

Dual Career Couple

Purbudi Wahyuni, Pribadi Widyatmojo
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Yogyakarta

Keywords: Career, Employee, Family Life

Abstract: This study examined the relationship between a couple of career and family life. The double role of female worker gets complex problems, that produces organization and the female worker challenges, because of the role function of the woman (Parasuraman dan Greenhaus, 1992). The balance of workplace support and family support composes job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and declining job stress. That spouses realize that supporting each other is capable of success achieved in the workplace. This phenomenon enhances this research, especially about why employees have a readiness to support their peers in the workplace, and the influences on well-being on the dual-career couple. Population research is all dual career-couples or a married couple of employees in Private Hospital because these dual career-couples need to build their characteristics of Hospital employees. The number of this research respondent is 186 employees. This is a lifestyle for many women, as the larger female worker opportunity dan, the larger female education opportunity. The analysis result shows that intergroup knowledge does not influence well-being in the workplace, and intergroup knowledge influence positive and significant toward peer support. The influence of intergroup knowledge toward well-being is negative and not significant.

1 INTRODUCTION

Many couples act as dual-career-couple, which means determine both husband and wife are working outside. This dual-career-couple grows up since the number of female workers growing up. This is a lifestyle for many women, as the larger female worker opportunity dan, the larger female education opportunity.

Female workers were asked to be professional workers and asked to be committed as couples of life, so that, the female workers are capable of actualizing themselves, which was indicated by their achievement in the workplace and family well-being.

The double role of female worker gets complex problems, that produces organization and the female worker challenges, because of the role function of the woman (Parasuraman dan Greenhaus, 1992). The influences of interaction and accumulated problems in the family and workplace, have to be resolved to prevent from serious job stress and career. Casio (2003) stated that one of many ways of reducing job stress is that the female workers have to manage their time as flexible as possible without

sacrificing their commitment to the workplace and family. Sekaran (1985) stated that the success of the double role management depends on social support. Greenhaus dan Parasuraman (1992) identified that social support reduced stressor on the strategic human resources, in different domains of work and family. Family support, especially husband support or wife support, called spouse support, meanwhile workplace support called the organization to support.

The balance of workplace support and family support composes job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and declining job stress. This research is done by Wahyuni (2010) to find out that spouses realize of supporting each other is capable of success achieved in the workplace. Organization support is workplace support that comes from the superintendent or supervisor directly, peer support, and co-worker support. Superintendent support has a significant influence on well-being, which means the fitness of job satisfaction and family satisfaction. Higgin and Duxbury (1992) stated that well-being consists of job satisfaction and, family satisfaction which are components of which is a component of work-life quality measurement.

The result of Holzbach (1978), Cobb's (1976, 1980) research, and Wahyuni (2009) research, stated that organizational support is simply peered support, which is the friend's capability of making coordination to switch with each other in case of unplanned special family urgent. This support is capable of improving work motivation, what more helping to solve the work problems. That support produces job satisfaction. The next Wahyuni (2010) research found that spouse support did not determine job satisfaction in the workplace, but it determined the family decisions. Meanwhile, the organizational support (that comes from the superintendent, coworker, and subordinate) gives positive signs of job satisfaction. But does not influence on family satisfaction. Accordance with the goodness of fit that social support, especially spouse support and organizational support variables, have a significant influence on well-being that comes from family satisfaction and job satisfaction. But, the social support variable is indicating a moderating variable of the influence of the stressor and well-being variable, but as an independent variable, it has a direct impact on the well-being variable.

Peer support in the workplace is measured by the perception of the context of social workplace support. The context refers to the social support theory as a way of comprehending a friend's support from each other in the workplace. Albrecht and Adelman (1987), stated that a friend's support came from mutually dynamic interactions, enhanced attitude, beliefs, emotion, and positive behaviors. The first research about peer support from workplace friend is conducted by Balk (1969) that stated that the more complex work, the more needs of peer support.

House (1981, 1985) stated that peer support is a facility or a way to ease the job implementation or task support, and enhance the cooperative readiness, and willingness to advice and guidance in to solve the problem. Keup (2004), Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), Jacob (1970), Kram dan Isabella (1985), Glesspen (1997), Mc. Evoy and Buller (1987), Sherony and Green (2002) stated that the higher the relationship between workplace friend, the higher peer support needed psychologically and physiologically what more in career development. Wahyuni research (2009) stated that intergroup knowledge and information sharing are antecedents of peer support psychologically and not physiologically are moderated by; work environment, and interaction tenure resulted from improvement capability expectation each other.

Meanwhile, Inman (2001) stated that diversity did not influence job satisfaction if the diversity is not completed with the close relationship between workplace friend, and positively influenced toward job satisfaction, especially concerning job satisfaction on compensation and promotion. Randolph dan Blencoe (1983) stated that the higher the knowledge capability level of a peer, the more positive peer support toward job satisfaction and teamwork and personally. Huselid (1995) found that the high-involvement strategy of autonomy has influenced work environment change without higher management initiation. The strategy influenced job satisfaction, and then it influences positively on a commitment to work and organization performance. Meanwhile, Rahab (2010), in the literature review, revealed that the readiness to share knowledge and experience with each other between peers in the workplace influenced the improvement of organizational capability. This information sharing between peers in the workplace needed the positive opportunity of critics, ideas, comment expression by the teamwork member. It means every member of the teamwork has the same opportunity to express all problems, difficulties, ideas to improve the organization's productivity and job satisfaction.

