over work time. Job complexity was significantly related to satisfaction with the work-family balance from a study of 570 telephone call center representatives (Valcour, 2007). Valcour (2007) work-life balance scale addressed the relationship between work demands and satisfaction with work-family balance with front-line workers, where previous research focused on managerial and professional workers. The results of the work-life balance scale demonstrated a decisive statistical significance between the relationship of work demands and satisfaction with work-life balance (Valcour, 2007). McNamara, Pitt-Catsouphes, Matz-Costa, Brown, and Valcour (2012) conducted a study of the relationship between hours worked per week and satisfaction with

work-family balance. The data from a 2007-2008 survey of employees using the Valcour (2007) work-life balance scale to test work hours, flexibility-fit, and supportive work culture (McNamara et al., 2012). The quantile regression analysis based on resource drain and resources demands, showed a difference between the 25th and 75th percentiles relative to hours worked per week and satisfaction with work-family balance (McNamara et al., 2012). Chiang, Birtch, and Kwan (2010) used the Valcour (2007) work-life balance scale in a study focused on the relationship of job stress, coping resources, and job stress in hotel and catering industry. Food service workers in the hotel and catering industry responded to understand job stress and job demand, and work-life balance (Chiang et al., 2010). The study showed positive work-life balance is high and perceived job stress is low when there is a higher control over the job (Chiang et al., 2010).

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was validated and reliable in a study that developed the short questionnaire to measure work engagement based on data collected from 10 different countries (Schaufeli et al., 2006). The factorial validity was based on confirmatory factor analysis which resulted in internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Schaufeli et al., 2006). The study includes burnout which measures exhaustion and cynicism, and engagement that measure vigor, dedication, absorption, and professional efficacy. The results show that engagement has a positive effect on burnout and the scale is appropriate to study organizational behavior (Schaufeli et al., 2006). Mills, Culbertson, and Fullagar (2011) analyzed the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale to conceptualize and measure engagement. The study factor structure and reliability of the scores was examined from the data sample. The construct was validated in correlation with other constructs (Mills et al., 2011). The results of the study show the scale as

valid and reliable and capture the three-factor dimension of the engagement construct. Shimazu, Schaufeli, Kosugi, Suzuki, Nashiwa, Kato, Sakamoto, Irimajiri, Amano, Hirohata, and Goto (2008) utilized the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale to validate work engagement in Japan. Data from three independent samples using confirmatory factor analysis shows reliability, factorial variance, and construct validity of the work engagement scale (Shimazu et al., 2008). The study revealed the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was reliable in measuring work engagement (Shimazu et al., 2008).

Ethical Procedures

The data will be collected from the panel provided by Qualtrics Software Survey company. Qualtrics is a privately held experience management company, with co-headquarters in Provo, Utah and Seattle, Washington, in the United States. The data collection process complies with Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Qualtrics has an established procedure for handling participant information and data collection. Qualtrics will be responsible for reviewing quotas and screeners, adding redirects, and approving the survey before launching to targeted respondents. Qualtrics does not release panel member's personal information to the party requesting the panel.

The researcher must provide privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity to the participants. An application to conduct the research will be submitted to Walden University IRB to obtain approval to conduct the research. Qualtrics has agreed to abide by the IRB guidelines in conducting the panel. Qualtrics will record the terminated responses as well as survey completion toward the number of responses. The terminated responses will not count against the total of completed responses. There are no other ethical concerns regarding the study.

The data will be collected from the panel by Qualtrics. The panel consists of two targeted populations, front-line managers, and front-line employees. Qualtrics will send the survey out to its panel partners to the targeted respondents to complete the online survey. The data will be collected and coded to ensure confidentiality and privacy. The data will be forwarded to the researcher by secure email. The personal information of the respondents will be protected and not included in the email.

Summary

The quantitative correlational study is designed to test the theory of Work-Life Balance (Greenhaus, 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990). The dependent variable and independent variable that tests the hypotheses regarding the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement. The research design is connected to research questions because they are constructed to explain the relationship between the variables and supports the research problem (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The methodology is a quantitative correlation design consistent with understanding manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The study focus is on US front-line supervisor and employees and a statistical test were performed to determine sample size. The measurement scales used in the study have been validated and are reliably consistent with the theoretical construct. The data will be analyzed using SPSS following the guidelines established by the Walden University IRB. Threats to internal and external validity have been identified and addressed. The participants and the responses have been protected, are ethical, and handled confidentially. The next chapter will focus on the result of the research by explaining the statistical testing and the results.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to test the Theory of Work-Life Balance (Graves, Ohlott, & Rudeman, 2007) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) that relates employee engagement to manager work-life balance, controlling for the managerial level of the manager, and their direct reports from various companies across the United States. The employee's perception of how well the manager's practice influences a positive work environment was the independent variable. The front-line manager's work-life balance was the dependent variable. Research Q1. What is the correlation of manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement?

Ha: There is no correlation between manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement.

Hb: There is a correlation between manager work-life balance satisfaction and employee engagement.

Research Q2. What is the correlation of positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement?

Ha: There is no correlation between positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement.

Hb: There is a correlation between positive manager work-life balance satisfaction and positive employee engagement.

Chapter 4 will focus on the results of the study which include the purpose of the study, the data collection, study results, and summary. The purpose of the study was based on the research questions and the hypotheses which aligned with the research design. The data

collection describes the steps used to collect and analyze the data. The analysis of the results involved testing the hypotheses to understand the significance of the population and hypothetical means.

Data Collection

The researcher contracted with Qualtrics research company to purchase a survey panel based on sample size of 85 front-line managers and front-line employees. The researcher conducted a Power and sample size Test 1 Mean 1-Sample, 2-Sided Equality to determine the sample size. Guidance was obtained from a prior Walden University research faculty and URR committee member. The University of California at San Francisco Clinical and Translational Science Institute sample size calculator was used to determine a sample size of 85 supervisors and employees based on a correlation of .10, the power is .80 and the alpha is 0.05. The predicted size effect was 0.15 because it is the most conservative prediction to achieve the largest sample size. Based on the conversation with the Qualtrics project manager, the company selected the target audience based on selection criteria of front-line manager or front-line employee, and the survey remained open until 85 complete responses were received from each participant group. Qualtrics provided an incentive to people from the target audience to participate which allow the recipient to buy online items.

After the participants completed the survey, the researcher received an encrypted protected file from Qualtrics. The Qualtrics project manager confirmed the survey methodology was scientific and complied with Walden University Institutional Review Board. The researcher obtained permission from both survey owners to use the Valcour Work-life Balance Scale (Appendix A) and the Utrecht Employee Engagement survey (Appendix B). Qualtrics was

provided both survey questions along with the consent forms (Appendix C) to be utilized by each participant group by the researcher. The researcher logged onto the Qualtrics survey web site and typed in the questions as outlined from each survey. The researcher reviewed and approved both survey questions for accuracy and uploaded the consent forms for each survey. Qualtrics opened the site for panel participants. Qualtrics notified the researcher (after about a two-week timeframe) that both surveys had received 85 complete responses. The researcher then received the encrypted data files with the 89 managers and 94 employee responses and uploaded it into SPSS. The researcher consulted on several occasions with two Walden University Tutor SPSS experts to conduct the Bivariate Correlation test to determine the strength of the relationship of the variables.

