

*Validating a Scale to Measure Family Work Balance.
A mixed methods approach*



By Prof. Spiros Gounaris
Department of Marketing
Strathclyde Business School
Leverhulme Trust Major Fellow

Funded by the

LEVERHULME
TRUST _____

Validating a Scale to Measure Family Work Balance. A mixed methods approach

Abstract

Family-work balance (FWB) is essential for the health and mental well-being of individual employees. This area of research is well-established in the literature but is primarily informed from a sociological or psychological perspective. The business perspective is lacking, resulting in the actual benefits of assisting employees in achieving such a balance being scarce and poorly documented. Consequently, the managerial efforts to improve perceived FWB remain sporadic and highly subjective. This manuscript aims to begin addressing this gap and to initiate the examination of FWB from a business and relational perspective. Grounded in Vocational-Fit theory, we derive a relevant working definition for FWB from the literature, and based on data from 19 in-depth interviews, we propose a measurement to assess how salespeople perceive a balance between their personal and work lives. We empirically test the newly developed scale using a total sample of 473 salespeople, comprising 314 from the UK and 159 from Greece. We then examine the conditions affecting perceived FWB and its implications. Academic and practical implications for salesperson management are discussed, along with suggestions for future research.

Keywords: *family-work balance; measure validation; canonical correlations analysis; mixed methods*

Validating a Scale to Measure Family Work Balance. A mixed methods approach¹

Introduction & Scope for the Investigation

Balancing the dynamic interaction between professional and personal life has long been recognised as crucial for employee well-being (e.g., Bakalim & Karçkay, 2017; Baral & Bhargava, 2010). While organisations can also derive performance-related benefits from fostering this equilibrium, doing so requires a precise definition and a robust metric to gauge employees' perceived balance between work and family commitments.

Academic efforts to understand this interplay have generated a diverse and evolving body of literature (e.g., Duxbury, Lyons, & Higgins, 2008; Allen & Martin, 2017; Guedes et al., 2023). However, inconsistencies in terminology reflect a lack of consensus across perspectives (e.g., Duxbury et al., 2008; Greenhaus et al., 2012).

Role Theory has prominently guided much of this research (Biddle, 1986; Crooker, Smith, & Tabak, 2002), framing employees' experiences through the lens of organizational role expectations and social norms. Within this stream, two specialized subfields have emerged: "Work-Life Conflict," which highlights incompatibilities between roles (e.g., Bande et al., 2015; Kelly et al., 2014), and "Work-Life Enrichment," which emphasizes beneficial cross-role effects (e.g., Carlson et al., 2014; Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2020). A more integrative approach—Family Work Balance (FWB)—incorporates both streams to examine the full spectrum of work-family dynamics (e.g., Clarke, Koch, & Hill, 2004; Wayne et al., 2017).

Another relevant framework is Identity Theory (e.g., Dumas & Stanko, 2017), which posits that individuals adopt roles aligned with their perceived social identity (Ashforth & Schinoff, 2016; Turner et al., 1979). When identities across work and family domains conflict, individuals often reprioritize roles (Ladge & Little, 2019; Manzi et al., 2024). Peripheral theories, such as Resource-Based Theory, address how individuals manage time and other resources to navigate role demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Zhou & Buehler, 2016).

¹ The author wishes to acknowledge the **Leverhulme Trust** for the funding and support of a broader research project, part of a Major Fellowship Award granted to the leading author, from which the data for this manuscript originate.

Despite these theoretical advancements, most studies center the individual as the primary agent responsible for maintaining balance. Consequently, the organisational role in enabling FWB remains underexplored. This gap necessitates a relational perspective that acknowledges the shared responsibility between employees and management.

To address this gap, we draw on Vocation Fit Theory (VFT). This theory encapsulates how employees assess the compatibility between their skills and preferences and the demands shaped by their roles, which are in turn influenced by managerial decisions (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Based on this framework, we investigate three key questions: (1) What constitutes FWB when framed relationally? (2) How can perceived FWB be measured from this perspective? (3) What managerial actions support employees in achieving FWB? A mixed-methods design guides this inquiry: qualitative interviews provide initial construct development, and a cross-national survey tests the scale and examines its antecedents and outcomes.

Balancing Personal and Work Lives: The Theoretical Framing

Role Theory has historically underpinned research into balancing professional and personal roles, with early contributions emphasising structured, hierarchical expectations tied to social identity (Gross et al., 1958; Biddle, 1986). The theory posits that individuals adapt behaviors to align with role expectations, often experiencing strain when navigating multiple roles (Kahn et al., 1964; Stryker, 1968). Identity construction emerges from classification into social categories (Ashforth & Schinoff, 2016; Turner et al., 1979), although congruence between behaviour and identity is not always realised due to situational pressures (Greenhaus et al., 2012).

Complementing this, Resource-Based Theory (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) explores how individuals allocate finite resources like time to manage conflicting demands. Some researchers emphasise role autonomy as key to achieving balance, where the ability to control role demands determines the presence or absence of conflict (Fleetwood, 2007; Frone, 2003). However, autonomy does not always translate into a perception of balance—remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, increased job control but often diminished perceived FWB (Hill et al., 2003; Stefanova et al., 2023).

More recent conceptualizations focus on enrichment—positive spillovers between work and family roles—achieved through resource transfer or emotional gains (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Wayne et al., 2004). However, such transfers are often constrained by practical limitations (e.g., Vijayakumar & Cunningham, 2020).

Due to these fragmented approaches, a universally accepted definition of FWB is lacking (Wayne et al., 2017). Recent integrative perspectives define it as employees' perception of harmony between work and personal roles in alignment with life priorities (Kalliath & Brough, 2008; Casper et al., 2018). While conceptually rich, these definitions lack operational tools, leaving management with limited guidance on how to support FWB.

Vocation-Fit Theory and Implications for Conceptualising the Balancing of Employees' Lives.

Fit and balance have recently been introduced to the work-family literature (Clarke et al., 2004). Rooted in vocational psychology, the concept of job-person fit links satisfaction to alignment between personality types and job characteristics (Holland, 1959, 1968). VFT extends this by evaluating perceived congruence between employees' skills and preferences and job demands, which are partially shaped by managerial input (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

VFT encompasses multiple dimensions of fit, including needs-supplies, demands-abilities, and supervisor fit. Although subjective, fit perceptions influence work attitudes and behaviors. Some scholars have used boundary theory to link fit to work-family dynamics (Voydanoff, 2005), but limited empirical support exists for such models. Therefore, we treat fit and balance as distinct constructs—fit as role compatibility and balance as perceived equilibrium between domains.

