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Abstract
The attributions to HR policy have been widely used in developing a theoretical foundation for person environment fit and work family practices. This research construes the theories of attribution and conceptualized that with the cognitive process under the domain of work family practice which is highly assimilated with perceived work family person environment fit (WEPEF). Moreover, this study has differentiated the attributions under work family practices with a particular environmental source and certain attributions to the intent’s source while adopting a specific practice. This study has also argued that available supplies with an employee to integrate or segment under the domains of work and family significantly indulged with attributions. Moreover, the study links the attribution process with different employees’ attitudes and behaviors pertained to different levels of environments (supervisor and...
organization) to have a fit mechanism of work family practices. Finally, this research contributed a consistent picture of work family fit which would also be helpful for future research.
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1: Introduction

Managers and supervisors are considered key decision makers of any organization. Their role is considered critical in the formulation of policies and practices which help their employees in managing their work and family roles. The term Work Family (WF) practices include three essential components, 1) formal practices (like some onsite programs for children), 2) informal practices (like the setting of flexible schedule of an individual with his/her supervisor) and 3) cultural norms of the organization (like certain expectation in the use of technological tools by which one can perform work from his/her home) (Kossek & Michel, 2011). For long, WF practices have been extensively researched domain among researchers and practitioners, yet the concept needs more clarity and advancement in terms of its conceptualization (Greenhaus & ten Brummelhuis, 2013; Mathews et al., 2016).

Similarly, in recent years, researchers have argued that Person Environment Fit (PEF) can be viewed as a developing paradigm and should be paid more attention towards the WF issues and their application (Matthews et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2009). As per Kristof-Brown & Billsberry (2013), PEF is aligned with a few of the intrinsic and extrinsic organizational factors, which further shape certain individuals’ attitudes and behaviors. According to various researchers, PEF seems to be a helping tool in understanding the WF practices and their effectiveness within the organization (Piszczech & Berg, 2014; Ollier-Malaterre & Foucreault, 2017). However, PEF needs advancement in its theoretical framework from the perspective of WF practices and their potential outcomes on the organization.

Nevertheless, the extensive literature on PEF and WF shows a critical gap that how individuals interpret, experience, and generate the ‘Fit’. Moen et al., (2008), stated that this understanding is somehow stated as the “WF black box” and yet gained very little attention in the context of research. This understanding thus requires employee perception regarding fit and employee attitude to perceive that fit. It is, therefore, necessary to understand the process that creates alignment between WF practices and PEF. The literature therefore must be contributed more with the perspective of WF and PEF to escalate fit perceptions. Further more, HRM contains rigorous Attribution theories, which are essentially helpful to examine and understand typical cognitive processes where individuals start to choose certain actions to manage WF interface following the ongoing policies of WF and environment.

The core purpose of this study is to integrate attribution to HR theories in the conceptual framework of WF and PEF. This study explains that how employees adopt certain attribution for both motivational intent and environmental sources to WF practices. Additionally, it also explains that how an appropriate WF fit process could be generated by shaping with the HR attributions. In this regard, this study expands the research by
including the border view of Work Family Person Environment Fit (WFPEF) which helps to understand that how the environment belongs to certain employee attitudes and behaviors. The theoretical framework for PEF has mainly been acknowledged by WF researchers to understand individual outcomes and organizational practices, however, its conceptual circle is very broad and thus requires some additional theoretical grounds to expand the concept of WF. The fit between work and family is being explored by researchers, and used several ways to reach on, but a large portion is yet unknown in the perceptive of ultimate outcomes for an individual. Meanwhile, this study has incorporated the theoretical underpinnings of attribution in the framework of PEF. This framework would be more viable and would be potentially helpful for WF researchers. This study also explains that how these WF practices are conceptually linked with the attribution theory of HR. Hevett et al., (2018), revealed the work of attributions to HR is being splinted into multiple streams and it is recommended by scholars to integrate these streams having intent, process, and content aspects to attribution for HR policy (Ostroff & Bowen, 2016).

This conceptual study, therefore, has drawn a combination of the attribution process. This study has touched the functional area which is yet untapped in the content of attribution to HR policy and WFPEF. Started from explaining the theory of attribution and its application in HRM, this study has discussed two main components of attribution, 1) Source and 2) Intent. The source includes the person or individual who is responsible for such practice and on the other hand, intent contains particular purpose and objective of that practice. Subsequently, the study reviewed the literature on WF practice and its current state. Lastly, the study incorporated attributions to HR policy in the context of the WFPEF framework. To achieve the conceptual underpinnings, the study has also developed some propositions based on theoretical grounds (see Fig-1).