Many types of researches show that there are debates about behavior that produces peer support in the workplace, what more dual-career couple toward well-being that produces job satisfaction and family satisfaction. Those research observe employees in the individualism philosophy country. Schaubroeck and Lam (2002) stated that there are workplace peer support in the collectivism philosophy country and those peer support in the individualism philosophy country. People from individualism countries before the individual need fulfillment, so that little bit has paid attention to their peers in the workplace, then in the collectivism country. Vice versa, people in the collectivism country pay more attention to their peers in the workplace.

This phenomenon enhances this research, especially about why employees have a readiness to support their peers in the workplace, and the influences on well-being on the dual-career couple. People in the collectivism country, including Indonesia, married, are an important status of social life. But this status has consequences of rising interest conflict; the wife and husband married that they both work outside. Thereby, the next question is that if peer support is capable of mediating job and family satisfaction.

2 THEORY

This research is analyzing the peer support variable, a mediator variable between intergroup knowledge and information sharing variable toward *well-being* that producing job satisfaction in the workplace, and family satisfaction as a double career couple. Every married and working outside a couple, are eager to balance job satisfaction and family satisfaction.

Organization success needs its employees to work well, and thereby the employees should support the organization's success optimal. The two interests (job satisfaction and family satisfaction) are mutually exclusive to each other sometimes, and the question is if the two interest is mediated by peer support, *intergroup knowledge*, and *information sharing*. What more, employees who work in the organization facing the community directly, such as employees working in a hospital.

2.1 Intergroup Knowledge and Information Sharing Influence and Peer Support

Bacharach *et al.* (2005) Schaubroeck & Lam (2002), Ibarra (1997), Thomas (1993), Fried & Tiegs (1993), Baum, (1991), Kirmeyer (1987), Love (1981), Cob (1980), O'Reilly III (1977), Blau (1977), Thomas, Balk (1969) found that Supportive Relationships such as Intergroup knowledge and information sharing influence positive and significant toward peer support, though in the heterogeneous teamwork. Goldberg (1981) and Borkenau dan Ostendorf (1988) stated that intergroup knowledge and various information strongly determined peer support. There is no different support between American and Afroamerican peer support in the workplace. Someone or some people get high peer support as long as they are well known as high capability and education though they are heterogenous teamwork.

Kloeppel (2006) *mood* and motivation a positive correlation on peer support, let alone there is positive information between peer in the workplace from confidence speaker or peer in the workplace. In contrast, negative information adds workload. Wahyuni (2009), in her qualitative research, found that intergroup knowledge and information sharing as an antecedent of peer support psychologically and in psychologists moderated by the work environment and tenure of interaction with each other with an expectation of capability and knowledge improvement. Make (1994), Crary (1987), DeNisi *et al.* (1983), Blau (1977) interaction

tenure and collaboration intensity influenced positively and significant toward peer support.

DeNisi, Randolph, dan Blencoe (1983) stated that the higher knowledge, the higher peer support, and influence positively toward job satisfaction individually or teamwork. Rahab (2010) concluded that the willingness to share experience and knowledge between peers in the workplace influenced the improvement of organizational capability. He stated that information sharing between peers by the opportunity of sharing information, idea, critics, and comments. Thereby, hypotheses 1a and 1b are formulated as follows.

Hypothesis 1a: intergroup knowledge influence positively toward peer support.

Hypothesis 1b: information sharing influenced positively toward peer support.

2.2 Intergroup Knowledge, Information Sharing, and Well-being

Bruning & Seers (2004), Miller (2005), Lepine & Dyne (2001), Huselid (1995) stated that *cognitive ability /knowledge* influenced positively and significant toward peer support, to help the peer./*altruism*, and empathy. Peer support mediates the influence of *Cognitive ability/knowledge* and work experience toward job satisfaction. Holzbach (1978), Cobb (1976, 1980), Wahyuni (2009) stated that high *support relations* between the smart peer and willingness to share information in heterogeneous ethnic influenced job satisfaction and commitment. *Organizational support*, especially peers support, influenced directly on *well-being* without any moderation.

Lilius (2006), Kim (2003), Mc.Cormick (2001), Bacharach *et al.* (2000) Ibarra, (1997), Thomas (1993), Fried & Tiegs (1993). Podsakoff *et al.* (2000). Jackson & William (1985), Harkins & Jackson (1985), DeNisi *et al.* (1983), Latane (1981) stated that peer cohesiveness produces peer significance. Peer support mediates both career support, peer significance, and increasing self-confidence and professionalism and increasing peer health. Therefore, hypothesis 2a and 2b are formulated as follows:

Hypothesis 2a: intergroup knowledge influence positively toward *well-being*.

Hypothesis 2b: information sharing influence positively toward *well-being*

Hypothesis 3: Peer Support mediates the Influence of Intergroup knowledge and Information sharing on Well-Being

Social Support is assisting the employee stress because of the dual-career couple (Parasuraman *et al.*, 1992). The research found that there is a negative relationship between social and *well-being*, in which the couple support reduce stress in the workplace and family stress. Social support is a moderating variable on the relationship between stressors and well-being (Suchet dan Barling; 1986). In the context of social support, people individually receive good brotherhood in their professionalism and family life, manifestation in peer support, and organizational support formally. Informal support receives from spouse, family, friend, and society. There are many concepts of social support, such as by Kahn and Antonucci (1980) defined *social support* as an interpersonal transaction that involved affection, affirmation, and assistance support. House (1981) proposed that *social support* as interpersonal transactions involved in four kinds of *support*, such as; emotional, instrumental informational and judgmental, or evaluative.

