Traditionally work and family domains were considered mutually exclusive. Men were the hunters, they were breadwinners and women were homemakers who looked after and took care of family needs. Earlier there was little concern with the consequences of work and family interference on working women. More recently, a variety of workforce and societal changes have led to increased attention to work and family issues among working women. There is an increased interest in balancing work and family life. The number of women in the workforce has increased tremendously and will continue to rise at a high rate in future too. It has attracted the attention of behavioural scientists and work-family interface has produced a strong emphasis on integrating work and family research. Research is focused now on issues like, relative impact of job stressors on family life, and the impact of family stressors on job life (Frone, 2003). Additionally, it is focusing on work family conflict as another source of stress that may influence well-being or mental health this line of research is rather promising in terms of integrating research on work and family stress.

Work-family conflict is described as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The psychological experience of ‘conflict’ is influenced by the level of demands individuals are confronted with at work and home, the meanings they attach to their participation in the work-family system, and by the resources available and their ability to use them to handle these demands (Phizacklea, & Walters, 2002). This definition implies a bidirectional dimension to work-family conflict (Frone et al., 1997), and thus, work-family
conflict could originate in either domain: work can interfere with family responsibilities (work-to-family conflict) and/or family can interfere with work responsibilities (family-to-work conflict) (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). Research had shown that work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict are related but are distinct concepts that have independent antecedents and outcomes (Frone et al, 1997).

Work-to-family conflict occurs when involvement in a work-related activity interferes with participation in a competing family activity (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). This type of conflict may be influenced by lack of support from management and coworkers, limited job autonomy, increased job demands and overload, inflexible working schedules, and increased number of hours worked (Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001). Family-to-work conflict occurs when involvement in a family activity interferes with participation in a work activity (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). Several factors lead to this type of conflict such as having a working partner, spousal support, equity in the division of labor at home, adequacy of child care or eldercare provisions, gender and marital status of the person working, impairment level of adult-care recipients, and age of dependent children (Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001).

Overall, researchers had recognized that work-family conflict is a complex, multi-dimensional construct. Work-family conflict is conceptualized as a construct with dual direction (work-to-family and family-to-work) specific to multiple life roles (e.g., spouse, parental, elder care, home care, and leisure) and multiple forms (time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based). Three sources of interrole conflict in the work family interchange were identified by Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) that is, time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict. The time-based conflict occurs when demands in one domain are difficult to fulfill because of the time spent in the other domain. It reflects that time is a limited resource, that is, time spent in paid work is not available for
family activities. Time based demands include the amount of time in paid work, for example the number of work hours and the conditions under which time is spent, such as being required to work extra hours without notice, shift work, and overnight travel. The strain-based conflict occurs when strain (e.g., dissatisfaction, tensions, anxiety, and fatigue) in one domain interferes with normal responsibilities and relationships in the other domain. Strain reduces personal resources (e.g., energy and physical or mental capacity) needed for role performance (Pleck et.al., 1980). Finally, the behavior-based conflict occurs when behaviour developed in one domain is incompatible with role demands in the other, and the person is unable to adjust his or her behavior when moving between domains.

Voydanoff (2002) describes the work-family interface as a mesosystem consisting of linkages and processes between work and family, which are viewed as microsystems consisting of networks of face-to-face relationships. Geurts and Demerouti (2003) use a broader term, work/non-work interface, which they define as a point where work and non-work encounter each other, and the encounter can be either positive or negative. The term non-work is not limited to family; it refers to activities and responsibilities both within family and within private life beyond or not including family. The work-family interface can further be described through four aspects: amount, direction, quality, and context. Amount of the work-family interface refers to the degree of segmentation versus integration between work and family domains. In segmentation, there are strict physical, temporal, functional, and psychological boundaries between work and family which are thus seen as relatively independent and as having no reciprocal influence on each other (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). By contrast, in integration or identity, work and family domains are tightly intertwined in terms of time, place, people, behaviour, thoughts and emotions (e.g., family business or among clerics), and therefore work and family
roles are so closely interweaved that they are indistinguishable (Clark, 2000; Frone, 2003; Känsälä & Kovalainen, 2005).

Direction of the work-family interface refers to a reciprocal relationship between work and family domains: work can affect family life (work-to-family direction), and family can affect working life (family-to-work direction), (Crouter, 1984; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kirchmeyer, 1992). With the two possible directions of spillover, a distinction was made between the work-family interface (work influencing family) and the family-work interface (family influencing work). Quality of the work-family interface refers to negative versus positive interaction between work and family domains. Negative work-family interaction includes concepts of work-family conflict, interference, negative spillover, and resource drain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Positive work-family interaction includes concepts of work-family enhancement, enrichment, positive spillover, and facilitation (Wayne et al., 2007). Context of the work-family interface refers to the perspective from which the work-family interface is studied. The present study examines the work-family interface from the perspective of a working individual with a partner and children, concentrating on both negative and positive work-family interactions. The inclusion of both negative and positive work-family interaction is one of the key issues in obtaining a comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon (Kinnunen & Mauno, 2008).

**Conceptual Models of Work-Family Interface**

Relationship between work and family life were explained based on several taxonomies of models developed during early research of work-family interface. However, in past research six basic models or linking mechanisms (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) can be identified. Morf (1989) further classified these models as being either noncausal (segmentation model/segregation model, identity or integrative model and congruence model) or causal (spillover model,
compensation model and resource drain model). The Segmentation model assumes that work and family are independent domains and that individuals may separate them in terms of time, physical location, emotions, attitudes, and behaviours (Lambert, 1990). It also explains work-family conflict as a form of interrole conflict in which family and work-demands are incompatible in some way.

While, Compensation model describes that people who are not satisfied in one domain will seek satisfaction in another domain by compensating for dissatisfaction in one role in several ways like they can reduce the importance ascribed to a less rewarding role or they can seek rewards and invest more time and attention in an alternative role. It was found that women who experienced negative effects from family were more engaged with their work, as confirmed by the compensation model (Jones, Burke & Westman, 2006). This model proposes that individuals invest more heavily in one domain to make up for what is missing in the other domain and vice-versa (Staines, 1980). Spillover results if unhappiness or job dissatisfaction at work is transferred to the family (Gryzywacz, Almeida & McDonald, 2002).

Spillover model reflects two different sets of concepts. One set is negative spillover between work and family which includes work family conflict or interference. Co-occurring negative events e.g. stressors on the same day in various domains or from one person to another (Almeida, Wethington, & Chandler, 1999) are viewed as a type of negative spillover. Another, set of concepts represents positive spillover between work and family i.e. resource enhancement and work-family success or balance (Milkie & Peltola, 1999). Earlier research had also indicated that negative forms of spillover are related, yet distinct from positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Identity model reflects that the self consists of a collection of identities, each of which is based on occupying a particular role. These role identities are said to influence
behaviour in that each role has a set of associated meanings and expectations for the self. This model has also made use of the assumption that a man’s performance of the work role also fulfils his family role as society has deemed a man’s primary role to be that of providing for the family, whereas, for women, there is no overlap between the two identities. Within society women’s primary role is considered to be that of looking after children and the household (Stryker & Burke, 2000).

Therefore women who have a high investment in both work and family would experience a great deal of work-family conflict (Stryker & Burke, 2000). The congruence model posits that although work and family variables may exhibit either a positive or negative correlation, the relationship is spurious because both the work and family variables share a common cause. In contrast, the three causal models posit that what happens in one domain of life (e.g., work) can have a causal impact on what happens in another domain of life (e.g., family). The resource drain model also postulates a negative relationship between work and family and posits that the use of finite resources (time, energy, or attention) in one life domain (e.g., work) reduces the availability of these same resources for use in another life domain (e.g., family). Of the three perspectives, spillover theory has been the most well articulated and influential (Frone, 2003), stating “each sphere induces similar structural patterns in the other spheres” (Zedeck, 1992).

