Introduction

Despite prior claims that work and family are independent domains (Blood & Wolfe, 1960), few researchers or laypersons today would dispute their interdependence. Research has demonstrated that the work-family interface relates to a variety of variables, with implications for individuals, families, and organizations (e.g., Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000). This chapter focuses on work-related outcomes in particular, providing support for the notion that organizations cannot afford to ignore the interconnectedness between work and family.

The objective of this chapter is to review the existing literature regarding outcomes associated with the work-family interface. The chapter is organized as follows. First, work-related outcomes pertaining to the "negative side" (i.e., work-family conflict) are reviewed. We then review outcomes associated with the "positive side" (i.e., work-family enhancement) of the work-family interface. Next, a summary of multinational studies is presented. Finally, a summary and critique of the literature, as well as directions for future research, are provided. Throughout the chapter, work-related outcomes are grouped into four categories: job attitudes, career outcomes, performance-related outcomes, and withdrawal behaviors and intentions.

Work-Family Conflict and Work-Related Outcomes

Although researchers have suggested a variety of possible mechanisms linking work and family domains (see Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), a depletion argument underlies the majority of research. Drawing from a resource drain model (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) and role theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964), the depletion argument assumes that engaging in multiple roles leads to role conflict, given that individuals have a fixed amount of time and energy. Due to the emphasis
on this viewpoint, research linking work-family conflict (WFC) to work-related outcomes dominates the literature. A summary of this body of research is discussed in this section.

**JOB ATTITUDES**

**Job Satisfaction**

The relationship between WFC and job satisfaction has received a wealth of empirical investigation, with the vast majority of research indicating that greater WFC relates to less job satisfaction. Meta-analytic reviews have reported weighted-mean correlations of -.12 to -.24 for WIF, -.14 for FIW, and -.27 for bi-directional WFC (Allen et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). It is important to note that the majority of studies employed global measures of job satisfaction, rather than facet-level or composite scales.

WIF has been negatively associated with global measures of job satisfaction in studies conducted in the US (e.g., Allen, 2001; Netemeyer, Maxham & Pullig, 2005; Thompson & Prottas, 2005), India (Aryee, Srinivas & Tan, 2005), Hong Kong (Ngo & Lui, 1999), Singapore (Aryee, 1992), and the Netherlands (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004). WIF has also been negatively associated with composite measures of job satisfaction in the US (e.g., Anderson, Coffey & Byerly, 2002). In one of the few studies that measured job satisfaction at the facet-level, Boles, Howard and Donofrio (2001) found that WIF related to satisfaction with work and promotion but not to satisfaction with co-workers, highlighting the multidimensionality of the job satisfaction construct. Moreover, Bruck, Allen and Spector (2002) found that WIF related to global, composite, and facet measures of job satisfaction, though relationships were significantly greater for composite versus global job satisfaction. Differential relationships have also been found across dimensions of WIF, with behavior-based WIF demonstrating the strongest relationship with job satisfaction (Bruck et al., 2002).

Other studies have examined FIW or bi-directional WFC and job satisfaction, uncovering similar results. Negative relationships have been reported between FIW and job satisfaction using samples from the US (e.g., Anderson et al., 2002; Netemeyer et al., 2005; Thompson & Prottas, 2005), Hong Kong (Aryee, Luk, Leung & Lo, 1999), and India (Aryee et al., 2005). At the facet level, FIW has been associated with satisfaction with pay, work, co-workers, and supervision (Boles et al., 2001). Type of FIW has also been investigated. Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) found a relationship between global job satisfaction and strain-based FIW only. Bruck et al. (2002) found the strongest relationship between behavior-based FIW and job satisfaction. Using bi-directional measures of WFC, significant negative relationships have been found in studies conducted in Canada (Beatty, 1996), Hong Kong (Hang-yue, Foley & Loi, 2005), Israel (Drory & Shamir, 1988), and
Singapore (Chan, Lai, Ko & Boey, 2000). Although the majority of research has demonstrated a significant relationship between job satisfaction and WFC, several studies found no relationship (e.g., Lyness & Thompson, 1997).

An increasing number of studies have investigated moderating and mediating variables of the WFC-job satisfaction relationship. Based on samples from the US (Grandey, Cordeiro & Crouter, 2005) and Finland (Kinnunen, Geurts & Mauno, 2004), WIF predicted job satisfaction one year later for women but not men. In terms of type of satisfaction, Boles, Wood and Johnson (2003) found that WIF predicted satisfaction with work, co-workers, and policy for women, but satisfaction with pay, supervisor, promotion, and policy for men. Finally, research has found the WFC-job satisfaction relationship to be partially mediated by value attainment (Perrewe, Hochwarter & Kiewitz, 1999) and by job stress (Judge, Boudreau & Bretz, 1994).

Overall, research has supported a negative relationship between WFC and job satisfaction, using diverse samples and measures of WFC/job satisfaction. Although few researchers examined job satisfaction at the facet level, those that did uncovered differential relationships across dimensions. Thus, future research should continue to explore how relationships vary across facets of job satisfaction.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment has also received much empirical attention, with research indicating that greater WFC relates to less organizational commitment. In terms of meta-analytic findings, Allen et al. (2000) reported a weighted-mean correlation of -.23 between commitment and WIF, and Kossek and Ozeki (1999) reported weighted-mean correlations of -.05 for WIF, -.17 for FIW, and -.27 for WFC.

Studies have found a negative association between WIF and organizational commitment in the US (e.g., Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins & Wambold, 2006; Netemeyer, Boles & McMurrian, 1996; Netemeyer et al., 2005) and India (Aryee et al., 2005), though others have reported no relationship (e.g., Geurts, Taris, Kompier, Dikkers, van Hooff & Kinnunen, 2005). Similarly, FIW has been negatively related to organizational commitment across diverse samples from the US (e.g., Carlson et al., 2000; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Netemeyer et al., 2005), India (Aryee et al., 2005), and the Netherlands (e.g., Geurts et al., 2005). On the other hand, null results have also been found between FIW and commitment (Hill, 2005; Hogan et al, 2006). Carlson et al. (2000) used a multidimensional measure of WFC, finding that only behavior-based FIW related to commitment. Finally, several studies found bi-directional measures of WFC related negatively to affective commitment (e.g., Allen, 2001; Blau, 1995) and to general organizational commitment (Good, Sisler & Gentry, 1988).

While research has supported a negative link between WFC and organizational commitment, most studies have focused on general or affective commitment,
rather than continuance or normative. Meta-analytic support for divergent relationships across types of commitment was found by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky (2002), with weighted-mean correlations of $-0.20$ for affective, $-0.04$ for normative, and $0.24$ for continuance, across various measures of WFC. Similarly, Lyness and Thompson (1997) found that WIF negatively related to affective commitment, positively related to continuance commitment, and was unrelated to normative commitment. Additionally, Casper, Martin, Buffardi and Erdwins (2002) reported a positive association between WIF and continuance commitment, but no relationship for affective commitment. Thus, most research supports a negative association between organizational commitment and WFC, though the relationship seems to vary by type of commitment.

**CAREER OUTCOMES**

**Career Satisfaction**

While much research has examined the relationship between WFC and job attitudes, relatively little has investigated career-related attitudes. Allen et al. (2000) reported a weighted-mean correlation of $-0.04$ across two studies. Null results have also been reported in other studies (e.g., Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 1999; Lyness & Thompson, 1997). However, more recently, Martins, Eddleston, and Veiga (2002) found that WIF negatively related to women's career satisfaction, but for men it was related to the career satisfaction of older men only. Parasuraman and Simmers (2001) found WFC negatively related to career satisfaction among organizationally-employed, but not among self-employed individuals. These moderators may help explain the null findings in previous studies.

Studies examining the relationship between FIW and career satisfaction have produced more consistent results. Both Beutell and Wittig-Berman (1999) and Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, and Beutell (1996) reported a negative relationship between the two variables. Focusing on career commitment, Carmeli (2003) found that Israeli chief financial officers high in emotional intelligence (EI) demonstrated a negative relationship between FIW and career commitment whereas a positive relationship existed for those low in EI. Overall, career satisfaction appears to have a stronger relationship with FIW than WIF. However, given the paucity of research, as well as the potential for moderators, more studies are needed.

**CAREER SUCCESS**

Even less research has examined career success as an outcome of WFC. Peluchette (1993) found that WIF and subjective career success were negatively related among full-time faculty members. More recently, Ngo and Lui (1999) found
a negative association between WIF and subjective career achievement in a sample of Hong Kong managers. Gender differences have also been uncovered, though inconsistently. While Ngo and Lui (1999) found that the relationship between WIF and subjective career achievement was stronger for women, Aryee (1993) found that WIF (job-parent and job-spouse conflict) was positively related to perceived lack of career progress among husbands but not wives. Using an objective index of success, Aryee and Luk (1996) found a positive relationship between WIF and monthly salary among wives but not husbands, with a sample of dual-earner couples in Hong Kong.

In terms of FIW, Chi-Ching (1992) found that family-related barriers to work (e.g., a lack of spousal support regarding respondent's career) was not predictive of career mobility or salary among female business graduates in Singapore. Ngo and Lui (1999) found that the relationship between FIW and subjective career achievement was stronger for men than for women. Butler and Skattebo (2004) provided further support for the notion that FIW differentially impacts career success across gender in a laboratory study. Specifically, they found participants gave lower reward recommendations to a hypothetical male manager experiencing FIW (as compared to a male manager without FIW). Conversely, no differences were found for females. Finally, Carnicer, Sanchez, Perez and Jimenez (2004) found a bi-directional measure of WFC was negatively related to functional mobility but unrelated to upward mobility among employees in Spain. Thus, the literature on WFC and career success has produced mixed results, with findings varying by direction of conflict, gender, and the operationalization of career success.

**Performance-Related Outcomes**

**In-role Performance and Productivity**

Results of studies examining WFC and in-role performance have been mixed. In terms of meta-analytic results, Allen et al. (2000) reported a weighted-mean correlation of −.12 between WIF and performance, while Kossek and Ozeki (1999) reported weighted-mean correlations of −.03 for WIF, −.45 for FIW, and −.19 for bi-directional WFC, though the latter two were based on only one study each. Although the majority of studies have used self-ratings of performance, supervisor ratings have been used as well.

Significant negative relationships have been found between WIF and self-rated performance among employed adults (Frone, Yardley & Markel, 1997); between job-parent conflict and self-reported work quality among married professional women in Singapore (Aryee, 1992); and between WIF and supervisor ratings of performance among online electronics retailers (Kossek, Colquitt & Noe, 2001). Conversely, null findings have been reported between both job-spouse and job-homemaker conflict and self-reported work quality (Aryee, 1992); between
WIF and self-reported sales performance among accountants and female real estate agents (Greenhaus, Bedeian & Mossholder, 1987; Netemeyer et al., 1996, respectively); and between WIF and supervisor-ratings of performance in a sample of New Zealand salespeople (Bhuian, Menguc & Borsboom, 2005) and professionals in Fortune 500 firms (Kossek, Lautsch & Eaton, 2006). Kossek et al. (2001) found a significant, albeit small, positive correlation between WIF and performance among employees of a public Midwestern university.

Research examining FIW and performance has produced mixed results as well. Researchers have found negative relationships between FIW and self-rated performance (Kossek et al., 2001; Netemeyer et al., 1996), as well as supervisor ratings of performance (Netemeyer et al., 2005). Conversely, Carmeli (2003), using self-reported performance, and Kossek et al. (2006), utilizing supervisor ratings of performance, found no relationship. Furthermore, in the experiment described previously, Butler and Skattebo (2004) found that FIW negatively impacted performance ratings for males but not females.

Finally, a few studies have utilized bi-directional WFC measures, or examined potential mediators of the WFC-performance relationship. Kossek and Nichol (1992) found a negative relationship between WFC and supervisor-rated performance. Similarly, inter-role conflict was negatively related to work quality/effort among automotive retail employees, and the relationship was mediated by job satisfaction (Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Netemeyer et al. (2005) found support for a mediator as well, with job stress mediating the relationship between WIF and performance.

Although several studies have examined the impact of WFC on performance, more research is necessary given the inconsistent findings across directions of WFC and sources of performance ratings. It seems important to uncover contextual factors that impact these relationships. Additionally, it is critical to note that for some researchers, a performance decrement is inherent to the conceptualization of WFC. For example, Greenhaus, Allen and Spector (2006) define WFC as “the extent to which experiences in one role result in diminished performance in the other role” (p. 83), which corresponds to Edwards and Rothbard’s (2000) proposition that role performance is a necessary component of interference. Other studies have not utilized this definition, instead considering WFC as occurring when the demands in one role make it difficult to meet the requirements of the other role. Thus, it is important to consider the definition of WFC when discussing its impact on performance, given these discrepancies.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

A few studies have examined the WFC–OCB relationship; generally finding that greater WFC relates to less OCB. Netemeyer et al. (2005) reported that both WIF and FIW negatively related to supervisor ratings of extra-role performance.
Similarly, Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino and Rosner (2005) found that WFC negatively related to self-rated OCB among teachers. Tompson and Werner (1997) found a negative association between role conflict and OCB (self-report); however, their measure of role conflict placed conflict and facilitation on a continuum, thus blurring the results. In another study, Bolino and Turnley (2005) suggested that engaging in more OCB would increase WFC. The authors did find a positive relationship between spouse ratings of individual initiative (a dimension of OCB) and WFC. However, this study, as most research in this area, was cross-sectional, so causality could not be determined. Researchers have also examined potential mediators between WFC and OCB, including job stress, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Netemeyer et al., 2005; Tompson & Werner, 1997). Among the tested mediators, support was only found for organizational commitment, and this only held for the loyalty dimension of OCB (Tompson & Werner, 1997). Although the mechanisms underlying the relationship between WFC and OCB remain unclear, research generally converges to support a negative association between the variables. However, more research is needed to determine whether relationships differ depending on the direction of WFC and the type of OCB, and longitudinal research is necessary to offer insight into the direction of causality.

WITHDRAWAL BEHAVIORS AND INTENTIONS

Absenteeism

Although research has revealed a positive relationship between WFC and absenteeism, findings are by no means conclusive. In fact, even meta-analytic reviews have reported divergent results. Allen et al. (2000) found no relationship between WIF and absenteeism (r = -.02) using two studies. On the other hand, Kossek and Ozeki (1999) found one study which reported a positive relationship between absenteeism and WIF (r = .18) and reported a positive relationship between absenteeism and a bi-directional measure of WFC (r = .17) across four studies. Finally, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) reported a weighted-mean correlation of .18 between both FIW and WIF and a composite of organizational withdrawal, which included tardiness and turnover.

The research linking WFC and absenteeism appears to be strongest for studies using bi-directional WFC measures, while the relationships between WIF/FIW and absenteeism are more tenuous. For example, researchers have reported null results between WIF and both self-reported absenteeism (e.g., Gignac, Kelloway & Gottlieb, 1996; Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999) and company records of absenteeism (Boyar, Maertz & Pearson, 2005; Cohen & Kirchmeyer, 2005), across diverse samples in the US, Canada, and Israel. Additionally, Hackett, Bycio and Guion (1989) found that WIF was related to a desire to be absent but not to actual absences, and Hammer, Bauer and Grandey (2003) found that WIF related to self-reported absences among...
husbands but not wives. Thus, despite the generally null findings, there may be certain situations in which WIF and absenteeism are positively related.