Based on Lukka and Vinnari (2014) and Jaakkola (2020), we use VFT as a method theory to define FWB as: "The presence of a distinct boundary between work and personal life, each contributing meaningfully to life satisfaction. This balance varies across individuals and time, depending on personal and career stages."

This framing emphasizes the dynamic and individualized nature of balance, rooted in evolving personal values and contextual job demands. It prioritizes perceived equilibrium over objective conditions or conflict resolution mechanisms, diverging from earlier work (e.g., Frone, 2003; Casper et al., 2018).

Research Design & Findings

A mixed-methods approach was employed to test and empirically validate a measure derived from this working definition, and to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. The former allows us to explore the notion of FWB in line with our working definition. The latter offers the platform to empirically validate a measure to assess perceived FWB and to look at the conditions under which such a balance becomes possible. We describe the research design and findings of each study in the following sections.

Study one: In-depth interviews & Approach to research

We followed an inductive approach to ensure the face validity of this study's outcomes. We completed 19 semi-structured in-depth interviews to capture participants' context and lived reality of a "balanced life" (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The context of choice was selling because people with very diverse backgrounds in education, experiences, or personalities find themselves starting and then pursuing a career in sales (e.g., Billups & Poddar, 2018; Clift, 1997; Greenberg & Greenberg, 1980; Wiles & Spiro, 2004). Also, sales roles are demanding because selling roles are the prominent revenue-generating roles in a company (Habel et al., 2020). Salespeople usually receive clear sales/revenue/profit objectives (Avila, Fern, & Mann, 1988; Dubinsky & Lippitt, 1980), and their advance depends on meeting these objectives, which is a significant source of stress (Dubinsky & Lippitt, 1980; Good & Schwepker Jr, 2001; Leischnig, Ivens, & Henneberg, 2015; Weeks & Fournier, 2010; Leischnig et al., 2015). Hence, from the VFT's perspective, sales roles reflect work-life conditions and personal circumstances that are probably beyond what other job roles can reflect. Participation required at least two years of continuous experience in a selling role and at least 12 months with the present employer. This ensures participants understand the sales role well and fully grasp their work-life role with their employer and the implications of balancing this aspect with their personal lives (eligibility criteria).

Research Protocol and Method of Analysis

In-depth interviewing is used to advance a theory from an inductive approach through interpretivism (Brounéus, 2011; Gubrium & Holstein, 2002; Smith & Osborn, 2003). The extant literature has provided the grounds for developing a theoretical framework and our working definition. Hence, semi-structured in-depth interviews are appropriate for empirically collecting data to validate this working definition (Brounéus, 2011). In total, 19 interviews proved enough to achieve information saturation (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). The first three participants were recruited from the part-time MBA course according to the eligibility criteria (at least two years of experience in sales and at least 12 months with the same employer). Using chain referral sampling, the first three participants identified more candidates from their social and professional network, who did the same upon accepting to participate and completing the interview (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). In recruiting potential informants the participants named, in addition to the eligibility criteria, we also monitored certain demographic characteristics, such as gender, marital status, and parenthood, to ensure that participants could voice broad enough views regarding the aim and goal of the study. Table 1 summarises the key demographic characteristics of the 19 participants.

Table 1: Participants' Demographic Profile.							
		N	%			N	%
Marital Status	Single	9	47%	Gender	Male	7	37%
	Married	10	53%		Female	12	63%
Kids	Yes	7	37%	Family Annual Income	Up to £25k	3	16%
	No	12	63%		£26-50k	6	32%
Age	20-30	4	21%		£51-75k	5	26%
	30-40	4	21%		£75-100k	4	21%
	40-50	6	32%		£100k +	1	5%
	50-60	3	16%	Education	High School	2	11%
	60+	2	11%		Apprentice	2	11%
					College	5	26%
					University	10	53%

The interview guide consisted of three primary and distinct parts. First, the interview focused on aspects of the participants' work life (e.g., years of experience, job role and tasks, perceived stress from job role and coping mechanisms, work climate, etc.). Next, the discussion moved on to their personal life (e.g., habits and hobbies, usual activities and preferences, caring for any minors or elders, as well as exploring what an "ideal" personal life would look like) before engaging with the notion of balancing personal and work lives. At that

stage, each participant was presented with the working definition [*“To have a clear line between work and personal life, each of which equally contributes to one's bliss with life. Balancing the two is different for different people and changes over time, reflecting different phases in one's work/career and personal life”*] and asked to comment and elaborate on this. We also asked them to reflect on barriers impeding them from achieving such balance. To serve the aims of this manuscript, we focus on sharing the findings from analyzing (a) the components of employees' perceived FWB, (b) what obstacles they see in achieving such balance, (c) what are the critical components of their personal life after work, and (d) how they see their work life.

Template analysis, combining elements of content analysis and grounded theory approach, that is, *a priori* and emergent coding, informs the analysis of the interviews. Template analysis emphasizes hierarchical coding while allowing the researcher to develop new codes as they emerge from rich data (Brooks et al., 2015). The review of the pertinent literature and the developed working definition of FWB provided the basis for the initial template. Each transcription was marked with the appropriate code. Two coders analyzed the transcripts independently, developing coding frames to appreciate patterns (Miles, 1994) while categorizing them according to the research focus (Bryman & Burgess, 2002). These codes were revised repeatedly during the analysis when a relevant concept that did not match existing codes emerged, thus allowing us to record emergent or unforeseen codes.

Template Analysis: Findings and Key Themes for FWB

The first theme that emerged as a component of FWB is having *“gratifying experiences,”* which depend on four essential conditions (codes). Two are work-related, namely, the amount of stress people carry in their personal lives from their work and the amount of their [individual] time that their work takes away. Two typical responses, each informing these two codes, appear below:

[amount of stress:] “Balancing the two is mainly about managing stress. Work is a source of stress, but your personal life can also cause stress, for instance, when others do not understand. So, managing stress makes your life better. And more balanced.”

[loss of personal time:] “You cannot have a balanced life unless you work only as much as is necessary. Often, this is not the case. Lengthy meetings, for instance, without any true purpose distract you, waste your time, and you have to work late.”

The other two are specific to their perceptions of their personal lives: the quality of their time and how enjoyable their personal life is:

[quality of personal time:] “When I go out, for instance, I want to enjoy my time. Not to have part of my mind locked at work.”

[enjoyable personal life:] “A balanced life is one that allows you to enjoy the time you have for yourself.”

