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Abstract

Work and family is a contemporary topic within the field of industrial and organizational psychology that traverses disciplinary boundaries and has important implications for both individuals and organizations. As family structures have become more heterogeneous, interest in the topic has virtually exploded over the past several decades. The aim of this chapter is to review what we know about work and family interactions. The chapter is organized such that research is reviewed from the perspective of the individual, the family, the organization, and the globe. The chapter concludes with an agenda for future research.
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Introduction

The study of work and family has grown tremendously over the past several decades. Work-family research examines the intersection of employee work experiences and family lives. A burgeoning interest in the topic has been fueled by a variety of factors. A primary driver of the interest in studying work and family issues has been the increased heterogeneity in family structure. Traditional male-breadwinner families in which the male pursues full time work while the female pursues full time homemaking are the statistical minority. The majority of individuals today are involved in both paid employment and unpaid family work. According to the 2006 U.S. Census Bureau 52% of all married couples are in dual earner marriages. The percentage climbs to 62.2% in married couples with children under the age of 18 and to 67.6% in couples with children aged 6-17 (but none younger; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). In addition, data from the 2008 National Study of Employers indicates that an increasing percentage of employees have eldercare responsibilities (Galinsky, Bond, Sakai, Kim, & Giuntoli, 2008).

Another factor that has created interest in work and family is the changing expectations between employers and employees. Organizations no longer offer lifetime security and employees are less willing to sacrifice family for career (Sullivan, 1999). In addition, although the average number of hours Americans work each week has remained relatively stable, the number of Americans who work long hours (more than 50 hours a week) has been on the incline (Barnett, 2006). Technology has created more opportunities for individuals to devote more time to work anytime and anyplace (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006). Thus, the boundaries between work lives and family lives have become increasingly blurred (Fletcher & Bailyn, 1996).
Also contributing to the growth of work-family research is the fact that concerns about work-family balance is an issue that resonates beyond the halls of academia. Indeed, it is a “kitchen-table” subject that has become part of the public vernacular. Columns on work-family balance are included in newspapers such as the Wall Street Journal. The topic is one that crosses the science-practice divide within industrial and organizational psychology. Balancing work/personal demands and aspirations may be one of the greatest challenges individuals face in contemporary society (Halpern, 2004; Kossek & Lambert, 2005). Data from the 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce indicated that 45% of the U.S. workforce reported experiencing interference between their job and their family life a lot/somewhat (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prattas, 2002). Integrating career, marriage, and family can affect career progression, marital satisfaction, and overall health and well-being. Given these changes and challenges, it is not surprising that industrial and organizational psychologists have made a concerted effort to increase our understanding of the work-family intersection.

Interest in the topic is demonstrated by the explosion of edited books that have been recently published with a focus on work and family (e.g., Bianchi, Casper, & King, 2005; Halpern & Murphy, 2005; Korabik, Lero, & Whitehead, 2008; Kossek & Lambert, 2005; Pitt-Catsouphes, Kossek, & Sweet, 2005; Poelmans, 2005b). Additionally, in the past five years alone there have been numerous special issues devoted to the topic in scholarly journals such as American Behavioral Scientist (Halpern, 2006), Human Relations (Kossek, Hammer, & Lewis, in press) Journal of Managerial Psychology (Bakker, Westman, & van Emmerik, in press; Heraty, Morley, & Cleveland, 2008), Journal of Occupational and Organizational Behavior (Greenhaus, 2008), Journal of Organizational Behavior (Brough & Kalliath, in press), and The Psychologist-Manager Journal (Koppes & Swanberg, 2008). Finally, both qualitative and
quantitative comprehensive reviews of the literature have appeared in recent years (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert 2007; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer 2007).

Historical Perspective/Key Events

The growth of the work and family field can be traced to several key works and events. While other authors have traced timelines of the work and family field in general (e.g., Pruitt & Rapoport, 2008) in the following section I outline key events that I believe sparked and have sustained scholarly interest in the topic within industrial and organizational psychology during the past several decades.

Women entered the workforce in record numbers in the 1970s, leading to the emergence of the dual-career couple. In their book entitled, Dual Career Families, dual career couple, Rhona and Robert Rapoport brought attention to the roles of men and women living dual career marriages (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971). Kanter (1977) is often credited with shattering the myth of separate worlds between work and family. Kanter (1977) recognized that organizations acted as if employees’ home lives did not exist and that all that mattered was their life at work. The 1977 Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn & Staines, 1979) provided data that formed the basis for a number of early studies examining conflict between work and family including publications in Journal of Applied Psychology (Staines & Pleck, 1984).

In 1985 Greenhaus and Beutell published their seminal article that provided the theoretical underpinnings of work-family conflict. In this article, different types of work-family conflict based on time, strain, and behavior were delineated, shaping the field of work-family conflict research over the next several decades. A citation classic, this piece has been cited over 700 times according the SSI database. A watershed event that brought work-family issues
widespread attention to industrial and organizational psychologists was Zedeck’s 1987 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) Presidential Address. In his address, Zedeck (1987) called for I/O psychologists to study the relationship between work and family roles. The groundbreaking publication of the I/O Frontiers Series edited volume entitled, *Work, Family, and Organizations* (Zedeck, 1992) soon followed. Work and family issues rapidly became a recognized and growing area of focal study within the field of I/O psychology.

A decade later, in his 1998 SIOP Presidential address, Kevin Murphy again raised the need to increase our understanding of work and family issues. Murphy’s (1998) address bemoaned the lack of attention given by I/O psychologists to the relationship between careers and the rest of one’s life. Murphy (1998) suggested that we should reconsider the definition of career success in light of the extent that career conflicts with (or enhances) the family role. As President of the American Psychological Association in 2004, Diane Halpern also brought visibility to the topic by making work-family synthesis one of her presidential initiatives and developing a guide intended to help shape public policy (Halpern, 2004). The 1990s also witnessed dedicated financial support provided to study of work and family. Since 1994 the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation has played a pivotal role in nurturing work-family scholarship through funding research projects and academic centers that focus on work-family issues, and through the development and financial support of a comprehensive online information resource (Sloan Work and Family Research Network [http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/]).

Most recently, the need for work and family intervention research received recognition and a financial boost when the *Work, Family and Health Network Initiative* was funded through a cooperative agreement by the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The Network is comprised of interdisciplinary research teams from multiple
universities and was developed to better understand the relationship between work stress and the health of workers, their children, and other dependents (http://www.kpchr.org/workplacenetwork/).

Chapter Overview

The intent of the current chapter is to review the state of knowledge within the work and family field and to present ideas designed to stimulate boundary-expanding research on the topic. Work and family researchers have mined from an extensive quarry of research questions and issues that are both micro and macro in scope. The literature base has become voluminous. A search in the Psychinfo database alone as of August 2008 using the term “work-family” produced 2040 hits. Given the expansive nature of the literature, there are many different ways in which this chapter could be organized. The approach taken in the current chapter is to view the literature from that of the worker, the family, the organization, and the globe. This organizing structure is not meant to imply that the constructs discussed necessarily reside at these given levels. Moreover, these perspectives are overlapping and interdependent. However, it is hoped that this framework will provide some shape to the vast array of topics to be covered. Given the breadth of knowledge that has accumulated on the topic, the review is broad in scope. The chapter concludes with an agenda for future research that highlights specific suggested areas of inquiry for moving the field forward.

Focus on the Worker

Theoretical Overview

The theoretical foundation for most conjecture regarding the blending of work and family roles began to emerge in the 1960s (MacDermid, 2005). Three competing mechanisms were posed to explain the linkage (or lack thereof) between work and family: segmentation, compensation, and spillover (Lambert, 1990; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). The segmentation
view refers to the notion that work and family are independent spheres that do not relate to each other (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). The compensation hypothesis suggests that individuals compensate for dissatisfaction in one role by increasing their involvement in the other role or by pursuing rewards in the other role (Dubin, 1967; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). That is, there is an inverse relationship between work and family variables. In contrast, spillover suggests that experiences in one domain carry over into the other such that changes in one domain (work or family) lead to similar changes in the other domain (e.g., Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Staines, 1980). The nature of spillover can be positive or negative (Piotrkowski, 1979). For example, positive or negative affect can be carried from work and result in positive or negative affect, respectively, at home. Both spillover and compensation have been supported under different conditions, but the majority of research finds evidence for spillover (Staines, 1980).

A related line of theory focused on the impact of role accumulation. One perspective regarding role accumulation emphasizes the potential for role interference and strain among individuals who simultaneously participate in work and family roles. Goode (1960) developed what was referred to as the scarcity hypothesis. The scarcity hypothesis refers to the idea that individuals possess a finite amount of time, energy, and attention and that greedy social organizations tend to demand the majority of those resources. The more roles one accumulates, the greater the probability that the individual will face conflicting obligations and therefore suffer role strain and distress. Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) examined organizational stress that arose from role conflict and role ambiguity. The term interrole conflict was coined to describe when pressures in one role become incompatible with the pressures from another role.
An alternative point of view emerged at the time regarding role accumulation that suggested that the advantages of multiple role engagement outweighed the disadvantages (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). The enhancement hypothesis suggests that individuals’ supply of energy is expandable and that multiple roles can increase psychological well-being (e.g., Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Thoits, 1983). Crouter (1984) used the term positive spillover to describe circumstances when activities in one role support, facilitate, or enhance activities in the other role. Although slow to gain traction, an impressive body of research is beginning to develop from this perspective.

Most recently, researchers have articulated theory regarding integrative rather than causal relationships between work and family that feature the construct of work-family balance (Carlson & Grzywacz, 2008; Greenhaus & Allen, in press). Although definitions of work-family balance are continuing to be developed and refined, one theme is that balance reflects an overall appraisal of and/or orientation toward work and family life.

In subsequent sections, a review of the literature that reflects the conflict, enhancement, and integrative perspectives is provided. The dominant approach to date has been to examine the negative aspects of combining work and family roles, chiefly by focusing on the work-family conflict construct.

The Role Conflict Perspective

By far, the greatest attention within the work-family literature has been on the issue of conflict between work and family roles. Work-family conflict (WFC) research is grounded in theories of role stress and interrole conflict. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) extended Kahn et al.’s (1964) definition of interrole conflict to form a definition of WFC that has become the operative definition with which most research and measurement has been based. Specifically, WFC is
defined as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (p. 77). WFC is the mechanism that links constructs within one domain such as job demands with constructs in other domains such as family satisfaction (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992).

Current research distinguishes the directionality of the conflict. Family interference with work (FIW) is viewed as a distinct construct from work interference with family (WIF). Each has unique antecedents and consequences (e.g., Carlson, 1999). As noted by Greenhaus and Powell (2003) work-family conflict itself involves simultaneous pressures from the work and family roles. The directionality of the conflict only becomes apparent after the individual makes a decision regarding the resolution of the conflict. Those decisions generally appear to favor work over family. In terms of prevalence, mean rates of WIF are consistently higher than that of FIW (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). The family boundary is more permeable than is the work boundary.

**Dimensions.** While researchers generally agree that there are two directions by which work-family interference flows (work interferes with family; family interferes with work), there is less consensus regarding the dimensions or type of conflict. The most recognized dimensional structure is that proposed by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) that consists of time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict. Time-based conflict occurs when time spent on activities in one role inhibits the fulfillment of responsibilities in another role. Strain-based conflict occurs when pressures from one role impede the fulfillment of requirements in another role. Lastly, behavior-based conflict occurs when behaviors necessary to fulfill one role are incompatible or incongruent with behavior patterns necessary in the other role. Of these three dimensions, greater emphasis has been placed on time and strain, often to the exclusion of the behavior dimension.
Greenhaus, Allen, and Spector (2006) proposed a modified typology that refined the strain-based aspect of WFC into that which is effort-based and emotion-based. van Steenbergen, Ellemers, and Mooijaart (2007) used a similar modified typology in recent work that examined strain, time, behavioral, and psychological WIF and FIW. Carlson and Frone (2003) proposed two dimensions, internal and external. External interference refers to interference generated by demands in one role that inhibit or preclude participation in the other role. Internal interference is represented by psychological preoccupation with one role that interferes with the ability to fully engage in the other role while in the other role. They show that external WIF was primarily associated with work hours while internal WIF was associated with psychological work involvement. However, there has been little subsequent research using this typology.