Research examining FIW and absenteeism has found positive, null, and even negative relationships. Positive relationships have been reported, utilizing self-report measures of absenteeism, in the US (e.g., Anderson et al., 2002) and Canada (e.g., Gignac et al., 1996; Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999). On the other hand, Hammer et al. (2003) found that FIW was unrelated to self-reported absences for both husbands and wives, but wives’ FIW was negatively related to husbands’ absences.

Studies examining the relationships between bi-directional measures of WFC and absenteeism have tended to reveal positive findings. Kossek (1990), examining public utility workers, and Kossek, DeMarr, Bachman, Bachman and Kollar (1993), studying eldercare providers, found positive relationships between WFC and self-reported absenteeism. Additionally, Kossek and Nichol (1992) found a positive relationship between WFC and supervisor ratings of absenteeism, and Horn and Kinicki (2001) found that inter-role conflict impacted self-reported job avoidance (which included absenteeism) among employees at an automotive retail store. Conversely, no relationship was found between WFC and self-reported absenteeism by Thomas and Ganster (1995).

Despite the generally positive findings between bi-directional WFC and absenteeism, Kossek and Ozeki (1999) point out that results differ depending on the measure of absenteeism. Specifically, studies conducted by Kossek and colleagues asked about family-related absences in particular, and their findings tended to reveal stronger relationships. Thus, it is important to consider how absenteeism is measured when assessing its relationship with work-family variables. The relationship may also vary by gender. Using company records of absenteeism, Boyar et al. (2005) found that women with high WIF or FIW had absenteeism, whereas there was little relationship among men. Overall, the literature has produced mixed results regarding WFC and absenteeism, and more research is needed before conclusions can be drawn.

Partial Absenteeism

Partial absenteeism includes such behaviors as arriving to work late, leaving early, or experiencing family-related interruptions while at work. Although no reviews have focused on the impact of WFC on partial absenteeism, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) included tardiness in their analysis of organizational withdrawal behaviors (see “Absenteeism” for a summary). Studies have examined the impact of both WIF and FIW on indices of partial absenteeism, generally finding a positive relationship between these variables.

WIF has been positively associated with leaving work early (Boyar et al., 2005), though the same study found no relationship between WIF and tardiness. WIF has also been related to interruptions from work (husbands and wives) and
lateness (wives only) in a sample of dual-earner couples (Hammer et al., 2003), and work-eldercare conflict has been related to partial absenteeism (Barling, MacEwan, Kelloway & Higginbottom, 1994). In a study spanning 20 days, work-parent conflict was positively correlated with partial absenteeism, though SEM results were not significant (Hepburn & Barling, 1996). Barrah, Schultz, Baltes and Stolz (2004) also reported null results regarding starting late/leaving early among eldercare providers.

Regarding FIW, Barrah et al. (2004) found a positive relationship between FIW and starting late/leaving early among men but not women, and Hepburn and Barling (1996) found FIW (parent-work conflict) positively related to partial absenteeism. Moreover, Hammer et al. (2003) found that FIW positively related to work interruptions but not lateness. Interestingly, the study also found crossover effects, with husband FIW predicting wife lateness, and wife FIW being related to husband interruptions.

Two moderators that have been examined include gender and kinship responsibilities. Boyar et al. (2005) found a significant interaction between WIF/FIW and gender in predicting leaving early; specifically, women with high WIF/FIW were more likely to leave work early than were all other groups. They also found that the relationship between WIF and leaving early was stronger when kinship responsibilities were high. Finally, the relationship between FIW and tardiness was moderated by kinship responsibilities as well, with the highest tardiness being exhibited for individuals with low FIW and low kinship responsibilities. The authors suggest that this group may have been less committed to their jobs. Future research should examine this possibility and continue to study the relationship between WFC and partial absenteeism.

Turnover

A great deal of research has examined the relationship between WFC, particularly WIF, and turnover intentions, consistently finding a positive relationship. Allen et al.’s (2000) review found that, among the work-related outcomes, turnover intentions had the highest relationship with WIF \( (r = .29) \). Similarly, Kossek and Ozeki (1999) reported that turnover intentions related to WIF \( (r = .32) \) and FIW \( (r = .17) \). Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) included turnover intentions in their composite of organizational withdrawal as well, as summarized earlier. While these reviews emphasize the positive relationship between WFC and turnover intentions, studies examining actual turnover found weaker results, as described below.

Positive relationships between WIF and turnover intentions have been reported among diverse samples in the US (e.g., Batt & Valcour, 2003; Netemeyer et al., 1996), Canada (e.g., Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999), and in a multi-country study that examined married expatriates in 46 countries (Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley & Luk, 2001). Additionally, Kelloway, Gottlieb and Barham (1999) found
that strain-based WIF correlated with turnover intentions, though time-based WIF did not. Two studies examined WIF and actual turnover. Specifically, Cohen and Kirchmeyer (2005) found that WIF was unrelated to turnover among Israeli nurses, and Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Collins (2001) found that WIF did not relate to withdrawal from public accounting 22 months later.

Fewer studies have investigated FIW and turnover intentions/decisions, but the results have shown positive relationships. FIW positively related to turnover intentions in the US (e.g., Kossek et al., 2006; Netemeyer et al., 1996), and across multiple countries (Shaffer et al., 2001). Null relationships have also been found (e.g., Greenhaus et al., 2001; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Kelloway et al. (1999) found that strain-based but not time-based FIW related to turnover intentions six months later.

Results of studies using bi-directional measures of WFC have mirrored the results for WIF, exhibiting a positive relationship that is stronger for intentions than actual turnover. Positive relationships have been found in the US (e.g., Good et al., 1988) and Hong Kong (e.g., Hang-yue et al., 2005). Moreover, Hom and Kinicki (2001) found that inter-role conflict led to withdrawal cognitions, which predicted actual turnover, and Greenhaus, Collins, Singh and Parasuraman (1997) found a positive relationship between WFC and actual turnover as well.

Mediators of the relationship between WFC and turnover intent have also been examined, with researchers finding support for job satisfaction (Hom & Kinicki, 2001), stress symptoms (Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999), emotional exhaustion, and burnout (Hang-yue et al., 2005). In terms of moderators, Shaffer et al. (2001) found that the relationships between WIF/FIW and withdrawal cognitions were exacerbated by high affective commitment, while Greenhaus et al. (2001) found the relationships to be weaker among those with low career involvement.

The relationship between WFC and turnover is robust, though it appears to be stronger for WIF and turnover intentions as compared to FIW and actual turnover. Additionally, different types of WFC (e.g., time-based, strain-based) exhibited dissimilar relationships with turnover intentions, highlighting the importance of investigating dimensions of WFC separately.

**SUMMARY**

Overall, a wealth of research exists regarding the relationship between WFC and work-related outcomes. However, job attitudes tended to be over-represented in the literature, while research that links WFC to career attitudes/outcomes and OCB is sparse. Despite the vast amount of research on job attitudes, researchers have tended to focus on global job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. Given the multidimensionality of these constructs, and the support for differential relationships across dimensions, future research should continue to examine how various components of job satisfaction and organizational commitment relate to
WFC. Similarly, more research is needed on how WFC differentially relates to facets of career satisfaction, in addition to other career-related outcomes.

With regard to behavioral outcomes, the literature generally supports a negative relationship between WFC and performance, and a positive relationship between WFC and withdrawal behaviors/intentions. However, relationships tended to be stronger for self-reported compared to other-reported outcomes, and for measures that specifically tapped into family as the cause for withdrawal (i.e., family-related versus general absences). These findings highlight the role that methodological factors play in relationships between WFC and outcomes. Still, it is important to note that significant relationships were found using non-self-report data, including supervisor ratings of performance/OCB, objective indices of productivity, and archival records of absenteeism/turnover, providing compelling support that WFC impacts the bottom-line.

Despite these findings, relationships were by no means conclusive. Across all work-related outcomes, some studies reported no relationship with WFC. Moreover, findings were more inconsistent for some outcomes than others. Research linking WFC to job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and turnover intentions appears to be particularly robust, while less consistent results were reported for career-related outcomes, performance, and absenteeism. Discrepancies across studies highlight the importance of searching for moderator variables, and several researchers have already begun this task. Some support has been found for the moderating role of gender, dispositional factors, family responsibilities, and other variables, though more research is needed. The field would also benefit from more research on mediators.

Another important observation is that relationships were generally found for both WIF and FIW. This contradicts the domain specificity hypothesis, which posits that situational variables associated with a given domain relate to conflict originating from that domain (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992). Thus, researchers are encouraged to study both WIF and FIW when assessing how WFC relates to outcomes, rather than focusing on one direction. While most studies examined WIF and FIW separately, surprisingly little research investigated time-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict. Among the few that did, relationships often differed across dimensions of WFC, underscoring the importance of examining each type. Finally, the field would also benefit from using more diverse methodological approaches, as the majority of studies were cross-sectional and self-report.

WORK-FAMILY BALANCE, FACILITATION, AND ENHANCEMENT AND WORK-RELATED OUTCOMES

Given that work-family research has been dominated by a conflict paradigm (Rothbard, 2001), far fewer studies have examined the facilitative aspects of
the work-family interface. Those that did used various terms to describe similar, yet distinct, constructs, including work-family enrichment, positive spillover, and facilitation (see Chapters 3–5 for a thorough discussion). Despite differences, the argument underlying these constructs is that engaging in multiple roles can be beneficial, rather than draining (Rothbard, 2001). Empirical studies linking such constructs to work-related outcomes are reviewed in this section.

**JOB ATTITUDES**

Of the few studies that investigated facilitative effects of the work-family interface, most examined job attitudes. WF and FW facilitation were positively related to job satisfaction in the US (e.g., Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne & Grzywacz, 2006; Hanson, Hammer & Colton, 2006) and job satisfaction and affective commitment in India (Aryee et al., 2005) and the Netherlands (Geurts et al., 2005). However, in another study, WF facilitation but not FW facilitation related to job satisfaction (Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2002). Moreover, Hill (2005) reported that WF facilitation was positively related to job satisfaction but unrelated to organizational commitment, while FW facilitation was negatively related to organizational commitment for males and unrelated to job satisfaction. Using data from the 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Thompson and Prottas (2005) found that job satisfaction related to bi-directional positive spillover. Work-family balance has also been positively related to job satisfaction (Barnett, Del Campo, Del Campo & Steiner, 2003) and organizational commitment (Finegold, Mohrman & Spreitzer, 2002). Finally, Cohen (1997) found that nonwork-to-work positive spillover was unrelated to job satisfaction using a Canadian sample. Thus, despite many positive findings, inconsistent results have emerged.

**CAREER OUTCOMES**

Little research has investigated the relationship between the “positive side” of the work-family interface and career-related outcomes, and those that did often reported null results. For example, Aryee, Chay and Tan (1994) found that the integration of work and family was unrelated to career satisfaction among managers in Singapore. Though somewhat peripheral to work-family enrichment and related constructs, researchers have found that parental role quality was positively associated with career satisfaction, though marital role quality was not (Aryee et al., 1994). Moreover, spousal support has been linked to career satisfaction among dual-earner couples in Hong Kong (Aryee & Luk, 1996).
PERFORMANCE-RELATED OUTCOMES

Although researchers have offered various definitions for such constructs as work-family facilitation, enrichment, and positive spillover, some of the definitions specify a performance increase as inherent to the construct. For example, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) define enrichment as when experiences in one role improve the quality of life (i.e., affect or performance) in the other role. Similarly, Rothbard (2001) describes the enrichment process as occurring when engagement in Role A leads to positive emotion, which leads to engagement in Role B. Engagement is conceptualized as being fully absorbed in role performance. Thus, one would expect a positive association between family-to-work enrichment and work performance.

Despite these definitions, there is very little research linking work-family enrichment and related constructs to performance. Tompson and Werner (1997) found that role facilitation was unrelated to self-reported performance but positively related to OCB; however, as mentioned earlier, they placed role conflict and role facilitation on a continuum, so their measure is tapping both constructs. Moreover, Baruch-Feldman, Brondolo, Ben-Dayan and Schwartz (2002) found that family support was unrelated to productivity among traffic enforcement agents.

WITHDRAWAL BEHAVIORS AND INTENTIONS

A few studies have examined turnover intentions in relation to positive spillover, reporting mixed results. Thompson and Prottas (2005) found that bi-directional positive spillover negatively related to turnover intent. Conversely, Cohen (1997) reported no relationship between positive nonwork-to-work spillover and withdrawal cognitions among employees of a western Canadian school district. Social support from one’s significant other was also unrelated to turnover intentions among public child welfare workers (Nissly, Barak & Levin, 2005). Bretz, Boudreau and Judge (1994) found that a desire for more work-family balance did not predict actual separation a year later.

SUMMARY

In summary, there is a paucity of research examining how positive work-family variables impact work-related outcomes, with the majority of research to date investigating job attitudes. Additional research on the construct, measurement, and outcomes of work-family facilitation/enrichment is sorely needed, though recent strides have been made (e.g., Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Furthermore, as with WFC research, studies are needed that investigate
potential moderators and mediators of these relationships. Given the theoretical and practical importance of this topic, future research examining potential links between the positive side of the work-family interface and work-related outcomes is clearly warranted.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS

As evidenced by the review in the preceding sections, the majority of work-family research has utilized Western samples, predominantly from the US. However, individuals from Singapore, Israel, the Netherlands, and Hong Kong have also been investigated, among others. Studies conducted in other countries often replicate those in the US, testing whether the relationship between WFC and a work-related outcome extends to a non-US sample. More recently, researchers have begun to conduct cross-national comparative studies. Five such studies are summarized in this section.

Hill, Yang, Hawkins and Ferris (2004) tested the veracity of a work-family model across four cultural groups of IBM employees (Eastern, West-Developing, West-Affluent, and West-US), composed of 48 countries. They found that WIF and FIW related to job satisfaction via work-family fit. Moreover, the relationships were similar across cultural groups. Further support for the generalizability of work-family relationships with work outcomes across culture was found by Spector, Cooper, Poelmans, Allen, O'Driscoll, Sanchez, et al. (2004). Managers in 15 countries were categorized into three culturally distinct regions: Anglo, China, and Latin America. Across all regions, work-family pressure was associated with job satisfaction and turnover intentions.

Other studies have compared a US sample to a sample from one other country. Posthuma, Joplin and Maertz (2005) compared American and Mexican grocery employees; in both samples, WFC was not related to turnover intentions but was negatively related to job satisfaction. Conversely, Janssen, Peeters, Jong, Houkes and Tummers (2004) discovered that WFC was associated with job satisfaction among Dutch but not American nurses. Finally, Wang, Lawler, Walumbwa and Shi (2004) examined the impact of culture among American and Chinese employees in the banking sector. The moderating effect of country as well as individual-level allocentrism (an individual’s tendency to put the collective unit first) and idiosyncrasm (an individual’s tendency to put personal interests first) were examined. They found WIF related to job withdrawal intentions in the US sample, while FIW related to job withdrawal intentions in the Chinese sample. Moreover, the relationship between WIF and withdrawal intentions was stronger for individuals high on idiocentrism, while the relationship between FIW and withdrawal intentions was stronger for those high on allocentrism. This study highlights the importance of considering culture at both the individual- and country-level.
Overall, cross-cultural studies have uncovered more similarities than differences. Still, more research is necessary, particularly examining a wider range of outcomes and studying the impact of culture at multiple levels of analysis.

OVERVIEW OF EXISTING WORK, PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As the current review demonstrates, there has been an abundance of research examining the work-family interface and work-related outcomes. However, the emphasis has been on job attitudes and uni-dimensional measures of WFC, with less research on WF enrichment, cross-cultural comparisons, and multidimensional WFC measures. Moreover, while results are robust for certain outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction), relationships concerning other variables (e.g., performance) are less clear-cut. Divergent findings across studies highlight the need to identify contextual factors that impact the strength and direction of relationships.