2:Attributions to Human Resource

The parameters for social psychological concepts are highly integrated with Attribution Theory (Weiner, 1986; Kelley, 1973; Jones & Davis, 1965; Heider, 1958). It has a main concern to explain the certainty and causes of success and uncertainty about failure (Martinko et al., 2011). This theory intends to explain the causes faced by individuals against of particular action or event. Nishii et al., (2008), explain that this theory is free from the specific domain of WF practices, so, the theory does not or may not explicitly captures the domain-specific process of attribution. Moreover, Kelley (1973), considered attribution theory as a dramatic classification for “Questions and Issues” of a large class or could be pertained in the organizational context like self-efficacy (Gist & Mitchell, 1992), work exhaustion (Moore, 2000), and WF conflict/interference (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In the context of HR policy, the attribution theory is largely applicable. However, studies conducted under various domains and contexts contain different aspects of the attribution process which is nearly the same as integrated with the social psychological attribution process (Hewett et al., 2008).
Hewett et al., (2018), based on the work of Heider (1958), differentiates the attribution in terms of internal and external context. As per them, internal attribution is likely to happen when an action or set of actions are being assigned to an individual and are finally available in front of the user. On the other side, external attributions are likely to happen when an action or set of actions are assigned following a particular contextual environment or status. According to Kelley (1973), the attribution process can bring up together with external and internal contexts. Nishii et al., (2008), reported that in the extensive literature of HR policy and management, the attribution process has been evolved with the comprehensive concept of HR attribution theory. This evolved concept brings the locus of causality among employees who are often involved with internal and external HR practices. As the outcomes from external or internal HR systems can be emphasized as harmful & helpful for employees as well as the organization, depending on the organizational contingencies (Hwett et al., 2018).

This study refers that attribution to an employee is intensely an intent attribution which is a rationale behind a particular HR policy. This intent attribution can be explained as employees’ understanding regarding why a particular practice is adopted by the organization (Nishii et al., 2008). Moreover, Nishii et al., (2008), stated that employees may have dissimilar attribution for the same HR policy and practice which simultaneously generates some outcomes like citizenship behavior, satisfaction, and commitment. According to Koys (1991), and Bowen & Ostr off (2004), the attitudes and behaviors of employees are mainly concerned with their judgment that how a practice is perceived. In addition, studies have also elaborated that how attribution to employees can be examined based on diverse effects on individual’s practices like high-performance practices are considered and attributed to satisfy organizational goals and objectives (Shantz et al., 2016).
However, this research study brings evidence of the growing importance for perception among employees regarding “intent” highlighted towards outcomes of practice (Ostr off & Bowen, 2016). Ostr off & Bowen (2016) revealed that it is good to understand why “intent” attribution is behind a particular HR policy, but it is not sufficient, we do understand that how “source” of attribution by which an HR policy begin to be implicated. Hewett (2018) considered it as the second stream for attribution to HR policy and he contributed essential and strong concepts in the study of Bowen and Ostr off (2004). According to Ehrnrooth & Björkman (2012), the HR system must be strongly implicated, so the sources do handle it professionally, because it directly affects the employee’s behaviors both positively and negatively. In addition, organization, and supervisors both are considered major sources to contend with HR attribution (Hewett et al., 2018).

This study explains that organizations, supervisors, and other aspects of the organizational environment, are subject to the attribution to HR policy. Moreover, to the attribution process of the intent regarding a specific HR policy, the literature reports that most of the employees can offer a different set of attribution related to a particular source, which pertains to different actors in the organizational surroundings or environment. Although attribution to HR recognizes the organization’s importance in shaping the HR policy, this study also assumes the important role contributed by supervisors related to WF-HR practices (Eaton, 2003). To sum up, this research accounts for and frames the WFPEF to explain the employees’ role of attribution to HR policy.