The second theme closely relates to the first and captures FWB's “**welfare**” component. Three conditions [codes] are associated with this theme: again, the amount of stress people carry in their personal lives coupled with making fewer sacrifices to one’s personal life for the sake of work while actively seeking to maintain one’s mental health [given the responsibilities people have in their personal and work lives].

[amount of stress:] “A balanced life is a life that is not stressful. You can go about doing your work but also do the things you do in your private life.”

[fewer sacrifices:] “We all have to work to make a living. Yes? For me, the question is what we need to give up so we can make a living!”

[mental health:] “A balanced life is the one that lets you keep it together. You don’t want to go mental. Stay in control of both work and personal life.”

The third emerging theme reflects “**job fulfillment**” as part of FWB. Job security, recognition at work, and opportunities for career development inform this theme:

[job security:] “Times are very competitive. Knowing you have the support of your manager, and you won’t lose your job is important if you are to balance work and personal life.”

[recognition at work:] “I do not get the recognition I deserve at work. To say I have balanced the two includes the management recognizing what and how I contribute to the company.”

[career development:] “Career development is also important. To have balance between the two, they both need to advance. Improve your personal life but also improve in developing your career.”

Notably and surprisingly, the template analysis also allowed for an unexpected theme to emerge: “**Delusion**”. This theme reflects views that FWB is either an “illusion” or is no longer relevant in our times. This theme would appear to have a “negative” on the overall perceived FWB. The theme actually emerged from only two of the 19 participants (10% of participants), “Angela” and “Ali” (pseudonyms), but it was worthy of attention. Their comments follow:

[illusion:] “As I said, I enjoy my work and am happy when working. I don’t believe in balancing the two because one complements the other. Would painters consider balancing their personal lives burdened by their passion for painting? When they produce art, they work, and they are happy. So am I in my business life!”

[outdated notion:] “I don’t think many people consider this balance anymore. You simply do your work and provide for yourself or your family. Maybe this was possible in the past, but not anymore.”

Next, the interview focused on what the participants considered to prevent them from achieving FWB in both their work and personal lives. This produced five themes: three regarding their personal lives and two regarding their work lives. The first emerged theme captures “*personal dispositions*” informed by “habitual behaviors” and “family “background.”

[habitual behaviors:] “Become less engaged with social media and use my time better for the things I want. My weekly screen time reports say I spend too much time on my phone”

[family background:] “As I said, my dad was always working and never distinguished between family and work life”

The second personal life-related theme reflects “*work zeal*” as a condition the participants referred to as restraining them from sustaining a balanced approach between their work and personal lives. The theme is rooted in three codes: “ambition,” “choices in life,” and “shelf-restraining”:

[ambition:] “The more you hope to achieve and the sooner you want them the less balanced your life will be. People are responsible to keep the measure in their life”

[choices in life:] “Yes, times are hard and getting a good job is not always easy but what can you do? At some point, you need to draw the line if you want to have a life.”

[shelf-restrain:] “You cannot allow work to take over. If you want balance in your life you need to stop yourself from being the company’s chump.”

The final theme regarding the personal life barriers to FWB that emerged is the “*career life cycle*,” which refers to the stage of one’s career. Single code “career life cycle” for this one since, conceptually, it would not fit with any of the previous two.

[career life cycle:] “At this stage of my career I understand I need to set my priorities straight if I am to achieve what I want to achieve, so work comes first. It must. In the future, I hope I will be able to balance things out better.”

Concerning the work-life-specific barriers, one theme that emerged is “*working conditions*,” which is rooted in “the stress at work” and the “load of the job description.”

[stress at work:] “The lack of a store manager for a month or so was chaotic. This caused a lot of stress for everyone. Balance was lost during this time.”

[load of the job description:] “It comes with the job, as I always say. The job is demanding. On top of everything else, practically, you also are the advisor and provide psychological support for many of your customers. This consumes and drains you.”

The other emerging theme is “*supportive colleagues and managers*,” which, when missing or not sufficient, also has a negative impact on perceived FWB. “Company attitude” and “managerial expectations” are the two codes informing this theme:

[company attitude:] “As long as companies look at profits and revenues without considering employees as human beings it is very hard for the employees to enjoy a balance between work and their personal life”

[managerial expectations:] “Managers set the objectives and your goals without consulting you. Then you need to deliver on this, even if what they ask is not realistic.”

Table 2: Common post-work activities

<i>Codes</i>	<i>Indicative Quote</i>	<i>N of participants with similar quotes (total participants = 19)</i>
Wind-Down	<i>I always take a shower. Helps me “wash off” the day</i>	12
Relax	<i>To have quality time with my husband and our friends. Staying at home and relaxing from work</i>	13
Work-out; Gym	<i>I like going to the gym. This is important for me although cannot do as often as I wish</i>	8
Take care of me	<i>I indulge myself in quality time. Sometimes, it is candles and wine; sometimes, it is listening to music; sometimes, I do yoga.</i>	7
Work from home	<i>I’m looking at my meetings in my calendar and prepare for what comes tomorrow.</i>	4
Time with family members	<i>I love spending time with my family. I have a big family, and I’m always invited to family events.</i>	6
Time with friends	<i>I like going out with friends. Spend time with them and share things.</i>	9
Watch a movie	<i>Netflix is a life saver! Turn the TV on and watch a movie before going to bed</i>	16
Cook	<i>I like cooking. Do some pasta or chili, enjoy the food, and relax.</i>	15
Tidying up	<i>I’m a woman. My husband understands and is helping but taking care of our home is mainly my responsibility</i>	9

<i>Codes</i>	<i>Indicative Quote</i>	<i>N of participants with similar quotes (total participants = 19)</i>
Travel	<i>I want to see the world in a relaxed way. I travel a lot and see different places, but this is part of my work, so I take every opportunity to do this privately.</i>	3
Study	<i>I work a Sunday and then I'm in (uni) usually on a Monday so that's like oh no I would rather sit and do uni work than be at work and come back.</i>	4
Shopping	<i>I enjoy going to the shops when I can</i>	6

We also asked the participants to describe a “typical” day after work. The things they usually do, not what they would like to do. This part of the interview sought to codify popular and everyday activities comprising the various aspects of one’s personal life, which were used in study two. Table 2 summarizes the key codes the transcripts allowed us to generate, supplemented with one typical comment from a participant.

Finally, we also asked participants to reflect on their work life and share what, if anything, prevents them from enjoying their work life. The stress-coping mechanisms they use to deal with work stress were also discussed in this part of the interview. Again, the purpose of doing this was to inform study two. Similar to Table 2, Table 3 summarises the key codes that emerged from this part of the interview.