Traditional approaches to work-family stress are based on the notion that distress occurs when someone perceives environmental demands to exceed personal resources (McGrath, 1976). Hobfoll (1989) integrated this argument into the conservation of resources (COR) model, which was used by Grandey and Croprazano (1999) to explain work-family conflict resulting from threats to, or loss of, resources. A basic premise in COR theory is that anticipated or actual resource loss or a failure to gain resources after resource investment will induce
distress and proposes that individuals seek to acquire, and preserve resources. Hobfoll (1989, 2001) described resources as properties of the environment that can be acted upon. Resources represent objects, personal characteristics, energies, and/or support that are important for the individual. Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) proposed that “interrole conflict leads to stress because resources are lost in the process of juggling both work and family roles”. These potential or actual losses of resources lead to a negative “state of being,” which may include job and family dissatisfaction, life distress, and physical weakness.

Demerouti and associates (2004) provided evidence for the cyclical nature of work–home interference and suggested that work pressure, work–home interference and exhaustion had causal and reversed causal relationships over time. For example, results showed that work pressure caused loss of resources, which resulted in work–family interference and then feelings of exhaustion. These feelings of chronic fatigue then resulted in more work pressure, thus starting the cycle over again. Individual differences are treated as resources in the COR model. These differences in levels of resources may affect individual’s reaction to stress (or the loss of resources). Emphasizing the lack of an integrative theoretical framework for the study of work-family interface, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1986, 1999; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998) suggests that the work-family experience is a joint function of process, person, context, and time characteristics (PPCT model).

Further, Bronfenbrenner (1995) described two types of person characteristics: directional dispositions (e.g., exploratory behaviors) and biopsychological resources (e.g., mental ability). These two types of personal characteristics contribute to produce “synergetic effects” for his/her development in the contexts of environment. Different responses are elicited by different person characteristics from the social environment, which in turn, condition person-environment interactions (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). In
operational terms, specific individual level characteristics might moderate the association between different work and family interactions and the work-family experience. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) identified significant correlates of both positive and negative spillover between work and family by developing a more expanded conceptualization of the work-family interface using ecological theory. As compared to previous theory, however, ecological theory mandates a broader scope of work and family factors that shape an individual's work-family experience, and ecological theory does not restrict the experience to either positive or negative spillover.

Empirical evidence supports each component of the ecological model. Contextual factors in both work and family microsystems are often found to be independently associated with work-family conflict. Specifically, a higher level of negative person-environment interactions (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994), such as work or family pressure, is found to be associated with more work-family conflict (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). By contrast, a higher level of positive person-environment interactions, like spouse or family support, reduces negative spillover between work and family (Weiss, 1990). Person characteristics, such as work or family role salience, are also frequently associated with work-family conflict (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1995). Processes, or interactions between the individual and the persons, objects and symbols of his/her environment that are perceived as positive, promote development (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994). By contrast negative interactions between the individual and the persons, objects and symbols in his/her environment such as spouse disagreement, family criticism or work related pressure might be seen as potential barriers to development in different domains (Lawton & Nahemow, 1973).

Consistent with ecological theory, available researches suggests that the work-family experience reflects the adequacy of fit between the individual and his or her environment (e.g. Barnett, 1996; Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Person–
environment (P-E) fit theory is the most versatile in psychological stress theories (Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998). P-E fit theory defines stress as a perceived mismatch between the environment and the person’s values, desires, or goals. The primary contribution of P-E fit theory is that it provides an explicit and systematic framework for understanding how person and environment factors combine to produce stress.

P-E fit theory also underscores the notion that stress not only influences well-being but also stimulates efforts to resolve misfit or dampen its effects (Edwards et al., 1998). The core elements of P-E fit theory capture three key distinctions. First, the person and environment, second, objective person (attributes of the person as they actually exist) and the third, subjective person (how these attributes are perceived by the person) and objective environment (situations and events as they exist in reality) and subjective environment (person’s perception of situations and events). The distinctions between these combine to yield four types of fit between person and environment constructs: (a) objective P-E fit, (b) subjective P-E fit, (c) contact with reality (the correspondence between the objective and subjective environment), and (d) accuracy of self assessment (match between the objective and subjective person) (Caplan, 1983).

Another fit model proposed by Barnett (1998) stresses the importance of fit as a mediating process in the relationship between the number of hours worked and psychological health outcomes like burnout. “Fit” is conceptualized as “the extent to which workers realize the various components of their work–family strategies” (Barnett et al., 1999). When available workplace options permit workers to realize their strategies, they experience compatibility and low distress. Otherwise, they experience conflict and high distress. The fit construct does not assume an inherent conflict between work and family. Rather it assumes that adaptive strategies are formulated so as to simultaneously maximize
employees’ ability to meet the needs of the workplace and their ability to meet the needs of the family system. Empirical evidence suggests that all of these explained mechanisms exist and that many of them operate simultaneously (Lambert, 1990). These perspectives are not competing perspectives instead these are different ways of looking at the same phenomenon. When considered individually, none of these provide a useful conceptual basis for understanding the dynamics of work-family interface. Therefore, there is a need to bring them all together, along with other processes, to develop an integrative and dynamic understanding of work-family interface.

**Theoretical Background of Negative Work-Family interaction**

Kahn and colleagues (1964) propounded the Role Stress Theory more than five decades ago which postulates that if a given set of social roles impose conflicting role expectations and pressures towards a focal person, it can create psychological conflict and role overload for him. The simultaneous occurrence of role pressures, that preclude the compliance of competing role expectations, is the fundamental element of a role conflict. They also identified four types of role conflict: intra-sender conflict (when same person imposes incompatible expectations on a focal person), inter-sender conflict (when demands from two or more persons towards a focal person are in contradiction), inter-role conflict (role pressures associated with one role are in conflict with role pressures arising from another role) and person-role conflict (requirements of a given role oppose the needs and values of a focal person). Following this idea, and especially the notion of inter-role conflict, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) developed a model of work-family conflict and quoted Kahn et al. (1964) in defining ‘interrole’ conflict as a “simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other”.

In addition to the work-family conflict approach, negative work-family interaction has also been conceptualized as negative spillover and refers to the
extent in which participation in one domain negatively impacts participation in another domain. Resembling the ideas of Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), Small and Riley (1990) presented three processes that describe how work spills over to family life: time, psychological absorption, and energy. Time spent at work may take away time spent at home. Due to work concerns an individual may be absent-minded although physically present at home, and due to the physical and/or psychological demands of work an individual may be too fatigued to manage adequately their personal and family life. Thus, work–family conflict is a within-person across-domains transmission of demands and consequent strain from one area of life to another.

Small and Riley’s (1990) conceptualizations of work-family conflict and negative spillover correspond closely with the scarcity approach to multiple roles. The scarcity hypothesis proposes that individuals have a limited (fixed) amount of time, energy, attention and commitment. These scarce resources, which can be easily drained, lead to role strain resulting in work-family conflict or negative work-family spillover (Etzion & Baylin, 1994). Similar to it, depletion approach suggests that multiple roles lead to role strain (the felt difficulty in performing role obligations). Because of scarcity of resources, multiple roles could easily and quickly deplete an individual’s resources if not allocated appropriately. When applied to work-family conflict studies, role theory has certain limitations as it has paid less attention to family roles, which is essential to understand work-family conflict. Furthermore, role theory does not directly specify moderating variables which might buffer the relationships between work and family stressors and stress outcomes (Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

Edwards and Rothbard (2000) have tried to integrate other theories/models more specific to work-family research into one theory that is, The Person-Environment Fit Theory. Edwards and Rothbard (2005) focus on
linkages that are relevant to the stress process, build on previous models of work and family stress, and are prominent in work-family research.