With regard to methodology, the vast majority of studies relied on cross-sectional designs and self-report measures. Cross-sectional designs are problematic in their inability to determine the direction of causality. More studies utilizing longitudinal designs and experience sampling methodology are needed. With regard to the over-reliance on self-report measures, it is important to note that findings have generally been stronger between WFC and self-reported, rather than other-reported outcomes. This speaks to the possibility of common method bias, as well as potential discrepancies between participants' reports and intentions versus their actual behavior. Finally, researchers have criticized current measures of WFC (see MacDermid, 2005), and measures of positive work-family variables are just beginning to be developed (e.g., Carlson et al., 2006). Given that existing measures of the work-family interface may be subject to numerous cognitive errors (MacDermid, 2005), further development of psychometrically sound measurement tools is needed (see Chapter 4 of this volume for further discussion of this issue).

Another area that would benefit from additional research is the theory underlying the relationships reviewed in this chapter. Many studies did not provide well-developed theoretical arguments for why relationships exist. Although many researchers cited role theory, a resource drain model, or role accumulation, a description of how and why work-family variables should relate to specific outcomes was lacking. The field would benefit from more descriptive theories and a heightened emphasis on theory-driven approaches. Research examining potential mechanisms linking work-family variables and outcomes is also warranted, as is integration between the positive and negative sides of the work-family interface.

Despite limitations in the literature, it is clear that work-family variables relate to work-related outcomes, ranging from job and career attitudes to withdrawal behaviors. These findings have definitive implications for policy and practice at the
individual, organizational, and societal level. Individuals need better tools to manage the work and family domain, and organizations need to be aware of the significant impact that family has on business-related outcomes. Researchers have already begun investigating the role that family-friendly initiatives have on mitigating the negative impact of WFC (see Chapters 18, 19 and 20 of this volume), but a broader consideration of interventions is necessary. For example, research should explore whether employees can be trained to better manage their work and family lives, and interventions designed to enhance facilitation and minimize conflict should be considered. Moreover, the field would benefit from a life-course perspective (see Chapter 6 by Moen & Chesley in this volume), examining how family-related variables impact one's job and career over time. Finally, in an age of growing globalization, more multicultural comparisons are necessary; such research has important theoretical and practical implications regarding the impact of work-family variables. While past research has clearly shown that organizations cannot afford to ignore the work-family interface, future research should continue to provide guidance regarding what companies can do about it.
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INTRODUCTION

Family dinners have attracted national attention. The advantages of shared meals have made headlines and the popular media, citing findings from recently conducted studies—most notably the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse’s (CASA) latest report has highlighted their contribution for child development, individual health, and family functioning. For example, adolescents who reported at least five family dinners per week were substantially less likely to smoke cigarettes, use drugs and alcohol, and had higher grades at school compared to their counterparts who ate dinner with their family less frequently (2006). Gathering at the dinner table has been celebrated as a recipe for family connectedness, a powerful yet simple means to improve well-being and promote the next generation’s success.

Family dinners, however, are not an easy thing to do considering the hectic schedules of both parents and children in contemporary western society. Parents’ long work hours and children’s participation in many after-school programs have made getting together a challenge that requires considerable effort and strategizing (Bianchi, Robinson & Milkie, 2006; Presser, 2003). For example, in CASA’s study, 57% of parents reported that because of work-related reasons, such as conflicting schedules and working late, family dinners were not as frequent as they wished them to be (2006).

The challenge of family gathering around the dinner table, once a major pillar of family life, is just one illustration of the serious time squeeze that many families are currently experiencing. It is not surprising that in light of the growing complexity of work and family lives, integrating between the two has become difficult. Stress, feelings of overwork, role strain, and the wish to spend more time with family are at the heart of the work-family conflict.
In this chapter, we seek to shed light on the emotional dimensions of family time. Family time can be a form of interactive togetherness or a contested terrain where antagonistic relations develop (Shaw 1997). We argue that generally being together is a positive experience that can be an important source of support for working parents. By decomposing family time, we seek to reveal the emotional experiences associated with different family activities and their implications for parents' well-being, particularly as they relate to their perception of balancing work and family demands.

CONTEMPORARY FAMILIES AND THE GROWING COMPLEXITY OF WORK AND FAMILY LIVES

Changes in the nature of work, the organization of the workplace, and the move toward a 24/7 economy have created new challenges for workers and their families. Longer work hours, declining job security, nonstandard work schedules, lack of flexibility, and extended commutes have brought about new sources of stress and have made it more difficult for working parents to negotiate their multiple roles at home and work (Carnoy, 2000; Mishel, Bernstein & Schnitt, 2001; Presser, 2003).

The challenge of integrating work and family lives has become especially acute for dual-earner families, a growing proportion of all families in the population (Casper & Bianchi, 2002; Waite & Nielsen, 2001), who need to orchestrate between three jobs, two at work and one at home. For this reason, it is important that social scientists treat the family as a whole unit of investigation in their attempt to describe and explain the impacts of work on family well-being and functioning. Consistent with this approach, contemporary research indicates that dual-earner families have experienced an important increase in their joint-work effort; parents' combined number of work hours has steadily grown in the last three decades (Jacobs & Gerstel, 2004; Mishel et al., 2001).

The need to juggle work and family demands has also become a major challenge for single parents, another group that has increased in size in the last few decades. Single-parent families need to support their children with one income and cannot rely on a spouse or partner to help with childcare and household tasks. Following the 1996 Welfare Reform, many single parents, particularly low-income mothers, have been pressured to leave the welfare rolls and join the labor force. However, the move from welfare to work has not been a smooth one. Welfare leavers, as do other single parents, typically hold low-skilled low-paying jobs that do not provide much economic security and often require them to work under highly inconvenient circumstances (Casper & Bianchi, 2002; Loperst, 1999).

These trends have had important implications for individual well-being. A large number of workers feel overworked. For example, Jacobs and Gerstel (2004) report that the gap between actual and ideal weekly work hours is especially high
among the married and parents of young children (the number of actual work hours is higher by more than 10 hours than the number of ideal work hours). They further note that many parents wished to work less or to have shorter work-weeks (see also Galinsky et al., 2001). Long work hours was also perceived as a problem among single parents, especially among those who worked multiple jobs, a common strategy to increase income, and experienced difficulties in coordinating childcare arrangements for their children (Chaudry, 2005).

**TIME SQUEEZE AND WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT**

Increased involvement in paid work has created new time squeezes at home and set constraints on what working families can do together. As Nock and Kingston point out “as the husband and wives in dual-earner families seek to fulfill all of their roles, they must wrestle with the combined time demands of work on the family as a unit” (1984, p. 334). Being a scarce commodity in contemporary society, time is a highly sensitive issue understood in terms of competition and substitution. Typically, more time spent at work, or on work-related activities, is interpreted as less time available for children and family.

Studies show that parents' time with children has not decreased dramatically in the last few decades, contrary to what one would have predicted considering parents' greater labor force participation (Bianchi, 2000; Bond, Galinsky & Swanberg, 1998; Sandberg & Hofferth, 2001). Rather, pressured by multiple demands at work and home, parents have developed strategies to maximize their time with children and with family (Bianchi et al., 2006). Spending “quality time” has been treated as a way for busy parents to be more involved with their children and family, which can compensate for increasing time spent at work (Snyder forthcoming; Voydanoff, 2002).

Yet, feeling rushed, a sense of life speed-up, and feelings of frustration that one does not have enough time are very common (Robinson & Godbey, 1999). Using time diary measures, Bianchi and her associates report that more than a third of parents reported always feeling rushed (2000). According to Daly this stems in part because “family time is a prescriptive term that upholds a set of traditional family values that may not be easily realized in the face of today’s work and family challenges” (2001, p. 293). Daly’s study describes the yearning for more family time and the feeling of guilt that accompanies it in working families (see also Chaudry, 2005; Voydanoff, 1988).

The experience of time deficit is especially acute among parents. Almost half of parents in a study using nationally representative samples felt that they do not spend enough time with their children (Milkie et al., 2004). This study further found that the likelihood of feeling time strain increased as parents' work hours increased. Similar patterns were observed for single and married parents. Scholars
have pointed out that the experience of a time squeeze is also the result of rising standards of parenting, which have created, besides high work expectations, additional sources of stress for parents (Bianchi et al., 2006; Lareau, 2002).

Job-related time constraints can also impair a parent’s ability to fulfill home obligations (Voydanoff, 1988), and the need to coordinate between two work schedules can contribute to the development of family conflicts about time allocation and time usage. Thus, the perception of a shortage of time constitutes a crucial dimension of the work-family conflict. This is especially the case for parents. Depending on the measure used to gauge work-family conflict, in some cases as many as 60% of parents, either men or women, reported tension between their work and family lives (Jacobs & Gerstel, 2004). Numbers for men and women without children were substantially lower (see also Roehling, Zarvis & Swope, 2005).

THE EFFECT OF OCCUPATIONAL CONDITIONS

Research indicates that the experience of work-family conflict is affected by occupational conditions and the workplace culture. Some argue that occupational conditions can matter more than the actual number of work hours (Jacobs & Gerstel, 2004). Especially important are autonomy and control over scheduling and job content, which are not only associated with job satisfaction and well-being at work, but have also been found to ease work-family conflict. Moen and Yu (2000), for example, show that among both men and women job autonomy was associated with higher levels of work-family balance (see also Voydanoff, 1988).

Supportive supervisors, access to benefits, and the ability to use family-friendly options are also important in this matter and can help parents better deal with the competing demands of work and family (Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2002; Hill, 2005). The organizational culture often prevalent in the professions and the corporate world, which requires complete time and energy devotion to the job, can be a serious obstacle to family life. Indeed, for some people in top positions, particularly women, being successful means remaining childless (Blair-Loy, 2003; Goldin, 2004).

Nonstandard work hours, on the other hand, have been shown to be detrimental. Rotating and night shifts are associated with greater marital instability (Presser, 2000) and work-family conflict (Moen & Yu, 2000). Shift work is also a source of stress for single parents, not only due to high levels of physical stress but also because this type of jobs makes it more difficult for them to secure childcare, thus increasing stress and parental concern over their children’s well-being (Chaudry, 2005).

The disadvantage of single parents also stems from the fact that they are substantially more likely to work nonstandard work hours compared to other parents. Because they are typically younger and less well-educated, single parents are more likely to be concentrated in low-status occupational sectors that have
inconvenient and rigid schedules, provide little control over the work process, and offer few if any benefits (Casper & Bianchi, 2002; Loperst, 1999). As such, single parents are especially vulnerable to experience severe time squeezes.

FAMILY TIME AS A SOURCE OF SUPPORT

In their attempt to better understand the causes and consequences of parents' daily struggle to juggle family life with paid work and other obligations, social scientists have typically examined the effects of occupational conditions, social policies, and access to informal sources of support on the experience of work-family conflict. Much less attention, however, has been dedicated to the role that the family itself can play in helping parents balance their work and family responsibilities.

Scholars such as Hochschild (1997) argue that in contemporary society the traditional emotional and supportive functions of the family have been seriously eroded. Because of the growing complexity of everyday life, people, most notably professionals, would rather spend more time at work than at home. In this way, the workplace has become a major source of support and personal fulfillment. We argue, however, that the family is still an important integrative entity that can help shield parents and children from the stressors of everyday life. Specifically, spending time with family can provide working parents and their children with a much needed break in the form of "time-out-of-time" (Gillis, 1996).

It is important to note that we do not want to portray a romanticized picture of family life. Rather, by examining the emotional experiences associated with family time and by decomposing it into different types of activity, we emphasize that family time is a complex and multidimensional concept that needs to be studied critically. We believe that this approach will also help reveal the aspects of family time that are most likely to affect working parents' well-being.

THE 500 FAMILY STUDY

To examine the emotional dimensions associated with family time, we present below a series of analyses based on data from the 500 Family Study. The 500 Family Study, conducted by the Alfred P. Sloan Center on Parents, Children, and Work, was designed to collect comprehensive information about the experiences of middle-class dual-earner parents and their children at work and at home. It deals with a variety of issues, such as experiences at work, quality of marriage, parent-child relationship, household division of labor, and psychological well-being (for more information about the sample see Hoogstra, 2005).

Multiple methods were used to collect data about the complex dynamics of work and family life among dual-earner families. In this study we use data from
two sources: surveys and time diaries. The survey administered to the parents provides detailed information about a variety of work-related issues, including occupational conditions and job duties. The experience sampling method (ESM), a form of time diary, provides comprehensive data about activities and emotional experiences in the course of a typical day. It uses preprogrammed wristwatches to randomly beep participants several times a day during their waking hours. When signaled, respondents are asked to fill out a questionnaire in which they describe their feelings and activities and provide information about their location and the people with whom they interact. The ESM provides an invaluable opportunity for studying real-time emotional experiences and activities as they occur in a natural setting. It is considered a valid and reliable instrument for examining time uses, subjective experiences, and emotional states (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987; Robinson, 1999). The analyses presented here are based on a subsample of families that includes 246 dual–earner couples with children who filled both the ESM and the survey questionnaires.

**Measuring family time, its emotional dimensions, and parental well-being**

We began by examining the amount of time dual–earner couples spend with their family. One of the questions in the ESM asked respondents to indicate whom they were with when signaled. We used this item to calculate family time, a variable indicating the proportion of beeps (out of total number of beeps) respondents spent together with her/his spouse and at least one child.

We then decomposed family time into various types of family activities by categorizing responses to the ESM question of “What was the main thing you were doing?” (primary activity). The family activities we examined are: (1) direct interaction, which includes items such as talking to, playing with, holding and kissing spouse and/or child; (2) household–related tasks, which includes activities such as cleaning, repairing, and cooking; (3) religious activity, which refers to participation in various religious events; (4) leisure activity, which includes activities such as watching a movie, going to the theatre, watching TV, and playing a board or computer game; (5) social activity, which refers to talking to and playing with friends or relatives, partying, and celebrating; (6) assistance to child, which includes activities such as taking or picking up child, putting child to bed, and helping child with homework; and (7) family meals, which refers to eating meals together.

In the next stage, we looked at the emotional dimensions of family time. We constructed three ESM measures to describe the emotional states associated with different family activities and with family time in general: positive affect, negative affect, and feeling engaged. Each of these variables is a composite measure ranging from 0 to 3, which was computed as the average of several emotional items from
the ESM. Positive affect is based on four items asking the extent to which respondent was feeling happy, cheerful, relaxed, and good about herself/himself when signaled. Negative affect is based on the items of feeling irritated, frustrated, and stressed. Feeling engaged is measured by how interesting the activity was, to what extent respondent enjoyed what she/he was doing, and how excited she/he was.

We also calculated the mean scores on positive affect, negative affect, and engagement for beeps with family only. These variables indicate how respondents feel when they are with family (as opposed to their general emotional assessment) and are used as predictors in a series of OLS regression models of parental well-being.

Work-family balance refers to parents' assessment of how well they handle family and work responsibilities and was used as a measure of parental well-being. It was computed as the mean of the following three survey items: "I feel confident about my ability to handle personal or family matters," "I feel confident about my ability to handle work-related matters," and "I feel I can't cope with everything I have to do" (reverse coded). Responses range from 0 to 4 with higher scores indicating a higher degree of balance of family and work lives.