Causes. Different approaches have been taken to understand the occurrence of WFC. Early research tended to focus on demographic factors, viewing gender and family status as primary predictors of WFC (e.g., Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). Most predictor research has focused on characteristics associated with work and home, postulating that work-related factors are the primary predictors of WIF and family-related factors are the primary predictors of FIW (Frone, 2003). More recent research has begun to identify dispositional variables that relate to WFC, suggesting that personality contributes incremental variance beyond situational factors in explaining WFC (e.g., Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). Brief reviews of findings are described below.

Demographic variables such as gender and number of children are thought to predict WFC through their association with work and family demands. With regard to gender, the direction of the interference is thought to matter. Because men tend to spend more time in the work domain than do women, men should experience more WIF than women. Because women
tend to take primary responsibility for the home domain, women should experience greater FIW than men. Meta-analytic research is consistent with this notion, but the effect sizes are small. Specifically, Byron (2005) reported an average effect sized of -.03 for WIF and .06 for FIW, suggesting men were slightly more likely to report WIF than were women and that women were slightly more likely to report FIW than were men.

Number of children at home consistently relates to reports of both WIF and FIW (e.g., Bruck & Allen, 2003; Carlson, 1999; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998). Parental responsibility generates more opportunities for conflicts between work and family roles to occur. In her study that included multiple demographic, situational, and dispositional predictors, Carlson found that the number of children living at home was one of the strongest and most consistent predictors of WFC. Importantly, Bryon (2005) also found that parental status moderated the relationship between WFC and gender. Specifically, when samples were comprised of more parents the gender difference in the experience of WIF and FIW widened such that women reported significantly more WIF and FIW than did fathers. Parenthood appears to increase both directions of interference for women.

Meta-analytic results shows little difference in WIF or FIW by marital status (single versus married), but parental status again moderates this effect (Byron, 2005). Single parents report more WIF and FIW than do married parents while married and single employees without children report similar levels of WIF and FIW (Byron, 2005). Marital type (single versus dual-earner) has also been examined. Dual earner couple members are thought to experience more WFC than their single earner counterparts (e.g., Higgins & Duxbury, 1992), but meta-analytic research shows no difference (Byron, 2005).
The most widely studied work/family environment variables are role stressors, role involvement, and social support. These variables are theorized to best explain WFC when they are divided into the work and family domains and predict the conflict originating from that respective domain (e.g., work role stressors predict WIF; Frone, 2003).

Role stressors are chronic sources of stress that can originate in either the work or the family domain (e.g., Carlson, 1999; Frone et al., 1992). Repeated exposure to role stressors has been linked to WFC (e.g., Aryee, 1992; Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992; Shamir, 1983). Role stressors may result in cognitive preoccupation or reduced energy needed to fulfill multiple roles (Frone, 2003). Of all of the predictors examined, Byron (2005) found that job stress, family stress, and family conflict had the strongest meta-analytic effect sizes with both WIF and FIW.

The importance of work and family roles, or job involvement and family involvement, also relates to WFC (e.g., Adams, King, & King, 1996; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Hammer et al., 1997; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996). The more one is involved in a role, the more conflict originating within that role one is likely to experience (Gutek et al., 1991). In addition, high levels of involvement in a role may create preoccupation with that role, resulting in difficulty fulfilling the other role (Frone et al., 1992). An objective indicator of work and family involvement is the number of hours spent engaged in paid work and family work. Kanter (1977) noted that occupational time demands are among the most obvious ways that work life affects family life. Because time is a finite resource, time spent in paid work restricts the time available to participate in family activities. Byron (2005) found relatively small meta-analytic effect sizes associated with subjective and objective role involvement.
Existing models of work-family conflict (e.g., Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1997) for the most part do not take into account dispositional differences. However, there is a growing body of research that demonstrates linkages between personality and reports of WFC. The dispositional variable that has received the most research attention is negative affect (NA). NA has been proposed to impact how individuals perceive their jobs and other life experiences and consistently has been associated with reports of stressors and strains (Spector, Zapf, Chen, & Frese, 2000). Thus, it is not surprising that multiple studies indicate individuals with greater NA also report greater WFC (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Carlson, 1999; Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002). Similarly, neuroticism has been linked to both WIF and FIW (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Wayne et al., 2004). Two studies have examined the Big Five variables in relation to WFC (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004). Both studies found that agreeableness and conscientiousness relate to WFC. Less agreeable individuals are more likely to report WFC, while, more conscientious individuals report less WFC (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004). Personality also moderates relationships between WFC and outcomes. In a study of employed fathers, Kinnunen, Vermulst, Gerris, and Makikangas (2003) reported that emotionally stable fathers were protected from the negative effects of WIF on well-being while agreeable fathers were protected from the negative effects of FIW on marital satisfaction.

Outcomes. Over the last several decades a large body of research has demonstrated that work-family conflict (WFC) is associated with a variety of outcomes. Numerous quantitative and qualitative reviews of this literature exist (e.g., Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Dorio, Bryant, & Allen, 2008; Greenhaus et al., 2006; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). These reviews establish that both WIF and FIW are associated with work outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to leave), family outcomes (e.g., marital and family satisfaction), and
physical and psychological health outcomes (e.g., depression, physical health complaints, substance abuse disorders).

Of particular interest has been the links between work-family conflict and health and health behavior outcomes. Based on data from the National Institute of Mental Health’s National Comorbidity Survey, Frone (2000) reported that individuals who reported WIF were significantly more at risk for mood, anxiety, and substance dependence disorders compared with those who reported less WIF. The rate of psychiatric disorders was 10-fold greater among those who reported WIF. There are a growing number of studies revealing links between WFC and health-related behaviors associated with diet and exercise (e.g., Allen & Armstrong, 2006; Roos, Sarlio-Lahteenkorva, Lallukka, & Lahelma, 2007). Greater FIW has been associated with eating more high fat foods and less physical activity (Allen & Armstrong, 2006). In addition, Allen and Armstrong (2006) reported that WIF was associated with eating fewer healthy foods. These findings have been attributed to perceptions of time scarcity. Food choices may be used as a way to cope with the competing time demands between work and family (Devine et al., 2006). Only 13% of parents reported maintaining health (eating right, exercising) as a strategy used to help meet the demands and expectations of work and home (Pitt-Catsouphes, Matz-Costa, & MacDermid, 2007). Poor diet and exercise contribute to overweight and obesity (Rosenbaum, Leibel, & Hirsch, 1997), which may help explain the finding of Grzywacz (2000) who reported a direct relationship between WIF and obesity. Frone and colleagues have amassed a considerable body of research that shows that WFC is associated with alcohol problems (e.g., Frone et al., 1997; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003).

It is important to note that the vast majority of work-family research has been based on cross-sectional research designs. However, there are a growing number of longitudinal studies.
While the findings are not consistent, longitudinal support of relationships between WFC and job satisfaction (Grandey, Cordeiro, & Crouter, 2005), hypertension (Frone et al., 1997), depression (Frone et al., 1997), and well-being (Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001) have been reported. However, there have also been longitudinal studies suggesting alternative causal flows. Variables typically considered as outcomes of WFC such as psychological well-being have been found to act as precursors to WFC rather than as outcomes (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999; Kinnunen, Geurts, & Mauno, 2004).

On the basis of the longitudinal research conducted thus far, several conclusions can be drawn. The causal direction of WFC-outcome relationships is not well understood. The longitudinal studies to date have been based on different time lags and have included different dependent variables, making comparisons difficult. This is complicated by the fact that behavioral, psychological, and physiological symptoms of strain can be expected to have different patterns of development over the same time course (Semmer, Grebner, & Elfering, 2004). There is also evidence that temporal effects may differ across gender (Kinnunen et al., 2004), direction of conflict (WIF versus FIW; Kelloway et al., 1999), and type of conflict (time-based versus strain-based; van Hooff et al., 2005).

Measurement. Measurement issues have been a frequent topic of discussion within the work-family conflict literature. Despite recent efforts to develop psychometrically sound measures of WFC (e.g., Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996), problems remain. A major criticism is that the scale items from common measures often confound cause and effect (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). Strain is embedded in many of the items used to measure WFC. For example, one item commonly used to assess FIW is, “Because of the demands I face at home, I am tired at work.” Because this item assesses fatigue during the
workday it is not surprising that it also correlates with strain. As a result of this construct overlap, relationships observed between WFC and strains such as anxiety and depression may be spurious or be inflated. Moreover, subjective measures such as those currently used to assess WFC may be prone to distortion due to trait affect (Schaubroeck, 1999). This potential problem is underscored by recent studies linking NA/neuroticism to WFC (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004).

A less serious, but related issue is that most existing measures of WFC are based on the use of strongly disagree to strongly agree response anchors (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). Work-family conflict is manifested on a day-to-day basis (Williams & Alliger, 1994) yet current measurement systems do not capture this aspect of the construct. Another issue for consideration is the clarity with which the nonwork side of the equation is specified (Huffman, Youngcourt, Payne, & Castro, 2008). For example, most scales refer to family (e.g., Netemeyer et al., 1996), but some use the term home (e.g., Grzyzack & Marks, 2000) instead. Still others refer to specific individuals in the family network as the referent for the conflict (e.g., work-spouse conflict; Aryee, 1992). Such differences make comparisons of results across studies difficult.

**The Role Enhancement Perspective**

Although the conflict approach to work and family has been dominant, in recent years the number of studies examining the positive side of the work-family interface has grown substantially. Several unique, but highly related concepts have been developed including positive spillover (Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006; Kirchmeyer, 1993; Small & Riley, 1990), work-family facilitation (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004), and work-family enrichment (Carlson Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).
Positive spillover is defined as the transfer of generative mood, skills, behaviors, and values from work to family or from family to work (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Hanson et al., 2006). Studies first began to investigate positive spillover between work and family in the early 1990s (Small & Riley, 1990). The measure of positive spillover developed by Hanson et al. (2006) captures three types of work-to-family positive spillover: affective, behavior-based instrumental, and values-based. Each of these types of spillover can occur from family to work as well as from work to family.

Facilitation refers to the extent that engagement in one life domain provides gains that contribute to enhanced functions in another life domain (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007). van Steenbergen et al. (2007) considered facilitation to be the conceptual counterpart of conflict. That is, while conflict deals with the extent that participation in one role is made more difficult by participation in the other role, facilitation refers to the extent that participation in one role is made easier by virtue of participation in the other role. They identified four types of facilitation similar to the types of conflict examined in the literature, energy-based, time-based, behavioral, and psychological. Recently, Grzywacz, Carlson, Kacmar, and Wayne (2007) suggested that the term facilitation be used to denote theory and research that pertains to system-level issues within the work-family interface. However, it is important to be aware that existing studies have used the term facilitation when conducting research investigating intra-individual across domain experiences (e.g., Rotundo & Kincaid, 2008).

Enrichment is defined as the extent that experiences in one role improve the quality of life (performance and positive affect) in the other role through the transfer of resources or positive affect from one role to the other role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) specify two paths by which enrichment occurs. Resources generated in one role
can be directly transferred to the other role. In addition, a resource generated in one role can generate positive affect within that role that in turn produces high performance and positive affect in the other role. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) also identify five types of resources that can be role generated, including skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources.