Table 3: Work-stress coping mechanisms & Impediments of an enjoyable work-life		
STRESS COPING MECHANISMS		
Codes	QUOTE	N of participants with similar quotes (total participants = 19)
Discuss with partner	<i>George [pseudonym for husband] is an amazing guy and a great listener. When I'm stressed or have issues at work, we sit together, and I tell him my problems. Usually over a glass of wine. His advice is always helpful, and I go to sleep with less trouble.</i>	8
Jogging / working out	<i>I work out. I'm jogging a lot. While running my mind empties. Stress goes fully away during these times</i>	6
Forbearance	<i>So even though you put in the effort in, you feel like you're letting everybody down. The rest of the company, they hear about the sales figure, it being a zero, and they wonder if you're-what you're doing all day</i>	12
Discuss with colleagues	<i>Talking to other managers to get ideas is always helpful.</i>	14
Discuss with manager	<i>They [Senior Management] always telling you, you know, to push it a bit more and try and do more. But if that doesn't happen, there's nothing else you can do. If the customer doesn't want it. So, it can be a bit stressful. Yes.</i>	6
Share with manager	<i>I have regular formal meetings with my manager. Like monthly. We discuss my progress. Friendly. And she advises me how to move on the next month and do better</i>	11
Share with team	<i>I'm talking to my team, and we are trying to find solutions together. What can we do better to meet our targets?</i>	15

Mentoring	<i>When I started this job, I was assigned to Alex [pseudonym for mentor]. He helped me a lot to understand the role and the tasks but also cope with the challenges.</i>	3
It solutions & support	<i>We have CRM system in place. This helps in monitoring and prioritizing in meeting our objectives</i>	7
Planning templates	<i>We use tools and templates to help us set reasonable objectives in the outset. This helps to be more realistic and makes meeting objectives less stressful</i>	8
IMPEDIMENTS TO AN ENJOYABLE WORK LIFE		
Lack of support	<i>You're told to try and push XXXX [private label] first and then, if not, go to the other side. I find myself like without realizing that I'm pushing toward the XXXX items before the other brands.</i>	12
Lack of training	<i>They just tell you to try your best. But that's that. I mean that they do tell you that. Just try your best but never say "how" to do this.</i>	9
Lack of mental peace	<i>Business is becoming more and more demanding. More competitive. You need to be on the edge all the time and you cannot ease off.</i>	11
Stress	<i>It's always a challenge and it's always stressful. It's always stressful, and here we've got a perfect scenario where last quarter, we achieved very high sales, whereas this quarter, we haven't achieved anything at all.</i>	14
Income	<i>I work the same hours as many male colleagues, but I know I am paid less!</i>	12
Working hrs	<i>Usually, it seems that work never ends. You get emails in the evening, for instance, and you are forced to reply though we are told we do not have to. But if you do, you show you care for your job, and this is always "appreciated."</i>	14
Company policies	<i>[Management] will just say: "Right. You've not taken that amount of money, so you're now over hours. They'll try and cut back hours from the store. So, you will be working with less staff."</i>	9
Vocation fit	<i>Stress comes with the job [sales]. I know this is not for me, and I need to plan how I will change my career path.</i>	10
Digitalization	<i>Nowadays, everything is about influencing. We are forced to be on camera and if we don't live on social media, we are going to disappear; become irrelevant</i>	4

Study two: Research approach, Sample & Data collection.

Guided by insights from the qualitative phase, the second study employed a structured survey to validate the FWB scale and identify influencing conditions. The sample comprised 473 sales professionals—314 from the United Kingdom and 159 from Greece—selected to explore contextual generalizability.

In the UK, firms were identified using the FAME database. From a stratified random sample of 500 companies, sales directors were contacted to nominate eligible salespeople. Ultimately, 314 qualified participants completed the questionnaire (response rate: 31%). In Greece, the ICAP business registry served as the sampling frame. A similar procedure yielded 159 eligible responses (43% effective response rate).

Eligibility criteria mirrored those from the qualitative phase: a minimum of two years of sales experience and at least one year of service with the current employer. Demographic characteristics were recorded to ensure representativeness across both contexts.

Initial data validation steps included testing for common method bias using a CFA marker variable approach (Podsakoff et al., 2003). No significant bias was detected. EFA on the Greek sample revealed four underlying dimensions of perceived FWB. CFA with the UK sample confirmed the structure, demonstrating good convergent and discriminant validity. Predictive validity was established by regressing the FWB scale on job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.375$).

Cross-validation across the two samples further confirmed generalizability. Measurement invariance testing (configural, metric, and scalar) indicated that the scale was stable across cultural contexts. The following table outlines the demographic profile of the participants in this study.

Table 4: Participants' Demographic Profile.

Gender							
	Male	Female	Total	Non-binary / third gender	Prefer not to say		
UK % (n=314)	65.2	34.8	94.3	0.3	5.4		
GR % (n=159)	59.1	40.9	100	0	0		
Total Sample % (n=473)	63.1	36.9	94.1	0.06	5.3		
Age							
	20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+	Total	Prefer not to say
UK % (n=314)	14	24	33	22	6	99	1
GR % (n=159)	11	32	27	25	1	96	4
Total Sample % (n=473)	13	27	31	23	4	98	2
Income							
	Up to £25,000	£25,000 to £50,000	£50,001 to £75,000	£75,001 to 100,000	£100,000 or more	Total	Prefer not to say
UK % (n=314)	29.7	32.4	19.6	5.7	12.5	94.3	5.7
GR % (n=159)	42.3	32.2	14.1	4.7	6.7	93.7	6.3
Total Sample % (n=473)	72	64.6	33.7	10.4	19.2	94.1	5.9
Married							
	No	Yes	Total	Prefer not to say			
UK % (n=314)	35	65	94.6	5.4			
GR % (n=159)	45.3	54.7	94.3	5.7			
Total Sample % (n=473)	38.5	61.5	94.5	5.5			

Variables and their measurement

Study one informs most of the measures employed in study two. For FWB, a pool of items reflecting each code was generated for each of the 13 items, one for each code that emerged from the in-depth interviews. This pool was then presented to two colleagues, who were briefed on the study's aim and what the generated

items were intended to capture. The final pool was agreed upon after a thorough discussion and various rewordings and versions for each item. A pilot study with 25 MBA part-time students served to validate the wording and clarity of these statements. Minor changes were made. Precisely the same process was observed to generate items to measure perceived barriers preventing the achievement of FWB (10 items in the final pool. Job satisfaction was measured with a single question (overall job satisfaction) and a 5-point Likert scale. We have also employed Reynold’s (1982) scale for social desirability as the marker variable in assessing potential common methods bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Data Analysis

The first stage was to detect if common method variance is a concern. We relied on the CFA marker variable approach using “social desirability” as the marker variable (Richardson, Simmering, & Sturman, 2009). The results from this test [independently for the UK and GR] showed that none of the loadings associated with the marker variable were related to any of the items in the constructs for either of the two contexts. Thus, method bias is not a concern. Next, we checked for differences between the two samples. At this early stage, this was done by independent t-test checking for differences in the means. The results from this preliminary test did not reveal any statistically significant differences, suggesting we could potentially consider the entire data set as one.