The researcher used the Valcour Work-Life Balance (Valcour, 2007) survey tool to address the relationship between organizational support for manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The front-line managers were asked to indicate on a scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied, their level of satisfaction regarding work statements. The researcher used the Utrecht Employee Engagement Scale (UWES, Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006) to address the relationship between manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement. The front line employee participants were asked to rate 17 statements about how they feel about their job and if they had feelings, how often on a scale from 0 to 6 (0) never (1) almost never or a few times per month (2) rarely or once per month (3) sometimes or a few times per month (4) often or once per week (5) very often or few time per week, and (6) always or every day. The participant panel was obtained through Qualtrics research technology company. Qualtrics provided a panel of front-line managers from the general industry and front-

line employees to participate in the work-life balance and employee engagement surveys. The sample size that Qualtrics used was provided by the researcher based on the Power and sample size for a Test 1 Mean 1-Sample, 2-Sided Equality (Smithson, 2011). The expected correlation was .10, the power is .80, and the alpha was 0.05 which means the sample size should be 85 supervisors and employees.

Qualtrics provided a survey panel of front-line managers and front-line employees from US workers across the country from various industries. The manager participants responded to their perception of work-life balance such as how well they divide their time between work and family, by responding to the Valcour Work-life Balance Survey. The front-line employee participants provided their perception of the work engagement such as strength, dedication, and involvement in work the environment (Consiglio et al., 2015), by responding to the Utrecht Work Engagement Survey. Qualtrics collected the participant responses from the online survey and stored the data in an encrypted secure file. Qualtrics codified the participant personal data to protect the identity. Qualtrics forward the codified data to research via secured encrypted file. The researcher received the codified encrypted secure file and stored it in a secure file that is only accessible by the researcher.

Researchers selected a sample from the population and use the statistical results to generalize across the population based on similar conditions and results because it is not feasible to survey the entire population (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Qualtrics selected participants from the population of front-line managers and employees who report to the front-line manager. The results are generalized based on a sample of the target audience (Ferguson, 2004). The researcher has confidence in the generalizing results based on a sample of the target audience because the

target audience was randomly sampled. The study involved the test of variables that have been in the discipline for a long time, work-life balance and employee engagement which provided enough variance to avoid the external threat to validity.

The Pearson Correlational coefficient r was used to measure the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the pair of variables. This statistical test analyzed the statistical difference between the means of two groups (Fields, 2018). The two samples mean data was collected, and the sample means may differ slightly or significantly. We compared the mean results with that of what we would expect based on the null hypothesis. The standard error was used to measure the variability between the two means. A small standard error indicates most samples have similar means and sizeable standard error indicates a significant difference in the sample means. The test observed the differences between the means minus the expected difference between the population means divided by the estimate of the standard error between the difference of the two means (Fields, 2018).

Study Results

A Pearson Correlational test was conducted to compare the association between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The r value was the result of the strength and direction of the linear relationship. If the two groups are equal the result was known as the null hypothesis; however, if the t value is not consistent with the distribution the populations of the two groups is not equal and the null hypothesis is not true. The population of the sample groups was compared with the hypothetical sample if the mean of the two groups is equal there is no relationship between the two groups.

The Pearson Correlation test is widely used in quantitative research to understand the association between variables that are normally distributed (Nishishiba, Jones, & Kraner, 2017). The correlation test for association of the variables tells the researcher the magnitude of how close the linear relationship is to the straight line. The r value indicates the statistical significance of the linear relationship.

The Pearson Correlation test was used when there are two or more continuous variables, linear relationship among the variables, independent cases, bivariate normality, random sample data, and no outliers (Salkind, 2012). The observation should be a natural occurrence and not manipulated by the researcher. The homogeneity of the two groups was calculated by the Pearson Correlational test which is an estimate of population variance in the sample groups (Salkind, 2012). Normal distribution in each of the population exists provided the sample size was adequate. The populations are formulated naturally and are not manipulated to impact the outcome. The power of the test was based on statistically significant results when there is an actual difference in the population of the two groups. The power was influence by the difference in the population means, variability, and the sample size (Salkind, 2012). This study expected correlation was .10, the power was .80, and the alpha was 0.05 which generated a sample size of 85 supervisors and employees.

The Pearson Correlation test compared the mean responses by front-line managers and front-line employees to determine if there is statistical significance between the populations. The mean results were compared with that of what we would expect based on the null hypothesis. The standard error was used to measure the variability between the two means. A small standard error indicates most samples have similar means and sizeable standard error indicates a

significant difference in the sample means. The test observed differences between the means minus the expected difference between the population means divided by the estimate of the standard error between the difference of the two means (Fields, 2018).

Manager work-life balance was the dependent variable, and employee engagement is the independent variable. The data was analyzed in SPSS using analyze, bivariate, and correlational test. The results sections are group statistics and the independent sample t-test. The Group Statistic table showed summary data from the experimental groups such as the number of participants, mean, standard deviation, standard error mean, and bootstrap report. Bootstrapping is a feature of SPSS and allowed the researcher to estimate the sampling distribution by adjusting the confidence intervals (Wagner, 2017).

There was a reported significant difference between the means of the two groups. The scores for managers ($M = 16.53$, $SD = 4.13$) and employees ($M = 60.71$, $SD = 22.61$); $t(18.153) = 99.5$, $p = .01$.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ManagerS	89	10.00	25.00	16.53	4.13
EmpS	94	4.00	102.00	60.71	22.61
Valid N (listwise)	89				

The results of the correlation are statistically significant if the linear relationship exists between the two continuous variables, the strength of the relationship being as close to a straight line, and the direction of the linear relationship is increasing or decreasing. The value of the

correlation ranges is from -1 to 1, and the sign of the correlation indicates the direction of the correlation. The strength of the relationship is expressed as small or weak correlation, medium or moderate, and large or strong correlation. The p value indicates the significance level and whether the line is due to chance. The sample size is listed as n, and the R squared is the coefficient of determination which shows how much of the variance is unexplained.

The test of significance indicated the difference between the sample means compared to the population was different and is not a chance difference (Sirkin, 2011). The mean difference for the employee was $M = 60.71$ and the manager was $M = 16.53$. If the difference was based on sampling or chance, difference it is not statistically significant. Most research uses the .05 probability as the guide to statistical significance, which means that if the strength of the p value is less than .05 there is no correlation.

The study finding for the Pearson Correlational test indicate manager work-life balance and employee engagement association is not statistically significant linear relationship. The direction is positive, but the strength of the association is small and weak correlation. The direction is positive, but the strength of the association is small and weak correlation; therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected, and there is no association between the two variables. The results tell us there is no association between work-life balance and employee engagement.

The result of the p value was not statistically significant, and there was insufficient evidence to reject the null. The results of the Pearson Correlation test were not statistically significant and be significant to research because there was a difference in statistically significance and research significance (Sirkin, 2011). The research significance was based on the relevance to the researcher and the reader. The statistical significance was based on the

probability the mean difference from the two means is respective of the different populations and not a sampling error.

The researcher did not absolutely prove a null hypothesis because the hypothesis testing was focused on the evidence against the null and if the researcher did not find enough evidence against the null, it cannot be rejected (Salkind, 2012). The power test standards and sampling procedures used by the research in this study provides the assurance the probability of the Pearson Correlation $r(89) = 0.115, p > .001$, the null hypotheses there was no association between manager work-life balance and employee engagement, and there was no relationship between positive manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement. Based on the results of the study there was not enough evidence against the null hypotheses from both research questions.