**Spillover:** In terms of Person-Fit theory, values spillover signifies a causal relationship between psychological needs associated with work and family, given that values are represented by psychological needs. The effects of work and family needs on one another can be direct or indirect (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Work-family research also addresses spillover of skills and behavior between work and family (Zedeck, 1992). These two forms of spillover underlie behavior-based conflict, in which skills and their associated behaviors are inappropriately transferred from one domain to the other. The linkages between work and family skills and behavior can be direct or indirect, as when skills and behaviors become generalized knowledge structures. These can also reflect intentional applications of skills and behaviors across domains or unintentional displays of schemas and scripts (Lord & Maher, 1991).

**Compensation:** For P-E fit theory, domain importance is captured by the intensity of work and family needs, and time is part of the abilities the person can devote to work and family demands. Because compensation is a response to dissatisfaction, it signifies coping and defense efforts to reduce strain by managing objective and subjective P-E fit, respectively. Given that domain importance is subjective (Lambert, 1990; Lobel, 1991), altering domain importance represents defensive efforts directed toward work and family needs. Hence, compensation by shifting involvement between work and family is captured by positive direct effects between strain in one domain and coping and defense in the other domain, which influence abilities and needs in the latter domain, respectively (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

A recent meta-analysis indicates that two domains influence, and are influenced by, each other. Although these two types of work/family conflict are strongly correlated, they are conceptually distinct constructs evidenced by their
different predictors and consequences (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). It has also been found that the two dimensions, work-family conflict and family-work conflict are asymmetrically permeable, suggesting that the domains of the work and the family are flexible, which causes the conflict (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). This means that there is both overlap (reciprocity) and unique variance between these two conflict types that warrants the inclusion of them both, as separate and distinctive constructs, into a study design when examining work family conflict. Following these researchers, the present study explores W-F and F-W as both separate constructs as well as a single overall work-family spillover measure.

The most widespread model of work-family conflict based on the foundation laid by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) is the model of work-family interface (Frone et al., 1992). Its main elements are: bi-directional nature of work-family conflict, domain-specific predictors of work-family conflict, and work-family conflict as a key mediating variable between work and family characteristics and work-related, family related, and overall psychological distress (Frone et al., 1992). Work-to-family conflict causes family-to-work conflict when work interferes with family tasks and these unfulfilled family tasks start to hinder full performance in work. And similarly, family-to-work conflict causes work-to-family conflict (Frone et al., 1992). The domain-specific predictors are responsible for work-to-family and family-to-work conflict both of which have unique antecedents that are directly and positively related to them. For work-to-family conflict these antecedents reside in the work domain and for family-to-work conflict they reside in the family domain. The work-family conflict plays the role of mediator also. The job stressors and work characteristics are related to family distress and overall psychological distress indirectly through work-to-family conflict, whereas family stressors and characteristics are related to work distress and overall psychological distress indirectly through family-to-work conflict.
Frone, Yardley, and Markel (1997) later developed the model of the work family interface further and renamed it *the integrative model of the work-family interface*. It was proposed that the reciprocal relation between work-to-family and family-to-work conflict might alternatively be indirect rather than direct, so that the two directions of work-family conflict are related to each other through work and family distress. In addition to being domain-specific outcomes of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, work distress and family distress, respectively, are also domain-specific antecedents of these experiences. To illustrate more specifically, this means that, when work distress drains individuals' resources their capability and enthusiasm to meet the demands of the family domain are weakened, which leads to the experience of work-to-family conflict. Family distress, in turn, bounds individuals' resources to the family domain, which hinders the management of work obligations and leads to the experience of family-to-work conflict.

**Theoretical Background of Positive Work-Family Interaction**

Parallel to negative work-family interaction positive work-family interaction has also been operationalized as either a subjective cause-effect evaluation of the level of facilitation between work and family domains (Wayne et al., 2007) or as a transfer of mood, performance, and values from one life domain to another that improve quality of life in the receiving domain. Researchers also believe that multiple roles are not harmful; rather these are beneficial for both men and women in most cases (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). The *role accumulation theory* asserts that holding multiple roles is both sociologically normal and psychologically desirable for four reasons. First, the inherent and emergent *privileges* of each role benefit an individual in their unique way. Second, multiple roles offer *overall status security* because an individual's wellbeing is not dependent on success in one role but instead on the other roles as well, and role partners can buffer against hardships in one role.
Third, different role partners provide a variety of resources for status enhancement and role performance that are incidental in nature and come as a by-product of social relationships. Fourth, role accumulation has the potential for personality enrichment and ego gratification through tolerance of discrepant viewpoints, exposure to many sources of information, flexibility to the demands of diverse role-partners, and reduction of boredom. Consequently, involvement in multiple roles can have positive outcomes that in turn, lead to enhanced functioning in other roles (Barnett & Baruch, 1985).

Barnett and Hyde (2001) presented an expansionist theory of multiple roles and advocated that holding multiple roles was not the problem, but it was how particular roles and their quality and combinations produced strain. Their theory has four main principles. First, multiple roles are generally beneficial for both men and women, as adding worker roles for women, and family roles for men, produces better mental, physical, and relationship health. For example, for both men and women equal engagement to work and family roles was a buffer against psychological stress symptoms (Toivanen et al., 2005). Second, the processes of buffering-added income, social support, opportunities to experience success, expanded frame of reference, increased self-complexity, similarity of experiences, liberal gender-role ideology, heightened self-esteem and well being illustrate why and when the effects of multiple roles are beneficial for an individual.

Third, the advantageousness of multiple roles on health depends both on the number of roles and the quality of roles. It is the quality of roles that is important. That is, the greater the quality of a person's multiple roles, the greater their self esteem. More important is the subjective feeling that the roles are satisfying and reasonably manageable (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Research suggests that work can benefit family life via better personal well-being and that family can benefit work via stress management and reduction (Waldron, Weiss,
& Hughes, 1998). Fourth, unlike often claimed, the psychological gender differences are for most part small and even when they exist these gender differences are alterable. Broadly based on the explained theoretical background many scholars have defined positive work-family interaction in slightly different but closely related terms. For example Work-family Enhancement (Voyandoff, 2002), work family facilitation (Frone, 2003; Wayne et.al., 2007), positive work home interaction (Geurts et.al., 2005), work-family positive spillover (Hanson et.al., 2006), work-family enhancement (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

The feature that combines all these definitions is the emphasis on bi-directional beneficial effects between work and family domains. The main difference concerns the assumed outcome of these effects. Enhancement focuses on benefits gained by individuals and the possibility that these benefits may have salient effects on activities across life domains and will help in facing life challenges (Sieber, 1974), whereas enrichment is defined as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life, namely performance or affect, in the other role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Positive spillover (Crouter, 1984) refers to experiences in one domain such as moods, skills, values, and behaviors being transferred to another domain in ways that make the two domains similar (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). The construct, facilitation (Grzywacz, 2002), is defined as when engagement in a domain yields gains that enhance functioning of another life domain (Wayne et al., 2004).

Collectively, this kind of literature has created a new outlook towards work–family interface by arguing that individuals can benefit from combining work and family (role expansion) and that activities in one role can benefit an individual’s activity in another role (positive spillover) as well as the individual’s role performance and quality of life (enrichment) in another domain, despite the strains that may arise from combining work and family. There exists a theoretical void concerning the positive work-family interaction as a subjective cause-effect
evaluation (Frone, 2003). Simultaneously, Frone (2003) has warned that just substituting work-family conflict with work-family facilitation in established models is not a valid approach. To remediate this, two types of views have been proposed recently: a dual process model of work-home interference (Bakker & Geurts, 2004) and a resource-gain-development perspective (Wayne et al., 2007).