DeNisi, Randolph, and Blencoe (1983) stated that the higher knowledge peer has more positive peer support, enhance job satisfaction individually and teamwork. Huselid (1995) found that the *high-involvement* strategy resulted in autonomy and freedom of decision making to respond to environmental change, without higher management permission. This strategy has an influence on job satisfaction, in turn, produced positive commitment and organizational performance.

Cohen dan Will (1985) proposed four kinds of organizational support. First, appreciation support. This support is proposed by giving people that they are significance individually toward the organization and their family. This support produces a positive contribution to their own toward. Second, informational support. This informational support helps people define, realize, and problem-solving capability. Thus information support is indicated by the information available about the steps of *stressor* minimizing. Third, brotherhood support. This brotherhood support minimizes stress by affiliates people in social relationship contracts, or by minimizes the frailness. The third support, manifested by social activity, pleasure, or recreation. The fourth is instrumental support that produced in the availability of the organization facility to reduce the stress.

Organizational support is supported form the workplace, comes from a supervisor, *peer support*, and *co-worker support*. A coworker is a close friend in the workplace, that eager to help each other and motivate each other (Wahyuni, 2009).

Peer support variable is measured by their perception of social support each other in the workplace social, by *social support theory* and *social exchange theory*. Albrecht dan Adelman (1987) stated that *social support theory* functions as a way of comprehending *support* between friends in the workplace in the organization. The support obtained if there are mutually dynamic interactions among people or employees in the workplace as a result of positive *attitude*, *beliefs*, emotion, and behavior. On the other hand, Klein *et al.* (2004) stated that *social exchange theory* explaining the people's or employee's way of need fulfillment through profit maximization and cost minimization in the social relationship.

Balk (1969) stated that people or employe get more complex of peer support. Latane *et al.* (1979) founded a negative conclusion that team performance decreased by increasing teamwork members. The conclusion denied by their following research (Latane, 1981; Wills 1981), with their statement that teamwork cooperation as a result of *social impact theory*. This theory explains that peer support enhances social conditions absolutely (e.g., people join in a social group to get special status).

House (1981, 1985) expressed that peer support is a way to production facilities of work or *task support*, and functions as the willingness to join together, to *advice*, a *guide* to solve the problem. Keup (2004), Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), Jacob (1970), Kram and Isabella (1985), Glesspen (1997), Mc. Evoy and Buller (1987), Sherony and Green (2002) stated that the higher *the relationship* among peers, the higher peer support *psychologically* and *in psychologically* enhanced career development. Wahyuni (2009) stated that *intergroup knowledge* and *information sharing* are peer support antecedents *psychologically* and *psychologically*, which is moderated by the work environment and their interaction tenure. Their interaction tenure especially accompanied by their capability and knowledge teamwork improvement expectation. The last interaction produces job satisfaction and family satisfaction.

Inman (2001) stated that teamwork diversity did not influence job satisfaction, but influenced the team cohesiveness, which in turn produced the job satisfaction, especially job satisfaction on compensation and promotion. Wahyuni (2009) founded that team diversity did not moderate peer support. Bruning and Seers (2004) stated that team diversity in the organization influenced job satisfaction negatively, so do Miller (2005).

Schaubroeck and Lam (2002) stated that collectivism communities' behavior tended to work cooperative voluntarily. In contrast, the *individualism* community prefers to work individually. Thereby, this qualitative and quantitative research contributes to the comprehension of peer support and social enforcement process to manage them.

Task characteristic enhances peer support, especially the willingness to help each other, such as *social power* theory complemented with expectancy theory. The theory explained that teamwork members consistently supported each other in achieving the organization's goals, that producing job satisfaction in the workplace.

Social support is the information of value and willingness to cooperate in the workplace. Social support and cohesiveness are foundations of interpersonal relationship that produces *trust*, openness, and organizational *outcome* such as job satisfaction and organizational performance (Goldhaber *et al.*, 1978); Hellriegel dan Slocum (1974); Schnake (1983). *Trust* and openness function as *control* of right and wrong (O'Reilly and Roberts, 1974).

Egdof's (1996) research treats the antecedent variable is the personal capability to communicate, and *interpersonal communication* that moderated by *temporary income and half benefit* influences peer support. The conclusion expresses that the higher *interpersonal communication* and the higher *temporary income* influences peer support significantly.

In the case of *organizational downsizing*, peer support relieves the people or employee's tension by information sharing to get the new job. This phenomenon is founded by Egdof (1996) and Randell (1998). Egdof (1996) and Randell (1998) explained that peer support base on *interpersonal communication* and cohesiveness because of the emotion similarity toward peer existence in the workplace.

Peer attribution (locus of causality, controllability, and stability) based on attribution theory, explained that peer support willingness based on three factors, including; (1) behavioral characteristic, which means the willingness to cooperate in the teamwork that producing peer support, and *outcome*, (2) organization condition enforcing every people or employee cooperate each other (Smith *et al.*, 1983), (3) responsible behavior to help each other called *altruism* (Weiner, 1980a; 1986b; 1986, 1995).