Carlson et al. (2006) suggested that the distinction between enrichment and spillover is that enrichment requires that resources not only be transferred but that they be applied in ways that result in improved performance or affect for the individual. Wayne et al. (2007) suggested that enrichment and facilitation can be distinguished by virtue of the idea that that enrichment involves the within individual transfer of resources from one domain to the other while facilitation involves the positive influence of involvement in one domain on the functioning of the other system. An example of enrichment would be when skills learned in the workplace help make the individual a better parent. Facilitation would occur when the skills learned in the workplace help the individual improve the functioning of the family unit such as through enhanced interpersonal communication. Thus, enrichment involves intraindividual cross-domain transfer while facilitation involves individual to family system transfer.

Carlson et al. (2006) developed and validated a measure of work to family enrichment composed of three dimensions, developmental, affect, and capital. Their family to work enrichment measure was comprised of three dimensions entitled, development, affect, and efficiency. Developmental gains include the acquisition of skills, knowledge, values, or perspectives. Affective gains involve the alteration of moods, attitudes, and confidence. Capital gains involve the acquisition of economic, social, or health assets. Efficiency gains are enhanced focus or attention.
Although the distinctions between the various constructs are not always clear, all reflect the perspective that combining multiple roles can result in beneficial outcomes for the individual. Moreover, despite differences in definitions, the terms have been used interchangeably. In some cases the same measure (the MIDUS scale) has been referred to as positive spillover in one study (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) and as facilitation in another (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005). For the purposes of reviewing predictors and outcomes, the term enhancement is used in the following section as a generic way to denote research on the positive benefits of multiple role engagement. Like current research regarding WFC, work-family enhancement is typically studied in terms of direction. That is, positive benefits can flow from the work domain to the family domain, which is abbreviated hereon as WFE or from the family domain to the work domain (FWE).

**Predictors.** The sets of variables that have been examined as predictors of work-family enhancement to date are limited. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) suggested that the antecedents of WFE/FWE would be resources acquired from the originating domain. Consistent with this line of thought, research to date suggests that family factors such as psychological involvement in the family and marital role commitment are predictors of FWE (e.g., Allis & O’Driscoll, 2008; Graves, Ohlott, & Ruderman, 2007). Similarly, work-related factors such as job involvement have been associated with WFE (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005). Grzywacz and Butler (2005) found that characteristics of the job, such as greater decision latitude, variety, and complexity were associated with greater WFE. Butler, Grzywacz, Bass, and Linney (2005) provided further support for this finding based on a within-person daily dairy design that linked skill level and control with WFE.

Research has also examined individual differences associated with enhancement. Higher levels of enhancement have been found for women than for men (Aryee et al., 2005; Roehling,
Moen, & Batt, 2003; Rotundo & Kincaid, 2008; van Steenbergen et al., 2007). In addition, van Steenbergen et al. (2007) reported that enhancement differentially predicted the work and nonwork outcomes of men and women. Several studies have shown that personality is associated with enhancement (e.g., Grzywacz & Butler, 2005; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Wayne et al., 2004). Findings suggest that greater extraversion relates to greater WFE as well as to greater FWE. A secure attachment style has also been associated with greater enhancement in both directions (Sumer & Knight, 2001). Rotundo and Kincaid (2008) examined coping styles and found that a direct-action coping style was positively related to WFE but not to FEW. Advice seeking was positively associated with FWE, but not to WFE.

**Outcomes.** Enhancement shares many of the same outcomes as does work-family conflict, but opposite in effect. Outcomes examined include job related attitudes, family outcomes, and health and well-being. Multiple studies have found that greater enhancement relates to greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment (e.g., Aryee et al., 2005; Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Carlson et al., 2006; Geurts, Taris, Kompier, Dikkers, van Hooff, & Kinnunen, 2005; Hanson et al., 2006). Similarly, greater enhancement has been associated with greater marital satisfaction and family satisfaction (Hill, 2005; Voydanoff, 2005). In terms of directional differences, there is some indication that WFE more highly correlates with job satisfaction while FWE is more highly associated with family satisfaction (Carlson et al., 2006).

Enhancement has been associated with a variety of health and well-being outcomes, but the number of accumulated studies on any given single variable is small. One study has reported a positive relationship between FWE and sleep quality (Williams, Franche, Ibrahim, Mustard, & Layton, 2006). Research also documents that positive work-family interactions are associated with general well-being (e.g., Allis & O’Driscoll, 2008). One study has examined enhancement
and depression longitudinally. Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro (2005) found no significant bivariate relationship between either direction of enhancement with depression measured one year later.

**Relationship Between Work-family Conflict and Work-family Enhancement**

Most scholars agree that work-family conflict and work-family enhancement constructs are conceptually distinct (e.g., Hanson et al., 2006). One is not simply the absence of the other. Empirical evidence also supports the distinction between the two in that the two have been found to have unique antecedents and outcomes (e.g., Aryee et al., 2005). In addition, correlations between the two constructs tend to be low. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) reported an average correlation of .02 across 21 studies. It is also interesting to note prevalence differences across the two in terms of direction. Research consistently shows that work is more likely to interfere with family than family is likely to interfere with work, while family is more likely to enhance work than work is to enhance family (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

**Work-Family Balance**

The term work-family balance is frequently used in both the popular and scholarly press, but its definition has been nebulous. Unlike constructs such as work-family conflict and work-family enrichment, balance is not a linking mechanism between work and family because it does not specify how conditions or experiences in one role are causally related to conditions or experiences in the other role (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003). Rather, it reflects an interrole phenomenon. However, some scholars equate low or a lack of work-family conflict with work-family balance (e.g., Duxbury & Higgins, 2001; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman, 2001). Frone (2003) suggested that work-family balance is represented by a low level of work-family
conflict accompanied by a high level of work-family facilitation. Others refer to balance in terms of investments in multiple roles (e.g., Kirchmeyer, 2000; Marks & MacDermid, 1996).

Some scholars have linked balance with the “superwoman” myth, which suggests that all women can and should have an exciting career, handsome husband, and well-behaved children (Thompson & Beauvais, 2000). Rejecting the notion of balance, recent articles in the popular press have even encouraged individuals to “enjoy being unbalanced” (Beck, 2008).

Several recent efforts have been made to systematically review the balance construct and offer precise definitions. Greenhaus and Allen (in press) define work-family balance as, “the extent to which an individual’s effectiveness and satisfaction in work and family roles are compatible with the individual’s life role priorities at a given point in time.” Life role priority refers to the relative priority, focus, or emphasis placed on different life roles (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Career focused people and family focused people place work and family respectively at the center of their lives and derive their strongest sense of identity from their higher-priority role while career and family focused people place similar emphasis on both roles and they derive their sense of self from their experiences in both roles.

Another recent perspective on balance is that it should be viewed as a social, rather than a psychological construct. Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) argue that a decontextualized view of balance isolates individuals from their families and organizations. They define balance as, “accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his or her role-related partners in the work and family domains.”

There has been little empirical research on balance as an interrole concept. Greenhaus et al. (2003) investigated the impact of employees’ relative involvement in work and family roles on life outcomes. They found that those highly involved in both work and family roles
experienced higher quality of life if they were more involved in family than in work than if they were equally involved in work and family. The concept of balance adds to the ways in which we view the intersection of work and family roles and is likely to be a major topic of future study.

Focus on the Family

As might be expected industrial and organizational psychologists have tended to focus on the work-related side of the work-family equation. Limited attention has been given to outcomes that reside in the family domain (Eby et al., 2005). In addition, there has been an overemphasis on individual effects. In their review of critical gaps in work-family research, Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002) highlight that there has been limited investigation of couple-level work-family relationships and crossover effects from one partner to the other. This observation was echoed in Casper et al.’s (2007) review of methods used to study work-family issues. The authors reported that a mere 13% of the work and family studies published in IO/ OB journals examined crossover relationships and that only 5% used the couple as the level of analysis. Arguments for why employers need to be concerned with family-related outcomes such as child health have begun to emerge (Cleveland, 2005; Major, Allard, & Cardenas, 2004). The following section takes a closer look at work-family issues with a focus on the family. Specifically, research on dual career couple issues, crossover, and child health is reviewed.

Dual-career Couples

Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) first coined the term "dual-career families" to designate a type of family structure in which both heads of household-the husband and the wife-pursue active careers and family life. Breadwinning patterns among married couples have changed in several ways during the last three decades. From 1970 to 2001 wives income relative to their husbands increased steadily. In addition, wives employment hours have increased 23% within
same time period, while husbands’ employment hours have remained relatively constant (Raley, Mattingly, & Bianchi, 2006).

The work and family lives of dual career couples are interdependent. Each partner’s work and family experiences and outcomes are impacted by his or her own set of circumstances as well as by those of his or her partner (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002). Research suggests that work and family roles within couples remains consistent with traditional gender roles in which men are career primary and women are family primary. For example, 90% of the time when a child of a two-parent family is sick, the woman is the caretaker (Maccoby, 1998). Couples are often faced with decisions in which the career advancement of one member may come at the expense of the career advancement of the second member of the couple. The vast majority of trailing spouses in job relocations are female (Eby, 2001). Women are more likely than men to take parental leaves (Judiesch & Lyness, 1999). Even in Sweden, where there have been concerted governmental efforts to encourage male parental leave, fathers take a small proportion of paid leave available (Hass, Allard, & Hwang, 2002). As noted by Greenhaus (2003), a man’s marital status generally does not influence his choice of career roles, while family responsibilities often interfere with female career success.

A major topic within the dual-career couple literature is division of labor. Decades of research continue to show that division of labor tends to be unequally divided between men and women. Specifically, based on time diary data, men tend to contribute more hours to the paid labor force while women contribute more hours to home related activities (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006). Employed mothers average five hours more per week than employed fathers in terms of total workload inside and outside of the home. Other estimates suggests that women spend 2-3 times as many hours engaged in nonpaid routine housework relative to men (Coltrane,
Several theoretical approaches are used to study household division of labor. The time availability approach asserts that household members will divide task according to the time they each have available (Arrighi & Maume, 2000). However, research shows little relationship between wife’s employment and husband’s time in housework, suggesting that marital partners do not allocate family work on the basis of time availability. The relative-resources approach is based on the premise that housework is distasteful and will be avoided. Hence, individuals within the marital dyad with greater resources (e.g., more earning power) leverage those resources to avoid housework. Strong support for this perspective is lacking in that women do more housework than men even when they earn more than their spouses (e.g., Brines, 1994). The gender ideology framework poses that division of labor is based on attitudes regarding gender roles with more egalitarian views reflecting a more equal division of labor. For example, Arrighi and Maume (2000) found that egalitarian men spend more time in housework than do men who espouse more traditional gender role values.

The unequal division holds in samples of men and women in high status jobs. For example, based on a sample of academic physicians, Bergman, Ahmad, and Stewart (2008) found that men and women had the same total workload, but men spent more time in professional work than did women while women spent more time in unpaid work and childcare activities than did men.

Male and female partners in dual career marriages differ with regard to their views on how household responsibilities are shared. For example, Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) found that 62% of fathers reported that care of the children was fully shared between the partners while only 47% of mothers reported equal sharing. In the 500 Family Study both husbands and wives were asked to self-report their total number of hours spent in common household chores and to
also report on their spouses. Spouses tended to agree on the amount of time that the wife spent on these activities. However, men tended to report a higher estimate of their own hours than that reported by their wives (Lee, 2005).

Some attempt has been made to tie the division of labor to workplace conditions. Arrighi and Maume (2000) found that men who faced masculinity challenges at work participated less in household work. Men avoid housework because it is thought of as women’s work and therefore inconsistent with their identities as men. Hochschild (1989) also concluded that a man’s identity cannot be furthered threatened by engaging in women’s work at home when it is otherwise threatened by work-related factors. More research linking workplace factors with how couples negotiate their work and family responsibilities would be a welcome addition to the literature.