The dual process model of work-home interference draws on two theories: the job demands-resources model and the effort-recovery model (Bakker & Geurts, 2004). In this model, both negative and positive interference from work to home are considered. The key element of this model is that these two experiences are considered separate constructs, each having distinctive work-related antecedents. Excessive job demands are theorized to cause negative work-to-home interference either directly, or through job exhaustion caused by job demands. However, job resources are theorized to induce positive work-to-home interference either directly, or through flow at work generated by job resources.

The resource-gain-development (RGD) perspective is a model of primary antecedents, consequences, and moderators with work-family facilitation that extend the positive side of the dual process model. The basic premise of the RGD perspective is that because individuals have natural tendency towards positivity and development, they obtain resources and positive gains through role engagement, which in turn improve system (work, family) functioning in another role domain when the gains are applied, sustained, and reinforced in that domain (Wayne et al., 2007). Furthermore, greater the resources within one role and the accumulation of resources across different roles, greater is the likelihood of positive work-family facilitation. The resources enabling work-family facilitation are personal characteristics and environmental resources (Wayne et al., 2007). The work-family facilitation in itself includes three components: engagement, individual gains, and enhanced functioning. Engagement refers to the level of
investment of an individual toward work and family related activities. Through active engagement individuals acquire gains and these gains then promote enhanced functioning, which refers to improvements in vital work and family performance. Work-family facilitation is claimed to produce quantifiable enhancements in system and/or system member's functioning such as improved quality of work-related dyadic relations, work group cohesion, perceived unit effectiveness, marital quality, parent-child interactions, and family well-being (Wayne et al., 2007).

A model of causal structures for spillover between work and family (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) casts the relationship between work and family constructs as a direct effect, an indirect effect, or a spurious association due to a common cause. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have presented a theory of work-family enrichment in this regard. The transfer process of positive mood and affect from one life domain to another is very similar in both of these theories. Positive mood from originating domain spills over to the receiving domain, by enhancing the role performance and rewards in the receiving domain that then generates positive mood in the receiving domain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have described this mechanism as comprising an affective path of work-family enrichment. The resources of the originating role may enhance the performance in the receiving role also directly (i.e., without affective path), producing positive affect in the receiving role. They call this an instrumental path of enrichment. Instead of considering different resources as preceding factors for high role performance and positive affect, in Edwards and Rothbard's (2000) theory, values, skills, and behaviours each are assumed to have unique spillover effects from work to family and vice versa.

It is assumed that values, skills, and behaviours from the originating domain transfer either directly or indirectly (through general life values, knowledge structures, and behavioural schemas) to the receiving domain
producing similarity in these aspects. Thus, participation in both work and family roles can protect one from distress in one of the roles. Improved work performance resulting from the instrumental transfer of skills, behaviors, and knowledge from the family domain generates intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, which, in turn, weaken individual’s perception of hardships and struggles at work and subsequent job dissatisfaction (Hanson et al., 2006).

**Work-Family Balance**

The conflict and stress inherent in managing work and family responsibilities have been shown to be counterbalanced by the social psychological benefits that stem from participating in the work and family domains (Barnett, 1998). As a result, researchers have drawn attention to the need to complement the focus on conflict by examining how work and family experiences enrich the lives of individuals through the conceptual lens of work–family balance or integration (Frone, 2003; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Operating within the work-family balance perspective, Frone (2003) suggested that a comprehensive understanding of the work-family interface should include both components of conflict and facilitation. He defined work-family facilitation as “the extent to which participation at work is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed at home”. He further suggested a four-fold taxonomy of work-family balance along the primary dimensions of (a) direction of influence between work and family roles (work to family vs. family to work) and (b) the type of effect (conflict vs. facilitation).

Although Frone’s (2003) fourfold taxonomy of work-family balance provides a potential conceptual framework to examine work and family not only as mutually constraining but also as mutually reinforcing, there is a paucity of research as only few of the researchers has examined his fourfold taxonomy (Lu, Siu, Spector, & Shi, 2009). Given the emphasis on a balanced life, it is important to understand how work and family roles can be integrated. A *balanced life*
conceives of work and family as mutually reinforcing with family experiences as part of what workers bring to enrich their contributions to work and organizations, and vice-versa. Against this background, Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999) urged researchers to go beyond the study of work-family conflict to identify the mechanisms that integrate work and family lives. Accordingly, in this study, we examine the antecedents and outcomes of the enrichment and conflict components of work–family balance in employed parents in India.

Acknowledging the prevalence of work-family conflict and its negative outcomes, it became critical to develop a model on predictors of work-family conflict. It was predicted that the expectations surrounding each of the different roles a person performs can generate interrole conflict. The interrole conflict occurs because it is not possible for the focal person to satisfy all expectations of his or her work and family roles since each role requires time, energy and commitment (Kahn et al., 1964). This conflict perspective stems from the scarcity hypothesis which assumes that individuals have limited time and energy. Work and family are the two central spheres in most adults’ lives and these two spheres are interdependent (Pleck, 1977) proposed in his concept of the work-family role system. Recognizing the bidirectional nature of the interrole conflict construct two distinct types of conflict, namely, work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict were included in the framework.

Dunham (1984) developed a model based on stress-strain model and also relate to social identity theory of Lobel (1991). According to the stress-strain model, the predictors are referred to as stressors, and the conflict as strain. Social identity theory posits that people classify themselves in various social categories which define their identities and the roles they hold in a social environment. For example, a person could view himself/herself as a valued employee, a loving spouse, or a good parent, among other things. Each of these roles provides a
different aspect of identity to the individual. Some will view being a good spouse as the most important aspect of their identity, while others may gain more pleasure from the role of a valued employee and therefore value it more. When an individual who values a particular role is forced by situational constraints to spend less time than he/she would like in that role the conflict arises. These constraints or predictors could be job-related, family-related and individual-related factors predicting the extent of work-family conflict experienced by an individual.

Antecedents of Work-Family Conflict

a. Job Related Factors:

One of the characteristics predicting work family conflict is job type and conflict levels. Employees in managerial and professional positions report higher levels of work-to-family conflict than those working in non-managerial and non-professional positions (Duxbury & Higgins, 2003). Among Spanish employees it was found that there was a positive association between job category level and work-family conflict whereby managers experienced greater work-to-family conflict than lower category employees (Carnicer et al. 2004). A study of female Malaysian operators, clerks, secretaries, nurses and physicians found that physicians experienced the greatest intensity of work-to-family conflict. However, operators experienced the greatest intensity of family-to-work conflict (Aminah Ahmad, 2005).

Studies also suggest that work time commitment is related to the intensity of work-family conflict experienced by employees. One of the commonly measured forms of work-family conflict is time-based conflict which is defined as conflict that occurs when the amount of time devoted to one role makes it difficult to fulfill the requirements of another role (Greenhaus & Beutell. 1985). Long hours could have negative consequences for families and for workers who struggle to balance the demands of work and family roles. Work-family
researchers have found that time devoted to work contributes to conflict between employees’ work and non-work roles (Darcy & McCarthy, 2007).

Job involvement has been regarded as another antecedent of work-family conflict by other line of research. Individuals may be actively participating in one role at the same time they might be feeling distracted by thoughts, emotions, or demands that are tied to another role (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). According to the spillover theory, moods, thoughts and stress generated in one role domain often influence or spill over into other domains (William & Alliger, 1994). Moreover, Moorehead (2001) argued that this overlap is a relatively positive one and refers to this as “synchronizing work and family.” On the other hand, it was argued that these overlapping thoughts are distractions, which are the product of poor role quality, and may therefore result in negative outcomes. Research had demonstrated a positive relationship between job involvement and work-family conflict (Darcy & McCarthy, 2007). This indicates that individuals with high levels of psychological involvement in their work role may be more preoccupied with their work and, hence, may devote an excessive amount of energy to their role at the cost of their family role, leading to work-family conflict.