In examining the association between the emotional states of family time and work-family balance, we included several survey-based measures as controls. The first set of variables controls for occupational conditions and includes whether respondent is working 46 or more hours a week; whether he/she works standard work hours; and how much work autonomy he/she has. Because how parents feel when they spend time with family (and how much time they spend with it) is likely to be affected by the quality of their relationship with their spouse and children, we also controlled for marital quality and parent-child relationship.

THE EMOTIONAL DIMENSIONS OF FAMILY TIME

Distribution of family time

How much time do dual-earner families spend together and what do they typically do? We found that overall the mean proportion of beeps spent with family was 11% (SD = .07 and .08 for mothers and fathers respectively), meaning that families spent almost 12 hours per week together (.11 × 7 days × 15 hours) engaging in different family activities.

Interesting variation was found when we decomposed family time into types of activities. Families spent almost half of their time together in direct interaction (31.8 and 30.3% of beeps out of all family beeps for mothers and fathers respectively) or eating meals together (15.6 and 17.8% for mothers and fathers respectively). Not surprisingly, a substantial amount of time was also spent on household-related tasks (15.1% for mothers and 12.7% for fathers). Leisure activities
came fourth (7.4 and 9.1% for mothers and fathers respectively). Finally, less than 3% of all family beeps were spent on either assistance to children, religious, or social activities.

Note that there were minor differences between mothers' and fathers' responses because parents may not necessarily engage together in the same type of activity, although both of them are present. For example, mother may be cooking while father is helping child with homework in the kitchen. In this case, all family members are together in the same place although they engage in very different types of activities. It is therefore not surprising that mothers' share of family time spent on household-related tasks and assistance to children was slightly higher than that of fathers.

THE EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE OF FAMILY TIME

How do parents feel when they spend time with family and do their emotional experiences vary by type of activity? In a series of ANOVA's we first examined how mothers and fathers feel in general when they are with family compared to other situations. The results revealed similar emotional patterns for fathers and mothers. Overall, being with family was a positive experience. Parents reported higher scores on positive affect, lower scores on negative affect, and higher scores on engagement for family versus non-family beeps. All these differences, although moderate in size, were significant. Furthermore, mothers and fathers expressed similar daily emotional experiences. Differences in mean scores on positive affect, negative affect, and engagement by gender were very small and non-significant.

Although spending time with family was in general a positive experience, an examination of the emotional states associated with different types of family activities portrayed a slightly more complex picture of family time. For mothers, the highest score on positive affect was reported for social activities (3.3), for fathers it was leisure activities (3.1). Direct interaction and eating meals together were also associated with especially high scores (above 3) on positive affect for mothers and fathers alike. But most importantly, in all activities except household-related tasks, a mother's mean score on positive affect was higher when she indicated being with family than in other situations. In other words, spending time with family while doing household-related tasks was perceived by mothers to be a significantly less positive experience.

This finding was further supported by the results for negative affect. Mothers' mean score on negative affect for family time spent on household-related tasks was substantially higher than in other situations (.6 compared to .37). Mean scores on negative affect associated with family time spent on direct interaction, eating meals, and especially leisure activities, on the other hand, were lower compared to other situations. A similar pattern was found for fathers. In all family
activities, except household-related tasks, father's mean score on negative affect was lower than in other situations. The difference for family time spent on household-related tasks, however, was not significant for fathers.

Similarly, mean scores on engagements were higher for all family activities except household-related tasks. For both mothers and fathers, family time spent on household-related tasks was perceived as significantly less interesting, enjoyable, and exciting than other activities in general (a gap of .3 and .4 for mothers and fathers respectively). Mothers felt especially engaged while involved in religious and social activities with their family (mean scores of 3.5 and higher). Fathers felt most engaged while spending time with their families in social activities and having meals together (mean scores of 3.2 and higher).

**FAMILY ACTIVITIES AS A SOURCE OF SUPPORT**

To what extent does time spent with family constitute a source of support that can contribute to working parents' well-being? In the next analyses, we examined how parents' emotional experiences of family time are related to their assessment of work-family balance. We sought to understand how family time can fulfill important emotional needs required for dealing with the competing demands of work and family lives.

In a first series of regression analyses (results not shown here) we used proportion of time spent with family to predict work-family balance. Because no significant relationship was found between the two variables, we decided to focus on the emotional dimensions of family time. Table 10.1 presents the results of a series of OLS models regressing work-family balance on the emotional experiences associated with family time, controlling for occupational conditions and relational quality in the family. Scores on positive affect, negative affect, and engagement for beeps with family were entered respectively in Models 1–3.

The results indicate that for both mothers and fathers, positive family time (i.e., scores on positive affect when parents spend time with their family) is associated with a higher degree of work-family balance, whereas negative family time (i.e., scores on negative affect when parents spend time with their family) is associated with a lower degree of work-family balance. The effect of negative affect was especially pronounced for fathers ($\beta = -.219, p < .001$). For mothers, although negative in sign, the coefficient of negative affect was not significant. Parents' assessment of work-family balance was not related to the extent to which they felt family time was interesting, enjoyable, and exciting.

Interestingly, work-family balance was not related to most occupational conditions. No significant association was found with either hours of work or work schedule. Work-family balance, however, was significantly related to work autonomy. Consistent with past research, for both mothers and fathers, greater
Table 10.1

Ordinary least squares regression results for work-family balance (standardized coefficients and standard errors in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional experience of family time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.067)</td>
<td>(.100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;46 work hrs/week</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.088)</td>
<td>(.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work autonomy</td>
<td>.242***</td>
<td>.249***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.044)</td>
<td>(.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard work schedule</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.079)</td>
<td>(.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital quality</td>
<td>.286***</td>
<td>.308***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.003)</td>
<td>(.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child relationship</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.174**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.084)</td>
<td>(.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

work autonomy was related to a higher degree of work-family balance. As expected, family relational quality, measured by marital quality and parent-child relationship, was positively and significantly associated with work-family balance. This finding in itself suggests that good family relations can emotionally help parents deal with work-family conflict.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE**

The case provided here supports our argument that the nuclear family can be an important source of support for working parents. We found that controlling for relational quality in the family, the more emotionally positive family time was,
Conversely, emotionally negative family time was associated with a lower degree of work-family balance. What could be the underlying mechanism by which the emotional dimension of family time affects parents' well-being? We suggest that when time spent with family is a positive experience it can help busy working parents take a break from the stressors of everyday life and regain much needed energy. In this way, family time can boost parents' self-esteem and contribute to their confidence in their ability to manage the complexities of contemporary work and family lives (Barnett & Rivers, 1996).

This study further sheds light on the types of activities that are most likely to be emotionally enhancing. We found that for both mothers and fathers, most family activities were positive and engaging in nature, especially leisure and social activities and eating meals together. Time spent on unstructured direct interaction, such as talking and playing with spouse and child, was also an important positive experience of family time. Family time spent on household-related tasks, however, was a much more negative and less engaging experience. Considering that, on average, the dual-earner families in this study spent about 15% of their time together doing household-related tasks, this effect cannot be overlooked.

Interestingly, the negative emotional dimension of family time spent on household-related tasks suggests that “quality time” cannot be simply defined as time being together. Using a subsample of families from the 500 Family Study, Snyder and Lewin (2006) report that once controls for occupational conditions and work hours were included in their model, parents who defined quality time as “all the time they spent with family” did not differ in their level of work-family conflict from parents who defined quality time in terms of joint planned and structured activities.

The idea that quality time does not constitute family time in general is further supported by our finding that the proportion of time spent with family was not significantly related to parents’ assessment of work-family balance. Rather than quantity, this study indicates that the quality of family time, that is how parents feel when they spend time with their family, is what matters for parents’ well-being. This finding highlights the complex and multidimensional nature of family time.

Finally, it is important to stress that because of the nature of the sample, the results reported here best apply to dual-earner middle-class families and cannot be generalized to the overall population of working families. Nevertheless, it has important implications for low-income families. One of the strategies middle and upper middle-class families adopt to deal with the shortage of time is to use their disposable income to purchase household services in the market (Hochschild, 2003; Stuenkel, 2005). Low-income families, on the other hand, have a much more limited ability to do so. As a result, they may need to spend more of their precious family time on household-related activities, which are associated with more negative emotional experiences. Viewed in this way, in low-income families the time squeeze may be more severe and its effects on family well-being more detrimental.
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Sufficient data have now accumulated to allow the unequivocal assertion of the link between work stress and both physical and psychological health. With respect to the former, work stress has been associated with conditions ranging from minor psychosomatic complaints such as sleep disturbances and digestive problems (e.g., Schat, Kelloway & Desmarais, 2005), through increased risk of infectious disease (e.g., Cohen & Williamson, 1991; Schaubroeck, Jones & Xie, 2001) suppressed immune functioning (O'Leary, 1990) and musculoskeletal problems (e.g., Carayon, Smith & Haims, 1999; Lundberg et al., 1999). Evidence for the link between job stress and physical health is particularly strong for cardiovascular outcomes including elevated blood pressure (Barling & Kelloway, 1996), chronic hypertension (Schwartz, Pickering & Landsbergis, 1996), and coronary heart disease (CHD) (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Krantz, Contrada, Hill & Friedler, 1988; Theorell and Karasek, 1996). Importantly, prospective evidence from the Whitehall studies suggested that individuals in “low control” occupations were 1.5 to 1.8 times as likely to experience new heart disease at 5-year follow-up (Bosma, Stansfeld & Marmot, 1998). In addition to these “disease” outcomes, there is also evidence that suggests that individuals may increase their smoking (e.g., Conway, Vickers, Ward & Rahe, 1981; Parrott, 1995) or consumption of alcohol and other drugs (Grunberg, Moore, Greenberg & Anderson-Conolly, 1999; Jones & Boye, 1992) under periods of increased stress. Paradoxically, individuals in high-stress jobs report engaging in less exercise than do individuals in low-stress jobs (e.g., Payne, Jones & Harris, 2002). With regard to psychological health, disturbances in affect and cognitive functioning are also consistently identified as outcomes of work stress (e.g., Kelloway & Day, 2005). For example, Wang and Patten (2001) found support for the association between work stressors and major depressive disorders in Canadian workers.

These observations provide a starting point for considering the effect of the work-family interface on individual health and well-being. To the extent that the work-family interface is a source of stress, the available data would suggest...
that work-family interactions also have consequences for individual well-being. However, we suggest that the impact of the work-family interface on well-being is not entirely negative and that the available data suggest the existence of both positive and negative effects. The goal of this chapter is to review this evidence. In doing so, we depart from previous reviews (e.g., Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000; Bellavia & Frone, 2005; Frone, 2003; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003) by going beyond an exclusive focus on negative effects. From this basis, we examine current research practices as well as organizational, individual, and governmental policy and practices. Specifically, we provide an overview of the dominant theoretical perspectives that are used to guide research on the work-family interface. Subsequently, the nature of the work-family interface is reviewed, followed by a comprehensive review of the work-family literature. We conclude with a discussion of the future research needs and the implications for practice and policy.

THE WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE: LEVELS OF CONCEPTUALIZATION AND ANALYSIS

Most research on the work-family interface has focused on work-family conflict (Allen et al., 2000). This may reflect the fact that individuals are more likely to experience work interference in their family lives than family interference at work (Bellavia & Frone, 2005; Duxbury & Higgins, 2001; Eagle, Miles & Icenogle, 1997; Frone, 2003). While Duxbury and Higgins documented an increase in both work-to-family (WTF) and family-to-work (FTW) conflict in the decade between 1991 and 2000-2001, they also noted a change in the balance between them. Employees in 2001 were still far more likely to experience WTF interference than they are to experience FTW interference. Between 1991 and 2001, the rates of individuals reporting high WTF interference increased from 27% to 31% while the percentage of those reporting high FTW interference increased from 5% in 1991 to 10% in 2001 (Duxbury & Higgins).

Because most of the literature in this area has taken the conflict perspective, the dysfunctional consequences of the interference of one domain on the other (Hill, 2005; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002) has been extensively explored. Both Frone's (2003) and Geurts and Demerouti's (2003) reviews suggest that a different perspective is beneficial: the interface between work and family may also have positive consequences, more recently referred to as "facilitation" (Frone, 2003; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005; Hill, 2005; Kirchmeyer, 1993), "enrichment" (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Rothbard, 2001) or positive spillover (Barnett, 1998; Crouter, 1994; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 1992, 1993). These are salient distinctions in this discussion of outcomes because it has been suggested that the manifestations of the work-family interface, which encompasses both conflict and facilitation,
have different antecedents, outcomes, and moderators (Aryee, Tan & Srinivas, 2005; Demerouti & Geurts, 2004; Frone, 2003; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

The predominant theoretical perspectives that have guided research in the work-family domain include role theory and ecological systems theory. Prior to reviewing the health-related outcomes in the work-family literature, it is important to briefly review each of these theories.

Role Theory

Most of the research on the work-family interface has been guided by role theory (e.g., Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Within role theory, researchers have described the work-family relationship in terms of the number of roles occupied by an individual. Some researchers suggest that individuals have a limited amount of time and energy, thus engaging in multiple roles tends to be overly demanding. This perspective is known as the scarcity hypothesis (Goode, 1960), and assumes that conflict and strain are probable outcomes of performing multiple roles. The more roles an individual occupies, the greater the likelihood that an individual will experience stress. Kahn et al. defined this type of work-family relationship as role conflict, which is the “simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other” (1964, p. 19). Based on Kahn et al.'s conceptualization of role conflict, Greenhaus and Beutell defined WTF conflict as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible” (1985, p. 77). It is now generally recognized that work-family conflict is bidirectional, such that work can interfere with family and family can interfere with work (Frone, 2003). Much of the work-family research continues to call attention to the negative outcomes associated with conflicting roles between work and the family.

Within the role accumulation perspective, several theorists proposed an expansion hypothesis (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974) in which the roles in one area (e.g., work) can benefit one's role in another area (e.g., family). Similar to the scarcity hypothesis, the expansion hypothesis also focuses on the number of roles that an individual occupies. Expansion theorists do not disagree that occupying multiple roles can lead to conflict and stress. However, occupying multiple roles may also lead to positive effects on psychological health and well-being (Barnett & Baruch, 1985) and tend to be overlooked in the literature.

Stemming from the work of early expansion theorists, several researchers have examined enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Rothbard, 2001),
enhancement (Rudderman, Obhott, Panzer & King, 2002), and positive spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a; Hanson, Hammer & Colton, 2006). There is a growing body of empirical evidence supporting the notion that participation in multiple work and family roles can lead to positive effects on individuals’ physical and psychological health (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Barnett & Marshall, 1993; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a, 2000b; Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair & Shafiro, 2005; Hanson et al., 2006; Poelmans, Stepanova & Masuda, this volume).

**Ecological Systems Theory**

To develop a broader conceptualization of the work-family interface, researchers have drawn on ecological theory. Bronfenbrenner (1979) suggests that individual development occurs throughout one’s lifespan and is shaped by dynamic, reciprocal interactions between one’s self and the experiences one has as a consequence of immediate and broader social contexts.

There are four hierarchical environmental systems that influence individual development including the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem (for a review see Voydanoff, this volume). The microsystem is “the complex of relations between the developing person and environment in an immediate setting (e.g., home, workplace)” and “a setting is defined as a place with particular physical features in which the participants engage in particular roles (e.g., parent, employee) for particular periods of time” (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 514). Secondly, the mesosystem is a “system of microsystems” (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 514) and comprises the interactions among the major systems in the microsystem. Thirdly, the ecosystem is defined as “an extension of the mesosystem embracing other specific social structures, both formal and informal, that do not themselves contain the developing person but impinge upon or encompass the immediate settings in which that person is found” (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 515). Within the context of the work-family interface, for example, the exosystem could include the interaction between an individual’s experience at home and their partner’s work life (Bellavia & Frone, 2003). Lastly, the macrosystem is the “overarching institutional patterns of the culture or subculture, such as the economic, social, educational, and political systems, of which micro, meso, and exo are the conceived manifestations” (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 515).