3: Person Environment Fit’s (PEF) Applications and WF

According to various researchers, the concept of PEF has been largely used in shaping expatriate adjustment, individual differences, job attitudes, and comprehensively for HRM practices (Morgenson & Campion, 2008; Christoph et al., 2002; Helberberger et al., 2013; Christoph Brown et al., 2005). Further, the fit contains the notion of the correspondence between the needs of some individuals and organizational ability to instantly meet those needs (van Vianen, 2018). People adapt “fit” with different "environmental levels", these levels may be classified as co workers, a job, a supervisor, and organizations (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). Further, a multidimensional model that reflects an individual's adaptation of fit to his/her profession, organization, group, work, and these individuals would independently contribute the adapted fit to the global environment fit and contributes the results such as withdrawal, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Edwards & Billsberry, 2010).

The theoretical/conceptual work that applies the framework of PEF to WF research has been carried out extensively, typically varying between the domains of WF roles and their needs. For instance, in the domain of WF, the cognitive appraisal of an employee is taken as “fit”, these appraisals contain different dimensions having resources assessment that allow them to be effective in the WF role (Moen et al., 2008). Specific levels of fit in the workplace (such as fit with a supervisor or organization in the domain of work) have yet not received substantial consideration in research studies of WF fit. The model on WFPEF developed by Edwards and Rothbard (2005), is considered the...
most authentic and complete WFPEF model to date. His model provided a framework under the domains of Work and Family (W&F). This model focuses on how the fit processes and creates strain, tension, or stress for an individual through the interactions between the domains of W&F and outlines many possible types of fit procedures where it works. For Instance, the model sees “coping” as a method that individuals can use to increase PEF under the domain of WF. Although this model is expedient to consider PEF under the domain of WF with a higher level, however, it does not focus on how WF policies and procedures are specifically linked with “Fit”. There is also some other broad model of WFPEF (such as Vodanaf, 2005).

The researchers examined theoretical models and studied specific aspects of fit in the WF field to further improve the environment for WF fit. The center of this study regarding WFPET has focused on taking a review of most familiar and cited studies which are based on ability and segmentation preference (Piszczek & Berg, 2014; Kreiner, 2006; Barnett, Gareis, & Brennan, 1999). The segmentation (low) preference generally prefers to connect with the domains of WF, this connection moves frequently and quickly among them, while the segmentation (high) preference prefers to minimize the barriers and transitions between the domains of WF (Nippert-Eng, 1996; Ashforth et al., 2000). However, up-till now, attribution theories are rarely used in research that is appropriate for WFPEF. Moen et al., (2008), reveal fit’s theoretical framework for the scientific evaluation of fit components: such as 1) anticipation, attribution, and appraisals. Appraisals include perception of an employee, WF resources, job needs, and family outcomes that are typically related to WF disputes. Therefore, there is a subjective and objective relationship in terms of WF towards Fit’s assessment. This represents the first but most widespread application of the theoretical association in the structure of the WF. Moreover, balancing the resources in the future and anticipating the needs of the WF can help to understand how appropriate “fit” will lead to employees' attitudes and behaviors. At several events, it becomes tough for employees as well as managers to sustain with certain informed strategic selections about fluctuating their environment to have a better fit.

This study contends about the Cognitive assessment process (CAP), specifically in the context of attribution, which is necessary to understand the perception as well as consequences of WF in terms of employees' attitudes and behaviors.

4: The Attribution Process and WF

The conceptual model, as shown in Fig-1 illustrates the attribution process with WF and its assimilation to WFPEF. On the left side of the model, it contains the existence of WF practices. This study will explain that how this set of WF practices give a framework of integrated/segmented supplies to employees and the whole set would be highlighted as an attribution process. Secondly, this study would also explain the outcomes of fit while supplies for integration/segmentation put forward in the underlying environment at different levels and contesting with the attribution process. Finally, this research would also explain a certain specific level of fit that would create an influence on targeted attitudes and behaviors.
Previously, this study has mentioned that there is a wide range of work in the domain of WF, but there is yet lacking regarding liking the WF concepts with PEF to justify the generalized outcomes of fit (Kreiner, 2006; Chen et al., 2009). This could provide a wide understanding and oversimplifies the several levels of the environment which an individual starts perceiving in the context of “fit levels”. Studies have remained consistent to show that co-workers, supervisors, and organizations are relatively contributing the same level to enhances the individual’s that may be able to manage the WF interface (Thompson & Prottas, 2006; Hammer et al., 2009; Eaton, 2003; Allen, 2001). According to the study of Pan & Yeh (2012), the antecedents regarding WF conflict reported that the congruence value of person-organization and person-supervisor presumes to have the necessary support from the organization as well as the supervisor. However, WF policies often contain different players in their implications. The formal design for organizational policies can be formulated by organizational leaders with the intent of betterment of organizational performance (Van De Voorde & Beijer, 2015). On the other side, supervisors normally approve or implement the meticulous use of such policies and look after with their intention, so, we can say that supervisors are like gatekeepers of these practices (Eaton, 2003). This study copes that almost all individuals create an intent and source to attribution among the practices of WF, the process is shown in Fig-1, “Attribution Process”.