When the overall demand on time and energy are too great for an individual to perform the roles adequately it results in role overload (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Individuals who possess work roles and perceive that their workload is more than they can handle, would experience negative emotions, fatigue and stress. These feelings would then have positive effects on work-family conflict. Aminah Ahmad and Maznah Baba (2003) examined the role overload experienced at work and its relationship with work-family conflict among Malaysian female physicians in public hospitals. The study found that 87.7% of the physicians experienced moderate to heavy workload due to the relatively high frequency of on-calls, increase in the number of outpatients to be
attended and increase in the number of patients in the ward leading to a high patient to physician ratio. They also experienced a considerable intensity of work-family conflict and the conflict tended to increase with an increase in the workload. Other researchers have also demonstrated a significant relationship between role overload and work-family conflict (Fu & Shaffer, 2001). Casey and Chase (2004), and Allen (2001) laid importance on flexible work arrangements including job schedule flexibility. They found that the adoption of job schedule flexibility was related to work-family conflict. Similarly, Carnicer et al. (2004) found schedule flexibility was negatively related to work-family conflict.

b. Family-Related Factors:

Family structure has several aspects that are associated with work-family conflict comprising dependent care responsibilities, especially care for the elderly and disabled children or adults and life cycle stage. Duxbury and Higgins (2003) found that both male and female Canadian employees with dependent care responsibilities reported higher levels of work-to-family conflict. It was seen that employees with children and/or elderly dependents are more likely to have inflexible commitments at home that will conflict with expectations at work. The presence of children in the household has also been positively related to work-family conflict (Carnicer et al., 2004). The relationship between life-cycle stage and work-family conflict has been documented by researchers (Aminah Ahmad, 2007). Work and family role demands faced during adulthood varies with an adult’s life-cycle stage. Aminah Ahmad (2007) found that female factory operators with youngest child aged less than three years experienced more work-to-family conflict than those with youngest child aged three and above. On the similar view, Lu et al. (2006) found that age of the youngest child was negatively correlated with both work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict.

The findings also suggest that working mothers with younger children would experience more work-to-family conflict than those with older children.
Mothers of dependent young children were found to have higher family demands than those with older children. These unpredictable demands, such as childcare arrangement and care of sick child, would result in lower levels of control over the work and family interface and thus increases levels of work-family conflict. However, as the children get older the demands, especially those related to childcare decrease, resulting in increased levels of control and lower stress for the parents.

Studies posit that family involvement is related to work-family conflict. Family involvement refers to the degree to which individuals identify with their family, the relative importance of the family to individuals’ self-image and self-concept, and individuals’ commitment to their family. For example, a mother with an ill child may keep thinking about her ill child even though she must be at work and fulfill her work-role responsibilities. Carlson and Kacmar (2000) found that employees who were more immersed in the family domain experienced more family interference with work conflict. Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Collins (2001) found a positive relationship between family involvement and work-family conflict, a relationship that was stronger for males than females. It was also found in another study by Aminah Ahmad (2007) that Parent’s experiences of work are affected by child care arrangements. A study of female production operators in manufacturing companies revealed that the operators experienced work-to-family conflict and the intensity of conflict experienced was negatively related to satisfaction with child care arrangements.

c. Individual-Related Factors:

A number of individual-related factors could contribute to the experience of work-family conflict besides job and family related factors. The incorporation of individual values into the research of work-family conflict is important because life role values are central to organizing meaning and action for working people (Carlson, & Kacmar, 2000). In incorporating values into work-family
conflict research, Carlson & Kacmar (2000) has used three multiple perspectives, namely centrality, priority and importance. Centrality refers to the value expression of individuals with regard to how central work or family is in their lives when compared to other life roles. Thus, the different centrality placed on the role of work or family may be helpful in explaining differences in the experience of work-family conflict. Priorities refer to the value expression of individuals with regard to how individuals prioritize their life roles.

Variation in values as expressed by prioritization of life roles leads to differing experiences of work-family conflict. Life roles can also be examined from the perspective of importance which refers to the value expression manifested in the importance an individual places on a given role. The researchers found that individuals who valued work over family experienced greater family-to-work conflict. Additionally, the sources, levels, and outcomes of work-family conflict were found to differ depending on the life role values held by the individuals when expressed in terms of work centrality and importance. However, differences in the work-family conflict process were not found for individuals whose values were expressed in terms of priority or family centrality.

Another individual-related cause of work-family conflict is gender role orientation. This refers to the beliefs individuals hold about normal roles of men and women in meeting family and work responsibilities (Harris & Firestone, 1998). Conceptually, gender role orientation ranges on a continuum from traditional gender role orientation, to a focus on non-traditional gender role orientation characterized by role sharing between men and women. Hence, men who saw their roles as interchangeable with their wives’ roles tend to accept more responsibility for tasks associated with childcare, meal preparation and cleaning than men who endorsed specialized roles between men and women.

There are a number of dispositional factors that may influence the work-home interface. Fride and Ryan’s (2005) model proposes three ways in which
Dispositional factors can affect work-family interface. Personality affects the type and amount of work and home role requirements that an individual experiences, the individual’s perceptions of work and home role requirements, and the coping strategies used to deal with the interference of the two roles. Wayne et al. (2004) found a positive link between neuroticism and both directions of work-home interference, and a negative link between conscientiousness and work-home interference. Negative affectivity was also found linked to work-home interference. Similarly Ratanen, Pulkkinen, and Kinnunen (2005) found that neuroticism was positively linked to work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict. Bonebright, Clay, and Ankenmann (2000) revealed in their study that workaholics were found to have significantly more work-life conflict than non-workaholics.

Besides personality factors, self-evaluations are likely to have an impact on work-home perceptions (Fride & Ryan, 2005). According to the self-consistency theory (Korman, 1970), individuals seek and be satisfied with roles that maximize cognitive consistency. Those with more positive self-evaluations (including self-esteem, self-efficacy and perfectionism) will choose situations in which they can be effective, and avoid those in which they cannot. In sharp contrast, individuals with negative self-evaluations may actually experience more home and work stressors, and therefore perceive greater interference (Beauregard, 2006).

**Psychological Distress**

Job distress and family distress are two possible outcomes of work and family stressors. Distress in either domain involves a negative “state of being,” or dissatisfaction and tension, in that role. Work family conflict, domain specific stressors and domain specific psychological involvement are direct predictor of job and family distress. High levels of psychological distress is related to a given role may be experienced if one is frequently struggling to meet the demands of
that role because of interference from another role e.g. relative to individuals whose family life does not interfere with their jobs, individuals who experience high levels of family-work conflict may report increased levels of job-related distress because they are more likely to feel overwhelmed by the ensuing struggle to meet their responsibilities at work and therefore experience a reduction in the quality of their work life.

Trouble in the work domain might cause job distress. On the other hand, trouble in family domain might lead to family distress. Evidences of same domain stress outcomes had been found by previous research. For example, it has been that work role stress relates to the unpleasant feelings of higher job tension and lower job satisfaction (e.g., Frone et al., 1992; Kahn et al., 1964). Similarly, family role stress is also related to negative states of family tension and satisfaction (Frone et al., 1991). The Conservation of resources (COR) model proposes that interrole conflict leads to stress because resources are lost in the process of juggling both work and family roles. If resources are lost from the experience of inter role conflict, then distress occurs in both the work as well as family domains. It seems possible, from these results and from predictions based on the Conservation of Resources model (COR) that WFC and FWC directly relate to both work and family outcomes of distress. Chronic daily stressors are regarded as central factors in generating distress (Duxbury & Higgins, 1998). According to Judge & Colquitt (2004) work distress as “an aversive or unpleasant emotional and physiological state resulting from adverse work experiences, particularly experiences that are uncertain or outside the employee’s control”.