Blau (1977) expressed that peers, information, and task sharing increased cohesiveness and *trust* that increased a sense of helping each other. Crary (1987), and. Make (1994) founded that interaction tenure an intensity influenced peer to peer cohesiveness and performance (Baum, 1991).

Bacharach *et al.* (2000) stated that peer cohesiveness enforces people's significance in the teamwork, and produces dual-career couple improvement (Ibarra, 1997). Thomas (1993) stated that brotherhood and peer support improves self-confidence and professionalism. Pendaat Fried & Tieggs (1993) stated that peer cohesiveness reduced stress and improved employee's health take carelessly. Podsakoff *et al.* (2000) expressed that peer support improved individual and organizational performance.

Walz and Niehoff (1996) stated that peer support 39% enforced job satisfaction on customer service efficiency, operation efficiency, with high quality.

The social relationship is *trust*, taking care of each other through information and knowledge sharing (Uzzi, 1996).

Schaubroeck and Lam (2002) compared Hongkong Bank in the collectivist society with USA Teller in the individualism society found that similarity of personality and peer communication influenced peer support. Burnett's research (2005) found that personality influenced on peer support, and found that peer support increased outcome.

Therefore, Bacharach *et al.* (2005); Baum (1991); Thomas, (1993); Fried and Tieggs (1993); Walz and Niehoff (1996); Uzzi (1996); Blau (1977); Ibarra (1997); Schaubroeck and Lam (2002); and Burnett (2005) stated that peer support increased peer cohesiveness, and peer support did not come from demography similarity, instead of peer interpersonal relationship and high information sharing, *trust*. People or member interaction improved decision making, promotion.

Well-being is reflected in job satisfaction, indicated by individual stress. Parasuraman *et al.* (1992) stated that work-family domains, job satisfaction, and family satisfaction were well-being indicators. Higgins and Duxbury (1992) stated that job satisfaction is a measurement component of work-life, and family satisfaction is a measurement component of family life. Wahyuni (2010) found that spouse support did not influence job satisfaction; on the other side, *organizational* support influenced job satisfaction positive and significant. Spouse support influenced family satisfaction positively, and organizational support did not influence family satisfaction. Based on the

goodness of fit conclusion that spouse support and organizational support influence well-being significantly. Social support variable does not moderate the relation between stressor and well-being; therefore, the hypothesis formulated as follows:

Hypothesis 4: Peer support mediates the influence of intergroup knowledge and information sharing toward job satisfaction and family satisfaction.

We strongly encourage authors to use this document for the preparation of the camera-ready. Please follow the instructions closely to make the volume look as uniform as possible (Moore and Lopes, 1999).

Please remember that all the papers must be in English and without orthographic errors.

Do not add any text to the headers (do not set running heads) and footers, not even page numbers, because the text will be added electronically.

For the best viewing experience, the used font must be Times New Roman, on a Macintosh use the font named times, except on special occasions, such as program code (Section 2.3.7).

3 RESEARCHED METHOD

This research uses quantitative design. This research aim is figuring out the effect of *intergroup knowledge* and *information sharing* toward *well-being* (including job satisfaction and family satisfaction) that is mediated by peer support, especially for dual-career couples. This research set is a survey of data collecting techniques, with married employees individually analysis, to get high generalization.

Population research is all *dual career-couples* or a married couple of employees of Hospital because these dual career-couples need to build their characteristics of Hospital employees. The number of this research respondent is 186 employees. Collected questionnaire responses are 173 or about 93% response rate 93,01%, and it is good response rate of survey research in accordance to Hester & Dickerson (1984) statement that at least five times items of questionnaire statement, and Sekaran (2000) statement that at least 10 times research variables.

3.1 Validity and Reliability

Validity testing is conducted by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the Nilai loading factor at least

0,50. These loading factors more than 0,5, which means the instrument of measurement is valid. Reliability testing conducted by Cronbach's Alpha. The research instruments are *reliable* since the Cronbach's Alpha minimum 0,60. The item of intergroup knowledge and information sharing loading factor more than 0,5 that mean all item are valid.

The reliability examination of peer support that counted from, flexibility, communication, and cooperative indicators. This examination shows that these indicators are 0,848. Flexibility indicator 0,848, and communication indicator 0,881. Cooperative indicator 0,905. Cronbach's alpha more than 0,6, which means the variables are reliable.

Job satisfaction and family satisfaction CFA analysis shows that all questionnaire items loading factor more than 0,5; thereby, all questionnaire items of job satisfaction and family satisfaction are valid. Cronbach's alpha reliability of job satisfaction 0,842 and the reliability of family satisfaction 0,822. This means all questionnaire items of job satisfaction and family satisfaction are reliable.

3.2 Analysis of Multiple Regression

This multiple regression analysis is conducted by SPSS version 16.0 for windows.

3.3 Intergroup Knowledge and Information Sharing Influence toward Peer Support Analysis

The result of intergroup knowledge and information sharing toward peer support influence analysis shown in the 4.5. The result shows that intergroup knowledge influence positive and significant toward peer support ($\beta = 0,288$; $p < 0,05$). The contribution of intergroup knowledge determining peer support is 28,80%. The influence of information sharing toward peer support is significant ($\beta = 0,988$; $p < 0,05$). The contribution of information sharing determining peer support is 98,80%.