In the above discussion, the internal and external attribution is not similar in attribution theory. This research argued that there is certain existence of multiple environmental entities in which individuals’ attribution falls. Moreover, the work domain (which is external attribution) considers oneself and facets with different organizational players which are directly connected with the attribution process. This study has given the focus on organization and supervisor as key players, some others would be penned in the end (discussion section). This study has put forward an argument that employees are primarily concerned and in communication with supervisors, hence, they (supervisors) are considered as a primary source to attribution process, there could be three reasons behind supervisors and employee connection concerning the attribution process. First, Sanders et al., (2014), revealed that most of the employees are not often aware of a particular set of organizational practices. Secondly, Hevett et al., (2018), reported that these are only managers/supervisors who shape the message of every organizational practice, and they bring it into the communication process with employees. Thirdly, Eaton (2003) and Berkman et al., (2010), depicted managers as gatekeepers for WF practices.

Therefore, this study expects to have appropriate acknowledgment among the employees behind every attribution (internal or external) practice which directly connected with the supervisor. Furthermore, the strength of the HR system to WF practices will examine the degree of appreciation to supervisors in the implementation of such practices. According to Bowen & Astrov (2004), an apt HR system has small lacking and leaves very little space for supervisor discretion. In addition, good HR procedures create a strong position to guide employees and reflect positive attitudes and behaviors, regardless of individual differences. However, since the strengths of the HR system vary among organizations, thus, this study assumes that depending on the
strength of the management system, WF practices will be attributed to both the supervisor and the organization. Therefore, these attributions may be controversial and are not mutually exclusive. Following propositions have been elaborated in this study.

**PROPOSITION (1a):** At different levels individuals/employee attribution to WF practices with organizations as well as supervisors, a strong organizational attribution can be a result generated from a strong WF-HR system and a strong supervisor attribution can be result generated from weaker or less strong WF-HR system.

Considering the intend of WF-practices, it is typical to extract all perceptions supplies from practice and it is also a typical portion in the process of attribution, Fig-1 shows the conceptual model. The reflection of desired behaviors is the cause of good HR procedures (Ostroff & Bowen, 2016). In the context of WF, the desired behaviors may be reflected because of how an individual maintains and accomplishes the certain role boundaries of WF. The literature of HR process particularly with intent practice has different conducts. However, this study has only picked the conduct through “well-being” and “performance”. These conducts, performance & well-being, are also consistent with WF integration/segmentation. Taking the example of “Technological Use”, Duxbury et al., (2014) and Day et al., (2010), reported that work flexibility can be managed through technological use, and it manages the WF interface and helps employees to give extra hours of work. Moreover, Piszczek (2017), contends that the use of technology while at home is also the expectation of the employee, and it is consistent with an intent that helps to integrate. In addition, employees become more detrimental who prefer such types of expectations (segmentation) compared to those preferring integration. However, organizations that encourage such employee keeping the work domain separate from the family, it can be termed as segmentation of work over family. It is possible when employees willingly paying extra work hours, restrictions in the personal use of the internet or phone calls and having limited time off from working hours. Therefore, such policies may encourage segmentation and integration or could be based on employee choice to prefer segmentation or integration. Even though we find some motivations in the previous conceptualization of attribution with respect to the concepts of well-being and performance. An intent of well-being is relatively more adjustable between the work practice of integration or segmentation which are in the use of employees regarding WF roles. On the next side, an intent of performance is relatively more rigid or strict between the work practices of integration or segmentation which are in the use of employees regarding WF roles, and the choice would only be made to have with integration or segmentation. In this regard, supervisory support is most important in managing intent attribution which results in WF outcomes. Moreover, this explanation is supported by different studies (Moen et al., 2017; Hammer et al., 2009).