**Crossover Research**

The strain that individuals face as a result of work-family demands and conflict can be contagious. That is, the experience can be shared with family members and/or with coworkers. This can result in what is referred to as crossover. Within the work-family and stress literature, crossover effects refer to a process whereby stresses and strains experienced by one individual affect the stresses and strains experienced by a partner in that individual’s social system (Westman, 1991; Westman & Etzion, 1995; Westman & Vinokur, 1998).

Westman and Vinokur (1998) proposed that there are three mechanisms by which crossover occurs. Direct transmission occurs between partners who are closely related and have empathetic reactions for one another. Indirect crossover involves interpersonal exchange as a mediator. The experienced stress of one partner activates a negative interaction sequence that results in conflictual interactions such as social undermining (Westman & Vinokur, 1998; Westman, Vinokur, Hamilton, & Roziner (2004). The third way in which crossover occurs in
through common stressors (e.g., financial strain, threat of job loss). The shared environment of the partners results in the simultaneous increase of the strains of both partners, producing a spurious relationship between strains.

Westman (2006) charts several trends in crossover research over the past thirty years. The first wave of crossover studies conducted in the 1980s focused on the crossover of stress and strain from husbands to wives among men in high stress jobs (e.g., police work). These studies viewed wives as the victims of their husband’s job stress. With the advent of an increasing number of women in the workforce, the second wave of research, conducted in the 1990s focused on wife to husband as well as husband to wife crossover. Researchers also began to expand the types of variables examined. Specifically, studies included those that examined the crossover of job stressors of the individual to the strain of the spouse and some examined the crossover of strain of the individual to the strain of the spouse. Crossover effects have been found for psychological strains such as anxiety, burnout, depression, distress, and marital dissatisfaction (e.g., Jones & Fletcher, 1993; Pavett, 1986; Westman & Etzion, 1995; Westman et al., 2004).

Of particular interest to work-family researchers has been the crossover of WFC. Some studies examine the crossover of WFC from one partner to the other, showing a positive correlation between the self-reports of WFC of each spouse. For example, Hammer et al. (1997) reported that husbands’ and wives’ WFC explained unique variance in their partners’ WFC beyond their partners’ work salience, perceived flexibility, and family involvement. Westman and Etzion (2005) found that husbands’ and wives’ WIF explained unique variance in their partners’ WIF beyond their partners’ job stressors and family demands. Similarly, husbands’ and wives’ FIW explained unique variance in their partners’ FIW beyond the same set of variables.
Other studies examine how the WFC of one partner relates to the strains of another partner. Many of these studies find asymmetric effects for wives and husbands. Husbands’ FIW has been associated with wives’ lateness to work (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003). The same study found that wives’ FIW predicted husbands’ interruptions at work and absences. Grandey et al. (2005) found that husbands’ WIF predicted wives’ job satisfaction one year later. However, wives’ WIF did not predict husbands’ job satisfaction cross-sectionally or longitudinally. Hammer et al. (2005) found support for the crossover of a husband’s WIF on his wife’s depression. Matthews, Del Priore, Acitelli, and Barnes-Farrell (2006) found while wives’ WIF was associated with increased relationship tension for their husbands, husbands’ WIF was associated with decreased relationship tension for their wives.

There are several crossover topics just beginning to gain research attention (Westman, 2006). One topic ripe for research is positive crossover. Just as stressful demands have a negative impact on the partner's well-being, positive job events may also crossover to the partner and have a positive effect on his or her well-being. In addition, the crossover of FIW and family stressors into the workplace is in need of study. For example, individuals may bring stressors from home into the workplace thereby creating strain in coworker relationships.

Child Outcomes

While family researchers have a history of examining the relationship between parents’ work experiences and child outcomes (e.g., Crouter, MacDermid, McHale, & Perry-Jenkins, 1990), child outcomes have rarely been the focus of research by industrial and organizational psychologists. Recently, scholars have argued that children are the unseen stakeholders at work and that child health should be considered a legitimate business concern (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Major et al., 2004). Further, Cleveland (2005) noted that employer
requirements such as long hours and face time can result in employees who are dysfunctional in their roles as spouses or parents.

There are several ways in which children are affected by their parents working lives. Children sense and are aware of parental work stress. In her “ask the children” research, Galinsky (1999) found that what children most wish for is that their parents would be less stressed and less tired. Similarly, Sallinen, Ronka, Kinnunen, & Kokka (2007) investigated mother and father work experiences along with reports from their adolescent children. Their results were consistent with Galinsky’s (1999) in that lack of parents’ time due to work was less of a concern than was parents’ fatigue and bad mood.

Parental work experiences relate to the quality of parent-child interactions, which in turn relate to child health and well-being outcomes (Crouter & Bumpus, 2001; Stewart & Barling, 1996). Sallinen et al. (2007) reported adolescents’ perceptions of parents negative spillover from work to home was connected to less autonomy granting parental behaviors and to increased parent-adolescent conflict, which in turn was associated with adolescent depression.

Aspects of the work environment and work-family conflict can also impact family activities such as family dinners. Family routines and rituals contribute to the quality of family life and serve as a protective factor for children (Fiese et al., 2002). Research shows that what children remember most about their childhood is the everyday rituals and traditions that bring the family together (Galinsky, 1999). Allen, Shockley, and Poteat (2008) found that less family-supportive supervision was associated with few family dinners. This relationship was mediated by WIF. In addition, the availability of flexplace (i.e., telecommuting) was negatively associated with the frequency with which children ate fast food for dinner. These findings are important in that more frequent family dinners are associated with reduced risk for teen illegal drug use,
drinking, smoking, and aggressive behaviors and with healthy food intake (CASA, 2005; Fulkerson et al., 2006; Gillman et al., 2000). Fast food intake is associated with poor dietary quality and places children at risk for obesity (Bowman, Gortmaker, Ebbeling, Pereira, & Ludwig, 2004). Based on a longitudinal study using daily surveys at both home and work, Ilies et al. (2007) found that employee social behaviors (e.g., going on family outings, eating meals together) as reported by spouses was predicted by employee WIF.

Just as engagement in multiple roles has advantages and disadvantages for individuals, the same may be said in terms of child outcomes. Crouter, Helms-Erikson, Updegraff, & McHale (1999) found that mothers working longer hours knew as much about the children’s daily experiences as did mothers working fewer hours. However, husbands married to mothers working longer hours were better informed than were husbands married to mothers working fewer hours. Thus, children of mothers who work longer hours may benefit due to increased involvement of fathers. When the work is done appears to be an important factor. Children appear to be more at risk when parents work evenings or nights (Heyman, 2000; Presser, 2000). Nonstandard shifts inhibit parents from participating in family dinners, helping with schoolwork, and reading bedtime stories (Crouter & McHale, 2005).

Why should employers care about child health? The business case for caring about child health is that child health affects employees work lives (Major et al., 2004). In addition, child illnesses impact insurance claims and costs for the organization and increases employees’ absenteeism. Employers have implemented a number of different policies designed to help individual manage work and family life. Such policies are the focus of the following section.

Focus on the Organization

Overview
Considerable attention has been given to the role of the organization in helping individuals manage work and nonwork responsibilities. For the purposes of this chapter, three different types of support are reviewed. The first is the formal resources that are available to employees such as childcare and flexible work arrangements. Such resources are commonly referred to as “family-friendly benefits.” The second is the relational support provided by supervisors. The third type of support is based the organization as a whole, which considers factors such as the norms regarding expected prioritization of work and family among employees.

**Formal Resources**

*Overview.* Family-supportive/friendly benefits, policies, and programs (FSB) are those that are designed to help employees be effective in both their work and their family lives. A wide variety benefits may be included under the rubric of FSB (Lobel & Kossek, 1996). Although there is no commonly accepted categorization system, FSB are often clustered into two categories, those that involve dependent care and those that involve the timing and location of work. A review of the most commonly discussed and researched FSB follow.

*Flexibility.* Flexibility has received a great deal of attention from both the practice and the research community. It has been cited as key to helping employees manage work and nonwork responsibilities and there are a variety of initiatives in place to promote flexibility within the workplace (Galinsky & Backon, 2008).

Flexible work arrangements (FWA) are defined as “alternative work options that allow work to be accomplished outside of the traditional temporal and/or spatial boundaries of a standard workday” (Rau, 2003). FWA permit deviance from the traditional 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, 40-hour workweek by allowing work to be performed on a
reduced hours basis, before or after normal working hours, and/or from remote locations.

Flextime has been reported as the most frequently offered family-friendly benefit, followed by telework, within the United States and in Canada (Comfort, Johnson, & Wallace, 2003; SHRM Foundation, 2001). Flexible policies are assumed to facilitate the management of competing demands from work and non-work through increases in temporal flexibility (when work is done) and in spatial flexibility (where work is done; Rau, 2003). Individuals may choose to use FWA for a variety of reasons, including a decrease/elimination of commute time, ease in scheduling appointments or running errands, continuing education, childcare needs, or productivity purposes (Sharpe, Hermsen, & Billings, 2002).

The two most popular forms of FWA are flextime and flexplace (SHRM Foundation, 2001). Flextime refers to flexibility in the timing of work. For instance, employees may be empowered to alter the start and stop times of work while still required to be present during a set of specified core hours (e.g., 10:00 to 3:00; Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Neuman, 1999). Flexplace involves flexibility in the location where work is completed, often referring to work conducted at home (also known as telework or telecommuting). Flexplace arrangements may also involve flexibility in the timing of work, but this is not always so. For example, some organizations permit employees to work from home but require them to be electronically available and working traditional hours, whereas other employers place no temporal restrictions on remote work. Thus, there is a considerable variation in the restrictions associated with flexplace policies.

A number of positive outcomes have been associated with FWA. Baltes et al. (1999) reported that the effects of flexible and compressed work schedules on a variety of work outcomes and found that they related positively to productivity, job satisfaction, and work
schedule satisfaction, and related negatively to absenteeism. Importantly this meta-analytic review was limited to intervention studies. The availability of FWA has also been associated with greater organizational commitment (Grover & Crooker, 1995).

In their qualitative review of the research on FWA and WFC, Allen and Shockley (in press) suggest that the human case for FWA has been overshadowed by the business case. Specifically, although there is a robust relationship between FWA and organizational variables such as productivity and absenteeism, the evidence regarding WFC is considerably more mixed. Demonstrating the heterogeneity of effects, two recent meta-analyses came to two different conclusions. Byron (2005) reported a meta-analytic effect size of -.30 between flexibility and WIF and of -.17 with FIW while Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2006) reported an effect size of .00 with WIF and .06 with FIW. Most recently, Gajendran and Harrison (2007) reported a mean effect size of -.11 between telecommuting and WFC suggesting a small but significant relationship.

One explanation for the heterogeneous results regarding FWA and work-family conflict is that some individuals benefit from flexibility more than others. Family responsibility appears to be a moderating factor. In her meta-analysis Byron (2005) found that having a higher percentage of females in a sample was negatively related to the study effect size between schedule flexibility and WIF and FIW. Shockley and Allen (2007) found that family responsibility moderated the relationship between WFC and FWA availability such that the relationship was stronger for women with greater family responsibility than for women with less family responsibility. Thus, FWA may provide more of a protective benefit for women than for men by virtue of women’s greater family responsibility. More specifically, women are still primarily responsible for tasks such as scheduling doctor appointments, meetings with teachers,
etc. The type of flexibility also makes a difference. Shockley and Allen (2007) reported FWA related more highly to WIF than to FIW, and flextime availability was more highly associated with WIF than was flexplace availability.