Conflict within one’s occupational role, work role ambiguity, and work role overload (Kahn & Byosiere, 1992) causes work distress. The home can be a relief from job stress or it can be a source of turmoil. Family domain can also present a number of role stressors like family-role conflict (i.e., conflicting
expectations within the family role) and family-role ambiguity (i.e., uncertainty about expectations in the family role). Long-term patterns of marital and family interaction can affect the individual's ability to cope with stressful events. Stressors may also arise from significant changes in family roles and relationships associated with life-cycle stages. Therefore, home demand has been found to significantly predict increased home distress (Frone et al. 1997). A circular relationship prevails between work and home life as they interact so strongly (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). Moreover, antecedent conditions in work and family domains may or may not be highly stressful when considered alone, but their joint occurrence is apt to produce distress (Bedeian, Burke & Moffett, 1988), suggesting an additive effect (Frone, et al., 1992).

JOB-FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

The concept of Job Involvement (JI) has been defined in different ways. The definitions of Job involvement have been categorized by Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) into two categories. One category of definitions views Job involvement as a "performance-self-esteem" contingency i.e. Job involvement is the extent to which the self-esteem of individuals is affected by their level of performance at work. The other category views it as a "component of self image". Job involvement here refers to the degree to which individuals identify psychologically with their jobs. Job involvement can be defined as a generalized cognitive state of psychological identification with work in so far as work is perceived to have the potentiality to satisfy one's salient needs and expectations. The degree of involvement should be measured in terms of an individual's cognition about his identification with work. Factors causing job involvement have been classified into situational and individual difference variables. Kanungo (1980) had proposed a classification based on predisposing and precipitating factors. The predisposing factors such as the socio-cultural environment (rural-urban background, ethno-cultural environment etc.) are responsible for an
individual's past socialization and the internalization of work values. Family factors thereby influence the job attitudes of an individual and therefore need to be investigated in relation to Job involvement.

Apart from family variables, certain personal characteristics of individuals, e.g. age, education have been termed as the correlates of Job involvement. The other two types of correlates are work outcomes and situational variables. Brown (1996) criticized that job involvement would be in the highest level when the work environment makes one believe that one’s work is helpful; offers control over how work is taking place; keeps a clear set of behavioral norms; creates feedback concerning completed work available; and provides supportive relationships with supervisors and co-workers. Many other works have investigated that highly involved employees perform substantial efforts towards the achievement of organizational objectives and would less likely to turnover.

High work involvement and high family involvement have been shown to be positively related to the number of hours spent in work and family activities respectively. These hours in turn have been linked to increased work and family conflict resulting from role overload (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). In a study by Igbaria, Parasuraman and Badawy (1994) found that high levels of job involvement tend to enhance the beneficial effects of work experiences on the quality of work life in some cases; while in others such involvement tends to elevate the negative effects of role stressors. Job involvement is one potential work-related variable that may cause work-family conflict (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Martire, et al., 2000) Women with high role involvement may find it more difficult to comply with the demand of other roles.

There have been some studies examining the relationship between work involvement (salience) and work-family conflict. These studies have provided inconsistent results, however. For example, Greenhaus and Kopelman (1981)
found that, for a sample of men, work role salience was significantly and positively related to work-family conflict. Similarly, Beutell (1983) found that work role salience and work-nonwork conflict were positively related for men, but negatively related for women. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) proposed that these inconsistent findings may be the result of a conceptual shortcoming, namely a failure to consider unmeasured role pressures in the family domain. For example, if one is highly involved in one's job role, it is unlikely that a high level of perceived work-family conflict will ensue if the individual is not also highly involved in his or her family role. Based on the Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) analysis, it was hypothesized that the relationship between job involvement and work-family conflict would be moderated by the level of involvement in one's family roles. That is, job involvement and work-family conflict would be positively related for individuals high in family involvement and unrelated for individuals low in family involvement.

Furthermore, role involvement may increase the occurrence of inter-role conflict in two ways (Bartolome and Evans, 1979). First, high levels of involvement in one role may be related with an increase in the amount of time devoted to that role, thereby making it more difficult to comply with the expectations associated with a second role. Additionally, high role involvement may cause one to be mentally preoccupied with one role even when one is physically attempting to accomplish the demands of a second role. Several studies had been there which examine the relationship between work involvement and work-family conflict. Different results were yielded by two additional studies by Holahan and Gilbert (1979a, b). In one of their studies, Holahan and Gilbert (1979a) hypothesized those women who perceived their employment as a career experienced greater work-family conflict than women who perceived their employment as a job. They speculated that the higher degree of work-family conflict for the career group was due to the greater involvement
and personal investment of career pursuit. Instead, they found that women in the career group did not report significantly more work-family conflict than women in the job group. In another study by Holahan and Gilbert (1979b) it was found that the experience of work-family conflict for men and women, the degree of career commitment was not significantly related to work-family conflict. Based on the Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) analysis, it was hypothesized that the relationship between job involvement and work-family conflict will be moderated by the level of involvement in one's family roles.

**SOCIAL SUPPORT**

Social support also refers to interpersonal relationships and social interactions that help to protect individuals from the effects of stress (Nielson, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001). Social support describes an interpersonal transaction that involves emotional concern, instrumental aid, information, or appraisal (House, 1981), and is generally conceived of as a coping mechanism in the stress literature (Gore, 1987). In the work context, social support may be obtained from supervisors or coworkers. Work support has been reported to be negatively related to work–family conflict (Frone et al., 1997). Similarly, family support (e.g., from a spouse) has been reported to be negatively related to family–work conflict (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Cohen & Wills (1985) opined that social support attenuates the deleterious consequences of stress and therefore constitutes an important resource in stress prevention. It may also enhance the integration of work and family roles. Social support has also been found to benefit an individual threefold (Viswesvaran, Sanchez, and Fisher, 1999).

It was observed that social support reduces strain (the feeling associated with the stress), reduces the intensity of the stressor (entity providing the stress), and alleviates the affects of the stressors+. In other words, social support was found to minimize both the event and the feeling, while also diminishing the impact the feeling had on the event. A supportive work environment may
enhance flexibility, information, and direct help that will facilitate the integration of work and family roles (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999). Moreover, support obtained from the family, such as encouragement, information, and advice, can be used to enhance one’s functioning in the work role. Indeed, Grzywacz and Marks (2000) reported that social support was related to work–family facilitation.

Social support has been postulated both as a moderator between stressors and psychological well-being and as a determinant that influences psychological well-being (e.g., Cohen & Wills, 1985). Carlson and Perrewé (1999) studied family and work support as an independent variable and as a moderator in the role stressors and Work family conflict, and they concluded that social support could be best conceptualized as a variable that directly influences perceived stressors. Grandey and Cropanzano’s (1999) conservation of resources model has been applied to Work family conflict (Allen, 2001). The model suggests that individuals are motivated to acquire and maintain resources (i.e., social support networks) while coping with stress, which implies that social support has a direct effect on Work family conflict.

Spousal support is the help, advice, understanding, and the like that spouses provide for one another. Two forms of spousal support (emotional and instrumental) have been conceptualized and empirically tested (Adams et al., 1996). Emotional support includes emphatic understanding and listening, affirmation of affection, advice, and genuine concern for the welfare of the partner. Instrumental support is tangible help from the partner in household chores and childcare. Increased spousal support is shown to be associated with lower levels of Work family conflict (Buffardi & Casper, 2001), higher levels of psychological well-being (Fusilier & Mayes, 1986), greater life satisfaction (LaRocco, House, & French, 1980), and better marital adjustment (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). Other researchers concurred that spousal support was
particularly influential in reducing Family-to-Work conflict (Adams et al., 1996). Instrumental spousal support reduces the burden of family demands and enables individuals to devote more time to work, whereas emotional spousal support enhances feelings of self-efficacy both at home and at work (Parasuraman, Purohit, & Godshalk, 1996). From the review of literature, it is expected that spousal support has a direct and positive relationship with psychological well-being and marital satisfaction. Organizational support has been recognized as playing a key role in employees’ ability to balance work and family responsibilities (Allen, 2001; Behson, 2002).