**PROPOSITION (1b):** A source (supervisor, organization) that is attributed and perceived by employees also makes a sense of performance and wellbeing (intent attribution) in line with their respective source points.
While making logical reasoning, this study has argued that a suitable arrangement of attribution with respect to source and intent is emphasized by the available supplies with an individual to reconcile or filling up his/her WF role. It is extensively observed in the literature that there are interchangeable concepts of supplies and practice, however, proposition 1b stated that attribution (intent and source) of employees is based on the preferences and right signals generated by the attribution process to use the segmentation or integration of WF roles. Fig-1 shows that WF practices have generated integration or segmentation supplies, however, employees with certain supplies begin to extract from practices that are reliant on the process of attribution. Supplies to an employee are the most important attribute because it relies on perfection or equilibrium between need and supply (fit supplies), and source and intent practice to certain attribution that influences what degree of supplies are necessarily available to an employee. Consequently, it determines and contributed an essential role to WFF (Work-Family-Fit).

Some studies (Such as Piszczek & Berg, 2014; Chen et al., 2009; Kreiner, 2006) is consistent with this point that fit can be improved where the employee can take his/her preference about segmentation or integration. These studies had a big research gap as they did not account for anything with source or intent behind a particular practice which pushes to make the necessary supply. Firstly, an intent is attributable with supplies, thus, it is argued in this research that practice can produce supplies either with segmenting, integrating, or might be based on employee choice and preference whether to integrate or segment. If a particular practice of an organization pertains to the motivation of well-being, then it must be based on employee choice and preference. On the other side, when intent seems to be in practice based on performance then it is relatively either on the side of integration or segmentation and becomes consistent with a particular degree of performance. In brief, a better degree of fit may be achieved by having fit policies associated with certain preferences of segmentation and if policies are inconsistent then it may achieve quite a lower degree of fit. Similarly, practices of well-being (which allows individuals whether to be with segmentation or integration) can improve the level of fit when there is a perfect match between the integration or segmentation supplies.

PROPOSITION (2): The WF policies of employees can be highlighted with integration/segmentation supplies which may be moderated through attribution’s intent and source and such type of practice to the concept of employee well-being that may provide whether integration supplies or segmentation supplies, although, certain performance-based practice is only one-sided supplies either integration or segmentation.

In addition, the attribution’s source contributes a significant role in examine and association between Fit and integration/segmentation supplies; the attribution’s intent is probably not possible without attribution’s source. As it is a notion that fit occurs at its different level because of the perceived environment, so, source attribution also affects the level of fit in a particular environment. Moreover, it is likely to have a high degree of fit at one place and weaker at another. Therefore, this research cope that the fit may
be affected through the attributed source of supply at a particular environmental level concerned with integration/segmentation supplies. In some of the cases, employees implicate different ways of attribution practice to both organizations as well as the supervisor. For instance, sometimes organization provides flexible work hours to the employee but in the presence of supervisor employee become more restrictive and does not have flexibility in work hours and supervisors wanted employees to physically appear at the workplace. Thus, this scenario explains the high level of preference and motivation (well-being) for employees as the organization offers employees to manage his/her working hours at their desired schedule. Although, the supervisory restrictions over employees bring up more productivity (segmentation/integration supplies) and are considered performance based.

Following the findings of some previous studies, this research has argued that the capability to integrate or segment is in line with the level of preferences that brought an expanded fit. Moreover, this study has contended that behind the curtain of integration/segmentation supplies there is some sort of intent and source attribution which determines the degree of fit with respect to a particular environment. This study does not constrain to a specific WF practice either with integration or segmentation supply; moderately, it is linked with the level of supply to its source and perceived intent. Hence, supplies provided through a source and practice may be attributed as the essential determinant of WFF.