*Extending the flexibility concept.* The concept of flexibility has been extended to include flexibility in the timing of work across the lifespan. This can be referred to as career flexibility and involves the ability to reduce commitment to work during certain life cycles while maintaining the ability to opt back in when desired. Moen and Roehling (2005) argue that lockstep arrangements that force a pattern based on education, work, family, and then retirement, are outdated. Research has shown that 37% of highly qualified women voluntarily leave their career for a period of time. The vast majority of women (93%) who take a break want to return to work (Hewlett, 2005). Organizations that acknowledge and accommodate such changes in pace over the career course make provisions for employees to slow their career progress while also avoiding permanent career derailment.

*Paid leave.* Under federal Family Leave and Medical Act (FLMA), companies with at least 50 employees are required to allow employees to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave a year to care for a newborn, a sick family member or their own medical problem. However, some individual employers go beyond these requirements and provide paid leave. Leaves following the birth or adoption of a child generally demonstrate positive health benefits for mothers (Chatterji & Markowitz, 2004), but research that examines specific organizational paid leave policies and individual health well-being outcomes is sparse. There is some data based on a review of the California paid leave program to suggest that offering extensive family and medical leave benefits helps reduce turnover, but the data cannot rule out the possibility that companies that offer more extensive leaves are better employers in general (Milkman & Appelbaum, 2004).
Other studies have found that generous leaves, paid or unpaid, increase the likelihood that women will return to work following childbirth (Glass & Riley, 1995). On the other hand, taking a leave of absence has also been associated with negative career consequences for both men and women (Allen & Russell, 1999; Judiesch & Lyness, 1999).

Dependent care supports. The research regarding the efficacy of dependent care support is surprisingly sparse. Only a handful of studies have specifically examined the use of employer-supported childcare centers. Goff, Mount, and Jamison (1990) found no relationship between childcare center use and employee absenteeism or work-family conflict. However, satisfaction with childcare arrangements was associated with less work-family conflict regardless of location. and Nichols (1992) found that parents who used an employer sponsored onsite childcare center reported fewer childcare problems and more positive work-family attitudes than those who were on the waiting list. No relationship was found with performance or employee absenteeism. Most recently Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood, and Colton (2005) found that the use of dependent care supports (a variety of supports that included child and eldercare) were positively associated with WIF for dual-career women. Grover and Crooker (1995) found that the availability of childcare was associated with attachment to the organization.

Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2006) reported a meta-analytic effect size of -.14 for WFC and -.04 for WIF with dependent care availability and satisfaction. These effect sizes should be interpreted with caution because their research did not distinguish between childcare arrangements provided by an employer versus those provided by another source (e.g., homecare).

A large proportion of employees not only have responsibility for the care of children, but also for the care of parents (Neal & Hammer, 2007). Estimates indicate that 35% of workers provide care for an aging family member and that proportion is likely to increase (Bond et al.,
2002). In response to this challenge a greater percentage of employers are providing elder care resources to employees, with 35% providing such a benefit in 2005 based on data from the National Study of Employers (Bond, Galinsky, Kim & Brownfield, 2005). To my knowledge, research has yet to isolate the availability or use of eldercare benefits alone with employee outcomes.

**Supervisor Support**

The importance of the supervisor in determining how employees experience the workplace has been well documented. Employees who have positive relationships with their supervisors are more satisfied, more committed, and perform better (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Those with abusive supervisors have unfavorable job attitudes, more psychological strain, and lower family well-being (Tepper, 2007). Thus, it should not be surprising that supervisors also play a critical role regarding the extent individuals are able to manage their work and family responsibilities.

Individuals who report that their supervisors are more family-supportive also report less WFC (e.g., Allen, 2001; Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Frone et al, 1997; Goff et al., 1990; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). Breaugh and Frye (2008) recently corroborated the relationship through other reports of WFC. That is, employee reports of supervisor support were associated with reports provided by significant others of employee WFC. Family-supportive supervision has also been positively associated with positive job attitudes and lower intentions to leave the organization (e.g., Allen, 2001; Anderson et al., 2002; Roehling, Roehling, & Moen, 2001).

Unsupportive supervisors may block or make it difficult for employees to access structural supports such as flexibility (Brewer, 2000; Glass & Fujimoto, 1995; Warren &
Johnson, 1995) or place demands on employees that make it challenging for them to be available to family members when needed (e.g., Allen et al., 2008; Galinsky & Stein 1990). Indeed several studies have shown positive correlations between family-supportive policy use and family-supportive supervision (Allen, 2001; Breaugh & Frye, 2008; Thompson et al, 1999).

Hammer, Kossek, Zimmerman, and Daniels (2007) recently proposed that family supportive supervisor behavior is comprised of four dimensions. The dimensions include emotional support, instrumental support, role model behaviors, and recognition of the strategic importance of work-family issue. Hammer and colleagues (2007) also recently linked family-supportive supervision with health outcomes. Specifically, Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Zimmerman, and Daniels (2008) found that family-supportive supervision was associated with workday systolic and diastolic blood pressure. Thus family-supportive supervision has the potential to be implicated as a cardiovascular risk factor. This is not surprising when considering CVD risk has been linked to a lack of social support in previous research (Uchino, Cacippo, & Kiecolt-Glaser, 1996).

Informal Organizational Support

It has been noted that despite the implementation of specific family-supportive policies such as flextime, organizations have changed little in terms of overall structure and approach. That is, they continue to expect employees to put everything into their work, even at the sacrifice of family (Williams, 2000). The “ideal worker” is available 24/7 and takes little time off for childbearing or for caregiving. Such entrenched expectations can negate the usefulness of formal policies and undermine employee efforts to achieve work-family balance.

Several related constructs and measures have been developed to assess informal organizational work-family support. Thompson and colleagues (1999) refer to work-family
culture as “the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives.” (p. 394) Allen (2001) used the term family-supportive organizational perceptions (FSOP) to describe the global perceptions that employees form regarding the extent that the organization is family-supportive. Thompson et al. (1999) consider three dimensions of culture, career penalties, time demands, and managerial support. In contrast, Allen’s (2001) conceptualization is unidimensional and based on the notion that supervisor/manager support is a related, but distinct construct. Other dimensions that might be considered part of the domain of family-supportive organizations/cultures have also been proposed such as face-time orientation (Shockley & Allen, 2008).

Employees who perceive their organizations as more family-supportive report less WFC than do those who perceive the organization to be less family-supportive (Allen, 2001; Behson, 2005; Shockley & Allen, 2007; Thompson et al., 1999). These findings have been supported in studies conducted outside of the U.S. (Lapierre, Spector, Allen, Poelmans et al., 2008; Mauno, Kinnunen, & Pyykkö, 2005; O’Driscoll, Poelmans, Spector, Kalliath et al., 2003). In addition, stronger perceptions that the organization is family-supportive have been associated with less intent to leave the organization (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999), greater job satisfaction (Allen, 2001; Lapierre et al., 2008), and greater family and life satisfaction (Lapierre et al., 2008).

Thompson, Andreassi, and Prottas (2005) identified the structural factors thought to serve as antecedents of work-family culture. They include market focus (e.g., product life cycle), job demands (e.g., 24/7 service orientation), job characteristics (e.g., measurability of job
performance), characteristics of the organization (product technology), and work group characteristics (group cohesiveness).

Summary

Because there have been few studies based on large representative samples of the working population and even fewer based on experimental designs, it is difficult at this point to present firm prescriptive recommendations for what organizations should and should not do in terms of specific policies, benefits, and practices. A quote from Urie Bronfenbrenner that is often repeated is that, “If you want to understand something, try to change it” (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 291). Change driven research is sorely lacking within the work-family literature (see Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002 for an exception). Our knowledge of effective workplace practices is hampered by a limited number of intervention studies. For example, we know surprising little regarding how the implementation of flexible work policies relate to changes in employee WFC. This may begin to change over the next few years as research from the Work, Family and Health Network Initiative begins to emerge.

Focus on the Globe

Overview

Dual-earner families are common in developed nations around the world (Caligiuri & Givelekian, 2008). Thus, it is no surprise that a concerted effort has been made in recent years to expand work and family research across the globe. International research, particularly from Europe and Asia, has proliferated (e.g., (Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999; Aryee et al., 2005; Cousins & Tang, 2004; Janssen, Peeters, de Jonge, Houkes, & Tummers, 2004). In examining issues from a global perspective, it is also important to consider societal level issues that influence work-family interactions. Accordingly, in this section research is considered that
focuses on work-family issues across societies as well as the influence that societies have on how individuals experience their work and family lives.

*International and Multicultural Research*

International comparative studies of work-family issues remain relatively rare. Given the expanding global economy, this is a critical gap in the literature. Comparative studies that do exist have been limited in theoretical scope, focusing primarily on individualism-collectivism to explain cross-national differences in work-family conflict relations with other variables (Lu & Gilmour, 2005; Spector, Allen, Poelmans, Lapierre, et al., 2007; Spector, Cooper, Poelmans, Allen, et al., 2004; Yang, 2005; Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000). These studies generally demonstrate that the relations between work-family conflict and predictors such as work demands and outcomes such as job satisfaction are weaker in collectivist societies than in individualist societies (e.g., Spector et al., 2007; Spector et al., 2004). This is attributed to the notion that in collectivist cultures work hours are viewed as a contribution made to the family while in individualistic societies work hours are viewed as something the individual does for his or her own career gain. Not all studies show differences. In a 48-country study, Hill, Yang, Hawkins and Ferris (2004) demonstrated that a model that linked work demands to WIF and job attitudes held universally across four country clusters. However, all of the participants in the study were employees from IBM. Hence one possible explanation for the findings was that the IBM culture was stronger than the country culture.

Other research suggests that work-family experiences may not be similar across all cultures. Grzywacz, Arcury, et al. (2007) found no association between WFC and health among a sample of immigrant Latino low-wage workers after controlling for job characteristics. However, these findings differed across gender in that there was a relationship between WIF and greater
anxiety and depressive symptoms for women but not for men. Research by Lyness and Kropf (2005) also points to the potentially important role of gender and gender role ideology in examining work-family across cultures. In a study of European managers from 20 different countries, national gender equality was related to perceived work-family culture and the availability of flexible work arrangements, which in turn related to work-family balance (Lyness & Kropf, 2005).

The prevalence of work-family conflict itself may differ across countries/cultures. Grzywacz, Arcury, et al. (2007) found that the degree of conflict reported by the immigrant workers in their study was infrequent compared to findings based on the typical American professional sample. In a comparison of 18 different countries with regard to work-family pressures, Spector et al. (2005) found significant mean differences in the level of work-family pressure reported by participants with individuals from Taiwan and Hong Kong reporting the highest and individuals from the UK and Australia reporting the lowest.

Country Level Social Policy

Social policies or government level supports for work and family vary enormously across the world (Heyman, Earle, & Hayes, 2007; Waldfogel, 2001). For example, countries differ in terms of the extent that they sponsor paid leave for childbirth and adoption, childcare is readily available and affordable, and that early education programs exist.

The welfare regime typology has been used as an organizing framework for understanding variation in social policy across countries (Esping-Andersen, 1990). The welfare regime typology represents the way that the state, the market, and the family shape different backgrounds for understanding the work-family interface (den Dulk, 2005). The three distinct regimes are referred to as liberal, conservative, and social democratic. Liberal regimes are
characterized as market dominated (Eikemo, & Bambra, 2008). In such regimes state provision of welfare is minimal. Government interventions and regulation for work-family supports are limited and are left to market forces. The ideology of the liberal welfare regime centers on free-market capitalism with minimal state interference (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Working parents are encouraged to rely on their own resources for managing work and family and the adoption of work-family arrangements within organizations is framed as a business case (den Dulk, 2005). Government aid that is provided is primarily means-based. Conservative regimes are characterized as state dominated and occupationally related. Benefits are typically earnings related and administered through employers (Eikemo, & Bambra, 2008). In such regimes, the state and organizations are viewed as active participants who both should contribute to the development of work-family policy. The state provides services, but simultaneously retains social status differences. In social democratic regimes the state dominates and the focus is on egalitarianism. Government takes responsibility for a wide array of social issues including work-family arrangements such as childcare and parental leave. Full employment of all citizens is encouraged.