These environmental systems interact to have an effect on individuals’ work-family experiences and serves as a useful framework for understanding the work-family interface (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b). Much of the research focuses on the mesosystem level of the ecological model as it focuses specifically on how roles, relationships, and experiences at work are related to roles, relationships, and experiences in one’s family (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1993; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b; O’Driscoll, Ilgen &
Hildreth, 1992; See also Voydanoff, this volume). Others have focused on the exosystem level by examining the effects of one family member's experiences on another family member (e.g., Kohn, 1969; Morgan, Alwin & Griffin, 1979). For example, Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian and Mossholder (1989) examined the effects of women's' employment status on their partners' well-being and job satisfaction, and Harrison and Ungerer (2002) examined the effects of mothers' work experiences on child-mother attachment security. Researchers have also examined the work-family interface at the macrosystem level (Barnett, 1996). For example, Aryee, Fields and Luk (1999) examined the cross-cultural generalizability of a work-family conflict model (see also Aycan, this volume).

Overall, there is a growing body of empirical evidence supporting each level of the ecological model (Bellavia & Frone, 2003). The theory is useful for understanding the work-family interface as it encompasses a broader range of factors that influence both the positive and negative work-family experiences of individuals. Furthermore, ecological theory is a valuable conceptual model that can be used to examine how environmental systems interact and influence individual health and well-being (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b; Stokols, 1996).

THE NATURE OF THE WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE

WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT MODELS

One of the earlier comprehensive frameworks of WTF conflict was proposed by Frone, Russell and Cooper (1992). The framework extends previous theories of WTF conflict (e.g., Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kopelman, Greenhaus & Connelly, 1983) by specifically testing and providing empirical support for the reciprocal relationship between WTF and FTW conflict. In this theoretical framework, WTF conflict mediates the relationship between stressors and job characteristics and family distress. FTW conflict, in turn, mediates the relationship between family demands and job distress. Furthermore, both WTF conflict and FTW conflict are positively and directly related to overall psychological distress.

Research supports Frone et al.'s (1992) bidirectional theoretical framework suggesting that WTF and FTW conflict are two distinct forms of conflict that each have unique, although not mutually exclusive outcomes (Frone, 2000; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Hammer et al., 2005) such as increased psychological distress (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1997; Frone, Yardley & Markel, 1997; MacEwen & Barling, 1994; Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2004) and alcohol abuse (Frone et al., 2003). However, the results reported in the literature are not consistent and researchers suggest that gender and personality may moderate the link between WTF conflict and FTW conflict and psychological distress. For example, Rantanen and colleagues found that WTF conflict, resulting from number of hours spent working,
occupational status, and work demands, was shown to be associated with increased psychological distress. The link between WTF conflict and psychological distress in women was moderated by neuroticism. FTW conflict, resulting from parental demands associated with children under school age, also predicted psychological distress. The relationship was moderated by gender such that young children had a positive impact on men's well-being and a negative effect on women's well-being (Rantanen, Pulkkinen & Kinnunen, 2005).

In a longitudinal study of employed parents, WTF conflict was associated with increased levels of alcohol consumption, and FTW conflict was associated with increased levels of depression and poor physical health (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1997). Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood and Colton (2005) found similar results in their longitudinal study of the effects of the work-family interface on depression among dual-earner couples, demonstrating a significant effect of FTW conflict on depression, yet a non-significant relationship between WTF conflict and depression. Gender differences were also found such that the effects of FTW conflict on depression were significant for men but not for women. Thus, only men reported increased levels of depression when FTW conflict increased.

**WORK–FAMILY POSITIVE SPILLOVER**

In response to the over-emphasis on role conflict in the work-family literature, researchers have proposed various constructs to explain the positive and reciprocal effects of combining work and family roles. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) proposed a model of work-family enrichment that describes the positive outcomes associated with combining work and family roles. Work-family enrichment is defined as "the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role" (Greenhaus & Powell, p. 73). The relationship between work and family is reciprocal, such that WTF enrichment occurs when an individual's experience at work improves the quality of their family life, and vice versa.

The enrichment model suggests that resources generated in Role A (work or family) can have a direct impact on one's quality of life in Role B (work or family), as measured by performance and positive affect. For example, skills or psychological resources (e.g., self-efficacy) generated in one area of our life (work or family) can directly impact our performance in another area. Moderators of the direct path between resources generated in Role A and quality of life in Role B include salience, perceived relevance of a resource, and consistency with norms of Role B. In addition, the model incorporates an affective path (Hanson et al., 2006) in which the relationship between resources generated by Role A have an effect on positive affect, which in turn affects an individual's performance in Role B. The relationship between affect in one role and performance in another is moderated by the salience of role B. Researchers have yet to empirically test and
validate the enrichment model proposed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006); however, it provides a very useful framework for extending research on the interface between work and family.

Theoretical frameworks and a measure of work-family positive spillover have been proposed by other researchers (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Hanson et al., 2006). Hanson et al. defined work-family positive spillover as "the transfer of positively valenced affect, skills, behaviours, and values from the originating domain to the receiving domain, thus having beneficial effects on the receiving domain" (p. 251), and suggested that positive spillover can be divided into six subdimensions including (a) WTF affective positive spillover, (b) WTF behaviour-based instrumental positive spillover, (c) WTF value-based instrumental positive spillover, (d) FTW affective positive spillover, (e) FTW behaviour-based instrumental positive spillover, and (f) FTW value-based instrumental positive spillover. Empirical support was provided for the multidimensional scale in addition to the reciprocal nature of the types of spillover, such that positive spillover occurs in both directions (WTF, FTW). Furthermore, there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that positive spillover is related to improved attitudes and well-being (Grzywacz, 2000; Hammer et al., 2005; Poelmans et al., this volume). For example, family role commitment is associated with decreased psychological strain, through FTW positive spillover (Graves, Ohlott & Ruderman, 2007). Family role commitment has also been shown to enhance leadership skills and well-being at work (Rudderman et al., 2002). With respect to WTF positive spillover, research suggests that characteristics of the job such as variety and authority positively impact employee attitudes, self-esteem, and motivation, which in turn enhances functioning in the family domain (e.g., Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005).

**Family Care**

Demographic changes such as the increased participation rates of women in the labour force and an aging population have resulted in various types of family care roles that employees occupy. In a recent survey of over 31,000 employed Canadians, 70% of the sample were parents, 60% reported eldercare responsibilities, and 13% reported having both child and eldercare responsibilities (Duxbury & Higgins, 2003) referred to as the sandwiched generation (e.g., Ingersoll, Dayton, Neal & Hammer, 2001). In addition, approximately 13% of the respondents indicated that they provided care for a disabled family member.

There is a growing body of research that examines the caregiving roles that individuals occupy (e.g., Barling, MacEwen, Kelloway & Higginbottom, 1994; Bainbridge, Cregan & Kulik, 2006; Stephens & Townsend, 1997). Research on the effects of combining work and caregiving roles has predominantly been examined from the role conflict perspective (e.g., Goff, Mount & Jamison, 1990; Hammer
et al., 2005) and has largely focused on parent-employee conflict. For example, research suggests that childcare responsibilities create time-based conflict such that participation in the family role makes it difficult to perform work roles (e.g., Baltes & Heydens-Gahir, 2003; Frone et al., 1992).

The roles of providing eldercare or care for a person with a disability or chronic illness has also received increasing attention (e.g., Barling, et al., 1994; Hepburn & Barling, 1996; Marks, 1998; Sahibzada, Hammer, Neal & Kuang, 2005). There is a considerable body of research suggesting that dependent care responsibilities are associated with poor health and increased work-family conflict (e.g., Frone, et al., 1992; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Hammer, Allen & Grigsby, 1997). Researchers have identified various stressors related to the care provider role such as the type of disability/illness, and the amount of care required or time required to provide care, as well as the effects of these stressors on psychological strain (e.g., Cannuscio, Jones, Kawachi, Colditz, Berkman & Rimm, 2002). The role conflict perspective (e.g., Kahn et al., 1964) suggests that commitment to the caregiving role may reduce the resources and energy that could be devoted to work roles.

A small number of studies have examined the effects of family care from the enrichment perspective (Bainbridge et al., 2006; Scharlach, 1994) and are raising questions about the adequacy of the role conflict perspective (e.g., scarcity hypothesis) to explain the experiences of individuals who occupy work and caregiving roles. In fact, based on the results of a recent study, Bainbridge et al. caution against the exclusive use of the role scarcity framework and suggest that researchers should examine the effects of role enrichment by measuring the benefits associated with the caregiving role. Consistent with the view of enrichment/expansionist theorists (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974), research suggests that the benefits of occupying multiple roles (e.g., work and family roles) outweigh the detrimental factors (Rothbard, 2001).

OUTCOMES OF THE WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE

INDIVIDUAL EFFECTS

Psychological Well-Being

A significant body of research across several disciplines has examined the various psychological outcomes of the work-family interface (Allen et al., 2000; Frone, 1992, 2003; Frone et al., 1997; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Although it is unequivocal that conflict between the two domains has negative consequences, there have been contradictory findings about the specific associations. In his 2003 review, Frone notes that many studies have assessed only WTF conflict, or have used global measures that confound what has been more recently assessed
as separate constructs (Allen et al., 2000; Demerouti & Geurts, 2004; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003; Hill, 2005; Voydanoff, 2002). Most studies have been cross-sectional and achieve results that differ from findings of longitudinal studies. For example, Allen et al. observed that all cross-sectional studies have found significant correlations between work-family interference and depression, while Frone’s (1997) longitudinal study found no such association. Bellavia and Frone (2004) noted that generally there are a multitude of negative effects of both WTF and FTW conflict on the individual including, for example, stress (Kelloway, Gottlieb & Barham, 1999), general psychological strain (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a), alcoholism (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1993), somatic/physical symptoms (Burke & Greenglass, 1999), burnout and depression (Allen et al., 2000; Frone, 1992), medication use (Burke & Greenglass, 1999), and decreased life satisfaction (Allen et al., 2000; Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Demerouti & Geurts, 2004; Hill, 2005; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

Many studies have reported correlations between WTF conflict and life satisfaction; two meta-analyses reported similar weighted mean correlations with bidirectional work-family conflict: .28 (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998) and .31 (Allen et al., 2000). Hill (2005) found that FTW conflict was positively related to individual stress, but not to life satisfaction.

Some findings suggest that the bidirectional effects are not of equal magnitude; Brotheridge and Lee (2005), for example, found that general well-being is primarily predicted by work-related conditions, such as WTF conflict. Kelloway et al. (1999), in a longitudinal study, highlighted the need to consider both the source and the nature of work and family conflict and noted the ambiguous nature of WTF conflict effects. These findings suggest that only strain-based FTW conflict is a precursor to perceived stress; in fact, it appears that perceptions of WTF conflict may result from, rather than predict, stress reactions. Demerouti and Geurts (2004) found that when employees perceive their work-home interaction as primarily negative, they experience psychological health symptoms at a higher level than employees who perceived a positive influence from their jobs.

The relationship between positive aspects of the work-family interface and individual outcomes has not been empirically investigated to any great extent (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) support their theoretical model of the work-family enrichment process with an integrated review of a disparate body of work. In their analysis of 19 studies that measured work-family enrichment, they found that the average enrichment score was at least as high as the average conflict score, and generally was substantially higher. Although there is little data on specific psychological outcomes of work-family enrichment or positive spillover, this finding suggests that employees perceive that their work and family roles do enrich one another. Demerouti’s and Geurts’ (2004) findings support this argument. Their analysis identified five clusters. Approximately one-third of respondents experienced work and family as two separate spheres (i.e., with no interaction between work and family). A very small number (approximately 5%)
experienced primarily negative interactions between work and family. The majority of participants experienced some kind of positive interaction, including approximately 40% who perceived a primarily positive interaction, with the remaining participants experiencing both negative and positive interactions.

Interestingly, those who experienced separation did not enjoy better outcomes than participants in the other clusters; they had the second lowest scores on the negative health indicators and only average scores on positive health indicators. This suggests that interaction between work and family, if positive, offers the best quality of life (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004). Grzywacz’s and Bass’s (2003) research supports this suggestion. They contend that work-family fit is more than the absence of conflict; their results suggest that FTW facilitation is a family protective factor that buffers the negative effects of work-family conflict on mental health and that adult mental health is optimized when FTW facilitation is high and FTW and WTF conflict are low.

**Physical Well-being**

A large amount of research has shown a correlation between work-family conflict and reduced physical well-being. Outcomes such as obesity (Grzywacz, 2000), hypertension (Frone et al., 1997), psychosomatic symptoms (Burke & Greenglass, 1999), and substance use (e.g., Frone et al., 1994, 1997) have all been associated with the work-family conflict. This is both a significant personal and societal issue. For example, Duxbury and Higgins (2001) calculated the societal cost of increased visits to physicians associated with declines in physical health at almost half a billion Canadian dollars.

Two recent reviews of the relevant literature support the connection between negative experience of the work-family interface, in either direction, and decreased physical health (Allen et al., 2000; Bellavia & Frone, 2004). Bellavia and Frone noted that the direction of the conflict has been linked to specific health problems, with FTW conflict predicting the onset of hypertension in a longitudinal study (Frone et al., 1997), and WTF conflict predicting obesity (Grzywacz, 2000). In their meta-analysis, Allen et al. obtained a weighted mean correlation of .29 between work-family conflict and increased physical symptoms or somatic complaints.

There has been little empirical investigation of the potential for positive physical effects emerging from the work-family interface; however, there are grounds for positing such a relationship. In a recent investigation, for example, Williams, Franche, Ibrahim, Mustard and Layton (2006) reported that hospital workers who reported positive FTW spillover also experienced better sleep quality. Barnett and Hyde (2001) reviewed the literature relating to multiple roles and summarized their findings by stating that research consistently demonstrates that women and men who engage in multiple roles report lower levels of stress-related mental and physical health problems and higher levels of subjective well-being than do those who engage
in fewer roles. More recent research has attributed these positive effects primarily to the employee role. Grzywacz and Marks (2000b) observed that research in related bodies of literature consistently finds that employed married mothers enjoy better physical and psychological health than unemployed married mothers, suggesting that work and family life can benefit each other. In their own investigation, they found that all forms of work-family spillover (negative FTW, negative WTF, positive FTW, and positive WTF) were uniquely associated with both physical and mental health after controlling for the other forms of spillover.

**Health-Related Behaviors**

The psychological and physical effects of a negative work-family interface may contribute to unhealthy behaviors as well. Bellavia and Frone (2004) have noted research that documents various health-related behaviors that have a deleterious effect, such as substance use, overeating, and eating poorly or skipping meals completely. Ng and Jeffery (2003) demonstrated that high stress for both men and women was associated with a higher fat diet, less frequent exercise, and increased cigarette smoking. The use of medications (Burke & Greenglass, 1999), cigarettes (e.g., Frone et al., 1994), and alcohol (Frone et al., 1997; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003) have also been associated with work-family conflict.