It was impossible for the researcher to collect information on the entire population; therefore, a sample of the population was used to infer certain things about the entire population. The null hypothesis provides the answer to the odds if the relationship in the population was zero, then the relationship in the sample was zero (Allen, 2017). The null was the opposite of the hypothesis. The null testing involved generating evidence that overturned the presumption there was no relationship between the two variables. The null was the opposite of what the research was trying to prove.

In this research the hypothesis for the first research question: the association between manager work-life balance and employee engagement was the population coefficient is 0; and there is no association. The second research question hypothesis was the association between

positive manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement coefficient is 0; and there is no association.

The research question, what is the association between manager work-life balance and employee engagement and what is the association between positive manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement along with the associated hypotheses were examined based on the correlation test, significance, and strength of the relationship. The hypotheses for research question one are (H1) the population correlation coefficient is 0; there is no association and (H2) the population correlation coefficient is not 0; a nonzero correlation could exist. The association between manager work-life balance and employee engagement is not statistically significant based on the p value therefore there is no association between manager work-life balance and employee engagement.

The hypotheses for research question two are (H1) the population correlation coefficient is 0 and there is no association and (H2) the population correlation coefficient is not 0; and a nonzero correlation could exist. The result shows there is no association between positive manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement. The association between positive manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement is small and weak based on the correlation test.

Summary

The answers to the research questions were there a correlation between manager work-life balance and employee engagement and was there a correlation between positive manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement and based on the Pearson Correlation there was a nonsignificant correlation, which means the population coefficient is 0; and there is no

association. The goal of testing the hypothesis was not to absolutely reject the null but identify evidence against the null. The study results were statistically not significant as the data points are not close to the straight line. The study is important to the body of knowledge because it provides practitioners more evidence to focus on the relationship of organizational support for manager work-life balance in the organization and the relationship between manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement.

The researcher took great care to provide the purpose, background, and theoretical foundation for the research, which informed the research design, data collection, and analysis. The sampling and sampling procedures along with the features of SPSS ensured the research avoided pitfalls of rejecting the null when it was true or accepting the null assumption when it should be rejected. The Pearson Correlation test is a widely used statistical tests available to the researcher.

The next chapter will interpret the findings of the study, discuss the limitations, identify recommendations, and implications for the future. The findings will be reviewed and compared to the body of knowledge of past research findings and summarized. The reliability and validity of the study will be examined to understand how it was executed in the study. Recommendations that are grounded in the interpretation of the result and limitations of the study will be identified.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to test the theory of Work-Life Balance (Graves, Ohlott, & Rudeman, 2007) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) that relates employee engagement to manager work-life balance, controlling for the managerial level of the manager, and their direct reports from various companies across the United States. The employee's perception of how well the manager's practice influences a positive work environment was the independent variable. The front-line manager's work-life balance was the dependent variable.

The key finding was there is a relationship between organizational support for manager work-life balance. There is a relationship between manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement. The results of the hypotheses testing show there was sufficient statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis of both research questions. Organizational support for manager work-life balance was important to the manager and employee engagement. The results provided more evidence for practitioners about the role that organizational support plays in the manager work-life balance and how the manager's work-life balance was related to positive employee engagement.

Interpretation of Findings

The study findings were reviewed to understand how they relate to the theoretical framework and the body of knowledge in the discipline. The review consisted of the theoretical framework, the major research themes of the literature review, and the approaches to work-life balance and employee engagement from previous research.

The study was based on the Greenhaus' et al. (2003) Work-Life Balance Theory and Kahn's (1990) Employee Engagement Theory which support the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement. Greenhaus' et al. (2003) established a measurement for work-life balance from the study that measured time, involvement, and satisfaction with the work-life balance from the 400 people out of 1000 randomly selected participants. Greenhaus et al. (2003) discovered a significant increase in the quality of life when individuals invest an adequate amount of time and involvement in work and family roles. Satisfaction with the amount of time and commitment among the work and family roles resulted in higher work-life quality. Kahn (1990) Employee Engagement Theory focused on the idea that individuals engage degrees of self in roles in support of the organization. Kahn (1990) developed the Engagement Theory from the empirical data result of two case studies which established the degrees of self in which people physiologically perform their role and support for the organization. Kahn (1990) focused on the experiences that generate the highest level of commitment and create the highest level of performance and support for the organization.

The results of the study link to the Work-life Balance Theory (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990) because the results suggest organizations that support manager work-life balance or more likely to produce managers who are good at balancing the work and family in a manner that does not create work stress. Based on Greenhaus et al. (2003) study people have less stress at work when they are happy with the amount of time and participation in their work and family role. The results show there is a relationship between the organizational support for manager work-life balance and employee engagement. The results confirm the manager who has the organizational support for a balanced work-life is more

effective in employee engagement. The results confirm the Kahn (1990) Employee Engagement Theory because the manager along with the organization, and interaction with co-workers affects the employee involvement. Based on the previous research the manager plays a key role in determining the degree of participation and commitment in support of organizational goals and objectives.

There are four themes in the work-life balance research, organization, manager, organization outcome, and social context. The work-life balance studies that focused on the organization explored two categories, satisfaction and work environment. Organizational satisfaction by Greenhaus et al. (2003) provided the consistent definition of work-life balance. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) and Parkes and Langford (2008) developed the work-life balance satisfaction factors. Parkes and Langford (2008) used a Work-Life Balance scaled by Valcour (2007) and Emotional Support Scale by (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lynes, 1999) to develop satisfaction measurement. The work-life balance research that focused on the work environment was led by Kozjek et al. (2014) and Stankiewicz et al. (2014) which identified factors that foster an active work-life balance culture.

The work-life balance research manager themes were studied with the focus on the importance of the manager's support for work-life balance as evidenced by Hammond (2015) and Kishino (2015). Gilley et al. (2015) went a step further with identifying no difference in generational manager's approach to work-life balance. Graves et al. (2007) expanded on manager support for work-life balance by identifying how work-life balance affects their attitude and performance. Sirajunisa (2004) contributed to the social context of in the study of the effect

of work-life balance on women professional workers. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) explained the impact of strategic work-life balance in driving organizational outcomes.

The results of the study confirmed the findings from previous work-life balance research related to organization, manager, organizational outcome, and social context. The results of the study confirm the findings by Greenhaus et al. (2003) who provided the consistent definition of work-life balance because the measurement was used in this study to gather feedback from the participants regarding organizational support for work-life balance. The study confirmed the work by Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) and Parkes and Langford (2008) that developed the work-life balance satisfaction factors because the factors are present in the study and were tested by the hypotheses. The study results confirm the findings by Parkes and Langford (2008) used Work-Life Balance scaled by Valcour (2007) and Emotional Support Scale by (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lynes, 1999) to develop satisfaction measurement because the study used the Valcour (2007) to gauge organizational support for manager work-life balance. The study confirmed the finding by Kozjek et al. (2014) and Stankiewicz et al. (2014) because factors that foster an active work-life balance culture is a key component of organizational support for manager work-life balance and is evident in the study.