As a liberal regime nation, it is often noted that the U.S. lags behind other industrialized nations in terms of social policies that help individuals manage work and family. For example, Heyman et al. (2007) reported that 169 of the 173 countries they studied offered guaranteed leave with income to women in connection with childbirth and 98 of those countries offer 14 or more weeks of paid leave. In contrast the U.S. has no federal guaranteed paid leave for mothers. In the U.S. parents rely on tax credits to help with child care expenses while childcare assistance in Europe is usually provided through publicly funded programs (Waldfogel, 2001).
Greater family-related government social supports are often called for in the U.S. (e.g., Gornick & Meyer, 2003; Neal & Hammer, 2007). Welfare regime research indicates that individual health tends to be best in social democratic welfare states (e.g., Chung & Muntaner, 2007; Coburn, 2004). However, there is little research linking social policy with individual outcomes such as work-family conflict. It is also worth noting that within the United States several individual states have enacted paid family leave laws. Signed into law in 2002, California was the first state to create a paid leave program (Milkman & Appelbaum, 2004). Workers who participate in the State Disability Insurance Program are eligible for up to six weeks of partial pay each year for the purposes of bonding with a newborn/adopted child or to care for an ill family member. This program is funded by the state, not the employer. Washington approved a law in 2007 that provides up to five weeks of paid family leave due to the birth or adoption of a child. Most recently New Jersey passed a law based on the California model. Other states are currently considering their own versions of paid leave. Research tracking the outcomes associated with these changes in policy for working parents would be informative.

An Agenda for Future Research

Overview

As underscored at the beginning of this chapter, there has been a tremendous amount of research conducted on work and family issues in the past five years alone. However, much remains to be learned. Greenhaus (2008) recently made the call for work-family researchers to ask new and theoretically meaningful questions with more innovative methods. Below I describe five areas thought to be worthy of concerted research attention over the next five years.

Multilevel Models and Approaches
As the organizing structure of the review portion of this chapter illustrates, work-family interactions can naturally be viewed from several different levels of analysis. Although work-family relationships inherently involve multilevel phenomena, and researchers recognize this fact, the research itself has been primarily based on individual level perceptions (Casper et al., 2007). For example, constructs that naturally reside at higher levels of the organization such as culture and climate have been studied from primarily an individual perspective (e.g., Kossek, Colquitt, & Noe, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). Moreover, Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) multilevel ecological model of human development increasingly has been used in recent years as a theoretical platform for work-family studies, but the data collected and analyzed have been solely at the individual level (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Individual perceptions are important to study and are often what most influences individual behavior. However, by focusing almost entirely on individual perceptions, we are likely limiting our understanding of work-family issues.

Kozlowski and Klein (2000) describe multilevel models as those that link phenomena at one level with phenomena at another level through both bottom-up processes (e.g., from the individual to the organization) as well as top-down processes (e.g., from the organization to individuals). There have been several recent attempts to develop multilevel models that describe different aspects of the work-family interface. Most of these models address issues related to family-supportive policies. Poelmans and Sahibzada (2004) presented a multilevel framework intended to illuminate the macro- and meso-level factors thought to influence individual perceptions, and the adoption, of work-family policies. For example, it is proposed that companies in countries that have more extensive family-supportive policies (e.g., paid maternity leave) will be more likely to adopt organizational level family-supportive policies. Along the
same lines, Poelmans and Beham (2008) developed a multilevel model of the processes involved in work-family policy allowance decisions of managers. Swody and Powell (2007) proposed a multilevel model intended to explain employee participation in family-friendly programs. Finally, Van Dyne, Kossek, and Lobel (2007) developed a cross-level model designed to examine how the individual use of flexibility influences group-level processes and outcomes. In total, these models provide a rich array of research propositions that remain to be tested.

Empirical research at multiple levels of analysis is rare. Several recent notable exceptions have appeared in the literature, which help demonstrate the potential fruitfulness of further study. Kopelman, Prottas, Thompson, and Jahn (2006) found that at both the individual and the work-unit levels offering more work-family practices was associated with greater perceived organizational family support and affective commitment. In contrast the number of programs offered was not associated with FIW nor with WIF at either level. The authors also found that results were stronger at the work-unit level than at the individual level, giving credence to the notion that shared climates result in an emergent social system that relates to individuals overall affective reactions. Major, Fletcher, Davis, and Germano (2008) examined cross-level relationships between work-family culture, leader-member exchange (LMX), coworker support, and WIF among employees from 10 different organizations who worked in the IT industry. They found that employees do form shared perceptions of the organization’s work-family culture and that these perceptions indirectly relate to individual WIF through its influence on LMX and coworker support. Hammer et al. (2005) examined the use of workplace family supports (e.g., flexibility, childcare) at both the couple and individual level of analyses. Findings revealed no significant longitudinal couple-use effects on WIF or job satisfaction.
There are many multilevel questions that need to be answered. Such research involves several challenges (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). Measures designed to capture system level constructs need to be developed. Samples that consist of multiple organizations and multiple family units will be required. The family as a unit in particular has rarely been examined. In addition to testing the propositions developed from the multilevel frameworks of researchers as noted above, below are several additional ideas:

- How do organizational level policies interact with government level support to impact individual level work-family conflict?
- Do organizations possess micro-level climates of family-supportiveness in addition to organizational cultures of family-support?
- How do the aggregate job demands of dual career couples as a unit influence individual child health and behavior outcomes?
- How does aggregate family support relate to individual job performance?
- How do work group norms relate to individual experiences of work-family conflict and work-family enhancement?
- How does individual WFC relate to group level performance?
- Can constructs such as balance be studied from the couple and/or family level?

*Less Reliance on Self-Reports*

Methodological limitations associated with work-family research are well documented (Casper et al., 2007). The work-family literature has been dominated by studies in which both the independent and dependent variables are based on self-report. Studies based on such designs are relatively easy and inexpensive to conduct and often serve the important function of establishing initial support for relationships prior to conducting more complex, costly, and time-consuming
studies. Moreover, this is a criticism that is not necessarily unique to work-family research as it applies to many areas of study within industrial and organizational psychology. However, it is particularly vexing for the area of work and family.

The ability to offer sound, evidence-based suggestions for organizational practice are hampered because of the limited inferences that can be drawn from such research designs. For example, relationships between variables such as WFC and health may be overstated because of statistical artifacts such as consistency effects. Several potential directions for future research that can help remedy this limitation seem particularly fruitful.

Outcomes. As discussed previously, work-family conflict has been an issue of particular concern because of its association with health and well-being. However, the vast majority of this work has been based on self-reported health outcomes. The inclusion of objectively measured health indicators can help lead to more firm conclusions regarding the relationship between WFC and health. Moreover, this type of evidence can provide compelling evidence to organizations and policy makers regarding the need to take action to address work-family issues.

Physiological systems have their own characteristics that differ from what is captured through self-reports of health. As noted by Sonnentag and Fritz (2006) self-reports and physiological measures do not substitute for each other but likely reflect different underlying processes or aspects of stress responses. Indicators of health such as cortisol levels, catecholamines, and blood pressure can add to our understanding of the health effects associated with simultaneous pressures from work and family roles.

Cortisol is a stress hormone that is sensitive to socio-emotional demands at work (Lundberg, Granqvist, Hansson, Magnusson & Wallin, 1989). It can be measured relatively non-invasively such as through saliva samples. Cortisol stimulates the mobilization of energy in
demanding situations. Sustained levels of cortisol have been associated with an assortment of negative health effects, ranging from depression and immune suppression to cardiovascular disease (e.g., Bergman et al., 2008; Ganster, Fox, & Dwyer, 2001). Cortisol patterns can reflect the demands individuals face in their work and family lives. Bergman et al. (2008) found that there is a combined effect of sex and home responsibility that contributes to cortisol release over the day. The more perceived responsibility at home, the higher the cortisol level in the evening. This finding held for both men and women. Goldstein, Shapiro, Chicz-DeMet, and Guthrie (1999) observed that married women had higher cortisol levels at night than did unmarried women.

Catecholamines such as epinephrine (adrenaline) and norepinephrine (noradrenaline) reflect the sympathetic nervous system’s reaction to stress. Their levels too appear to be patterned based on the challenges of meeting work and family demands. Goldstein et al. (1999) showed that unmarried women experienced significant decreases in norepinephrine on off days as compared to workdays, whereas married women had similar levels of norepinephrine on off days and workdays. Frankenhaeuser, Lundberg, Fredrikson, and Melin (1989) reported that male managers’ catecholamine output dropped sharply at 5 pm, whereas female managers’ norepinephrine secretion increased after work. Similarly, Lundberg and Frankenhaeuser (1999) found that the elevation of norepinephrine after work was significantly greater for women than for men, especially for women with children.

Elevated blood pressure is a significant marker for cardiovascular risk. Frankenhaeuser et al. (1989) found that male managers’ blood pressure fell after work, whereas female managers’ blood pressure remained high. Extensive family responsibilities, in conjunction with high job strain, were associated with high levels of systolic and diastolic blood pressure among white-
collar women holding a university degree (Brisson, Laflamme, & Moisan, 1999). Similarly, Goldstein et al. (1999) found that decreases in heart rate from day to evening were significantly greater for women without children than for women with children. As mentioned previously, there is also research indicating that family-supportive supervisor behavior is associated with blood pressure (Hammer et al., 2008). Relatively inexpensive portable blood pressure monitors designed to record multiple readings throughout the day make the incorporation of blood pressure assessments more feasible than in the past.

Most of the research to date provides indirect evidence that the combination of work and family demands result in detrimental physiological responses. Research is needed that directly assesses and links reports of work-family conflict with physiological assessments. In addition, the potential positive effects of multiple role engagement should also be examined. For example, it may be useful to investigate what type of after work family activities serve to reduce cortisol and blood pressure from day to evening. Finally, while it is important to incorporate physiological measures, it should also be noted that physiological measures are not without their own limitations (Semmer et al., 2004). For example, single readings of blood pressure are known to be unreliable. Cortisol reading levels have been found to vary across laboratories.

**Predictors.** As mentioned earlier the primary predictors of WIF are thought to reside in the workplace. Here again, workplace factors are often limited to self-reports. Most research linking organizational characteristics with constructs such as work-family conflict has been based on employee reports. One way to more objectively assess occupational conditions is to assess variables such as job complexity using the O*Net. Developed by the Department of Labor, O*Net is a continuously updated online database that has extensive information regarding U.S. jobs [http://online.onetcenter.org](http://online.onetcenter.org). Crouter, Lanza, Pirretti, Goodman and Neebe (2006)
provide a primer on how the O*Net may be used by work-family researchers. Researchers must collect data in sufficient detail regarding occupations so that it can be further coded. For example, an occupation such as “teacher” is too vague in that O*Net has over 70 different codes for teacher. This approach can shed new light with regard to the occupational conditions that give rise to both work-family conflict and work-family enhancement.

A similar, occupationally focused approach was taken in recent research. Dierdorff and Ellington (2008) used O*Net information to capture behavior-based antecedents of work-family conflict. The authors concluded that the occupation in which someone works accounts for significant variation in WIF (based on a single item measure). Specifically, individuals working in occupations that required greater interdependence and responsibility for others (e.g., police detectives, firefighters) reported greater WIF than did those working in occupations that required less interdependence and responsibility for others (e.g., taxi drivers, tellers).