**Family/Dyadic Effects**

It is a given that most employees live in some kind of a family structure and that what happens to one family member affects others. Barnett (1998) found that negative job experiences for one partner created psychological distress for the other, an example of emotional contagion as a crossover effect. Some research has demonstrated that negative family/dyadic effects occur in one direction, with WTF conflict associated with family-related distress and dissatisfaction, poor family performance, and family-related withdrawal. In contrast, FTW conflict is hypothesized to mainly relate to organizational outcomes (Frone, 1992). Subsequent studies (Aryee et al., 2005) suggest that both forms of work-family conflict predict lower family satisfaction, directly or indirectly (Bellavia & Frone, 2004). Perry-Jenkins, Repetti and Crouter (2000) in their review of the impact of occupational stress on families, note that there is a substantial body of research that suggests that chronic job stressors affect families when they induce feelings of role overload or role conflict between the two spheres. In Allen et al.’s (2000) meta-analysis, the link between work-family conflict and family-related stress was clear; the weighted mean correlation was .31. Generally, researchers have found that increased levels of WTF conflict are inversely related to marital functioning or adjustment (Barling, 1986). WTF conflict has also been inversely related to family satisfaction in most
studies (Allen et al.; Frone, 2003). From the perspective of WTF facilitation, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) noted that research suggests that positive aspects of the work environment, such as supportiveness and flexibility, have been associated with positive outcomes in the family domain such as family satisfaction (Frone et al., 1997; Voydanoff, 2001). It has also been suggested that work satisfaction is related to family satisfaction, and to positive parenting and child outcomes (Barling, 1986; Rothbard, 2001).

**PATHS TO WELL-BEING**

Bellavia and Frone (2005) suggest that the effect of work-family conflict on physical health may occur through multiple, and perhaps complementary, pathways. As a preliminary specification, consideration of the data reviewed above suggests several of these pathways. First, work-family conflict is associated with numerous health behaviors including substance use, smoking, and overeating (Greeno & Wing, 1994). Thus, one effect of increased work-family conflict would be to decrease engagement in health promoting behaviors (e.g., nutrition and exercise) while at the same time increasing adverse health behaviors such as smoking or drinking alcohol.

As noted above, work-family conflict also has an impact on psychological well-being including stress, anxiety, and depression. The links between these outcomes and physical health are also well documented (e.g., Hurrell & Kelloway, in press) and work-family conflict may impact physical health indirectly by adversely affecting psychological well-being. Using longitudinal data, Kelloway and Barling (1994) directly tested and supported this suggestion finding that job stress led to depression which, in turn, impaired family relationships. We further note the potential for these effects to spiral, that is, for negative family or dyadic effects to exacerbate the stress experienced by individuals, perhaps leading to more adverse health behaviors.

**FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS**

The role of family configuration and context has been extensively explored, although findings about several variables are inconclusive. Family characteristics such as marital status, the presence of children, the number and age of children, amount of marital support, family roles, and the availability and suitability of childcare have all been investigated and generally found to have some effect on work-family relationships. For example, there is evidence that spousal support (or related constructs such as spousal criticism) moderate the effect of work-family conflict (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Suchet & Barling, 1986). There are mixed findings about the presence and age of children. For example, Voydanoff (1988) found that age of children significantly affects the work-family interface, with conflict being
highest among those with younger children. Duxbury and Higgins (2001) found no relation between life-cycle stage and WTF conflict, while FTW conflict was strongly associated with life-cycle parameters. Hughes and Galinsky (1994) found that the presence of children younger than 13 in the family moderated the relationships between job characteristics and family functioning. In their recent review, Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux and Brinley (2005) reviewed the research on potential moderators and concluded that family structure is an important construct in work-family research and that simultaneous consideration of several family characteristics may be required to fully understand the work-family interface.

**Organizational Characteristics**

A number of work-related variables have been shown to moderate the relationships involved in the work-family interface. Hours spent working has been shown to be related to levels of WTF and FTW conflict (Bellavia and Frone, 2004). Grzywacz and Marks found that working more than 45 hours/week was associated with more negative WTF spillover for both men and women. The findings relating to hours of work have been mixed however (Hill, 2005), and appear to be linked to type of job (professional/nonprofessional) (Duxbury & Higgins, 2001) and gender (Hill, 2005). Another moderator that has been extensively researched is supervisory support. Levels of supervisory support have been found to moderate the relationship between work role conflict and WTF conflict (Bellavia & Frone, 2004; Eby et al., 2005). Hill found that manager support of the employee on the job had a stronger impact on work-family conflict and facilitation than did manager support of the parent in his/her parental responsibilities. More broadly, support from one’s supervisor, organizational culture, or a mentor has been found to positively influence the work-family interface (Brotheridge and Lee, 2005; Duxbury and Higgins, 2001; Eby et al.) through various mechanisms, such as reducing job strain (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004) and increasing perceived control (Clark, 2002; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

**Moderators of the Work-Family Interface**

Allen (2000) observed that the range of differential findings in this literature suggests the existence of undetected moderator variables. We would expand this suggestion to include the potential for a variety of indirect effects including both moderated and mediated relationships. Viewed from an ecological systems theory or fit theory perspectives, in which the work-family interface is a joint function of process, person, context, and time characteristics (Eby et al., 2005; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Perry-Jenkins et al., 2000), the list of potential moderators is long indeed.
Gender is perhaps the most researched individual characteristic (Korabik, McElwain & Chappell, this volume). Bellavia and Frone (2004) report that, as with research into gender differences in the prevalence of work-family conflict, there is little evidence that gender plays a moderating role in the relationship between either direction of work-family conflict and its antecedents and outcomes (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004; Frone, et al., 1997; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998; Kirchmeyer, 1992). Some studies have found differences along gender lines, both in the prevalence of work-family conflict and in the pathways by which work factors influence WTF conflict. For example, Duxbury and Higgins (2001) found that mothers reported higher levels of role overload than fathers, and that motherhood was associated with higher levels of stress and depression than was fatherhood. Hill (2005) found that gender moderated the strength of five different relationships, such as between job hours and WTF conflict, and concludes that gender should always be included as a variable in this type of research. The limited research into work-family facilitation suggests that gender may moderate the amount and direction of positive spillover, with women reporting slightly more positive spillover from work to family than men (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Age moderated this relationship as well, with younger women reporting higher levels of positive and negative spillover. Given the mixed findings that emerge from these studies, it appears that more research is required into the role gender may play in the experience of the work-family interface.

The role of personality factors in the experience of work-family interface has been minimally investigated. Extraversion has been positively related to both directions of work-family conflict (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Wayne and colleagues (2004), however, found that extraversion was related to greater facilitation but not conflict, whereas neuroticism was related to greater conflict, but was only weakly related to facilitation. Conscientiousness was related to lower levels of conflict, which was generally negatively related to work-family outcomes, whereas facilitation was positively related to the same outcomes. Other studies suggest that lower levels of work-family conflict are perceived for those who are high self-monitors, exhibit Type A tendencies, and have less negative affect (Eby et al., 2005). Finally, attachment style has been linked to work-family spillover; specifically those with preoccupied attachment styles report more negative spillover between work and home while those with secure attachment styles report more positive spillover in both directions (Sumer & Knight, 2001).

**Mediational Processes**

In an extensive recent review of the work-family literature, Eby et al. (2005) report on the various configurations in which general or unidirectional work-family conflict has been examined as a mediator variable. For example, general
work-family conflict has been found to mediate relationships between job expectations and quality of work and family life (Higgins, Duxbury & Irving, 1992), supervisory support and improved health (Thomas & Ganster, 1995), and work and family overload with work and personal outcomes (Greenhaus, Collins, Singh & Parasuraman, 1997).

More generally, we suggest that the work-family interface has to be understood within a broader context of the effects of work on the individual. The literature on work stress is far too large to be reviewed herein, but we note that a variety of factors that have been identified as predictors of individual well-being also plausibly have an impact on the work-family interface. The model of job stressors proposed by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) (Sauter, Murphy & Hurrell, 1990) identifies the principal stressors as comprising: (a) work load and work pace, (b) role stressors (conflict, ambiguity), (c) career concerns, (d) work scheduling, (e) interpersonal relations, and (f) job content and control. These stressors have an impact on both work-family conflict (Bellavia & Frone, 2005) and individual well-being (Kelloway & Day, 2006). The extent to which the effects of work stressors on well-being conflict are fully mediated or partially mediated by the work-family interface remains an empirical question.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE**

**Future Research**

Several key research needs have been identified in the work-family literature. Although theorists support the reciprocal nature of the work-family relationship, Bellavia and Frone (2003) call for researchers to measure both work to family and family to work dimensions, as such studies have been lacking. Furthermore, the need for a common conceptual definition and valid measure of work-family conflict has also been expressed in recent reviews of the literature (see Bellavia & Frone for a detailed discussion of conceptual and measurement issues).

Given the emphasis on the negative effects associated with work-family conflict, researchers have identified the need for a more balanced approach which recognizes the positive effects associated with combining work and family roles (Bellavia & Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Grzywacz, 2002; Rothbard, 2001). Frone (2003) and others have suggested that an individual's experience in one role can facilitate one's experience in another role. A variety of constructs have been proposed to describe the positive effects of combining the work and family domains, including positive spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Hanson et al., 2006) and work-family facilitation (Wayne et al., 2004). Greenhaus and Powell provided a definition and a comprehensive theoretical framework of work-family enrichment to guide
future research. Given the proposed constructs that explain the benefits associated with combining work and family roles, there is a need for clear construct definition, the development of a comprehensive theoretical model, and the development of valid measures. In addition, research on work-family enrichment must also address similar measurement challenges that have been identified in the work-family conflict research (see Bellavia & Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) also recommended further investigation of the relationship between work-family depletion, work-family enrichment, and their correlates. Previous research suggests that enrichment and depletion have different correlates (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) and work-family facilitation can buffer the negative effects of work-family conflict on well-being. Thus, additional research is necessary to empirically examine the relationships between work-family conflict and work-family enrichment to gain a more complete understanding of the work-family interface and its effects on health and well-being.

Frone (2003) suggests that research should move beyond work-family balance to explore balance between work and other non-work roles (e.g., caregiver, student, spouse) and to assess the characteristics of each role separately. There are a limited number of studies that have examined the role of caregiving from an enrichment perspective (Bainbridge, 2006). Future researchers should examine different types of caregiving roles that individuals occupy (childcare, eldercare, care for a disabled person, etc.) to better understand both the positive and negative outcomes of combining work and family-care roles. Eldercare, for example, has not been examined to the same extent that work-childcare balance has (Lee, Walker & Shoup, 2001). Furthermore, the effects of multiple caregiving roles (e.g., sandwiched generation) occupied by individuals and the personal characteristics of the care provider also warrant further investigation (Bainbridge et al., 2006).

Finally, on a more methodological note, we would be remiss not to comment on the overwhelming predominance of cross-sectional survey research designs in the literature. While we do not suggest that such designs are without value, we do note the need for research to move toward the use of alternative research designs such as longitudinal, experimental, and quasi-experimental research. Further we note the advisability of explicitly examining non-self report indicators of well-being. These suggestions are not unique to our review but, to date, researchers have largely ignored these methodological challenges and we suggest that it is now time to move in that direction.

**Implications for Practice and Policy**

**Organizational Practice**

With Duxbury and Higgins' (2001) findings that work-family conflict is on the rise and daily news reports about the difficulty of attracting and retaining
staff in almost all industries, there is a very strong imperative for organizations to implement policies that effectively reduce negative spillover and increase positive spillover between work and family life (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Grzywacz and Marks (2000) make an interesting argument for organizations determining the goals of their policies. Given the orthogonal nature of the four variations of spillover (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Hill, 2005), one set of interventions may not be effective. Based on their research, Grzywacz and Marks argue that if the goal is to reduce negative WTF spillover, then programs, policies, and job redesign efforts that aim to reduce work pressure, build supportive cultures, and promote close family relationships are indicated. If, however, the goal is to enhance the positive potential of the work-family interface, organizations need to focus on increasing decision latitude and control (Clark, 2002). Hill notes that because spending more time with one's children enhances FTW outcomes, organizations should consider implementing flexible programs that enable parents to do so. Bellavia and Frone (2004) argue that companies have provided these kinds of family-supportive interventions to reduce FTW conflict, mitigating the adverse impact of family responsibilities on the organization, and recommend that organizations should find ways to help employees manage the invasion of work into family.

Given the substantial research that demonstrates the importance of various forms of supervisory support (Eby et al., 2005; Hill, 2005), Duxbury and Higgins (2001) recommend that organizations invest in sound management development to ultimately enhance work-family facilitation and reduce conflict. Other programs that enhance employees' perception of the supportiveness of the organizational culture, such as orientation and opportunities for collective socialization, are beneficial (Eby et al., 2005; Hill, 2005). Recent research on workplace culture (Andreassi & Thompson in this volume; Duxbury & Higgins, 2005) highlights the impediments to using family-friendly workplace arrangements and identifies the importance of workplace culture per se as a factor influencing role overload and work-family conflict. The culture in place in many organizations discourages the use of alternative work arrangements and caregiving leave, especially for professionals, suggesting that implementing such programs is not enough—building a truly supportive corporate culture is essential to minimize work-family conflict and enhance facilitation. Kirchmeyer (1992) suggests that organizations' human resource policies should reflect the findings of the preponderance of research that shows no gender difference in the prevalence of work-family interference (Bellavia & Frone, 2004), which was previously used as an excuse to deny women responsibility and advancement. Batt & Valcour (2003) argue that the most effective organizational responses to work-family conflict are drawn from the concept of high involvement work systems, in which work-family policies are combined with other human resource practices, including work design and commitment-enhancing incentives.
Individual Behavior

The research on the implications for individuals in managing the work-family interface is sketchy and mixed. Kirchmeyer (1992) found that strategies that were effective in coping with the demands of multiple life domains involved altering one's own attitudes rather than trying to alter those of others, and increasing one's efficiency rather than decreasing one's activity level or trying to rely on others. A study of police officers' ability to cope with work and non-work strain found that an emotion-focused strategy (putting the situation in perspective) was more effective than praying, meditating, or developing a plan of action and following it (Beehr, Johnson, Nieva & Hurrell, 1995). Duxbury and Higgins (2001) suggest that employees take full advantage of any support policies that exist in their organizations, raise work-life balance issues in the community and the organization, and educate themselves on how to effectively deal with stress.

Social Policy

Duxbury and Higgins (2001) recommend that unions have an important role to play in establishing family-friendly workplaces. They suggest that unions can play a strong advocacy and educational role in organizations. For governments, they recommend changes to legislation to ensure common labor standards relating to family-friendly issues, such as time off in lieu of overtime pay. Outside of legislation, there are other ways in which governments can further the work-family agenda, for example by being a model employer, developing national child and eldercare programs, revising the taxation system to facilitate child and eldercare options, and finally funding research in this area. On a more macro level, several authors have called for governments in North America to investigate and adopt the supportive policy structures of European countries (Frazee, 1998; Gornick & Meyers, 2004; Lero & Lewis this volume; White, 1999).