The goodness of fit or contribution of intergroup knowledge and information sharing determining peer support is 57,30% ($R^2 = 0,573$; $p = 0,000$) and simultaneously influences positive and significant toward peer support. Intergroup knowledge and information sharing that consists of diligent behavior have a significant positive influence on peer support ($F = 48.942$; $p = 0,000$). Intergroup knowledge and information sharing consist of work flexibility that has a significant positive influence on peer support as ($F = 173.887$; $p = 0,000$). Intergroup knowledge

and information sharing consists of communication has a positive and significant influence on peer support as ($F = 94.329$; $p = 0,000$). Intergroup knowledge and information sharing consists of cooperative, has a significant positive influence on peer support as ($F = 25.992$; $p = 0,000$). Thereby, hypothesis 1 is supported.

3.4 Intergroup Knowledge and Information Sharing Influence toward Well-being Analysis

The result of intergroup knowledge and information sharing influence toward well-being shown in table 4.5. The analysis result shows that intergroup knowledge does not influence well-being in the workplace with ($\beta = -0,086$; $p > 0,05$), thereby hypothesis 2a is not supported. Information sharing information does not influence well-being in the workplace with ($\beta = 0,178$; $p > 0,05$), thereby hypothesis 2b is not supported.

3.5 Intergroup Knowledge and Information Sharing Influence toward Well-being Analysis Mediated by Peer Support

Table 4.6. Shows details of the influence of intergroup knowledge toward well-being. The influence of intergroup knowledge toward well-being is negative and not significant ($\beta = -0,086$; $p = 0,103$). The influence of information sharing toward well-being is positive by not significant with ($\beta = 0,178$; $p = 0,173$). Thereby, the influence of peer support toward well-being is positive but not significant, with ($\beta = 0,034$; $p = 0,643$). The influence of intergroup knowledge, information sharing, and peer support toward well-being are positive but not significant, with ($R^2 = 0,021$; $p = 0,245$).

The analysis of intergroup knowledge and information sharing influence toward well-being that mediated by peer support, shows in table 4.6, that although intergroup knowledge and information sharing variables influence positive toward peer support, the regression coefficient is not significant. Thereby, a causal relationship between peer support and well-being is not significant. It means peer support does not mediate the influence of intergroup knowledge and information sharing toward well-being, or hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Variable	β	t/ F	R ²	Sig
Constanta	8.425	8.423		0,000
<i>Intergroup knowledge</i> interaction toward peer support	0,288	3.654		0,000
<i>Sharing Informasi</i> Interaction toward peer support	0,988	8.717		0,000
<i>Intergroup knowledge</i> Interaction and <i>Information Sharing</i> toward peer support		109.818	0,573	0,000
Intergroup knowledge interaction and information <i>Sharing</i> toward diligent behavior (Y1)			48.942	0,000 ^a
Intergroup knowledge and <i>Information Sharing</i> toward Flexibility (Y2)			173.887	0,000 ^a
Constanta	8.425	8.423		0,000
<i>Intergroup knowledge</i> interaction toward peer support	0,288	3.654		0,000
Intergroup knowledge interaction and <i>information Sharing</i> toward diligent behavior (Y1)			48.942	0,000 ^a
Intergroup knowledge			173.887	0,000 ^a

and Information Sharing toward Flexibility (Y2)				
Intergroup knowledge interaction and information Sharing toward Communication (Y3)			94.329	0,000 ^a
Intergroup knowledge a piece of information sharing Interaction toward Cooperative (Y4)			25.992	0,000 ^a
Intergroup knowledge interaction toward <i>Well-Being</i>	-0,086	-1,110		0,269
Information Sharing Interaction toward <i>Well-Being</i>	0,178	1,367		0,173
Peer support Interaksi toward <i>Well-Being</i>	0,034	0,464		0,643
Intergroup knowledge interaction and Information sharing and peer support toward <i>Well-Being</i>		1.398	0,021	0,245

4 DISCUSSION

The descriptive statistics show that response average of intergroup knowledge variable (X1) is 4,09, and average response of information sharing variable (X2) is 4,01, and response average of peer support variable (Y) is 4,19; that indicates the organization is compact and has nice communication climate in order to improve knowledge and increase peer

support in the teamwork. This condition indicates that organization members comprehend the importance of cooperative climate in achieving organizational goals. It means they support each other in the workplace.

The average response of job satisfaction (Z1) is 3,65, which means the employees have moderate job satisfaction in the workplace. The average response of the family satisfaction variable (Z2) is 3,77, which means the employees have a moderate family satisfaction level. The average response of the well-being variable (Z) is 3,96, which means the employees have moderate job satisfaction and moderate family satisfaction. Most of the employees are young workers with 25 up to 34-year-old, and diploma education level, and low work experience less than a 10-year level. Robbin & Judge (2007) stated that this kind of young employees tends to resign to find out the better opportunity of work, that produces a high turnover. It means that employees with low work experiences tend to have low job satisfaction, vice versa employees with high work experiences because the high tenure tends to have high job satisfaction.

The result of Multiple regression analysis indicates the same result with Bacharach et al. (2005), Schaubroeck & Lam (2002), Ibarra (1997), Thomas (1993), Fried & Tieg (1993), Baum, (1991), Kirmeyer (1987), Love (1981), Cob (1980), O'Reilly III (1977), Blau (1977), Thomas & Balk (1969) finding that supportive relationships including intergroup knowledge and information sharing influence positive significant toward peer support, though in heterogenous teamwork, especially on decision making quality. This research found that intergroup knowledge and information sharing influence positive significant toward peer support.