Social support tends to involve three types of activities (a) help by the stimulation of psychological resources to overcome problems of emotional disorder, (b) sharing of tasks which the individual must perform and (c) providing the material and financial resources, skills and supervision necessary to face up the stressful situation. Pinneau (1975) also attempted to define social support and differentiated three forms of social support: material help, evaluative/informational help and emotional help. Sidney Cobb (1976) viewed social support as a moderating factor for the effects of stress. Gottlieb (1978) defined four types of support: emotional, instrumental, indirect help which is only a more general form of emotional support and finally, any action undertaken directly on stress factors surrounding the affected individual. Kahn and Antonucci (1980) defined social support as all interpersonal transactions involving one or many of the following dimensions: affection, affirmation, and help. He also proposed that social support be considered as an interpersonal transaction involving four types of support: emotional (feelings and emotions), instrumental (goods and services), informational (facts and data), and finally judgmental or evaluative (judgment, appreciation).

The notion of social support can be defined following a matrix of two axes: 1) One axis is of the formal (e.g. organization, superior, institutions) and informal sources (e.g. spouse, family, friends, neighbours) who are likely to
provide social support, and 2) the other axis is of forms (emotional, evaluative, informational and instrumental) which the support emanating from the above sources can take. It is hypothesized to influence stress and its related outcomes in three main ways (House 1981). First, social support may have a main effect on outcomes such that individuals who experienced higher levels of support are expected to experience better health, less dissatisfaction with their jobs, and so on (Fisher, 1985). Second, social support may have a direct or main effect on perceived stress such that when social support is present the level of perceived stress is reduced or alleviated. The third effect of social support is a buffering, moderating or interactive one. The main idea is that social support can alter the relationship between stress and its outcomes. A key notion in understanding the buffering hypothesis is that social support interacts with stress such that the relation between stress and its outcomes becomes more pronounced for individuals with low levels of support than for individuals with high levels of support.

Giving and receiving of social support often has been viewed as women's core or major strategy for coping with stress there is huge evidence that people with larger social networks and those who perceive that support is available to them show less reactivity to stressors or have better health (Banyard and Graham-Bermann 1993). On the other hand, studies investigating whether concrete acts of support explain these beneficial effects have produced disappointing results (Bolger, Zuckerman, & Kessler, 2000). Availability of social support protects people from the effects of stressors (Stroebe & Stroebe, 1996), therefore it is supposed that people who are integrated into social networks or who perceive that support is available to them make effective use of this support in times of stress. Perceived support is rooted in the everyday fabric of relationships, in the routine interactions that people have with their friends and partners, interactions that are not necessarily viewed as acts of support (Leatham
& Duck, 1990). Researches had shown that inequities in received support, namely, feeling over benefited, can lead to increased distress (Gleason et al., 2003).

Lieberman (1986), in reviewing the finding that many people in supportive networks claim not to turn to these networks for help, has argued that such people probably do receive support but that it is delivered so smoothly that they do not notice it. Indeed, Coyne and Bolger (1990) posited that it is the absence of explicit support that may attest to the strength of a close relationship. Explicit or “visible” acts of support from a close partner may represent reparative work, potentially signaling problems in the relationship. Thus, one possible explanation for the discrepancy between the effects of perceived and received support is that the most effective support from friends and partners takes place “between the lines” and either goes unnoticed or is not interpreted as support. This is referred to as “invisible support” (Bolger et al., 2000). Elman and Gilbert (1984) first reported a significant negative relationship between role conflict and spouse support in their sample of dual-career women with preschool-aged children. Others also found greater support from husbands to be significantly correlated with lower conflict between roles (Aryee, 1992), decreased role strain (Van Meter & Agronow, 1982), and fewer symptoms of depression (Ross, Mirowsky, & Huber, 1983).

In contrast, Parasuraman et al. (1992) did not find any significant effect of husbands' support on a measure of life stress for women, and Reifman et al. (1991) found no confirmation for their hypothesis that marital support would buffer women from the negative effects of stress. It is possible that these contradictory findings may be due to the different conceptions of spousal support used in the various studies. Both studies employed measures focusing on emotional and informational support offered by spouses, whereas studies that obtained significant relationships between women's role strain and spousal
support often used measures that emphasized instrumental support (e.g. assistance with child care or housework) or a mixture of instrumental and emotional support items. Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990); those that look at the supportiveness of coworkers (Reifman et al., 1991) and several that have attempted to assess this construct in an overall or global manner (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Parasuraman et al., 1992). Although previous researches show no relationship between coworker support and role stress for women.

There is some indication that supervisors’ support, particularly with regard to potential conflicts between work and family responsibilities, may have a positive influence. Goff et al. found that supervisors’ supportiveness around family-related problems was directly related to lowered role conflict for their women participants and both Warren and Johnson (1995) reported that supervisors’ flexibility with regard to family responsibilities significant contribution to reducing women’s strain. Parasuraman et al. found no effect of general work support on women’s life stress whereas Greenhaus, Bedeian, and Mossholder (1987) reported a significant relationship between perceptions of a non supportive work environment and increased work-family conflict. Stress is generally defined as incongruence between environmental demands and coping resources. Social support is one critical coping resource, and it refers to everyday actions that convey care and concern (Cutrona, 1996). For example, the job demands–job resources model (Karasek & Theorell, 1990) and person–environment fit model (Quick et al., 2001) suggest that individuals who face significant work pressures with little support are likely to experience strain, or the bio behavioral responses of a person experiencing stress. Social support is also a critical variable in the experience of work–life conflict: Role demands are less likely to translate into such conflict for individuals with support (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999). Spouses constitute an important support source. They provide a sense of stability at home, help with child care, alleviate work–life conflict (Rao,
Apte & Subbakrishna, 2003), and are critical for working individuals (Janning, 2006). Women judge support at home as being vital, even if they have access to other support sources (Coyne & DeLongis, 1986). Studies uphold, however, a support-gap hypothesis, whereby women report levels of spousal support lower than men’s (Xu & Burleson, 2001).

MENTAL HEALTH

The phenomenon of mental health had occupied the attention of scholars from various disciplines. According to encyclopedia Britannica (1982) the term mental health represents a variety of human aspirations; rehabilitation of the mentally disturbed, prevention of mental disorders, reduction of tension in a conflict-laden world and attainment of a state of well being in which the individual functions at a level consistent with his mental and physical potentials. Mental health is regarded as the condition of the individual relative to one’s capacities and social environmental context.

Disturbances to an individual’s mental well being can adversely compromise these capacities and choices, leading not only to diminish functioning at the individual level but also broader welfare losses at the household and societal level. Mental health refers to the broad array of activities directly or indirectly related to the mental well-being component included in the WHO’s definition of health. “A state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity” (WHO, 2001). Similarly, other experts view mental health as the capacity to live life to the full in ways that enable us to realise our natural potentialities, and that unite us with, rather than divide us from all other human beings who make up our world e.g. (Guntrip, 1964). Mental health problems may arise as a result of prolonged exposure to chronic stressors. It may reduce one’s coping resources and lead to depression and other mental health risks. Moreover, daily stressors, painful physical experiences and psychological distress have been found to cause
depression (Eckenrode, 1984). Likewise, anxiety is also one of the most significant problems faced by people that hinder day-to-day adjustment and overall mental health.