Table 5: Results from CFA using the UK sample.				
	Std. b	AVE	CR (composite Reliability)	Convergent Validity (AVE/MAX.C ORR > 1.0)
Work-life reflection on Personal life [WL-PL]		0.659	0.885	1.01131
Recognition at work	0.900			
Job security	0.729			
Opportunities to advance my career	0.776			
More quality of my personal time	0.833			
Personal-Life conditions [PLC]		0.684	0.896	1.05498
Less stress in my personal life	0.741			
Fewer sacrifices in my personal life	0.776			
An enjoyable personal life	0.936			
Maintain my mental health	0.841			
Unreachable (-) [UN]		0.657	0.781	2.28834
There is no such a thing as a "balance" between personal and work life	0.996			

The whole idea of such a balance is obsolete.	0.567			
Work Life Conditions [WLC]		0.684	0.865	1.04856
Less stress at work	0.732			
Less time at work	0.942			
Fewer sacrifices at work	0.792			
CFA model summary	X2			d.f.
	1739.29			48
Base line comparisons	TLI			CFI
	0.97			0.94
RMSEA	0.049			

The next stage involved developing scales for the concept of perceived FWB. To achieve this, we conducted exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the Greek sample. The results are presented in Table A1 in the Appendix. We then utilised the factorial design generated by the EFA to create summative scales for the UK sample and conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), as shown in Table 5. As illustrated in Table 5, the CFA confirmed the EFA results from the Greek sample. At the same time, the individual scales produced demonstrated strong evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. This enabled us to create the same summative scales for the Greek sample.

The final check for the newly established measure was to establish predictive validity and cross-validate it since our database includes two distinct groups (UK and GR), allowing cross-validation. For predictive validity, we regressed the four scales upon which perceived FWB reflects against job satisfaction since the effect of the former on the latter is established in the literature (e.g., Guedes et al., 2023; Rapp et al., 2014; Haar et al., 2014).

Table 6: Cross-validation of the perceived FWB.

		UK					GR				
		R ²	b				R ²	b			
			WL-PL	WLC	UN	PLC		WL-PL	WLC	UN	PLC
Job Satisfaction	GR	0.47	0.52	0.42	-0.35	0.46					
	UK						0.44	0.49	0.41	-0.33	0.43

To establish predictive validity, we relied on the UK sample, and the results show that our newly developed scale explains a significant amount of the variability in job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.375$), with WL-PL and PLC being the strongest predictors ($b = 0.62$ and $b = 0.57$), while the other two -WLC & UN- not falling too far behind ($b = 0.48$ and $b = -0.40$). This establishes predictive validity. For the cross-validation, we first used the perceived FWB measures from the UK sample to predict job satisfaction in the GR sample, and we

then reversed the process (Kuhn & Johnson, 2013). Results, presented in Table 6, indicate that the scale is generalizable across both contexts in our study.

Table 7: What perceived barriers prevent salespeople from having FWB.

Canonical Correlations								
	Correlation	Eigenvalue	Wilks Statistic	F	D.F	Denom D.F.	Sig.	
1	0.595	0.548	0.378	10.045	48	1677.704	<.001	
2	0.539	0.410	0.585	7.775	33	1285.24	<.001	
3	0.339	0.130	0.825	4.419	20	874	<.001	
4	0.261	0.073	0.932	3.566	9	438	<.001	
<i>H0 for the Wilks test is that the correlations in the current and following rows are zero</i>								
Predictor Set Canonical Correlation Coefficients								
Variable		1	2	3	4			
Habitual behaviors (e.g., spending too much time in social media)		-0.191	0.584	-0.231	-0.369			
Family background and values		0.256	-0.229	0.706	0.163			
The choices we make in life		-0.602	-0.754	0.530	-0.266			
Ambition		0.515	0.095	0.581	-0.105			
Setting your own limits at work		-0.635	0.538	0.034	0.877			
Setting your own limits in your personal life		-0.325	-0.292	0.11	0.354			
Stress at work		0.232	0.844	0.113	0.079			
Job description		0.194	-0.08	0.024	0.500			
Management's expectations		0.502	-0.034	0.718	0.350			
Company attitude		0.524	0.203	-0.081	-0.656			
Company culture		0.667	-0.028	0.006	-0.751			
Stage in your career (e.g., developing a career vs. having established a career)		-0.235	-0.244	0.899	0.352			
Criterion Set Canonical Correlation Coefficients								
Variable		1	2	3	4			
WL-PL		-0.774	-0.162	-0.326	0.838			
PLC		-0.35	-0.595	0.195	-0.185			
WLC		-0.573	0.257	-0.158	0.780			
UN		0.367	-0.356	0.844	0.261			

Finally, we revisited the two contexts (UK and GR) to check for configural, metric, and scalar invariance, using the newly developed scale, which had been adequately validated and cross-validated. All three tests for invariance were successful, suggesting we could treat the sample as a single dataset for the subsequent analysis. The last stage of the analysis aimed to explore how perceived barriers to achieving FWB. Table 7

summarises the results from examining perceived FWB concerning the obstacles to achieving such a balance.

Given the predictor set, the criterion set's redundancy was approximately 47%, which is well above the levels reported by other business researchers using canonical correlations (e.g., Gounaris, Avlonitis, & Papastathopoulou, 2004; Grossbart & Crosby, 1984). For each subgroup in the sample (UK & GR), we repeated the analysis and calculated the redundancy in the criterion set in each subset. The percentage remained very close to that of the total sample, suggesting this is not a random result. Loadings with an absolute value of 0.40 and over, which appeared to be significantly related to each variate, are bolded to assist interpretation.