This research shows different conclusions with Walz dan Niehoff (1996), Inman's (2001) research, that stated the closer brotherhood of employees the lower job satisfaction, especially in career, promotion, and compensation. Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1992), Higgin and Duxbury (1992), Wahyuni (2010) find out that family support influence career development in the workplace. Organization support consists of peer support, and direct supervisor support influences well-being, which consist of job satisfaction and family satisfaction. Higgin and Duxbury (1992) stated that well-being consists of job satisfaction and family satisfaction functions as a component of family life quality. Organizational support, especially peers, support, influences well-being.

Lilius (2006), Kim (2003), Mc.Cormick (2001), Bacharach et al. (2000) Ibarra, (1997), Thomas (1993), Fried & Tiegs (1993). Podsakoff et al. (2000). Jackson & William (1985) Harkins & Jackson (1985), DeNisi et al. (1983), Latane (1981) stated that the closeness of an employee's brotherhood relationship increases the brotherhood significance in the workplace. This employee closeness increases their career success, self-confidence, and increase trust in the workplace, and professionalism. This employee closeness reduces stress in the workplace and supports each other in the workplace so that they improve individual and teamwork performance. Weiner (1980a.b, 1986, 1995), Smith et al. (1983). Stated that peer attribution (locus of causality, controllability, and stability) based on attribution theory, generally explains the employee's willingness to support each other and to cooperate that improve organization outcome.

This research found that peer support influences positive significant toward well-being, neither job satisfaction nor family satisfaction. Although this research supports the prior research, this research finding conforms with (Robbin & Judge's, 2007) explanation that employee work experience tends to increase turnover. Younger and well-experienced employees tend to resign to find out a better job that improves job satisfaction. It means that young employees tend to have a low level of job satisfaction, vise Versa the old employees tend to be steady and get a high level of job satisfaction.

The failure to detect the influence of the mediating effect of peer support, probably because of the little amount of sample and because of situational peer support rising in the workplace. This research found that young employees tend to resign to find a better opportunity for a career, producing a high *turnover*. This condition is enhanced by the information in the workplace if the employees receive positive information from trust peer in the workplace, the employees tend to be glad, vice versa the employees get stress, and induce low performance (Kloeppel, 2006).

It is important to check the mediating effect of peer support toward well-being variable again, to cope with the career development of the dual-career couple.

REFERENCES

- Ashford, S. J. & Tsui, A. S., 1991. Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(2):251-280.
- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P. A., & McKinney, V. 2000. Boundary management tactics and logics of action: The case of peer-support providers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45:704-736.
- Bacharach, S. B. & Bamberger, P. A., 2005. Diversity and homophily at work: Supportive relations among white and African-American peers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4):619-644.
- Balk, W. L., 1964. Status perceptions of management "Peer". *Academy of Management Journal*, December 1964:431-437.
- Baron, Reuben M & David A. Kenny. 1986. The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Consideration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Bartol, K. M., Durham, C. C., & Poon, J. M. L., 2001. Influence of performance evaluation rating segmentation on motivation and fairness perceptions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(6):1106-1119.
- Beehr, T. A., Walsh, J. T., & Taber, T. D., 1976. Relationship of stress to individually and organizationally valued states: higher-order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61:41-47.
- Beehr, T. A., & McGrath, J. E., 1992. Social support, occupational stress, and anxiety. *anxiety, stress & coping: An International Journal*, 5:7-19.
- Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A., 2000. Work stressor and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance; *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21:391-405.
- Borman, W. C., White, L. A., & Dorsey, D. W., 1995. Effects of rate task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1):168-177.
- Bradway, L. K., 2002. Effect of upward influence tactics on coworker: An equity perspective, *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Brief, A. P., 1980. Peer assessment revisited a brief comment on Kane & Lawler; *Psychology Bulletin*, 88(1):78-89.
- Burnett, D. D., 2005. A personality trait activation framework applied to coworker preference, *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*
- Chapell, N. L., & Novak, M., 1992. The role of support in alleviating stress among nursing assistants. *The Gerontologist*, 32:351-359.
- Cobb, A. T., 1980. Informal influence in the formal organization: Perceived sources of power among work unit peers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(1):155-161.
- Cumming, A., 1997. The radicalness of employee ideas: An interactive model of co-worker networks and problem-solving Styles. *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Creswell, J. W., 1994. *Research Design, Qualitative & Quantitative Approach*. SAGE Publications. London. New Delhi.