Mental health is not just the absence of mental illness. It is defined as a state of well being in which every individual realizes his or her own potential, can cope with the normal stressors of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to his or her community (WHO, 2007). This definition makes it clear that mental or psychological well-being is influenced not only by individual characteristics but also by the socioeconomic circumstances in which persons find themselves and the broader environment in which they live. Individual attributes and behavior relate to a person’s innate as well as learned ability to deal with thoughts and feelings and to manage self in daily life i.e. emotional intelligence, as well as the capacity to deal with the social world around by participating in social activities, taking responsibilities or respecting the views of others social intelligence.

Basically, mental Health is about how we feel about ourselves, how we feel about others and how we are able to meet the demands of life. Standards of mentally healthy behaviour vary with the time, place, culture, and expectations of the society. Briefly, different peoples have different standards. Mental health is one of the human values; it should not be regarded as the ultimate good in itself. No completely acceptable and all-inclusive concept exists for physical health or physical illness; similarly, none exists for mental health or mental illness. In contrast, within a clinical context, mental illness can be defined as a clinically recognizable set of symptoms (relating to mood, thought, or cognition) or behaviour that is associated with distress and interference with functions that is, impairments leading to activity limitations or participation restrictions (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). In this sense mental illness is referred to collectively all diagnosable mental disorders or health conditions that are characterized by alterations in thinking, mood or behavior associated with
distress or impaired functioning. In the health care and public health sphere, more emphasis and resources have been devoted to screening, diagnosis and treatment of mental illness than mental health.

These problems affect the way a person think, feel and behave. Mental health problems range from the worries experienced as part of everyday life to serious long-term conditions. The majority of people who experience mental health problems can get over them or learn to live with them, risks to mental health manifest themselves at all stages in life. A life course approach is generally used as it shows how risk exposures in the formative stages of life can affect mental well-being many years or even decades later (Fisher et al., 2011).

Researchers suggest that there are indicators of mental health, representing three domains. These include the following (a) Emotional well-being such as perceived life satisfaction, happiness, cheerfulness, peacefulness (b) Psychological well-being such as self-acceptance, personal growth including openness to new experiences, optimism, hopefulness, purpose in life, control of one’s environment, spirituality, self-direction, and positive relationships (c) Social well-being social acceptance, beliefs in the potential of people and society as a whole, personal self-worth and usefulness to society, sense of community (Ryff, 1995; Keyes, 1998). Jeromme (1993) views health as a sense of control, predictability and coherence that comprises the ability to adapt to physical and psychological demand and disruption. Traditional views about health also explain it in negative terms and had emphasized that health is not being sick or absence of illness. Hence, it is true that a healthy individual is free from diseases but still may not enjoy a vigorous satisfying life, thereby implying that health is not limited to our physical well being.

This way health is a positive and multidimensional state which involves three dimensions as inferred from WHO’s (2001) definition. These dimensions include physical, psychological and social health. Physical health involves having sound, disease free body with good cardiovascular performance, sharp
senses, a vital immune system and the ability to withstand physical injury. Among these are lifestyle habits, eating a nutritious diet, exercising regularly, sleeping well and avoiding use of tobacco and other drugs. Psychological health is being able to think clearly having good self-esteem and enjoying a general feeling of well being. It includes creativity, problem solving skills and emotional stability. Social health includes having good interpersonal skills meaningful relationships with friends and family and social support in time of crisis. It relates to socio cultural factors such as socioeconomic status, education, ethnicity, culture and gender. There is cross domain influence of each domain.

RATIONAL FOR THE STUDY

Review of related researches indicates that both Work-to-family interference and family-to work interference have cross-over effects on the spouse/partner. A model presented by Brotheridge and Lee (2005) conservation of resources perspective relating impact of conflict between work and family roles. The model puts forward a process of reciprocal influence in which: (a) work-related stressors and strains predict that work will interfere with family which, in turn, will lead to higher levels of family related stressors and strain; and (b) family related stressors and strains predict that family will interfere with work, which in turn, will lead to higher levels of work-related stressors and strains. An extended interactive model has been proposed here, which will be tested empirically.

Further, recent research on spillover (e.g., Hammed, 2008) has indicated that the within-domain relationship is likely to be stronger than cross-domain relationship. For example, although work distress is likely to be predicted by factors outside the work domain, it will likely be more strongly predicted by work demands and resources. Thus, it is expected that the impact of spillover is bounded by domain. Furthermore, it may be posited that subjective experiences in one domain are the part of one’s broader life experiences. This suggests that
both family and job distress predict lack of well-being in more general terms. The present study is oriented to examine these effects along with several sources of social support. Resources such as supportive supervisors, coworkers (at work), spouse, friends, or relatives (at family level) may serve as buffers between demands and subjective experiences of strain and distress. These resources are expected to moderate the impact of excessive work demands or family load on general mental health.

Consistent with the conservation of resources theory, some researchers have found that social support has stronger effects on subjective outcomes (Frone et al., 1997). Therefore, the present proposal considers resources such as social support to be potential contributors to subjective experiences. Further, these resources should have their strongest impact in the domain in which they originated. For example coworkers support has a greater impact on reducing job distress than on increasing satisfaction at home. Similarly, research also suggests that spousal support is associated with some satisfaction (e.g., Parasuraman et al., 1991) and reduced intention to leave home.

In present work-family scenario the experience of strain and distress among women is more pervasive. Reason is quite obvious; they carry more burden/load than men in the family. There is noticeably greater strain on women's mental health as they struggle to balance the multiple competing demands on their time and energy. This strain often occurs as the Indian women employees tend to meet the needs of their spouses, children, elderly parents, community, and of course coworkers. This situation can lead to various mental health problems in women. Mental health is a matter of concern for all as it is a key factor in maintaining the state of balance between the individual and the surrounding world. It could be seen as a state of harmony between oneself and others, a coexistence between the realities of the self and that of other people and that of the environment. The mentally healthy person is the person who is free
from internal conflict, who is not at “war” with himself. She knows herself; this
is to say that, she understands her needs, problems and goals, i.e., self
actualization.

Above indications about the potential effects of work and family conflicts
on ones mental health, specifically the woman, and direct or moderating impact
of social support suggest to undertake the present investigation. Moreover,
potential relationship between various conceptualizations operating in work and
family domains, the work family conflict examined within the context of a
multivariate approach. To date, research testing relationship between work-
family conflict and variables operating in family and work domain has not
utilized multivariate approach of required levels. Major research question now is
“does work-family interface affect the mental health of Indian women and does
social support alter its consequences?” With this aim in view, the problem of the
study may be stated as “WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE AND MENTAL
HEALTH OF INDIAN WOMEN: MODERATING ROLE OF SOCIAL
SUPPORT.”

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:
1. To examine the relationship of job and family distress with work-family
   interference.
2. To examine the relationship of social support with job and family distress.
3. To study the relationship between social support and work-family
   interference.
4. To examine the relationship of Job and family involvement with work-
   family interference.
5. To examine the relationship of job and family distress with mental health.
6. To study the relationship between work-family interference and mental
   health.
7. To study the relationship between work-family facilitation and mental health.

8. To study the moderating effect of social support on the relationship between work-family interference and mental health.

9. To test a hypothesized model of work-family interface.

**PROPOSED HYPOTHESES:**

1. Job and family distress tend to correlate positively with cross-domain interference.

2. Social support is likely to correlate negatively with job and family distress.

3. Social support is likely to correlate negatively with work interference with family and family interference with work.

4. Job and family involvement tend to correlate positively with cross-domain interference.

5. Job and family distress are likely to correlate negatively with mental health.

6. Work-family interference is likely to correlate negatively with mental health.

7. Work-family facilitation is likely to correlate positively with mental health.

8. Social support is likely to moderate the deleterious effects of work-family interference on mental health.

9. The proposed work-family interface model will prove a fit for the observed data.