The four canonical variables the analysis has produced delineate four different paths connecting the participants' perceived FWB and the impact different barriers have. The first one captures how work-life conditions and the effect of work-life on personal life can suffer from a combination of work-specific (i.e., management's expectations, company attitude, and company culture) and employee-specific (i.e., ambition, the "choices" we make and not setting your limits at work).

Notably, the combination of work- and employee-specific barriers in the predictor set highlights the shared responsibility between the management and the individual employee in increasing the level of salespeople perceived FWB.

The second canonical variable explains the contraction of the personal life facet of perceived FWB. This appears to be not only the outcome of employee-specific barriers (i.e., habitual behaviors or making wrong choices). The amount of stress in the workplace also significantly affects this dimension of perceived FWB, adding further evidence of the interplay between personal- and work-specific barriers in deterring salespeople from enjoying FWB.

The third canonical variable explains why some participants see FWB as unrealistic: employee-specific barriers (e.g., family background, ambition, and making confident choices in life to reflect the former) interplay with one's [early] stage in building a career would appear to boost the [negative] aspect of perceived FWB. The fourth canonical variable is also very interesting to consider. This variable is a negated version of the previous three. It captures how the absence of specific barriers explains the enhancement of the work-

life reflection on the personal and work-life conditions aspects of perceived FWB. This variable is directly comparable to the first one as far as the criterion set is concerned. But the composition of the predictor set varies: A fitting “job description” is necessary to boost the perceived facets of FWB in question, which does not appear to have an effect in contracting them, thus making “management’s expectations” not relevant (the first canonical variable detected this). From a theoretical perspective, this is a very important finding. This canonical variable suggests that having or not having FWB are not the two opposites of a linear continuum. Instead, it seems that the combination of the conditions fostering FWB and those deterring employees from enjoying such a balance is different.

Discussion & Contribution.

This white paper reports on the results of two studies. The first, a qualitative study, informed the process of deriving a measure to assess FWB from a relational perspective, anchored to the VFT. The second, a quantitative survey, allowed gaining the necessary data for validating this measure while opening the opportunity for understanding what steers/prevents increased levels of perceived FWB.

The main driver for study one is that the extant literature in FWB, while rich, is predominantly informed from either a psychology- or sociology-driven perspective, looking at the FWB question from three main vantages: role theory (e.g., Casper et al., 2018), identity theory (Manzi et al., 2024), or resource-based (e.g., Wayne, Vaziri, & Casper, 2021). As such, the focus has been on the individual employees and their sole responsibility in balancing these two aspects of their lives. However, researchers in the past have suggested that this responsibility is shared by individual employees and the company’s management (e.g., Haar, 2013; Voydanoff, 2005). Yet, work in this direction is mainly normative and has still to deliver an empirical measure for assessing perceived FWB from such a perspective (see Kalliath & Brough, 2008). Hence, there is a clear need to vest this stream of the FWB research with empirical evidence (and a measure for perceived FWB) before we can portray the impact the management can have in facilitating their employees’ perceived FWB, outline the management’s responsibilities and help companies develop environments and conditions that support employees in balancing these two aspects of their lives. Thus, the first study offered the key pillars for such a measure, while the second study produced the empirical evidence to validate this measure

alongside notable findings regarding the barriers of perceived FWB from this perspective. The following two sub-sections outline the key academic and practical contributions this manuscript offers.

Academic Contribution

The results of the qualitative data analysis from 19 in-depth interviews have allowed us to contribute to the FWB stream of research that takes a relational perspective on this question, conceding that balancing the interplay between personal- and work-life is not the sole responsibility of individual employees. Such advancement was possible by looking at this interplay through the theoretical lenses of VFT. Despite its clear relevance, this theory has been missed in the FWB research stream. According to VFT, employees choose their vocation so that their job role and requirements fit their personality and idiosyncratic conditions. By implication, achieving such a fit is a shared responsibility: For the employees to make the “right assessment” and for the management to design job roles and set conditions and requirements that employees will see as fitting.

In this regard, we report the four constituent components emerging from such a relational view of perceived FWB. The first reflects on the employees' responsibility to manage their personal lives. In line with the prevalent views in the literature, individual employees are responsible for managing stress levels in their personal lives, making fewer sacrifices so they can enjoy their personal lives while maintaining their mental health. The second advances the existing body of literature, allowing for reflection on management's responsibility in shaping working conditions that enable employees to experience less stress at work and spend less time on work-related tasks that require fewer sacrifices.

The third component advances the extant literature further by reflecting the interplay between the shared responsibility of managerial and individual employees in what we define as perceived FWB. This component demonstrates how work-life conditions reflect on the employees' personal lives, a function of having recognition at work, job security, and career opportunities that allow employees to enjoy a better quality of their personal time. Finally, the fourth component provides for capturing a negative constituent of perceived FWB that contracts perceived FWB: the attitude that FWB is unattainable, informed by such beliefs as “there is no such a thing as a "balance" between personal and work life” and that “the whole idea of such a balance is obsolete.” Crucially, in addition to delineating the key components of FWB from a relational perspective, this investigation provided empirical evidence to validate them (study two).

All the tests converge to the conclusion that the measure that emerged from the qualitative investigation is robust and reliable. This is an important contribution to the stream of research looking at the interplay between personal and work life, which so far has been focusing on the notion of “balance” without duly considering the broader ecosystem [work and personal life conditions as well as their present and evolving idiosyncratic situation] individual employees face in their quest for such a balance. At the same time, although this stream is mainly informed by the same domain theories, a consensus on how to define and measure the notion was missing (Wayne et al., 2017). By empirically deriving and validating our measure, we have complemented earlier attempts in this relational direction, which, however, remained normative (Kalliath & Brough, 2008).

The second significant contribution arises from the results of the canonical correlation analysis. The findings presented in Table 7 indicate that employees’ ability to balance the interplay between their personal and work lives relies on both their individual responsibilities and those of management. In Table 7, the first canonical variable reveals the impact of management's expectations, company attitude, and corporate culture on hindering employees from enhancing their perceived FWB. Notably, the third canonical variable in the same table illustrates the joint effect on perceived FWB stemming from elements of the broader ecosystem: personal life conditions such as family background and making confident life choices, alongside their current and evolving unique situations, as mirrored in the employees’ ambitions or career stages, can amplify the negative aspects of perceived FWB, thereby diminishing employees’ perception of balance. This is crucial for two reasons. First, it underscores the importance of understanding and evaluating perceived FWB from a relational perspective, as doing so provides a more comprehensive insight into the factors that obstruct such balance. Second, it highlights that the elements reducing perceived FWB are not merely the polar opposites of various conditions within a theoretical continuum. The academic implication is clear: managerial interventions aimed at improving FWB and/or preventing it from declining must acknowledge individuals’ personal circumstances. What proves effective for one may not suit everyone. The existing literature has overlooked this point (e.g., Allen & French, 2023; Bakalım & Karçkay, 2017; Greenhaus, Ziegert, & Allen, 2012).