Again, this type of methodology is not without its limitations. The use of occupational codes such as that provided by the O*Net treats all jobs from the same classification as identical, which misses potential differences in individual job design (Morgeson, & Campion, 1997). Thus, such approaches may be considered as complements rather than replacements of self-reports. Nevertheless, including alternative assessments of workplace factors is important to those interested in organizational policies and work-family cultures because this measurement approach can better clarify the role of environmental factors that induce WFC and related health outcomes (Dohrenwend, Dohrenwend, Dodson, & Shrout, 1984). Although individuals’ perceptions and feelings regarding work experiences are helpful to study, it is primarily so when one’s purpose is to try and change those perceptions. When the interest is to contribute to job design and/or develop interventions that address a specific need, it is more helpful to understand
objective stress exposure (Frese & Zapf, 1999). Organizational work-family interventions typically are not designed to change people’s perceptions of WFC. Interventions are focused on changing the conditions of the work environment that create the opportunity for WFC to occur, thus an objective standard is needed from which to evaluate the success of such interventions. Accordingly, more objective assessments of the work environment should be considered a welcome addition to the work-family literature.

**Affect, Emotion, and Self-regulation**

It is becoming clear that affect plays an important role in both positive and negative work-family experiences. As described previously, trait negative affect has been strongly associated with work-family conflict (e.g., Bruck & Allen, 2003). Recent work using experience sampling indicated that the affective states experienced at work continued at home after controlling for stable individual differences and work conditions (Ilies et al., 2007). Affect is a key variable in Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theory of work-family enrichment as well as in theories of positive spillover (e.g., Hanson et al., 2006). Still, our understanding of the role that affect and self-regulatory strategies play in work-family experiences is at a nascent stage. Programmatic research with systematic integration of affect within the work-family literature is needed. There are several existing bodies of literature from which work-family researchers may draw inspiration for such efforts.

George and Brief’s (1996) theory concerning motivational agendas provides one foundation for developing a theory of affect in work-family relationships. As noted by George and Brief (1996) people have motivational agendas that involve many possible selves that cross both work and nonwork domains. Possible selves refer to what people want to become. Individuals are not singularly directed, but rather they strive to become many things. For
example, individuals strive to be accomplished professionals, caring parents, and loving spouses. However, individuals do not have the capacity to focus motivationally on all possible selves simultaneously. Feelings serve as a cue as to which of the motivational selves require attention. That is, feelings serve as a source of information used to direct motivational attention (Schwarz, 1990). For example, a sick child can shift the motivational attention of an individual away from the self as high job performer to the self as caring parent.

One feeling that is part of the popular discourse regarding work and family, but has received little scholarly attention, is guilt. Guilt has long been linked with working parents, especially mothers. Current thinking is that guilt can be understood as a response to threats to interpersonal attachments (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994). When faced with a work-family conflict, guilt may occur if/when an individual perceives that he/she had a choice in the matter (e.g., a parent chooses to work on Saturday rather than attend a child’s soccer game), the individual cannot fully justify the decision (working Saturday was not required by the employer), the employee’s values about balancing work and family life are violated (the employee believes weekends should be reserved for the family), and the individual perceived the action was foreseeable/preventable (e.g., the employee knew about the child’s soccer game; Kubany et al., 1996; McElwain & Korabik, 2005).

Guilt typically has a negative connotation associated with it, but it can motivate reparative behavior such as confessing, apologizing, undoing, repairing (Tangney, 1990). That is, it can serve as a signal that a motivational self needs attention. In the example used above the parent may apologize to the child and provide the child with his or her undivided attention all day Sunday in an effort to restore his “caring parent” motivational self. Guilt can also be a tool used by role-senders (a mother expresses her unhappiness with her son for not calling home
more often). Individuals induce guilt in their relationship partners as a behavioral change tactic (e.g., as a way to get one partner to spend more time with the other). Investigating such dynamics sets the stage for new insights into understanding work-family experiences.

Another affective-laden topic that could inform the work-family literature is rumination. Rumination is defined as “the process of thinking perseveratively about one’s feelings and problems rather than in terms of the specific content of thoughts” (p. 400; Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco, & Lyubomirsky, 2008). Self-regulation theories regard rumination as initiated by perceived discrepancies between one’s current state or situation and a goal or desired state (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1998; Martin & Tesser, 1996). For example if an individual has the goal of maintaining a loving marriage and a fulfilling career but is frequently required to be out of town for work related travel, she is likely to focus on the discrepancy between her goal (devoted wife) and her current state (absentee wife). Self-regulation theory proposes that rumination can be adaptive or maladaptive. In this case, the result may be adaptive if the woman takes action to resolve the discrepancy (finds another job that does not require travel) or she modifies her goal (she quits work and abandons the goal of pursuing a fulfilling career) or be maladaptive (she perseverates regarding the amount of travel needed to advance her career and lack of time with spouse).

Perseverating on self-discrepancies results in negative affect (Pyszczynski & Greenberg, 1987). Rumination has also been found to predict depression, binge eating and binge drinking (Nolen-Hoeksema et al., 2008). In addition, chronic rumination can result in the loss of social support as friends and family members become frustrated with the ruminator’s need to continue to discuss his/her problems (Nolen-Hoeksema & Davis, 1999). Rumination should be examined as a response to work-family conflict as it may be one of the mechanisms that explain the
relationship between work-family conflict and negative outcomes such as depression and health behaviors. Moreover, incorporating rumination into work-family research could reveal new ways in which men and women differ in response to WFC. For example, women are more likely to use rumination to regulate their negative moods while men are more likely to medicate with alcohol (Nolen-Hoeksema & Corte, 2004).

Another focal point that involves attentional resources for further study is distractions. Distractions play a key role in the experience of work and family conflict. Individuals commonly find themselves participating in one role while simultaneously feeling preoccupied by thoughts, emotions, or demands associated with another role (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Cardenas, Major, & Bernas, 2004). For example, consider the parent who is thinking about work while his or her child is telling him/her about a problem in school that day. Such distractions can erode role quality and result in negative performance outcomes. Self-regulation involves the exertion of control over the self by the self (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Self-regulatory skills enable individuals to maintain focus in a given domain, particularly when demands in the other domain are high.

Work-family research has primarily focused on externally generated conflict from role senders as opposed to internally generated preoccupation or distraction. Cardenas et al. (2004) investigated the total number of hours per week that women felt distracted by family while working and total number of hours they felt distracted by work while with family. Participants reported more work distractions at home \((M = 9.30)\) than family distractions at work \((M = 5.54)\) despite spending more hours at work than at home. This suggests that individuals have a more difficult time regulating their focus on their family role than on their work role and is consistent with research suggesting the family role boundary is more permeable than is the work role.
boundary (Eagle, Miles, & Icenogle, 1997). A related line of research is that of psychological
detachment. Psychological detachment from work involves not participating in work related
activities or thoughts when away from the workplace. The inability to detach from one’s job has
been associated with indicators of poor well-being such as fatigue and sleep complaints (e.g.,
that individuals who detached from the job during the week reported a positive affective state at
the end of the workweek. The inability to focus psychological attention on members within the
social system that share our physical location may ultimately be damaging to both the individual
and his/her relationship partners.

Research on distraction and detachment may further expanded by considering the
growing body of literature regarding the concept of mindfulness. Mindfulness has been defined
as “intentionally paying attention to present-moment experience (physical sensations,
perceptions, affective states, thoughts and imagery) in a nonjudgmental way, thereby cultivating
a stable and nonreactive awareness” (p. 394; Carmody, Reed, Kristeller, & Merriam, 2008). It
has been lamented that the fast paced, technology overloaded, nature of today’s society has
eroded opportunities for deep focus, awareness, and reflection (Jackson, 2008). Cultivating a
mindful awareness can be a valuable self-regulatory behavior that gives individuals a greater
sense of control (Carmody et al., 2008). It is consistent with self-determination theory, which
promotes the individual’s ability to choose behaviors consistent with one’s needs, values, and
life interests (Kostanski & Hassed, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Being aware of moods and
thoughts should enable individuals to fully attend to others within the moment as well as identify
which motivational self needs to be called into attention.
Therapeutic interventions have been developed intended to help cultivate “everyday mindfulness.” Such interventions have been associated with improvement in depression, social functioning, and anxiety (Grossman, Niemann, Schmidt, & Walach, 2004). Most recently, a work-site mindfulness based intervention was investigated (Klatt, Buckworth, & Malarkey, in press). Results indicated that the intervention resulted in reduced stress among a group of working adults. Because the two critical components to mindfulness are, (a) self-regulation of attention and (b) the adoption of an orientation toward one’s experiences in the present moment, it has the potential to serve as a means to help individuals cope with the management of work and nonwork boundaries. It would be particularly interesting to examine the connection between the ability to practice mindfulness and work-family balance.

Finally, work-family researchers may also be informed by neuroscience research. There may be a neurobiological basis to an individual’s ability to manage high demands between work and family. The prefrontal cortex (PFC) is important for attentional control and when people are stressed their PFC does not function optimally. The PFC is critical to the regulation of behavior, attention, and affect (Brennan & Arnsten, 2008). Neuroscience research is beginning to elucidate the cognitive changes that occur in response to stressors. Specifically, the amygdala may be turned on while the PFC, which is the higher cognitive center is turned off (Arnsten, 1998). This is important in that the PFC inhibits distractions, permitting individuals to plan and organize effectively. In addition, inhibition of the PFC impairs the ability to multitask (Diamond, Campbell, Park, Halonen, & Zoladz, 2007). Thus, the PFC plays a key role in the skills and abilities that are important to the effect management of work and nonwork. Moreover, during stress, the amygdala induces catecholamine release in the prefrontal cortex, which results in cognitive dysfunction. The PFC functions optimally under conditions of moderate catecholamine
release. PFC working-memory functions are impaired under conditions of high catecholamine release. Fatigue can result in underproduction of catecholamines and stress can result in overproduction. This is important in that, as reviewed earlier, catecholamine release has been associated with patterns of work-family demands (e.g., Lundberg & Frankenhaeuser, 1999). In short, neuroscience research may be able to help us understand the brain processes involved in the ability to self-regulate work and family roles.

Understanding the Role of Individual Differences

There has been some tension within the work-family literature regarding placing the onus for the management of work and family on the individual versus the organization. One point of view is that organizational barriers and constraints are the primary drivers of work-family conflict and that the degree that an individual experiences work-family conflict is largely driven by his/her work and/or family situation (e.g., Lewis, Gambles, & Rapoport, 2007). Recommendations for managing work and family often focus on organizational or governmental level policy (Neal & Hammer, 2007). Employer-centered solutions and workplace redesign are thought to be the needed solutions (Eby et al., 2005). As noted previously, existing models of key constructs within the work-family literature such as work-family conflict do not take into account dispositional differences. It has been argued that viewing concepts such as work-life balance from the individual perspective is akin to “blaming the victim” (Gryzwack & Carlson, 2007). Lewis et al. (2007) further suggests that there are numerous constraints to personal choice in contemporary contexts. For example, high commitment management practices are viewed as manipulative maneuvers designed to encourage workers to increase efforts and work harder to improve performance.
Such a focus seemingly gives the individual little direct control over his or her work-family situation. Individuals are free agents who make a series of daily life decisions that impact the opportunity for work and family to conflict and or harmonize with each other (Poelmans, 2005a). Because attention has been focused primarily on organizational benefits and systems, less research has focused on what individuals can do to actively balance their work and family lives. Person-situation debates are not uncommon in organizational research. However, most of the field of industrial and organizational psychology has accepted the notion that dispositional differences can be a significant determinant of how individuals experience and perform within the workplace (e.g., Judge & Locke, 1993; Staw & Ross, 1985). Moreover, a substantial body of research has shown that personal characteristics can influence the subjective experience and appraisal of a situation (see Thompson, Poelmans, Allen, & Andreassi, 2007, for a review of the work-family and coping literature).