The results of the study confirmed the findings from the previous research because manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement is related to the factors that foster an active work-life balance as described by Kozjek et al. (2014). The study results confirm the manager's support of work-life balance as described by Hammond (2015) and Kishino (2015) because the relationship for transformational leadership and work-life balance is positively impacted by support for work-life balance. Gilley et al. (2015) described there is no difference in

generational manager's approach to work-life balance and the study is confirmation because the study included all generations. Graves et al. (2007) are confirmed by the research because the manager's support for work-life balance affects their attitude and performance which is reflected in the manager's engagement with employees. The study results confirmed Sirajunisa (2004) findings relative social context and effect work-life balance has on women because this study included all genders of US front-line employees and front-line managers in the opportunity to provide feedback. The study results confirmed Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) focus on the impact of strategic work-life balance in driving organizational outcomes because organizations need managers to achieve results through supervision. Next is the exploration of the employee engagement research themes and relativeness of the study results.

The employee engagement research themes are organization, manager, and individual. The organization focused research is evidence by Anitha (2014) and Radic (2017) which focused on the organization factors that build effective employee engagement. Hansen (2012), Hawrysz (2015), and Medlin and Green (2014) focused on manager support for engagement. Simbula and Guglielmi (2013) expanded on manager support by role modeling behavior to drive engagement. Consiglio et al. (2015) and Malik and Khalid (2016) explained participation from an individual perspective.

The study results confirmed the organizational support for the manager work-life balance is important in positive employee engagement as described by Anitha (2014) and Radic (2017). The results of the study confirmed the factors that build effective employee engagement as described by Anitha (2014) and Radic (2017) because one of the factors is the manager and manager work-life balance is relative to positive employee engagement. Manager support for

work-life balance is confirmed by the study results because managers who exercise work-life balance experience a degree of organizational support as described by Hansen (2012), Hawrysz (2015), and Medlin and Green (2014). Positive employee engagement related to manager work-life balance results confirmed the Consiglio et al. (2015) and Malik and Khalid (2016) description of the focus on the employee as the most significant organizational asset.

The work-life balance approach themes from the research are increased demand for time and flexibility, manager work-life balance conflict, and manager engagement and workplace influence. Increased demand for time and flexibility is described in the research by Sirajunisa (2004), and Kasper et al. (2005) that identified individual stress and the impact of work-life balance vary, the organization relies on the manager to accomplish the goals, and the way in which occupational stress affects the work-life balance impacts employee engagement. Ford and Collinson (2011) introduced the idea that manager work-life balance is not usually the focus of work-life balance research and because of the lack of focus, managers can become overwhelmed in the work-life balance. Managers are taught they have control over their work environment, but they cannot exercise this perceived control. The results of the study confirmed this finding because it provides insight into the importance of manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement as described by Sirajunisa (2004). The study results confirm the manager work-life balance conflict because the manager is under a lot of pressure to accomplish results through direct reports as described by Sirajunisa (2004) and Kasper et al. (2005). Managers who have support for work-life balance may engage and support subordinates willingly as opposed to those who do not know Ford and Collinson (2011). The study results confirm the assertion by

Ford and Collinson (2011) the manager work-life balance should be a focus of work-life balance studies and is evidenced by the focus of this study.

Manager work-life balance conflict research is led by Greenhaus et al. (2003) in the explanation of complexities of work-life balance and how it affects manager work-life balance. Graves et al. (2007) identified the commitment to family roles and how professionals manage it in avoidance of work conflict. Kesting and Harris (2009) described the work-life balance from a woman's perspective. Abendroth and Den Dulk (2011) described the important need for organizational support for work-life balance. Gregory et al. (2013) described the impact of economic factors in work-life balance approach. Stankiewicz et al. (2014) described the employee's perception of the relationship of the work environment in support of work-life balance. The study results show support for the manager work-life balance may have a positive impact on employee engagement because when manager work-life balance is supported by the organization, the relationship to positive employee engagement is more likely. The study is relative to research by Kesting and Harris (2009) because of the impact of work-life balance on women, even though the study did not identify women. Gregory et al. (2013) research are relevant to the study because manager work-life balance is a key component of the constantly changing work environment. Stankiewicz et al. (2014) description of the demand on the managers time and flexibility is impacted by organizational support for work-life balance.

Manager engagement and workplace influence research are led by Lautsch and Scully (2007) examined the work-life balance in the reduction of hours for hourly workers. Poelmans et al. (2008) described work-life balance strategy must be embedded in the policies, organization culture, and the strategic plan. Burchielli et al. (2008) identified managers did not support work-

life balance because the organization did not support the frontline managers. Parkes and Langford (2008) identified the approach of using work-life balance as retention for top talent. Hammond et al. (2011) examined how managers influence subordinate work-life management. Van Meel (2011) identified the origin of today's work environment from the 1960s and 1970s. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) focused on the role of culture on work-life balance in organizations.

Koubova and Buchko (2013) examined the effect of emotional intelligence on work and family balance satisfaction, Gilley et al. (2015) examined the managerial practice of supporting work-life balance by age. Kishino (2015) examined the effect of supervisor's behavior on subordinate's work-life balance. The study shows a relationship between organizational support for work-life balance and employee engagement; however, it is not a direct link to the study results because the study included full-time workers. The study confirmed Poelmans et al. (2008) idea that work-life balance should be embedded in the organizational strategy and culture because the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement is a function of the organization and culture. The study confirmed Burchielli et al. (2008) idea that managers do not support work-life balance because the organization does not support the manager because a manager who feels supported by the organizational work-life balance is more likely to promote work-life balance. The s Parkes and Langford (2008) idea that work-life balance should be considered in the talent management strategy because organizational support for work-life balance signals the importance of managing the demand and flexibility of the manager. The study confirmed Hammond et al. (2011) idea that managers influence subordinate work-life balance management because the manager controls the work environment and the

relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement would be impacted by the manager's influence on the subordinate.

The study confirmed Van Meel (2011) idea that managers influence subordinate work-life balance management because the manager controls the work environment and the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement would be impacted by the manager's influence on the subordinate. The study confirmed Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) idea that managers influence subordinate work-life balance management because the manager controls the work environment and the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement would be impacted by the manager's influence on the subordinate. The study confirmed Koubova and Buchko (2013) idea that managers influence subordinate work-life balance management because the manager controls the work environment and the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement would be impacted by the manager's influence on the subordinate. The study confirmed Gilley et al. (2015) idea that work-life balance should be considered in the talent management strategy because organizational support for work-life balance signals the importance of managing the demand and flexibility of the manager.

Employee perspective of engagement research is led by Kahn (1990) established the foundation of employee engagement with the study that focused on measuring the degree to which people commit their self emotionally and physically in support of the job performance and the organization. Fearon et al. (2012) explored multiple levels of efficacy that promote efficient work engagement. Medlin and Green (2014) evaluated the effect of management principles on employee engagement. Sambrook et al. (2014) examined employee engagement using the

autoethnography approach, being and studying the self. Consiglio et al. (2015) explored the social cognitive theory to explain how self-efficacy predicts employee engagement. Malik and Khalid (2016) evaluated the breach of the employment contract on work engagement and turnover through an empirical study using psychological contract theory to examine the impact of engagement and retention.