Consequently, having a universal map charting the actions and policies (e.g., providing both formal and informal support or rationalising working hours and improving the climate in the company) for enhancing

FWB for a company's employees is a necessary but insufficient condition. Additionally, it is vital to instil such policies with the proper degree of flexibility that will allow the company's policies to adjust to the broader idiosyncratic conditions employees face concerning their personal and work lives (e.g., mentoring and targeted skills development). The latter requires companies to become more focused on valuing the benefits their employees receive in return for their employment. (Gounaris, 2006). This is the third significant contribution from this study, as the findings enable us to conceptually bridge two related but previously independently investigated streams of research: internal marketing and IMO development (as an antecedent) with FWB (as its outcome). This bridging can advance the understanding of perceived FWB from a relational perspective, allowing for insights that have never been considered before.

Managerial Contribution

In addition to the study's implications for academics, practitioners also benefit from examining FWB from a business and relational perspective. The first implication is that management must be self-aware of what they ask and expect from employees. Because FWB is a shared responsibility, the management is responsible for setting reasonable work and performance expectations, role behaviours, and job and role descriptions. Shaping these conditions properly is key in delivering the company's part regarding FWB. In doing so, management must ensure, for instance, a participative approach to setting goals and objectives. Where necessary, management will also need to change attitudes and adopt a win-win approach that benefits both the company and individual employees by providing working conditions that focus on more than just goal achievement, sales revenue, customer retention, or profitability. While legitimate, such goals cannot and should not come at the expense of the employee's ability to see their work experiences as rewarding and fulfilling both their career and personal life expectations.

By implication, this requires revisiting the company's approach to managing its human capital: its people. For instance, our study has demonstrated how mentoring can be beneficial in helping employees address their circumstances or habitual behaviours, as well as their job role and expectations. Not every company offers mentoring; among those that typically provide it, they usually offer it only to relatively early-career employees. Our findings do not contradict this practice since the career stage, for instance, is an important factor for FWB. However, employees with longer work experience could benefit equally from such practices as mentoring in helping them to cope with the different challenges they face in their personal lives or their

habitual behaviours. Likewise, during recruitment, the management has to go beyond merely ticking boxes and matching job requirements with formal qualifications and/or past working experiences. Fitting the person with the job will have long-term benefits for both the company and the employee, but this requires the company to have the ability to make this assessment (either in-house or by outsourcing).

Such actions require more money to be diverted -and invested- in managing the company's human capital. The findings from our study suggest this is a worthwhile investment. Improving employees' perceived FWB has a direct positive impact on the employee's job satisfaction, from which companies benefit in many different ways, including the company's performance (e.g., Gounaris & Boukis, 2013; Yu, Barnes, & Ye, 2022).

Limitations & Directions for Future Research.

Sales functions provide a particularly suitable context for introducing a relational perspective on Family-Work Balance (FWB) management. This is mainly due to the diverse educational backgrounds, experiences, and personalities typically found among sales professionals (e.g., Billups & Poddar, 2018). Moreover, sales roles are inherently demanding and stressful, as they are often central to revenue generation within organisations (Habel et al., 2020). This critical role makes them a notable source of work-life stress (e.g., Leischnig et al., 2015). The relational perspective on FWB seeks to highlight the organisation's responsibility in fostering FWB and to provide a foundation for corresponding managerial interventions.

It is important to acknowledge, however, that not all organisations rely on sales personnel. Institutions such as hospitals and clinics, educational establishments like schools and universities, and certain non-profit entities, including museums and charitable organisations may not have formal sales functions. Nevertheless, despite differences in operational contexts, these organisations remain subject to managerial oversight. From the standpoint of the relational FWB perspective, management within such institutions still bears a degree of responsibility in supporting their employees' family-work balance. Given the contextual distinctions, the findings of the present study should not be directly generalised to such settings. This limitation, however, does not diminish the contribution of our research. Instead, it presents a promising avenue for future scholars to extend the relational perspective of FWB to these alternative organisational contexts.

Another significant consideration relates to the sample and cultural context of our empirical work. The study was conducted across two countries that differ substantially in terms of cultural values, beliefs, and the resulting perceptions and behaviors. These differences, along with the outcomes of the cross-validation procedures, support the development of a broadly applicable—if not universal—measure of perceived FWB suitable for what might be termed “modern, Western-values-driven” environments. Nonetheless, it is essential to recognize that the very notion of FWB is inherently subjective and shaped by individual perceptions. In cultural contexts such as those in Central Asia, China, Africa, Latin America, and the Arabian Peninsula, both the constituents of FWB and the managerial responsibilities associated with it may differ significantly due to cultural variations (Hofstede, 2001). While this again does not detract from the present study’s contributions, it highlights yet another valuable direction for future research, exploring the relational perspective of FWB within culturally distinct environments and value systems.

References

- Allen T.D., & French K.A. (2023). “Work-family research: A review and next steps” **Personnel Psychology**, Vol.76(2): pp. 437-471.
- Avila R.A., Fern E.F., & Mann O.K. (1988). “Unravelling criteria for assessing the performance of salespeople: A causal analysis” **Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management**, Vol.8(1): pp. 45-54.
- Bakalim O., & Karçkay A.T. (2017). “Effect of group counseling on happiness, life satisfaction and positive-negative affect: A mixed method study” **Journal of Human Sciences**, Vol.14(1): pp. 624-632.
- Biernacki P., & Waldorf D. (1981). “Snowball Sampling: Problems and Techniques of Chain Referral Sampling” **Sociological Methods & Research**, Vol.10(2): pp. 141-163.
- Billups M., & Poddar A. (2018). “Entry-level salesperson selection: An engaging experiential exercise for sales management students” **Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education**, Vol.26: pp. 18-24.
- Brounéus K. 2011. *In-depth interviewing: The process, skill and ethics of interviews in peace research*, **Understanding peace research: 130-145: Routledge.**
- Bryman A., & Burgess R.G. 2002. *Developments in qualitative data analysis: an introduction*, **Analyzing qualitative data: 1-17: Routledge.**
- Casper W.J., et al. (2018). “The jingle-jangle of work–nonwork balance: A comprehensive and meta-analytic review of its meaning and measurement.” **Journal of applied psychology**, Vol.103(2): pp. 182-214.
- Clift V. (1997). “Finding and keeping effective salespeople” **Marketing News**, Vol.31(15): pp. 8.
- Dubinsky A.J., & Lippitt M.E. (1980). “Techniques that reduce salesforce frustration” **Industrial Marketing Management**, Vol.9(2): pp. 159-166.
- Good D.J., & Schwepker Jr C.H. (2001). “Sales Quotas: Critical Interpretations and Implications” **Review of Business**, Vol.22: pp. 32-36.
- Gounaris S., Avlonitis G.J., & Papastathopoulou P. (2004). “Managing a firm's behavior through market orientation development: some empirical findings” **European journal of marketing**, Vol.38(11/12): pp. 1481-1508.