Research concerning the personal characteristics, strategies, and decisions made by individuals is needed to garner a more comprehensive understanding of work-family experiences (Greenhaus, 2008; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002). The evidence for individual differences does not negate the need for, nor the potential efficacy of, organizational interventions designed to help individuals be successful in both their work and their family roles. Rather, it potentially broadens our repertoire of possible solutions to individual work-family dilemmas. Two specific suggestions for focus are described below.

**Integration/segmentation.** One individual difference that has recently been examined is a person’s preference for segmenting their work and family lives versus integrating them. Segmentation/integration preferences are based on boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996). Boundary role theory suggests that individuals develop boundaries to
attempt to manage their work and family roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). Segmenters prefer the two domains to be kept apart while integrators prefer to remove boundaries and blend work and family together. Current conceptualizations place integration and segmentation as opposite ends of the same continuum (Kreiner, 2006). It has been proposed that there costs and benefits to either extreme on the continuum (Ashforth et al., 2000). Role segmentation allows for less role blurring of role boundaries, but makes transitions between role boundaries more difficult. Effective boundary management is thought to facilitate role performance in both work and family domains (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999).

There have only been a handful of studies to date that have directly tested segmentation/integration preferences. Kreiner (2006) found no relationship between segmentation/integration and WIF. The items used in Kreiner (2006) all refer to preferences with regard to keeping work separate from home (e.g., “I don’t like to think about work when I am at home.”). Shockley and Allen (2008) used the same measure and found no relationship with WIF and a slightly higher, but nonsignificant ($r = .13$) relationship with FIW in the direction of suggesting that a stronger segmentation preference was associated with more FIW. Shockley and Allen (2008) also reported that a stronger segmentation preference was associated with less use of flextime and flexplace. In contrast to Shockley and Allen (2008), Kossek, Lautsch, and Eaton (2006) reported that those who preferred integration telecommuted less. Their findings also indicated that individuals who preferred integration reported more FIW than those who preferred segmentation, however, the correlation was small ($r = .16$). No relationship with WIF was detected. It is interesting to note that the items developed by Kossek et al. (2006) are more reflective of keeping family out of the workplace (“I prefer to not talk about my family issues
with most people I work with.”) while others do not specify direction (“I actively strive to keep my family and work-life separate).

The findings to date suggest several directions for future research. First, the direction of the preference may matter. That is, individuals may vary in terms of the extent that they prefer to keep work out of the home versus home out of work. In addition, by placing segmentation and integration on a continuum, the extent that individuals may engage in dual strategies is lost. Finally, it seems important to separate preferences from behaviors or strategies. The measure developed by Kossek et al. (2006) gets closer to assessment of the active strategies individuals may choose to engage in versus stated preferences. It seems important to develop measures that tap into the actual strategies that individuals use to manage their work and nonwork boundaries and to recognize that those strategies may vary both within and across domains. Moreover, discrepancies between preferences and required strategies may be interesting to examine. A wide range of outcomes should be examined such as work-family enhancement and work-family balance. For example, it may be that integration increases conflict, but also increases work-family enhancement. Finally, mediating processes that may be involved should also be examined. For example, integration strategies may result in what Allport (1933) referred to as partial inclusion. Partial inclusion theory recognizes that individuals are members of multiple social systems and have multiple competing roles, both physically and psychologically. For example, individuals who bring family to work-related events such as professional conferences may find themselves unable to fully engage in either role, thus decreasing their satisfaction in both.

Decision-making perspective. Decisions that involve work and family roles occur on a daily basis. Choices are made such as whether to allocate time to work or to family, to accept or
decline a promotion requiring relocation and the loss of a spouse’s job, and whether to help a spouse with the dishes or read a report in preparation for a work meeting the next day. Such decisions make up the fabric of everyday working lives.

Work-family decisions are important to examine from both an individual and a couple level perspective. Research is emerging that examines the decisions that individuals make with regard to their work and family lives (Poelmans, 2005a; Greenhaus & Powell, 2003; Powell & Greenhaus, 2006). For example, Greenhaus and Powell (2003) used an experimental vignette study to investigate the factors that influence an individual’s decision in participate in a conflicting work versus family activity. The relative salience of work and family roles had the strongest influence on the decision. However, the decision was also influenced by external pressure received from role-senders (managers and spouses). This study was followed by a critical incidents study in which participants were asked to describe a time when they faced a difficult choice between participation in a work activity and participation in a family activity (Powell & Greenhaus, 2006). This study illustrates how when confronted with difficult choices, individuals may try and find solutions that prevent a decrement in performance in either role (e.g., mobilize support from others). Further study is needed to examine the long-term effects on the self and on others of various decisions and decision-making strategies.

The specific ways that dual career couples negotiate and make decisions regarding their work and family roles is not well understood. As noted by Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002) it would be instructive to investigate how dual-earner couples make decisions about the relative priority of each partner’s career and family. There have been several attempts to classify couples based on how they share involvement in home and career. Hall and Hall (1980) described four types of couples. Accommodating couples are those in which each party is highly involved in a
different domain (e.g., husband is highly involved in work and wife is highly involved in home). Allied couples have members who are both involved in the same sphere and neither are concerned with perfection in the other. Adversarial couples are those in which both members are highly involved in work and each want the other member to do more home tasks. Finally, acrobats are couples in which both members are highly involved in both home and work. Gilbert (1993) used the term participant dual-career families to designate couples in which parenting is shared but household duties are primarily the wife’s. Role sharing relationships are those in which both members of the couple share responsibility for parenting and household duties.

Such classification systems are helpful in a descriptive sense but do not provide information regarding the processes that occur by which couples evolve to form a particular type of lifestyle. For example, many couples may begin as egalitarian earners in which they are both career and family focused but then shift into a male career-dominant, female family-dominant pattern as children enter the picture. What are the within couple negotiations and processes that unfold over time and underlie such shifts? Research that attempts to assess decisions at the couple level of analyses and subsequent health and well-being outcomes for both the individual and the couple is needed.

Capturing Change Dynamics and Time

The issue of time has long played a central role in the study of work and family experiences. Time scarcity is a prominent element in the development of theory concerning multiple role engagement. Time-based conflict is a key dimension of work-family conflict research. Zimbardo (2002) notes that we are a nation that is perpetually trapped in a time crunch. Individuals opine that if they only had more time, they could better balance their work and family life. Take Back Your Time is an initiative intended to challenge overwork (de Graaf,
Many organizational policy initiatives are based on trying to help individuals manage time. For example, workplace flexibility is thought to be important because it gives individuals more control over the temporal elements of their work life. However, we also know that time spent in a role does not completely capture the subjective experiences that contribute to reports of WFC (Cardenas et al., 2004).

A more nuanced approach to the way we think about time and use the time construct may reveal new insights into work-family interactions. Organizational behavior theorists have argued that time should play a more important role in theory and theory building (George & Jones, 2000; Roe, 2008). Individuals’ state of existence in the present is closely connected to their past and to their future (George & Jones, 2000). For example, in attempting to make a work-family decision (should I take a promotion that involves relocation and will result in my spouse leaving a job she loves), individuals may look to the past (I relocated for my spouse last time), as well as to the future (this will be the last time we relocate). As noted by Greenhaus and Allen (in press) in thinking about work-life balance individuals’ may reflect on their past, present, and current situations.

Incorporating the psychological construct of time perspective may help researchers begin to understand ways in which time plays a role in work-family experiences beyond quantifying objective units of hours allocated to the work and to the family domains. Time perspective refers to an individual’s way of relating to the psychological concepts of past, present, and future (Boniwell & Zimbardo, 2004). Time perspectives can be “balanced.” Optimally balanced time perspectives blend, past, present, and future components and can be engaged in a flexible manner that best fits the situation’s demands and individual needs and values. Boniwell and Zimbardo (2004) argue that a time-balanced individual is capable of operating within a temporal mode that
is appropriate to the situation. When with families and friends, the individual is truly with them. When working, the individual is fully engaged in the work role. This ties in with the concept of mindfulness described previously. For those with a strong future orientation, enjoyment of the moment can be sacrificed in order to achieve work-related goals.

*Change dynamics.* An often repeated anecdote in reference to seeking work-family balance is, “No one on their deathbed ever said, ‘I wish I spent more time at work.’” Contrary to this popular homily, meta-analytic research regarding the content of regret shows that individuals are more likely to express regrets regarding career than they are about family (Roese & Summerville, 2005). This apparent discrepancy helps illustrate the importance of furthering our understanding of work-family decisions and dynamics from a long-term, life course perspective. The vast majority of work-family studies have been cross-sectional (Casper et al., 2007). Calls for more longitudinal research have occurred for many years within the work-family literature (Christensen & Staines, 1990). While longitudinal studies are beginning to emerge with greater frequency (e.g., Hammer, Neal, et al., 2005), few studies to date capture long-term change or even long term retrospective approaches in family circumstances and dynamics. Career and family priorities can shift across the life course, often in response to major life transitions (Sweet & Moen, 2006). Moreover, long-term study designs are also important because the dependent variables that are often of interest to work-family researchers have varying time lags (Frese & Zapf, 1988; Semmer et al., 2004).

Moen and colleagues have enriched the work-family field by incorporating a life course perspective into work-family research (Moen, 2003; Sweet & Moen, 2006). The *Cornell Couples and Careers Study* examined dual career couples in seven life stages. Life stages were operationalized primarily based on family stage. That is, seven groups were created based on
parental status and age of children (Roehling et al., 2003). Results revealed that FIW varied significantly across life stage for both men and women. FIW was highest for parents with preschool children and was lower among groups as children grew older. Interestingly, WIF was highest for younger couples without children. With regard to work-family enhancement, FWE varied across life stages for women but not for men. Mothers with young children reported less FWE than did women who were yet to have children. FWE was again higher among women with older children. WFE did not vary across life stage for men or women. These findings begin to elucidate the ways that work-family relationships may differ across the life course. However, the findings were based on cross-sectional data. Moreover, the sample was restricted to middle-aged, middle-classed professionals.

Long-term studies that incorporate life-span development issues represent an important future direction for work-family researchers. Career development researchers have long incorporated developmental models into their understanding of how careers unfold across the lifespan (e.g., see Greenhaus, Callahan, & Godshalk, 2000 for a review). Baltes and Dickson (2001) have suggested that life-span models such as selective organization and compensation (SOC) can be used help understand individual differences in work-family conflict and subsequent research has shown that the use of SOC behaviors relates to less WIF and FIW (Baltes & Heydens-Gahir, 2003). However, the data again are cross-sectional.

In sum, there is a need to understand the role that time plays in work-family dynamics in more complex ways. As noted by Mitchell and James (2001) in their excellent review of time in organizational theory, “Nonlinear relationships over time are possible, as are cyclical and oscillating ones. Change can be incremental or discontinuous. Cycles can spiral up or down, and the intensity can change. Various relationships can have rhythms or patterns over time.” (p. 532)
Thinking about work-family dynamics with these time complexities in mind offers rich fodder for future research.

Conclusion

With training that focuses on the well-being of both individuals and organizations, industrial and organizational psychologists are ideally suited for conducting research on the intersection of work and family roles. The dynamics at the center of the work-family intersection will continue to evolve such that new issues, concerns, and benefits can be expected to consistently arise. The continued development of the field will depend on innovative research that transcends any single culture, discipline, or level of analysis. It is hoped that this chapter provides a foundation and springboard for many future such studies.
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