**PROPOSITION (3): A WFF would be more (strongly) affected through a particular level of environment and individual when certain practice is attributed strongly with a source by an individual to that environmental level.**

In the implication process of attribution practice, the employee attitudes and behaviours are more important with environmental level. The research on WFF frequently investigated employee-orientated attitudes and behaviours (such as stress or WF conflict), the conceptual framework of this research has comprehensively included both intent and source as attribution factors that will make a change in attitudes and behaviours of employees with respect to the different level of environment. According to Jones & Devis (1965), situations are of two types, favourable situation and unfavourable situation, and the theory of attribution tends to move with favourable attribution (with a favourable situation) and unfavourable attribution (with an unfavourable situation). Nishii et al., (2008), revealed that HR practices with intent attribution may be logically linked with the above concept. This research contributed advanced concepts regarding the improvement of “fit” by adding a specific level of attitudes and behaviors in the workplace. In the words of Moen et al., (2008), the outcomes for the cognitive appraisal process can be well observed from the perceived WFF.

Consistent with the model of this study, it has focused on the different environmental levels proceeded by the supervisor as well as organization to incorporate different levels of fit and affect an individual differently. For instance, considering the perception regarding organizational family support which is more proximal for WFPOF instead of WFPSF. In the same manner, considering the concept of LME (leader-member
exchange) which is more proximal with WFPSF instead of WFPOF and to be expected with having a strong association with the former than the latter. In support of this argument, the research on WF has acknowledged that certain official policies may not pledge those individuals would have right of entry to the formulated policies because constraints or limits have been made by the supervisor to their subordinates due the reasons like lacking family demands, lack of trust, and preserving productivity, etc, (Eaton, 2003).

Furthermore, the extensive literature on HR attribution recognizes that for long employees have been going through with these inconsistencies and consistencies. The attitude and behaviour of the employee are strongly reflected by a particular fit level of environment. For instance, Supervisory perception regarding WF support do strongly connected with WFPSF instead of WFPOF, and organizational perception regarding WF support do strongly connected to WFPOF instead of WFPSF. Hence, Fig-1 shows the specific level of fit which will relate to and generate a specific level of outcomes.

PROPOSITION (4): Environmental levels (like supervisors and organizations) with high WFF do positively assimilate to the targeted attitudes and behaviors of individuals with that environmental level.

As a final point, Edward & Billsberry (2010), depicted that PEF varies among the different levels of the environment, and each layer of the environment independently contributes to extracting the results of fit. Following the domain of WF, this research expects relatively the same process. In the previous discussion, this study reported that PSWFF and POWFF are not identical and produce different outcomes under the attribution process of an employee. Though, employees consciously determine the appraisals to examine the level of employee preferences and WF demands (Moen et al., 2008). Furthermore, the satisfaction of WF is a consequence of an adequate process of fit with respect to a particular level of environment, and meanwhile, it comes from the process of attribution generated by the employee. It may be possible that employees become completely satisfied with the management of WF role which undergoes to prefer organization or supervisor, who so ever provides (either organization or supervisor) integration/segmentation supplies in the management of role boundary. Considering this way, the employee may become more satisfied with the management of the WF role, but there may be a moderate level of WFF pertaining to a specific environmental level. Metaphorically, the assessment of WFF may be more holistic when fit is independently assessed at the level of the environment (Fig-1).

PROPOSITION (5): The assessment of WFF is more holistic when the fit is independently assessed at the level of environment, and it is mediated by PEF’s intensity of perception.

5: Discussion

This study has incorporated attributions to HR policy and theories of attribution associated with the implementation in the context of the WFPEF framework. This research has uniquely contributed to the available literature of attributions to HR policy
and WF. This research tends to give a more robust framework and highlighted the disparate streams of the attribution process, the model of this study would be helpful for the employee to manage WF policies under the domain of work. Moreover, this research includes both source and intent which is faced by an employee to examine or choosing integration/segmentation supplies (Ostroff & Bowen, 2016; Hewett et al., 2018). As we incorporated the deep concepts attribution to HR policy and highlighted the context of WFPEF, so, this study expands by adding the framework of the WF interface in the perspective of attributions to HR (Hewett et al., 2018).

Previously, the concepts on WFPEF had only centric with the attributions of either family or work or often did not complexly indulge with the process of attribution. This study explicitly conceptualized cognitive appraisal following the PEF and attribution to HR and previously WFPEF framework was drawn by Moen et al., (2008), without the conceptualization of cognitive appraisal. The conceptual model of this research has several implications with necessary clarity and vividness regarding the association between integration/segmentation supplies and WF practices. Previously, researchers reported that both practices and integration/segmentation supplies can be treated interchangeably (Ostroff & Bowen, 2016). This study has argued that practices and supplies may not be similar because of different levels of environments, hence, every single motivation among employees to adopt a practice depends on how they perceive it. Moreover, in-depth analysis regarding attribution to WF practices refers that the fit process may be oversimplified by having extensive operationalization of a particular fit process.