CONCLUSION

The suggestion that both the nature and the quality of the work-family interface have implications for individual health and well-being is, by no means, novel. Indeed, research dealing with the nature and consequences of work-family relationships goes back over 75 years (Barling, 1990). While most of this research has focused on the potential for conflict or negative interactions, more recent theorists have also suggested a facilitation role whereby performance in one role enhances performance in another. With regard to health-related outcomes, it is plausible to suggest that engaging in one role may provide some "respite" from the other, and that support gleaned at either home or work may mitigate the stresses associated with role performance.
Researchers are now beginning to consider these issues in more detail. Although it is not novel to assert the existence of an effect of the work-family interface on individual well-being, we suggest that the pervasiveness of the effect has been largely overlooked in the existing literature. There is no doubt that both work and family roles are critical for individual well-being (Kelloway & Day, 2005). The work-family interface represents the intersection of those capabilities and, as such has a demonstrable impact on individual well-being. For this reason, work-family relationships were identified as one of the leading causes of stress (Sauter, Murphy & Hurrell, 1990) and the quality of those relationships may emerge as an issue of public health for the 21st century.
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The purpose of this chapter is to examine the role that gender plays in the work-family (WF) interface. During every day of their lives, people's gender influences the manner in which they are expected to behave, the way that they are perceived and evaluated by others, the kinds of roles that they take on, and the possibilities that are available to them. Work and family are two domains that have long had gender-related connotations, with men being more likely to be involved in business and women in domestic pursuits in most parts of the world. Moreover, as Haas has commented, "Gender boundaries set up a hierarchical structure of constraints and opportunities which can affect work-family linkages" (1995, p. 115). In this chapter we review the research that has been carried out on the intersection of gender with the WF interface and offer suggestions for integrating gender-related issues into W-F research. First, however, it is important to understand what gender is.

GENDER

What is Gender?

Gender refers to the psychosocial ramifications of biological sex (i.e., the implications of being a male or a female). Often gender is thought of simplistically as involving only whether someone is a man or a woman. In this paper we will use the term "demographic gender" to refer to this aspect of gender. Gender, however, is a multidimensional phenomenon (Bem, 1981) that consists of far more...
than demographic gender alone. For example, according to Korabik and Ayman's (2007; see also Korabik, 1999) multiperspective model, gender-related processes can be intrapsychic, interpersonal, or sociocultural (social structural) in nature.

From the intrapsychic perspective, gender encompasses the various aspects of gender roles that a person internalizes through gender-role socialization. These include gender schemas; gender-role identity; and gender-role traits, attitudes, and values (Korabik, 1999). The interpersonal perspective focuses on how gender-related beliefs and expectations both about the self (schemas) and about others (stereotypes) influence the interactions individuals have with one another. This approach recognizes the importance of situational cues, such as the sex-typed nature of tasks and skewed gender ratios in groups, which can make gender more salient and induce priming. From the social structural perspective, gender is seen as an ascribed status characteristic that influences access to power and resources. Thus, gender is both "a hierarchical structure of opportunity and oppression as well as an affective structure of identity and cohesion and families are one of the many institutional settings in which these structures become lived experience" (Ferree, 1995, p. 125).

We can see from the above discussion that not only are gender and gender roles culturally prescribed, but gendered norms regarding social status determine much of the structure of societies around the world (Unger & Crawford, 1993). Moreover, gender is socially constructed within a historical context (Haas, 1995). In North American society, during the past four decades the social norms regarding gender-role socialization have been changing to allow greater acceptance of femininity in men and masculinity in women (Bem, 1981). Moreover, the increase in dual-earner couples has led to modifications in the traditional roles that men and women enact. Mothers now spend more time in the workforce, while fathers fulfill more responsibilities inside the home (Bellavia & Frone, 2005).

These societal transformations are tied to dramatic changes in the way that psychologists think about gender. Forty years ago, definitions of gender were based on the assumptions of biological essentialism (that men and women have essentially different natures), biopsychological equivalence (that men should be masculine and not feminine and that women should be feminine and not masculine), and gender polarization (that these differences should be the organizing principle for interpersonal relationships and intrapsychic identity) (Bem, 1993). In contrast to the unidimensional models of gender that incorporated these assumptions, Bem (1974) and Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1975) proposed bidimensional models where gender roles were viewed as consisting of two conceptually independent dimensions (masculinity/instrumentality and femininity/expressivity) that were unrelated to whether someone was a man or a woman. Much research over the last four decades has confirmed their theoretical position and extended their models to include multidimensional, multilevel, and multiperspective frameworks (see Korabik, 1999; Korabik & Ayman, 2007).
PROBLEMS WITH THE WAY GENDER IS STUDIED IN THE WF LITERATURE

Despite the fact that gender is the demographic characteristic that has been studied most frequently in the WF literature (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003), most WF studies still do not include gender as a variable, combining samples of men and women for purposes of analysis. This approach is difficult to comprehend, given the dramatically different roles that men and women play both at home and at work and their unequal status in society.

Moreover, the WF research that does examine gender is riddled with problems. One of these is that most studies are either atheoretical or they are based on outdated theories of gender. Because of this, demographic gender (i.e., whether someone is a man or woman) is often used as a proxy for other aspects of gender (e.g., gender-role behaviour or gender-role attitudes). Often this approach is predicated on the mistaken assumption of biopsychological equivalence (that all men's primary orientation is work and all women's primary orientation is the family). Moreover, using demographic gender as a proxy variable is problematic because it can introduce confounds that can result in misinterpretation of research findings. In our society, demographic gender is a status marker, with men being attributed higher status than women. Because of this, what appear to be findings of gender differences can actually be due to differences between men and women in variables related to their status, for example power and authority (Korabik, 1999). Thus, it may appear that the levels of WF conflict that men and women experience are due to their demographic gender, when any differences are actually attributable to their differential access to power and resources or to their different social status.

The failure to equate men and women on confounding variables may have affected interpretations of past examinations of gender differences in WF conflict. For example, job type has a bearing on the ability to balance work and family demands. Managerial and professional jobs (which are more likely to be held by men) have more flexibility and control over work (e.g., Duxbury, Higgins & Lee, 1994; O'Neil & Greenberger, 1994), characteristics that have been related to decreased WF conflict. However, these types of jobs are also more demanding and require longer hours, which can produce higher WF conflict. Correspondingly, women's lower incomes may mean they have less money than men to pay for household helpers and other support services that would alleviate their WF conflict. Research shows that mean gender differences often disappear when the differences between men and women on such confounding variables are controlled (Korabik, 1999).

Another problem has been that the existing literature has largely focused on examining mean gender differences on variables related to the experience of WF conflict. Differences in the relationships among WF constructs (i.e., antecedents, role stress, and outcomes) have been neglected (McElwain, Korabik & Rosin, 2005).
As well, due to an inadequate conceptualization of gender as a variable, other important aspects of gender (gender-role traits, attitudes, etc.) have been virtually ignored in the literature. Moreover, the emphasis has been on the negative aspects of the WF interface, with WF conflict being studied to the near exclusion of WF facilitation/adaptation. In addition, most studies have employed one-shot cross-sectional designs. Finally, despite evidence that culture influences the nature of WF conflict (Joplin, Shaffer, Francesco & Lau, 2003; Ling & Powell, 2001), research has often overlooked the influence of historical context and culture.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN WF CONFLICT

We now review the literature on gender and the WF interface, explicating the problems with specific studies as we do so. We begin with the issue of mean gender differences in WF conflict, since this is the area where almost all previous work has been done. We then move on to the issue of gender as a moderator of the relationships between WF conflict and its antecedents and outcomes. Although we use the term gender differences when discussing these studies, it should be noted that in this research gender has been operationalized solely on the basis of demographic information about whether someone is a male or female. Therefore, rather than representing all aspects of gender differences, these studies are confined to the examination of the differences between how men and women experience WF conflict.

THEORIES

There are two competing theories about why mean differences between men and women in WF conflict should exist. One is the rational viewpoint (Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991), which posits that the more hours one spends in a domain, the more potential there is for conflict to occur. This theory predicts that men should experience more work interference with family (WIF) than women because they spend more time at work, whereas women should experience more family interference with work (FIW) than men because they spend more time in the home.

An alternative theory is the gender role hypothesis. It proposes that, although both men and women report that their family is valued more than their work, traditional gender roles impose different levels of importance for these roles for men and women (Greenhaus, Bedeian & Mossholder, 1987). These gender roles affect perceptions of WIF and FIW such that additional hours spent in one's prescribed gender role domain (family for women and work for men) are not seen as an imposition as much as additional hours spent in the domain associated
with the other gender. According to this perspective, women should report higher levels of WIF than men even when they spend the same total number of hours in paid work, and men should report higher levels of FIW than women even when they devote the same total number of hours to family activities. A recent meta-analysis of the WF literature (Byron, 2005) indicated that there was some support for each of these two rival theories.

**Research on Mean Gender Differences**

The research that has been carried out on the issue of whether there are mean differences between men and women in WF conflict has produced extremely contradictory findings (Voydanoff, 2002). Some studies have found that men experience more WF conflict than women (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Huffman, Payne & Castro, 2003; Livingstone & Burley, 1991; Yang, Chen, Choi & Zhou, 2000). But, it has also been found that women experience more WF conflict than men (Burley, 1995; Carlson, Kacmar & Williams, 2000; Hammer, Allen & Grigsby, 1997, as cited in Hammer, Colton, Caubet & Brockwood, 2002).

Other investigations have produced mixed results even within the same study. For example, Eagle, Miles and Icenogle (1997) found that men reported experiencing more strain-based FIW and time- and strain-based WIF than women, but there were no gender differences for time-based FIW. Still other studies (Gutek et al., 1991; McElwain et al., 2005) have found that women experienced more WIF than men, even when working identical hours, but that there were no gender differences in FIW. By contrast, Fu and Shaffer (2001) found that women experienced greater levels of FIW, but men experienced greater levels of WIF. Lastly, Duxbury et al. (1994) found that women reported both more WIF and more FIW than men.

On the whole, however, most studies have found no evidence of differences in WF conflict between men and women (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992; Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001; Grandy & Croanzano, 1999, as cited in Hammer et al., 2002; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Guerts & Demerouti, 2003; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998; Windslow, 2005). This is confirmed by a meta-analysis of 61 published studies which indicated that there were no overall mean gender differences in either WIF or FIW (Byron, 2005).

**Gender as a Moderator of Relationships Among WF Variables**

Relatively fewer studies have examined gender as a moderator of relationships among different aspects of the WF interface. This is an important avenue of
research in the WF literature because an understanding of how gender differentially impacts the manner in which the antecedents and outcomes of WF conflict are related could aid in reducing the conflict and its negative consequences. The results of investigations in this area have also been mixed.

In a study of military personnel, Huffman et al. (2003) found that time demands, as measured by the number of hours worked, were more strongly related to WF conflict for men than for women. This gender difference disappeared, however, when time demands were measured via perceptions of workload. McElwain et al. (2005) used a time demands measure that was a composite of work hours and perceived job demands. They did not find any significant gender differences in the path coefficients for the relationships between worktime demands and WIF. However, there was a significant gender difference in the relationship between family demands and FIW. Specifically, women were more likely than men to experience high levels of FIW when they had high family demands. Men's levels of FIW, however, were not dependent on the amount of family demands they had. Further, McElwain et al. (2005) found that FIW was a more significant predictor of job satisfaction for men than for women. In other words, men were more likely than women to report low levels of job satisfaction when they had high levels of FIW. The relationship between WIF and family satisfaction, however, did not differ for men and women. By contrast, Duxbury and Higgins (1991) found that women were more likely than men to report low quality of work life when they had high WF conflict, whereas men were more likely than women to report low quality of family life when they had high WF conflict. Along this same line, Burley (1995) found that the relationships of WF conflict to spousal support and marital adjustment were significantly more negative for men than for women.

Hill, Yang, Hawkins and Ferris (2004) carried out a test of the Frone et al. (1992) model of WF conflict. They found that being married was more likely to reduce FIW for women than for men. In addition, having responsibility for children was associated with significantly more FIW conflict for women than for men. Moreover, the experience of WIF was more strongly related to perceptions of a lack of WF fit for women than for men.

**Critique of These Studies**

Some of the discrepancies in the results of these investigations can be attributed to the differences in their methodologies. The studies have utilized many different kinds of WF conflict measures. Global measures of WF conflict or measures that confound the WIF and FIW subdimensions of WF conflict are frequently used (e.g., Bedeian, Burke & Moffet, 1988; Burley, 1995; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Huffman et al., 2003; Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001; Yang et al., 2000). This is an important limitation because research suggests that WIF and FIW have
unique role-related antecedents and outcomes (Frone et al., 1992). Even when studies employ measures that differentiate WIF and FIW, they often do not look at the time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based subdimensions of these constructs separately. In addition, Carlson et al. (2000) have expressed concern about whether scales of WF conflict have measurement invariance in regard to gender. They tested for gender differences during the development of their scale and found that women reported greater levels of time-, strain-, and behavior-based FIW, as well as greater levels of strain-based WIF than men.

Another issue is that the participants used in these studies differ considerably. Some studies have employed only managerial/professional employees (e.g., Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; McElwain et al., 2005), whereas others have used only blue collar workers (e.g., Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001). Still others (e.g., Fu & Schaffer, 2001; Hill et al., 2004) have used samples that combined managerial and nonmanagerial employees; despite the fact that research has shown that the experience of WF conflict is quite different depending on job type and level. For example, Schieman, Whitestone and Van Gundy (2006) found that men and women in higher status occupations experienced more WIF than those in lower status occupations.

Moreover, several investigations examining gender differences in the WF interface have used samples that have been skewed toward one gender or the other. For example, the Huffman et al. (2003) study was done with a military sample composed of 84% men. By contrast, Grant-Vallone and Donaldson's (1991) sample was composed of 70% women. Similarly, some studies have included only participants who are parents, whereas others have included only married individuals, and still others have included anyone regardless of their marital or parental status. Paying attention to sample composition is important because Byron's (2005) meta-analysis demonstrated that the percentage of men versus women in a sample, as well as the percentage of parents in a sample, moderated relationships between WF conflict and its antecedents and outcomes.

The samples of studies in this area have also differed regarding the employment status (full vs. part time) and family types (e.g., dual earner, dual career, single parent, etc.) of the participants. A particularly important aspect of this problem is that previous research on gender differences in the WF interface has been riddled with confounds because it has failed to equate men and women on key variables both in the work and family domains (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Huffman et al., 2003). It is, therefore, possible that some of the gender differences that have been found have actually been due to differences in the type and level of jobs men and women hold. Women tend to hold lower level jobs and work fewer hours when compared to men. All of these factors not only make it difficult to compare results across studies, they can potentially affect findings and should be controlled for.

In terms of implications for international research, a crucial issue is that the samples of most of the studies have been composed of primarily Caucasian
participants from the US and Canada (Byron, 2005). The exceptions are the Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) study which was done in Finland, the Fu and Schaffer (2001) study which was done with academic employees in Hong Kong, the Yang et al. (2000) study which compared employees in China and the US, and the Hill et al. (2004) study which sampled IBM employees from 48 countries. However, with the exception of the Yang et al.'s (2000) research, these studies were not truly cross-cultural in nature and their methodologies leave something to be desired when it comes to living up to the standards of best practices for cross-cultural research set down by Gelfand, Raver and Erhart (2002). Two of the studies (Fu & Schaffer, 2001; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998) only examined participants from one country with no between country comparisons made. Moreover, the measures used by Fu and Schaffer (2001) were etic in nature, having been developed in Western countries, and they were administered in English. And, although Hill et al.'s (2004) sample included participants from 48 countries, all of them worked for IBM and the measures used in the research also were etic. Hill et al. found little evidence of differences in the WF interface due to culture. However, they stated that this was probably due to predominance of the IBM corporate culture over the local cultures that were examined.

Thus, the generalizability of the findings of these studies to an international context can be questioned. This is particularly true in light of the evidence presented by Hurst (2004) that the most psychometrically sound measure of WF conflict (Carlson et al., 2000) demonstrates a lack of measurement equivalence for culture. Without measurement equivalence, meaningful cross-cultural comparisons can not be conducted. Certainly, more attention needs to be paid to having indigenous researchers develop emic measures that capture aspects of the WF interface that are particular to their cultures (see Aycan, Chapter 19 in this volume; Korabik, Ayman & Lero, 2003).