The study confirmed Kahn (1990) idea that of a degree of commitment from employees in engaging their emotional and physical self in support of the organization because the employee perception of manager engagement affects their engagement. The study confirmed Fearon et al. (2012) idea that positive influence from the manager drives positive employee engagement because the manager plays a key role in the engagement which shapes positive engagement. The study confirmed Medlin and Green (2014) idea that organizations should focus on improving management principles and processes because this is organizational support for the manager to be more effective in the performance of their job. The study confirmed Sambrook et al. (2014) idea that focus on the personal experiences help to understand the sociological aspect of organizational support and engagement because the manager work-life balance focus is a key to organizational support for the manager and employee. The study confirmed Consiglio et al. (2015) idea that self-efficacy predicts employee engagement because managers who exercise work-life balance exercise self-efficacy in the performance of their job. The study confirmed Malik and Khalid (2016) idea that work engagement mediates the relationship between psychological breach and turnover because the relationship between manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement makes the manager and employee relationship less stressful.

Manager perspective of employee engagement research is led by Hansen et al. (2012). Kerns (2014) evaluated a framework for fostering and managing engagement for managers. Hawrysz (2015) examined the relationship of the manager's influence on employee engagement. The study confirmed Hansen et al. (2012) idea that employees are attached to the organization under leadership that is caring and engaging because the goal of manager work-life balance is a more effective and engaged manager. The study confirmed Kerns (2014) idea that adopting logical engagement steps will establish and maintain engagement because organization support for the manager is logical and understanding the support implies user-friendly steps which result in the manager support for work-life balance and engagement. The study confirmed Hawrysz (2015) idea the manager's behavior has a tremendous impact on employee trust in their supervisor and co-workers because managers who exercise work-life balance are less stressed and can focus on employee engagement.

Organization perspective of employee engagement research is led by Shuck et al. (2010) explored the unique experience of employees engaged at work. Simbula and Gulielmi (2013) examined the reciprocal relationship between work engagement and consequences. Anitha (2014) focused on the determinants of employee engagement and the impact on performance. Rana et al. (2013) explored the Dubin (1978) model that links antecedents, outcomes, and moderators of employee engagement. Nutov and Hazzan (2012) developed an organizational engagement model for high school teachers in Israel. Sushil (2014) focused on job design as the determinant of employee engagement considering the competition organizations faces for talent and products, because of globalization. Castellano et al. (2016) examined management methods that can increase employee engagement.

Mehrzi and Singh (2016) examined competing through employee engagement to improve the organization competitive edge. Radic (2017) examined employee engagement determinants on a cruise ship. The study confirmed Shuck et al. (2010) idea that the immediate manager plays a key role in shaping culture in the learning focus in effective engagement cultures because organizational support for work-life balance demonstrates a commitment to the manager's effectiveness in the performance of the job. The study confirmed Simbula and Gulielmi (2013) idea the manager spends the most time with the employee and shapes their perception of the organization because a negative relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement can create negative perceptions of the organization over time. The study confirmed Anitha (2014) idea that organizational focus on an engaging work environment that is supportive, encourages communication, and trust increases worker engagement and performance because a positive relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement can affect organizational outcomes which sustain the organization. The study confirmed Rana et al. (2013) idea that work provides the platform for managers to understand employee engagement because of the relationship between manager work-life balance focus on the understanding the front-line manager job relative to employee engagement. The study confirmed Nutov and Hazzan (2012) idea that engaging managers and the organizational culture to develop the engagement process because the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement requires open communication and trust. The study confirmed Sushil (2014) idea the employee is the greatest asset and understanding their motivation and talents improve engagement and the organization. The study confirmed Castellano et al. (2016) idea that employee engagement must be embedded in the organization culture because organizational

support for work-life balance and employee engagement is rooted in the organization culture. The study confirmed Mehrzi and Singh (2016) idea that organizational support, supervisor and team relationships are mediated by employee engagement because the results of the study have these elements and are predicated on the extent of manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement. The study confirmed Radic (2017) idea that communication and progress and capacity to engage are the largest factors in determining engagement because the relationship between manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement involves communication and the capacity to engage.

Limitations of the Study

The study is a reliable and consistent examination of the relationship between manager work-life balance and employee engagement that was conducted to understand and test the hypotheses. Reliability refers to the consistency of the analysis and the idea that others can repeat it with similar conditions and produce similar results (Chudleigh, 2015). Validity refers to the strength of the premise in the design and conduct of the study (Chudleigh, 2015). The validity of the survey is supported by the researcher contracting with Qualtrics to obtain a panel survey. There was no manipulation of the survey population by the researcher which could cause a type I or type II error. The survey design was based on a quantitative study to test the hypotheses associated with the research questions. Internal validity occurs during the research process, and external validity occurs during the development and selection of the research method and population focus (Frankfort-Nachmias et al., 2015). The study was anchored by the statistical analysis of calculating the sample size with the University of California at San Francisco Clinical and Translational Science Institute sample size calculator and significance of the relationships

was illustrated by the statistical independent sample t-test using Levene's Equality of Variances and the t-test for Equality of Means.

The measurement tool for work-life balance was validated by Valcour (2007) was used as the survey instrument in the front-line manager survey. The Utrecht Employee Engagement tool which was validated by Balducci et al. (2010) was used in the front-line employee survey. The researcher's ten years of leadership and development of the regional employee wellness function for a healthcare organization influenced the selection of a manager work-life balance. Probability sampling was used to ensure the focus on the front-line manager, who has the primary contact and influence on employee engagement. The research design and selection of the subjects, the validated survey instruments, and the focus on the front-line managers provided reliability and validity. A limitation of the study is not including the front-line manager direct reports which would make the findings more definitive. A limitation of the study is not understanding the gender of the respondents which would make the findings more relevant.

Recommendations

The recommendations for future research based on the results of the study and the relationship to the current body of knowledge are conducting further research to determine if the relationship between organizational support for manager work-life balance is positive or negative. The hypotheses testing provided evidence to reject the null in both research questions; however, there was not enough information to determine if the relationship is positive or negative. Further research to determine the specific impact of strategic work-life balance in driving organizational outcomes relative to Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2013) could be beneficial to practitioners to link work-life balance with the organization's bottom line. Further review of the

impact of women in the workforce and the impact it has on manager work-life balance and employee engagement. Is there learning around how women handle work-life balance versus men which can build on the Kesting and Harris (2009)? Further research building on the current study would be to develop a survey tool that focuses on the manager's perception of organization support for work-life balance and the employee's perception of the employee engagement to front-line managers and their direct reports.

Understanding the demographics of the respondents to the front-line manager and front-line manager survey could provide insight into how gender, ethnicity, industry, and geographic responses differed in the survey. Understanding the demographics of the participant groups could add value to the analysis and implications for future practice. Build on this study by examining the respondents to respond to work-life balance and employee engagement by work status and employee group to understand the difference in perception. For example, understanding the difference in perception among part-time, full-time, on call, front-line manager, middle and top-level managers, exempt, non-exempt, and union type employees. It would be interesting to understand from this study the perception of front-line manager's relative to their level of engagement and the employee perception of work-life balance. One approach to understanding the relationship is to give the managers the employee engagement survey and the employee the work-life balance survey.

Implications

The goal is to affect positive social change by transforming work environments into sustained positive work environments, considering the amount of time individuals spend at work. The study provides insight to practitioners by identifying the significant influence of work-life

balance on manager well-being - the study challenged transformational managers to include work-life balance as consideration for improving upon or achieving transformational leadership. The hope is a quality of work-life improvement for both manager and employee from the result of a sustained positive work environment which is characterized by high productivity and less stress for managers and employees - organization investment in people including managers by providing logical steps toward work-life balance and employee engagement.