- Crook, A. M. S., 2001. Marital quality in a dual-career couple: Impact of role overload and coping resources. Dissertation yang tidak dipublikasikan
- De Nisi, A. S., Randolph, W. A. & Blencoe, A. G., 1983. Potential problems with peer ratings'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(3):457-464.
- De Nisi, A. S., & Mitchell, J. L., 1976. An analysis of peer ratings as predictors and criterion measures and a proposed new application. *Academy of Management Review*, April:369-374.
- Doyle, K. O. & Crichton, L. I., 1978. Student, peer, and self-evaluations of college instructors; *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(5): 815-826.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B., 1999. Effects and timing of development peer appraisals in self-managing workgroups; *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1):58-74.
- Dyson, Faith. 2006. The Relationship Between Optimism and Work-Family Enrichment and Their Influence on Psychological Well-Being. Thesis. Drexel University.
- Egdorf, K. L., 1996. Communicating with coworkers during organizational downsizing: A social construction perspective on sense-making and social support interactions; *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Farrel, S. K., 2005. Coworker Perceptions of distribution justice in response to rewarded organizational citizen behavior: The role of attributions; *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Fox, W. M., 1973. Dimensional analysis of the least preferred co-worker scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(2):192-194.
- Fox, S., 1989. Perceived similarity and accuracy of peer rating; *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(5):781-786.
- Glesspen, A. V., 1997. The development of a coworker relationship that supports or inhibits continuous learning; *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Grandey, A. A., 2003. When "The Show Must Go On": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery; *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1): 86-96.
- Hair, Joseph. Jr; Rolph E. Anderson; Ronald L. Tatham; and William C. Black. 1998. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Fifth Edition, Prentice-Hall.
- Haris, M. M., and Schaubroeck, 1988. A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peers, and peer-supervisor ratings; *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41:43-62.
- Hart, J. W., 1999. Achievement motivation and expected coworker effort on collective task performance; *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Heaney, C. A., Price, R. H. Rafferty, J., 1995. Increasing coping resources at work: A field experiment to increase social support, improve work team functioning, and enhance employee mental health. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16:335-353.
- Hester, S. B., dan Kitty, G. D., 1984. Serving dual-career families: Problem or opportunity? *Journal Extension*. <http://joe.org/joe/1984july/04.html>.
- Hicks, J. M., 1967. Comparative validation of attitude measures by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 27: 985-995.
- Hollander, E. P., 2000. The validity of peer nominations in predicting a distant performance criterion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 10(6):434-438.
- Hollenbeck, J. R., 2000. A structural approach to external and internal person-team fit. *International Association for Applied Psychology*, 49(3):534-549.
- Holzbach, R. L., 1978. Rater bias in performance rating: Supervisor, self, and peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5):579-588.
- Ibarra, H. 1997. Paving an alternative route: Gender difference in managerial networks. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60:91-102.
- Inman, J., 2001. Relationships among employees job satisfaction, satisfaction with coworkers interpersonal relationship styles; *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Jackson, S. E., et al., 1993. Some differences make a difference: Individual dissimilarity and group heterogeneity as correlates of recruitment, promotions, and turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5): 675-689.
- Kane, J. S. & Lawler III, E. E., 1978. Method of peer assessment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3): 555-586.
- , 1980. In defense of peer assessment a rebuttal to brief's critique. *Psychology Bulletin*, 88(1):80-81.
- Keup, L., Bruning, N. S., & Seers, A., 2004. Members, leaders, and team: Extending LMX to co-worker relationships. *Quebec*, 1-14.
- Kim, P. H., 2003. When private beliefs shape collective reality: The effects of beliefs about co-workers on group discussion and performance. *Management Science*, 49(6): 801-815.
- Kirmeyer, S. L. & Lin, T. R., 1987. Social support: Its relationship to observed communication with peers and superiors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30(1):138-151.
- Kloppel, E., 2006. Workplace disclosure of intimate partner abuse: An examination of supervisory and coworker support; *Disertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Kohli, A. K., & Jaworski, B. J., 1994. The influence of coworker feedback on salespeople. *Journal of Marketing*, 58:82-94.
- Kovera, M. B., & McAuliff, B. D., 2000. The effects of peer review and evidence quality on judge evaluations of psychological science: Are judges effective gatekeepers? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(4):574-586.
- Kram, K. E. & Isabella, L. A., 1985. Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1):110-132.
- Labianca, G., Brass, D. J., & Gray, B., 1998. Social networks and perceptions of intergroup conflict: The role of negative relationships and third parties. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1):55-67.
- LePine, J. A., et al., 1997. Effects of individual differences in the performance of hierarchical decision-making