In summary, as a recent review by Bellavia and Frone (2005) concludes, there is little evidence of mean gender differences in WIF or FIW. However, more research is necessary before firm conclusions can be drawn regarding the issue of whether or not gender moderates the relationships between WIF and FIW and their antecedents and outcomes (Byron, 2005). Almost all extant research has concentrated on WF conflict and research on WF facilitation is very limited. But, what does exist suggests that gender may moderate the amount and direction of positive spillover, with women reporting slightly more positive spillover from work to family than men (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

OTHER ASPECTS OF GENDER

All of the studies cited thus far have focused on differences between men and women rather than on differences in gender roles. Because gender is based
on culture and learned behavior, there may be greater within-sex variation than between-sex variation in gender roles (Cinamon & Rich, 2002a). We will now turn our attention to a discussion of three specific gender-role variables: gender-role orientation (e.g., masculinity/instrumentality and femininity/expressivity), gender-role attitudes (traditional/egalitarian), and gender-role values. These three intrapsychic aspects of gender influence not only individuals' identities, but also their behaviors, the roles they choose to enact and how they choose to enact them. Therefore, these aspects of gender may be better predictors of WF conflict or facilitation than whether a person is a man or a woman (Korabik, 1999). Because they are covered thoroughly in other places in this volume, we will not discuss some other aspects of gender roles—motherhood (see Chapter 13), fatherhood (see Chapter 14), gendered division of labor, or other aspects of gender-role behavior.

GENDER-ROLE IDEOLOGY/ATTITUDES

Gender-role ideology (GRI) refers to an individual's attitudes and beliefs about the proper roles of men and women. In other words, how a person judges the appropriateness of behaviors and characteristics of men and women in our society (Ayman, Velgach & Ishaya, 2005). Typically, GRI is conceptualized as falling on a unidimensional continuum ranging from traditional to nontraditional or egalitarian. Individuals with a traditional GRI believe that women should give priority to family responsibilities and men to work responsibilities. By contrast, nontraditional or egalitarian individuals believe in a more equal role distribution for men and women. The conceptualization of GRI does not make the assumption of biopsychological equivalence. That is, both men and women can have either traditional or egalitarian attitudes.

GRI and Interrole Conflict

Early research in this area examined interrole conflict in general rather than WF conflict specifically. This research demonstrated, for example, that men who had egalitarian attitudes about paid employment and housework reported higher marital satisfaction (Lye & Biblarz, 1993), were more likely to intend to have children and less likely to divorce (Kaufman, 2000), and spent less time in paid employment as the size of their family increased (Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000) than men with traditional gender-role attitudes. By contrast, egalitarian women reported more stress and marital conflict (Greenstein, 1995), were more likely to divorce and less likely to intend to marry or have children (Kaufman, 2000), and reported lower marital satisfaction (Lye & Biblarz, 1993) than women with more traditional attitudes. Lye and Biblarz (1993), however, found that when spouses/partners shared an egalitarian attitude toward work and family, egalitarian
women had high levels of marital satisfaction and low levels of marital conflict. Furthermore, they stress the importance of controlling for spousal/partner attitudes when examining gender-role attitudes.

**GRI and WF Conflict**

One way that gender-role attitudes should impact on WF conflict is by influencing the extent to which people engage in traditional or nontraditional divisions of labor. Because gender-role attitudes are precursors to behavior, knowing about someone's gender-role attitudes may be more important in predicting how much WF conflict they will experience than merely knowing whether they are a man or a woman. Thus, it would be expected that women with traditional attitudes who were spending time in paid employment would experience more feelings of WIF than women who espoused egalitarian attitudes about work and family. This is because their traditional attitudes dictate that they should be putting most of their efforts into their role as a homemaker. Similarly, men with traditional attitudes who spend time with their families would be expected to experience more FIW than men with egalitarian attitudes. These men's attitudes dictate that they should spend their time providing for their family through employment.

Recently, there have been several empirical examinations of how gender-role attitudes relate specifically to WF conflict. For example, we (Chappell, Korabik & McElwain, 2005) carried out a study in Canada with 13 men and 44 women who were members of dual-earner couples with children. We measured GRI with the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale developed by King and King (1993). Overall, we found no significant differences between those with traditional and egalitarian GRI on either WIF or FIW. However, men with traditional gender-role attitudes reported experiencing less FIW than men with egalitarian gender-role attitudes. Moreover, egalitarian men reported higher levels of FIW than egalitarian women. Our findings are limited, however, by the fact that we did not examine the subcomponents of WIF and FIW (i.e., time-based, strain-based, behavior-based) separately.

Ayman et al. (2005) conducted a similar study involving 15 men and 11 women employed by US corporations. They found significant negative relationships between GRI and strain-based WIF, time-based WIF, and time-based FIW, indicating that egalitarian individuals experienced lower WF conflict than traditional individuals on these dimensions. They did not analyze their results separately for men and women, however. A third investigation was completed by Drach-Zahavy and Somech (2004) with 37 Israeli men and women. No significant differences in WIF and FIW were found between those with traditional and egalitarian GRI.
Using preliminary data from five of the countries involved in Project 3535, Poelmans et al. (2006) did a cross-cultural analysis of the relationship between GRI and WF conflict. Their participants were men and women who were employed full-time and who had a spouse/partner and child(ren). The total sample size was 324 men and 511 women and the sample sizes for each country were: India = 228, Taiwan = 121, Spain = 148, US = 62, and Canada = 276. After controlling for job sector and job level (nonmanagerial/managerial), it was found that in all countries those with traditional GRI reported greater WIF and greater FIW than those with egalitarian GRI.

Critique of these Studies

Although these preliminary studies have provided a good start to understanding the relationship of GRI to WF conflict, they suffer from a number of limitations. First, with the exception of Poelmans et al. (2006), they have had very small sample sizes. Second, none of them employed complete designs, examining the data separately as a function of gender, GRI, and the different subcategories of WIF and FIW (time-based, strain-based, etc.). Third, important confounding variables (e.g., job sector, job level, marital and parental status) were seldom controlled. The aforementioned limitations should be able to be overcome once the final data from Project 3535 have been analyzed.

GENDER-ROLE ORIENTATION

Another gender-role construct that has been overlooked in the WF literature is gender-role orientation. Because previous research has used demographic gender as a proxy for gender-role orientation, an examination of gender-role orientation might explain some of the puzzling differences between men and women that have been found in the WF literature.

Gender-role orientation is conceptualized as a bidimensional construct. The two underlying dimensions are instrumentality (also known as masculinity or agency) and expressivity (also known as femininity or communion). Individuals who are sex-typed are socialized to have more characteristics from one dimension than the other (Bem, 1974). Thus, those high on expressivity and low on instrumentality...
are labeled feminine, while those high on instrumentality and low on expressivity are considered to be masculine. Androgynous individuals are above the medians on both dimensions, whereas undifferentiated individuals are below the medians on both dimensions (Korabik, 1999). Masculine and feminine individuals will interpret, evaluate, and organize information in terms of traditional gender-role appropriateness (e.g., women should be responsible for housework and men should financially support the family through paid employment; Bem, 1981). Androgynous and undifferentiated people have a weak gender schema and, therefore, do not categorize information according to gender appropriateness (Bem, 1981).

Livingston and Burley (1991) did not find a significant relationship between gender-role orientation and future expectations of WF conflict in a sample of university students from the US. By contrast, we examined the relationship between gender-role orientation and present experiences of WF conflict in a study conducted in Canada with 27 men and 49 women who were members of dual-earner couples with children (McElwain, Korabik & Chappell, 2004). We found no gender-role orientation differences in WIF, which was not surprising considering that all participants were employed full time. Moreover, there were no significant main effects or interactions as a function of demographic gender. Interestingly, both men and women who were high in instrumentality had significantly lower levels of FIW than those low in instrumentality. However, a significant interaction was found, indicating that the effect of instrumentality on FIW varied as a function of expressivity. Regardless of their demographic gender, feminine individuals had the highest levels of FIW, followed by masculine and undifferentiated participants. Individuals who were androgynous (high in both instrumentality and expressivity) had the lowest levels of FIW. The high levels of FIW experienced by feminine individuals could be due to the high priority these men and women put on the family domain (Thompson, 2002). However, androgynous individuals are as high in expressivity as feminine individuals, so they would also be expected to be family-oriented. But, they would likely balance this by putting an equally high priority on the work domain. Moreover, high levels of conflict and distress are atypical of androgynous individuals who are usually able to adjust to, cope with, and perform successfully in, a wide variety of social situations (Bem, 1981).

**Gender-role Values**

There has been an almost complete lack of research on gender-role values (or the relative salience of work and family roles) and WF conflict. An exception is research by Cinamon and Rich (2002a & b). Their participants were Jewish Israeli men and women who were married, had children, and were working in the computer technology or law fields. They used the Life Roles Salience Scale (LRSS) to
assess gender-role values. It measures the importance of four roles (work, spousal, parental, and housework). Based on this, they divided their participants into three groups: (1) dual—those who put equal importance on their work and family roles, (2) work—those who gave high importance to the work role and low importance to the family role, and (3) family—those who gave high importance to the family role and low importance to the work role.

They found that both demographic gender and gender-role values were important to the experience of the WF interface. Their results indicated that more men than women placed greater value on work than family and more women than men placed greater value on family than work. There were no significant gender differences, however, for those in the dual category who saw work and family as being equal in importance. Moreover, men were about equally distributed over the work, family, and dual categories. But, although about 40% of women were in the dual category, among the remainder considerably more were family-oriented than work-oriented. Women were higher in level and frequency of WIF and ascribed more importance to FIW than men.

**ROLE INVOLVEMENT AS A POTENTIAL MODERATING VARIABLE**

There are a number of moderating variables that might be important in explaining the mixed findings in the literature on gender and the WF interface. One of these is the degree of role involvement. In terms of underlying theory, both the rational theory of WF conflict and the gender role theory make the assumption of biopsychological equivalence. Thus, they are predicated on the assumption that gender differences in WF conflict are due to the acceptance by men and women of the traditional division of labor, in which the husband is the breadwinner and the wife is responsible for the family (Higgins, Duxbury & Lee, 1994). However, men’s and women’s roles have been changing and their degree of work and family involvement may no longer be divided along these lines. Carlson and Frone (2003)

\[3\text{It should be noted that nothing inherent in either of these theories implies that an assumption of biopsychological equivalence must be made. Thus, the rational theory could be reformulated to state that individuals (regardless of whether they are men or women) who spend more time on work-related activities should experience greater WIF than those who spend fewer hours on work-related activities. Likewise, individuals (regardless of whether they are men or women) who spend more time on family-related activities should experience greater FIW than those who spend fewer hours on family-related activities.}

The gender-role theory could be similarly reframed. It would then state that additional hours spent in the gender-role domain that is considered to be more important or valued more highly would not be seen as an imposition as much as additional hours spent in the domain that is considered to be less important or valued less highly. According to this perspective, individuals who value family more than work should report higher levels of WIF, whereas those who value work over family should report higher levels of FIW.
feel that the amount of involvement in work and family roles may be an important determinant of WF conflict. Involvement should be assessed both in terms of: (1) the number of hours per week spent in activities related to each domain and (2) the psychological perception of one's extent of involvement in each domain. These may differ by gender. For example, men may spend fewer hours doing housework and interacting with their children than women, but still feel the same degree of psychological role investment. Conversely, women may be highly psychologically invested in their work even though they are only employed part time.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE**

Before we can start to understand the role that gender plays in the WF interface, there is a need for improvement in a number of areas. First, WF researchers need to develop a better understanding of theories of gender, to use more sophisticated theories in their research, and to better articulate their theoretical stance. Second, there is a need for better WF measures (see Chapter 4 in this volume). As Hurst states:

> a lack of standardized measurement exists, which has resulted in theoretical (i.e., construct clarification) and practical (i.e., comparing results from multiple studies) problems. The vast majority of measures have either been self-developed...developed without using psychometricly rigorous procedures...or failed to distinguish between either the bi directionality of the construct...or its multidimentional nature (2004, p. 4).

Not only do these problems need to be addressed, but measurement equivalence for gender and culture needs to be established for measures of WF conflict.

Third, researchers need to use more control variables in their studies to equate women and men on factors that might confound their findings (Byron, 2005). Moreover, researchers need to use more complete designs that examine both demographic gender and other aspects of gender and look at time-based, strain-based, and behaviour-based WIF and FIW separately. There is also a need for both more longitudinal research and more studies of facilitation/adaptation, instead of focusing exclusively on conflict.

Finally, there is a need for more cross-cultural research. Asian cultures, for example, may have more communal gender roles than Western ones, making it difficult to generalize results from the West to the East (Adler & Izraeli, 1994). Greater generalizability, however, may exist in regard to demographic gender as androcentrism and patriarchy (i.e., whatever is associated with men is viewed as more valuable than whatever is associated with women) still prevail in most present-day societies. Consequently, women are underrepresented in positions of power and authority throughout the world (Adler & Izraeli, 1994). Still, there are
wide variations in the way that women and men enact their occupational and domestic roles in different cultures.

An increased understanding of the role that gender plays in the WF interface may have several practical ramifications as well. First, there are implications for individuals in that the detrimental effects of gender-role stereotyping in both the domestic and the occupational spheres should become more apparent. As a result, people should develop a greater realization of the negative impact that they produce when they judge others in terms of gender-role stereotypes. For example, they should become more aware that they should not criticize a mother who is engaged in full-time employment if she is not able to participate in her child’s school field trip or if she supplies store-bought rather than homemade treats for the school party. This should impact on both men and women in that they would no longer be expected to conform to the stereotypic gender roles to which they have long been relegated. Instead, they would be given more freedom and latitude regarding the gender-role orientations, attitudes, and values that they endorse and the gender-role behaviors that they enact at home and at work.

Second, there are implications for organizations in that they also should be less likely to react to their employees in terms of gender-role stereotypes. Knowledge about gender should lead organizations to a greater understanding that WF concerns are not solely “women’s issues” and that neither all women, nor all men, are the same in terms of the WF choices that they make or their needs for WF accommodations. Organizations that have developed such a realization will be more likely to embody “family-friendly” cultures and to not penalize employees (particularly men) who make use of family-friendly policies.

Finally, there are implications for society as a whole. The social structural perspective on gender emphasizes the role that patriarchy plays in maintaining the present power structure which gives women less access to influence and resources than men. If any real change is to occur within individuals, in their interpersonal interactions with one another, or in organizations, this power structure needs to change. For example, women are more likely than men to take time off from work to raise children because their lower pay means that they are the ones who bring fewer financial resources into the household. Likewise, wives have less power and influence in negotiating with their husbands around who will do the majority of the housework and childcare. And, within organizations gender is still a significant social cue that affects evaluations, resulting in biases in selection, performance evaluation, and promotion. Even though more and more women have entered formerly male-dominated professions, like medicine and law, the power of patriarchy is such that whatever is associated with women is automatically reinterpreted to be less valuable. To change these circumstances will require a complete overhaul of our present sociocultural system. This will be incredibly difficult to bring about and will take many years, if not generations, to accomplish. Still, there is reason to be optimistic as much change has already occurred and society is continuing to change at a rapid pace.
In conclusion, in this chapter we discussed the role of gender in the WF interface. It is apparent from our review that people’s gender-role traits, attitudes, and values influence the choices that they make in their work and family lives. Moreover, whether someone is a man or a woman has an impact not only on their degree of influence and their access to resources in both the employment and domestic spheres, but also on how they are evaluated and judged by others at home and at work. All of these factors contribute to the amount of WF conflict versus facilitation that men and women experience.
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