The study supported the relationship between manager work-life balance, and employee engagement as significant to the field of management and particularly human resources, as described by Gregory et al. (2013); Kishino (2015); and (Kahn, 1990)

- global competition has increased the demand on the employee's time and flexibility,
- work-life balance creates a conflict between the manager and vastly influence the manager's behavior in the work environment;
- and employees who experience positive work environments are more apt to use the various degrees of themselves in support of the organization objectives.

Organizations focus on the logical steps in developing and implementing work-life balance and engagement strategy improves the work environment.

The manager plays a critical role in the employee achieving the organizational goals. Productivity upon which the organizations rely on will be impacted, if managers are not effective in engaging employees (Rana et al., 2014). The manager role is a major influence in the work environment. Employees who experience a positive work environment are more willing to work in support of the organization goals. The research supports the professional practice of managers

in the field by providing insight into the well-being, and self-care of the manager as critical to positive employee engagement. For better or worse, the manager's behavior dramatically influences the employee's actions in the workplace, and the immediate supervisor's effectiveness is a leading cause of the organization's problems (Gilley et al., 2014). The study findings may influence the efficiency of the manager in engaging the workforce to achieve organization objectives.

Conclusions

The study was an examination of the literature on work-life balance and employee engagement to understand how manager work-life balance affects employee engagement. The results of the study showed there is no statistically significant evidence to show there was an association between manager work-life balance and employee engagement or an association between positive manager work-life balance and positive employee engagement. The study was supported by an exhaustive review of previous research on work-life balance and employee engagement that is based on the empirical Work-life Balance Theory (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and Employee Engagement Theory (Kahn, 1990). The study highlighted the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement. The highlights of work-life balance were predicated on understanding the increased demand for time and flexibility on the part of the manager and employee, manager work-life balance conflict, and manager engagement and workplace influence. The highlights of employee engagement were predicated on understanding the employee manager, and organization perspectives of engagement. To the extent this understanding is reached, the work environment can transform into a sustained positive work

environment which is characterized by high productivity and less stress for managers and employees.

References

- Abendroth, A.K., & Den Dulk, L. (2011). Support for the work-life balance in Europe: the impact of state, workplace and family support on work-life balance satisfaction. *Work, Employment & Society*, 25(2). doi: 10.1177/0950017011398892
- Allen, M. (Ed.) (2017). The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411
- Anitha J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3). doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008
- Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Italian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9): A cross-cultural analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 26(2). doi:10.1027/1015-5759/a000020
- Bhui, K. S., Dinos, S., Stansfeld, S. A., & White, P. D. (2012). A synthesis of the evidence for managing stress at work: a review of the reviews reporting on anxiety, depression, and absenteeism. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2012515874. doi:10.1155/2012/515874
- Buchner, A., Faul, F., & Erdfelder, E. (n.d.) G*Power. Retrieved January 29, 2010, from <http://www.gpower.hhu.de>
- Burchielli, R., Bartram, T., & Thanacoody, R. (2008). Work-family balance or greedy organizations? *Conciliación Trabajo - Familia U Organizaciones Voraces* 63(1), doi: 10.7202/018124ar
- Castellano, J. F., Roehm, H. A., & Shaw, C. M. (2016). Maintenance required: Deming's

- management method can help increase employee engagement. *Quality Progress*, 49(4).
<http://asq.org/quality-progress/2016/04/cost-of-quality/maintenance-required.html>
- Cegarra-Leiva, D., Sánchez-Vidal, M. E., & Gabriel Cegarra-Navarro, J. (2012). Understanding the link between work-life balance practices and organizational outcomes in SMEs. *Personnel Review*, 41(3), 359–379. doi: 10.1108/00483481211212986
- Chiang, F. F., Birtch, T. A., & Kwan, H. K. (2010). The moderating roles of job control and work-life balance practices on employee stress in the hotel and catering industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1). doi: [org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.04.005](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.04.005)
- Chudleigh, J. (2015). Research essentials: Understanding the key features of quantitative research and statistical tests. *Nursing Children and Young People*, 27(3). doi: 10.7748/ncyp.27.3.12.s13
- Comparing means between two groups. (2014). In Nishishiba, M., Jones, M., & Kraner, M. Research methods and statistics for public and nonprofit administrators (pp. 171-192). 55 City Road, London: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781544307763
- Comparing one or two means using the t-test. (2007). In Elliott, A. C., & Woodward, W. A. Statistical analysis quick reference guidebook (pp. 47-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412985949
- Consiglio, C., Borgogni, L., Di Tecco, C., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2016). What makes employees engaged with their work? The role of self-efficacy and employee's perceptions of social context over time. *Career Development International*, 21(2). doi: 10.1108/CDI-03-2015-0045

- Dubin, R. (1978). *Theory building*, New York, NY: Free Press
- Fearon, C., McLaughlin, H., & Morris, L. (2013). Conceptualizing work engagement. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37(3). doi: 10.1108/03090591311312723
- Ferguson, L. (2004). External validity, generalizability, and knowledge utilization. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 36(1). <https://sigmapubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/15475069>
- Field, Andy (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. (5th ed.). London: Sage.
- Ford, J., & Collinson, D. L. (2011). In search of the perfect manager? Work-life balance and managerial work. *Work, Employment and Society*, 25(2), 257–273. doi: 10.1177/0950017011398895
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D., DeWaard, J. (2015). *Research methods in the social sciences* (8th ed.). New York: Worth.
- Gilley, A., Gilley, J. W., Ambort-Clark, K., & Marion, D. (2014). Evidence of managerial malpractice: An empirical study. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 19(4), 24-42. doi: 10.9774/GLEAF.3709.2014.oc.00004
- Gilley, A, Waddell, K., & Hall, A. (2015). Manager behavior, generation, and influence on work-life balance: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Applied Science*, 20(1). http://www.whitneypress.com/JAME/JAME_Vol_20_No_1_2015.pdf#page=7
- Goffman, E. (1961a). *Encounters: Two studies in sociology of interaction*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Graen, G. (1976). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally
- Graves, L. M., Ohlott, P. J., & Ruderman, M. N. (2007). Commitment to family roles: Effects on

- managers' attitudes and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 44-56.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.44
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3). doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8
- Gregory, A., & Milner, S. (2009). Editorial: Work-life balance: A matter of choice? *Gender, Work, and Organization Journal*, 16(1). doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00429.x
- Gregory, A., Milner, S., & Windebank, J. (2013). Work-life balance in times of economic crisis and austerity. *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 33(9), 528-541.
doi: 10.1108/IJSSP-05-2013-0061
- Hallett, M. G. & Hoffman, B. (2014) Performing under pressure: Cultivating the peak performance mindset for workplace excellence. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 66(3). doi: 10.1037/cpb0000009
- Hammond, M., Cleveland, J. N., O'Neill, J. W., Stawski, R. S., & Jones Tate, A. (2015). Mediators of transformational leadership and the work-family relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(4). doi: 10.1108/JMP-10-2011-0090
- Hansen, A., Byrne, Z., & Kiersch, C. (2014). How interpersonal leadership relates to employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(8), 953.
doi: 10.9774/GLEAF.3709.2014.oc.00004
- Hawrysz, L. (2015) The managers' influence on the workers' engagement – A case study of public sector workers. *Manager Journal*, 22(1). <http://manager.faa.ro/en/article/The-Managers--Influence-On-The-Workers--Engagement---A-Case-Study-Of-Public-Sector->