- teams: Much more than g. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5):803-811.
- LePine, J. A., & Dyne, L. V., 2001. Peer responses to low performers: An attributional model of helping in the context of groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1):67-84.
- Lilius, J. M., 2006. Being there or being competent? How co-worker support contributes to unit performance. *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*
- Loughry, M. L., 2002. A co-worker is watching: Performance implications of peer monitoring. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1-6.
- Love, K. G., 1981. Comparison of peer assessment methods: Reliability, validity, friendship bias, and user reaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(4):451-457.
- Maurer, T. J., & Tarulli, B. A., 1996. Acceptance of peer/upward performance appraisal systems: Role of work context factors and beliefs about managers' development capability. *Human Resource Management*, 35:217-241.
- Mayfield, E. C., 1998. Value of peer nominations in predicting life insurance sales performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(4):319-323.
- McEvoy, G. M., & Buller, P. F., 1987. User acceptance of peer appraisal in an industrial setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 40(4):785-794.
- McCormick, M. D., 2001. Group cohesiveness and coworker ability as determinants of social loafing and social compensation. *Desertasi tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Miller, B. K., 2002. Helping disable coworker: An attribution - based laboratory experiment; *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Miller, C. C., 2006. Peer review in the organizational and management sciences: Prevalence and effects of reviewer hostility, bias, and dis census. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3):425-431.
- Miller, K. R., 2005. Supervisor and recipient perceptions of altruism: is coworker help always helpful? *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Mitchel, K. E., 1997. The Relationship of personality trait and coworker norm to performance and cheating. *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Morgan, R. B., 1993. Self and co-worker perceptions of ethics and their relationships to leadership and salary. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(1):200-214.
- Murphy, K. R., 1982. Relationship between observational accuracy and accuracy in Evaluating performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3): 320-325.
- O'Reilly III, C. A., 1977. Supervisors and peers as information sources, group supportiveness, and individual decision-making performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(5):632-635.
- Pickworth, R., 2005. Employee value congruence with supervisors and coworkers: A cross-cultural study. *Disertasi tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Powel, M.G., 1948. Comparisons of self-rating, peer-rating, and experts ratings of personality adjustment. *Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 8:225-247.
- Parasurahman, S dan Jeffrey, H. G., 1992. Role stressors, social support, and well-being among two-career couples. *Journal of Organization Behavior*. 13: 339-356.
- Randell, M. L., 1998. Coworker reaction to a partner with a physical disability. *Desertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan*.
- Rice, R. W., 1976. Psychometric properties of the esteem for the least preferred coworker (LPC) Scale. *Academy of Management Review*, January: 106-118.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R.J., & Lirtzman, S.I., 1970. Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15:150-163.
- Robbin, Stephen P and Timothy A. Judge, 2007. *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson International Edition, Twelfth Editon, Prentice-Hall.
- Schaubroeck, J. & Lam, S. S. K., 2002. How similarity to peers and supervisor influences organizational advancement in different cultures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6):1120- 1136.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Johnson, R. H., 1973. Effect of race on peer ratings in an industrial situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3): 237-241.
- Schimmack, U., Phanikiran, R., Shigehiro, O., Vivian, D., dan Stephen A. M., 2002. Culture, personality, and subjective well-being: Integrating process models of life satisfaction. *Journal Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(4): 582-593.
- Sekaran, Umma. 2000. *Research Methods for Business*. Third Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sherony, K. M., & Green, S. G., 2002. Coworker exchange: Relationships between coworkers, LMX, and work attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3):542-548.
- Shore, T. H., et al., 1992. Construct validity of self- and peer evaluations of performance dimensions in an assessment center. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1): 42-54.
- Snell, S. A., & Youndt, M. A., 1995. Human resource management and firm performance: testing a contingency model of executive controls. *Journal of Management*, 21(4), 711-737.
- Struthers, C. W., Miller, D. L., Boudens, C. J., & Briggs, G. L., 2001. Effects of causal attributions on co-worker interactions: A social motivation perspective; *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol.23 (3):169-181.
- Suci, G. J. & Vallance, T. R., 1955. A Study of The effects of "likingness" and level of objectivity on peer rating reliabilities. *Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 16:147-152.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy., M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D., 2004. Moderators of relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3): 455-465.
- Thorsteinson, T. J., & Balzer, W. K., 1999. Effects of co-worker information on perceptions and rating of performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20: 1157-1173.

- Trevino, L. K. & Victor, B. 1992. Peer reporting of unethical behavior: A social context perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(1):38-64.
- Uzzi, B. 1996. The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61:674-698.
- Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S., 2002. The moderating influence of job performance dimensions on the convergence of supervisory and peer ratings of job performance: Un-confounding construct-level convergence and rating difficulty. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2):345-354.
- Wahyuni, P., dan Vebriwati. 2009. Analisis pengaruh self-efficacy terhadap kinerja individu yang dimoderasi oleh penetapan tujuan (goal-setting). *Jurnal Manajemen, Ekonomika Madani*, 1(1): 71-86.
- Wahyuni, P., 2009. Dukungan rekan di tempat kerja, Studi kasus pada taman kanak-kanak "Salman Al-Farisi" di Yogyakarta, proses publikasi.
- _____. 2010. Analisis dual career couple: Pengaruh work role conflict, family role stressor, dan work family conflict terhadap well-being bagi pasangan bekerja dimoderasi social support. *Performance*, 1 (2): 1-28.
- Wahyuni, P. dan Reffi Sangi, 2010. Pengaruh leader member exchange dan kualitas hubungan terhadap penilaian kinerja yang dimoderasi oleh durasi. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis, EKOBIS*. 11(2): 219-229.
- Wahyuni, P (2011) Anteseden dan konsekuensi dukungan rekan, *JMIB Jurnal Management Inovasi dan Bisnis*, vol.1. no.2:232-263.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P., 1996. Organizational citizen behaviors and their effect on organizational effectiveness in limited-menu restaurants. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*:307-311.
- Water, L. K., and Waters, C. W., 2002. Peer nominations as predictors of short-term sales performance; *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 54. no.1: 42-44.
- Williams, K. D., & Karau, S. J., 1991. Social loafing and social compensation: The effects of expectations of co-worker performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(4): 570-581.
- Wohlers, A. J., & London, M., 1989. Rating of managerial characteristics: evaluation difficulty, co-worker agreement, and self-awareness. *Personnel Psychology*, vol.42: 235- 261.
- Yin, R. K., 1994. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Volume 5. SAGE Publications. London. New Delhi.
- Yu, H. & Murphy, K. R., 1993. Modesty bias in self-ratings of performance: A Test of the cultural relativity hypothesis. *Personnel Psychology*, 357-363.
- Zellar, K. L., & Perrewe, P. L., 2001. Affective personality and the content of emotional social support coping in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3): 459-467.