This study has also contributed that how different levels of the environment contend with certain practices of employee attribution alongside diversity among employees’ attitudes and behaviors. This study captures something outside of the domain of WF. It seems that holistically fit may be captured, the representation of holistic fit is that when there are several confounding effects generated at various levels of organization that might not pertain or indulged with overall fit to a person. Integration/segmentation is termed as familiar confounding parameters (Kreiner, 2006). This research has developed certain measures directed as “where I work” or “my workplace” as a pivotal level of environment and determines the fit between individual preferences and supplies that might lead to less degree of conflict at work & home. The WF scholars have frequently used this measure to have the preferences of segmentation. The environment is largely connected with a poor fit or good fit. Environmental levels fall under the umbrella of the workplace, and this level is perceived by employees through a source, and, to meet the source, supplies would be provided and generated from different levels of the environment. Only a holistic approach of WFPEF may overcome the severe complexities and reaped utmost results from employees. Furthermore, employee outcomes and WFF can be well understood through the conceptualization of WF practice, and this study has provided a direct understanding.

The study model of this research has comprehensively included the variations on the effectiveness of WF practices that are performed in an organization under the same policy. The environmental entities and actors are attributed with practices, and these are substantially influenced by a certain degree of employee variation. In addition, it is very
helpful to resolve such conflicting conceptualization that either to integrate or have a segment, and it is consistent with attribution research studies particularly in the context of organizations. To end with, attributions to HR policy has incorporated with the perspective of PEF, and the model has expanded some theoretical implication of attributions to HR. It is the notion that the theoretical framework of attributions and PEF are very broad, so, scholars, researchers, and academicians may find the model of this study useful to comprehend amid association between attributions to HR policy and PEF in the framework of “FIT”. Moreover, the study does not just put forth the theoretical contribution, but also suggested some practical implications below.

Firstly, the conceptual model of this research recommends that organizations may offer some practices with the intent of improvement among employee well-being, and these practices are also centric with segmentation/integration supplies. Practices with its single supply, are the policies restricting to have emails related to work in off-hours or outside of work, it may be unfavourable for employees’ PEF.

Secondly, the research model of this study argued about the environmental layers, and, suggested that there are multiple levels of environments as well as their actors to perform them, hence, employee fit be affected through a particular level of environment. Although, employee outcomes mainly rely on the fit level of the environment. The very first interest of organizations is to match or reconcile the intent of organizational practice with a particular level of environment, thus, it helps in creating synergetic alignment regarding the implementation process.

Third and finally, the research model of this study recommends that the communication system of organizations with their employee must be associated with WF practices, by doing so, the understanding regarding the intent of practice would be increased.

6: Conclusion

This research has put a centric focus on how attribution to HR policy contributes to the domain of WF practices. This study has comprehensively taken both intrinsic and extrinsic domains of attribution to WF. Intrinsic domains were mainly related to individual’s self-practice contributed to the organization, and extrinsic is related to the different levels of environments in the context of PEF that may be attributed to changing attitudes and behaviours of employees. Moreover, it is recommended for future research to enlarge the circle of attribution. Furthermore, the environmental level has been determined through supervisory and organizational support. These both are considered key components in the different levels of the environment. The reason behind selecting supervisory and organizational support was that because they are more relevant in the attribution process of WF practices, although, co-workers, unions, and regulative institutions were only suggested in the previous research of environmental fit (Berg, Kossek, Misra, & Belman, 2014; Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, &Hammer, 2011; Piszczek & Berg, 2014). The conceptual framework of this study has contributed some important theoretical arguments to understand WFF. Consequently, WFPEF is an essential measure to examine the WF interface. Moreover, this research effort to make
an easy sense of how the fit mechanism works and is controlled by stakeholders of the organization. The objective and subjective perspective of fit under the domain of WF could be well understood when implementing theories of attribution. Lastly, this study has conceptualized the operationalization of source and intent of WF practices, however, more factors could be added in future research to make a robust understanding of supplies, fit and supply’s attribution. In few words, this research has contributed theoretical foundations of WFPEF.
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