- Gounaris S., & Boukis A. (2013). "The role of employee job satisfaction in strengthening customer repurchase intentions" **Journal of Services Marketing**, Vol.27(4): pp. 322-333.
- Gounaris S.P. (2006). "Internal-market orientation and its measurement" **Journal of business research**, Vol.59(4): pp. 432-448.
- Greenberg H.M., & Greenberg J. (1980). "Job matching for better sales performance" **Harvard Business Review**, Vol.58(5): pp. 128-133.
- Greenhaus J.H., Ziegert J.C., & Allen T.D. (2012). "When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work-family balance." **Journal of vocational behavior**, Vol.80(2): pp. 266-275.
- Grossbart S.L., & Crosby L.A. (1984). "Understanding the bases of parental concern and reaction to children's food advertising" **Journal of Marketing**, Vol.48(3): pp. 79-92.
- Gubrium J.F., & Holstein J.A. 2002. **Handbook of interview research: Context and method**: Sage Publications.
- Guedes M.J., et al. (2023). "Does it pay off to offer family-friendly practices? Exploring the missing links to performance" **International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal**, Vol.19(2): pp. 667-690.
- Guest G., Bunce A., & Johnson L. (2006). "How Many Interviews Are Enough?: An Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability" **Field Methods**, Vol.18(1): pp. 59-82.
- Haar J.M. (2013). "Testing a new measure of work-life balance: A study of parent and non-parent employees from New Zealand" **The International Journal of Human Resource Management**, Vol.24(17): pp. 3305-3324.
- Haar J.M., et al. (2014). "Outcomes of work-life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures" **Journal of vocational behavior**, Vol.85(3): pp. 361-373.
- Habel J., et al. (2020). "When do customers perceive customer centricity? The role of a firm's and salespeople's customer orientation" **Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management**, Vol.40(1): pp. 25-42.
- Kalliath T., & Brough P. (2008). "Work-life balance: A Review of the Meaning of the Balance Construct" **Journal of management & organization**, Vol.14(3): pp. 323-327.
- Kuhn M., & Johnson K. 2013. **Applied Predictive Modeling**. New York: Springer.
- Leischnig A., Ivens B.S., & Henneberg S.C. (2015). "When stress frustrates and when it does not: Configural models of frustrated versus mellow salespeople" **Psychology & Marketing**, Vol.32(11): pp. 1098-1114.
- Manzi C., et al. (2024). "Moving from "balancing" to "blending": The role of identity integration for working parents" **Journal of Social and Personal Relationships**, Vol.41(1): pp. 200-224.
- Miles M.B. 1994. **Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook**.
- Podsakoff P.M., et al. (2003). "Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies" **Journal of applied psychology**, Vol.88(5): pp. 879.
- Rapp A., et al. (2014). "Salespeople as knowledge brokers: a review and critique of the challenger sales model" **Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management**, Vol.34(4): pp. 245-259.
- Reynolds W.M. (1982). "Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale" **Journal of clinical psychology**, Vol.38(1): pp. 119-125.
- Richardson H.A., Simmering M.J., & Sturman M.C. (2009). "A tale of three perspectives: Examining post hoc statistical techniques for detection and correction of common method variance" **Organizational Research Methods**, Vol.12(4): pp. 762-800.
- Smith J.A., & Osborn M. 2003. *Interpretative phenomenological analysis*. In S. J.A (Ed.), **Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods**: 51-80: Sage.
- Voydanoff P. (2005). "Toward a conceptualization of perceived work-family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach" **Journal of marriage and family**, Vol.67(4): pp. 822-836.

- Wayne J.H., et al. (2017). "In search of balance: A conceptual and empirical integration of multiple meanings of work-family balance" **Personnel Psychology**, Vol.70(1): pp. 167-210.
- Wayne J.H., Vaziri H., & Casper W.J. (2021). "Work-nonwork balance: Development and validation of a global and multidimensional measure" **Journal of Vocational Behavior**, Vol.127: pp. 103565.
- Weeks W.A., & Fournier C. (2010). "The Impact of Time Congruity on Salesperson's Role Stress: A Person--Job Fit Approach" **Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management**, Vol.30(1): pp. 73-90.
- Wiles M.A., & Spiro R.L. (2004). "Attracting graduates to sales positions and the role of recruiter knowledge: A reexamination" **Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management**, Vol.24(1): pp. 39-48.
- Yu Q., Barnes B.R., & Ye Y. (2022). "Internal market orientation, interdepartmental relationships and market performance: The pivotal role of employee satisfaction" **European Journal of Marketing**, Vol.56(5): pp. 1464-1487.

Appendix

Table A1: EFA of the FWB dimensions using the GR sample

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Recognition at work	0.826			
Opportunities to advance my career	0.794			
Job security	0.781			
Maintain my mental health		0.771		
Less stress in my personal life		0.684		
An enjoyable personal life		0.667		
More quality of my personal time	0.598			
Less time at work				0.822
Fewer sacrifices at work				0.786
Less stress at work				0.613
Fewer sacrifices in my personal life		0.517		
The whole idea of such a balance is obsolete.			0.847	
There is no such a thing as a "balance" between personal and work life			0.828	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings			
	% of Variance	Cumulative %	% of			
Total			Total	Variance	Cumulative %	
1	5.365	41.273	41.273	4.324	33.263	33.263
2	1.602	12.322	53.595	2.408	18.527	51.79
3	1.37	10.538	64.133	1.605	12.343	64.133
4	1.12	6.387	70.52	1.156	9.521	73.654
5	0.665	5.112	75.632			
...			
13	0.234	1.804	100			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.

0.851

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Approx. Chi-Square

886.448

df

78

Sig.

<.001