Workers~827.html

- Jurik, N. C., & Cavender, G. (2016). Sustainable workplaces as innovation. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 21(1), 53-71.
doi: 10.9774/GLEAF.3709.2016.ja.00006
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and misengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, (4), 692. doi: 10.2307/256287
- Kerns, C. D. (2014). Fostering and managing engagement: A framework for managerial leaders. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 11(1), 34-49.
- Kishino, S. (2015). The effect of supervisor characteristics on subordinates' work-life balance: a dyadic analysis in Japan. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, 19(3), 19-29. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-3965362591/the-effect-of-supervisor-characteristics-on-subordinates>
- Kofodimos, J. (1995). *Balancing Act. How managers can integrate successful careers and fulfilling personal lives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Koubova, V., & Buchko, A. A. (2013). Life-work balance. *Management Research Review*, 36(7), 700-719. doi: 10.1108/MRR-05-2012-0115
- Karassvidou, E., & Glaveli, N. (2015). Work-family balance through border theory lens: the case of a company "driving in the fast lane." Equality, diversity and inclusion. *An International Journal*, 34(1). doi: 10.1108/EDI-05-2014-0038
- Kasper, H., Meyer, M., & Schmidt, A. (2005). Managers dealing with work-family-conflict: an explorative analysis. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(5). doi:

10.1108/02683940510602978

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* 2d.ed. New York, NY:

Wiley

Kesting, S., & Harris, C. (2009). Providing a theoretical foundation for work-life balance - Sen's

capability approach. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 34(1). Retrieved

from <http://canterbury.summon.serialssolutions.com/2.0.0/link/0/eLvHCXMwVZ09>

DsIwDIUjdhYkEGMvUMlu4qSZERUH6AUS_7B14v7CRQwwe3zSZz_pPTmEASz2Xk3UtS5

9ZhJ1UxBzNqkg1f4arj80X07hoNs5rMt9vT3G7zOA8VkiGKsBabGRRSLWkpKHYmd

G410hqTspz839slkXIUqM6I4ertMZHgJx7ZnxrfXp1sm1zAQdcZm

Kozjek, T., Tomazevic, N., & Stare, J. (2014). Work-life balance by area, actual situation and

expectations - the overlapping opinions of employers and employees in Slovenia.

Organizacija, 47(1). doi: 10.2478/orga-2014-0004

Lautsch, B., & Scully, M. (2007). Restructuring time: Implications of work-hours reductions for

the working class. *Human Relations*, 60(5). doi: 10.1177/0018726707079199

Liliana, H. (2015). The managers' influence on the workers' engagement – A case study of

public sector workers. *Manager*, 22, (1). <http://manager.faa.ro/en/home.html>

Lokke, A., & Madsen, H. (2014). Public sector managers and work stress. *International Journal*

of Workplace Health Management, 7(2), 105-120. doi: 10.1108/IJWHM-03-2013-0009

Macey, W.H. and Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement, *Industrial and*

Organizational Psychology, (1). doi: =10.1.1.182.2845&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Malik, S. Z., & Khalid, N. (2016). Psychological contract breach, work engagement and turnover

retention: Evidence from banking industry in Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social*

Review, 54(1). <http://pu.edu.pk/home/journal/7/>

McNamara, T. K., Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Matz-Costa, C., Brown, M., & Valcour, M. (2012).

Across the continuum of satisfaction with work-family balance: Work hours, flexibility-fit, and work-family culture. *Social Science Research*, 42(2). doi:

10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.10.002

Medlin, B. & Green, K. W, J. (2014). Impact of management basics on employee engagement.

Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 13.2(2).

<http://www.abacademies.org/journals/academy-of-strategic-management-journal-home.html>

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe

Mills, M. J., Culbertson, S. S., & Fullagar, C. J. (2011). Conceptualizing and measuring

engagement: an analysis of the Utrecht work engagement scale. *Journal of Happiness Study*, 13(3). doi: 10.1007/s10902-011-9277-3

Mishra, P., Gupta, R., & Bhatnagar, J. (2014). Grounded theory research: Exploring work-family

enrichment in an emerging economy. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 14(3), 289. doi:

10.1108/QRJ-01-2013-0001

Nutov, L., & Hazzan, O. (2014). An organizational engagement model as a management tool for

high school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(4). doi: 10.1108/JEA-12-2012-0132

Parkes, L. P., & Langford, P. H. (2008). Work-life balance or work-life alignment? *Journal of*

Management & Organization 14(3). doi: 10.5172/jmo.837.14.3.267

Poelmans, S. A., Kalliath, T., & Brough, P. (2008) International expert commentary – Achieving

- work-life balance: Current theoretical and practice issues. *Journal of Management and Organization* 14(3). doi: 10.1017/S1833367200003242
- Radic, A. (2017) All hands on deck: Employee engagement on cruise ships. *African Journal on Business Management*, 11(6). Doi: 10.5897/AJBM2016.8247
- Rana, S., Ardichvili, A., & Tkachenko, O. (2014). A theoretical model of the antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26(3). doi: 10.1108/JWL-09-2013-0063
- Robertson, I.T. & Cooper, C.L. (2011). *Well-being: Productivity and happiness at work*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21(7). doi: 10.1108/02683940610690169
- Salkind, N. J. (Ed.) (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412961288
- Sambrook, S. A., Jones, N., & Doloriert, C. (2014) Employee engagement and autoethnography: Being and studying self. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26(34). Doi: 10.1108/JWL-09-2013-0072
- Sampling distributions. (2015). In Schumacker, R. *Learning statistics using R* (pp. 89-97). 55 City Road, London: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781506300160
- Sample size for bivariate correlation, Pearson correlation, and Pearson product moment correlation. (2017, October 17). Retrieved from <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/sample-size-for-bivariate-correlation-pearson-correlation-and-pearson-product-moment-correlation/>

- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. *Education and Psychological Measurement, 66*(4). doi: 10.1177/0013164405282471
- Sen, A. K. (1995). *Inequality Reexamined*, New York and Oxford: Russell Sage Foundation and Clarendon Press
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., Kosugi, S., Suzuki, A., Nashiwa, H., Kato, A., Sakamoto, M., Irimajiri, H., Amano, S., Hirohata, K., & Goto, R. (2008). Work engagement in Japan: Validation of the Japanese version of the Utrecht work engagement scale. *Applied Psychology: International Review, 57*(3). doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00333.x
- Shuck, M. B., Rocco, T. S., & Albornoz, C. A. (2011). Exploring employee engagement from the employee perspective: implications for HRD. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 35*(4), 300–325. doi: 10.1108/03090591111128306
- Simbula, S., & Guglielmi, D. (2013). I am engaged, I feel good, and I go the extra-mile: Reciprocal relationships between work engagement and consequences. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 29*(3), doi: 10.5093/tr2013a17
- Sirajunisa, K. (2004). Influence of occupational stress on work life balance among women professionals. *The Journal of Commerce, 2*(1).
<http://joc.newspaperdirect.com/epaper/viewer.aspx?noredirect=true>
- Smithson, M. (2003). *Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences: Confidence intervals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412983761
- Srivastava, A. K. & Singh, A. P. (1981). Construction and standardization of occupational stress index; A pilot study. *Indian Journal of Psychology, 8*(2).

- <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/journals/indian-j-clin-psychol/>
- Stankiewicz, J., Bortnowska, H., & Łychmus, P. (2014). Conditions necessary to maintain work-life balance of employees - in the light of the research results. *Management*, 18(1). doi: 10.2478/manment-2014-0024
- Sushil, S. (2014). Job enrichment as determinant of employee engagement. Review of *HRM*, (3), 140-146. <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/human-resource-management-review/>
- Tuckey, M.R., Bakker, A. B., & Dollard, M.F. (2012). Empowering leaders optimize working conditions for engagement: A multilevel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(1). doi: 10.1037/a0025942
- Two-sample t tests. (2006). In Sirkin, R. M. *Statistics for the social sciences* (pp. 271-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412985987
- Valcour, M. (2007). Satisfaction with Work-Family Balance Scale [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/t08744-000>
- Valcour, M. (2007) Work-based resources as moderates of the relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work-family balance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6). doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1512
- Van Maanen, J. (1976), *Handbook of work, organization, and society*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally & Company.
- Van Meel, J. (2011). The origins of new ways of working. *Facilities*, 29(9/10). doi: 10.1108/026327711111146297
- Wagner, W. E. (2017). *Using IBM SPSS Statistics for research methods and social sciences statistics*, 6th edition, London, UK: Sage

Welch, M. (2011). The evolution of the employee engagement concept: communication implications. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(4). doi: 10.1108/13563281111186968

Appendix A: Permission Valcour Work-life Balance Scale

Satisfaction with Work-Family Balance Scale
Version Attached: Full Test

Note: Test name created by PsycTESTS

PsycTESTS Citation: Valcour, M. (2007). Satisfaction with Work-Family Balance Scale [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/t08744-000>

Instrument Type:
Rating Scale

Test Format:

Respondents are asked to indicate, on a scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied, their level of satisfaction with each of the measure's five items.

Source:

Valcour, Monique. (2007). Work-based resources as moderators of the relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work-family balance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 92(6), 1512-1523. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1512

Permissions:

Test content may be reproduced and used for non-commercial research and educational purposes without seeking written permission. Distribution must be controlled, meaning only to the participants engaged in the research or enrolled in the educational activity. Any other type of reproduction or distribution of test content is not authorized without written permission from the author and publisher. Always include a credit line that contains the source citation and copyright owner when writing about or using any test.

Appendix B: Permission Utrecht Engagement Survey

RE: Requesting permission to use Utrecht Engagement Survey

permissions (US)
5/31/2018 3:10 PM

Hello Keith,

Thank you for your request. I am happy to report that you can consider this email as *gratis* permission to use the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-9 [UWEL-9] as detailed below in your upcoming Ph.D thesis/dissertation research as is required to complete your degree at Walden University.

Please note that this permission does not cover any 3rd party material that may or may not be found within the work. Distribution of the scale must be controlled, meaning only to the participants engaged in the research or enrolled in the educational activity. All copies of the material should be collected and destroyed once all data collection and research on this project is complete. Any other type of reproduction or distribution of scale content is not authorized without written permission from the publisher

You must properly credit the original source, SAGE Publications, Inc. If you wish to include the scale itself in your final thesis/dissertation report, please contact us again for that request

Please contact us for any further usage of the material and good luck on your thesis/dissertation!

All the Best,
Yvonne

--

Yvonne McDuffee
Rights Coordinator
SAGE Publishing
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, CA 91320

www.sagepublishing.com

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

The natural home for authors, editors & societies

*

From: Keith Murvin <keith.murvin@waldenu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2018 4:47 AM

To: permissions (US) <permissions@sagepub.com>

Subject: Requesting permission to use Utrecht Engagement Survey

Dear Mam or Sir,

I am requesting permission to use the Utrecht Engagement Survey in my dissertation to meet the requirements for a Ph.D. in Management at Walden University.

The article is listed below.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. & Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of Work Engagement With a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66* (4)

Thanks,

Keith Murvin

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Appendix C: Consent Forms

CONSENT FORM (Manager)

You are invited to take part in a research study about the relationship of leader work-life balance and employee engagement. The researcher is inviting supervisors who manage employees who deal directly with the customer or making the product to be in the study. This form is part of a process called “informed consent” to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Keith Murvin, who is a doctoral student at Walden University.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to understand the relationship between leader work-life balance and employee engagement

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to:

- Respond to your perception of work-life balance such as how well you divide your time between work and family.
- You will be able to respond to the survey using your smart phone or by email over a two week period.
- The survey will take no more than 15 minutes to complete.
- Here is a sample question: Please rate the following work-life balance statement on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) and 6 (very satisfied). The way you divide your time between work and personal or family life.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. You are free to accept or turn down the invitation. No one at Qualtrics will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to be in the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as finding time to respond to the survey within the two week time frame

The benefits of participating in the survey is an opportunity to provide input to making the work environment more positive for employees and managers.

Payment:

You will receive reward currency provide by Qualtrics for participating in the survey.

Privacy:

Reports coming out of this study will not share the identities of individual participants. Details that might identify participants, such as the location of the study, also will not be shared. Even the researcher will not know who you are. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purpose outside of

this research project. Data will be encrypted and stored in password protected electronic file. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via email at keith.murvin@waldenu.edu. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call the Research Participant Advocate at my university at 612-312-1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is **IRB will enter approval number here** and it expires on **IRB will enter expiration date.**

Please print or save this consent form for your records.

Obtaining Your Consent

If you feel you understand the study well enough to make a decision about it, please indicate your consent by clicking the link below.

CONSENT FORM (Employee)

You are invited to take part in a research study about the relationship of leader work-life balance and employee engagement. The researcher is inviting employees who deal directly with customers or making the product to be in the study. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Keith Murvin, who is a doctoral student at Walden University.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to understand the relationship between leader work-life balance and employee engagement

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to:

- To provide your perception of the work engagement such as strength, dedication, and involvement in work the environment, by responding to an employee engagement survey.
- You will be able to respond to the survey using your smart phone or by email over a two week period.
- The survey will take no more than 20 minutes to complete.
- Here is a sample question: Please rate this employee engagement statement on a scale from 0 (never) to 6 (always every date). At my work, I feel bursting with energy.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. You are free to accept or turn down the invitation. No one at Qualtrics will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to be in the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as finding time to respond to the survey within the two week time frame

The benefits of participating in the survey is an opportunity to provide input to making the work environment more positive for employees and managers.

Payment:

You will receive reward currency provide by Qualtrics for participating in the survey.

Privacy:

Reports coming out of this study will not share the identities of individual participants. Details that might identify participants, such as the location of the study, also will not be shared. Even the researcher will not know who you are. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purpose outside of this research project. Data will be encrypted and stored in password protected electronic file. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via email at keith.murvin@waldenu.edu. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call the Research Participant Advocate at my university at 612-312-1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is **IRB will enter approval number here** and it expires on **IRB will enter expiration date.**

Please print or save this consent form for your records.

Obtaining Your Consent

If you feel you understand the study well enough to make a decision about it, please indicate your consent by clicking the link below.