3 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The work-life field has grown enormously over the past two decades, as evidenced by the number of academic centers focusing on work-life issues both in the United States and across the globe. The range of journals across disciplines in which work-life topics are addressed, received enormous growth and have always have been the hot topics of discussion across various platforms. The range of topics at any conference or in any volume on work-life or work-family issues is vast: the quality of life in today's families, women's labour force participation, the allocation of household and paid labour, the quality and accessibility of child care, flexible work options, stress and so forth. Basically any research examines aspects of work or personal life can, and probably has been, approached as a work-life issue.

The field has certainly gained enormously by expanding its focus beyond formal employer policies aimed at helping workers with visible care giving demands (often with young children) keep their personal lives from interfering with their work performance. The literature now holds a wealth of information on how work conditions affect personal life and vice-versa. This literature is increasingly nuanced, focusing on specific conditions in the work place and in the home that are most important in explaining the ability of workers to combine effectively work and personal life.

In this chapter, an attempt is made to provide an overview of various aspects of work and family life and their association with various other factors. The sources referred in this chapter have been taken from various journals, thesis’, doctoral papers, working papers, magazines, books related to psychology and Human Resources, internet etc…. The study of literature has been classified following headings:

- Linkages’ between the work and family domains
- Research about the causes of work-family conflict
- Work-Family Linkages: Conflict versus Enrichment
• Role Conflict Perspective

• Individual Differences in Experiencing Work-Family Linkages

• The role of the organization in work and family

• Organizational Adoption and Evaluation of Work-Family Programs

• Impact of Work-Family Practices and Supportive Culture on Organizational Outcomes

• Outcomes related to work-family research

• Work-family initiatives and work outcomes

• Employee Attraction and Retention

• Work Performance and Work Behaviors

• Work-family initiatives and family outcomes

• Work-family initiatives and career outcomes

• Family friendly programs and work-life integration

• Consequences

• Moderators of WFC

• Work-Family Conflict Perspective

• Gender Differences in Work-Family Conflict

• Long Work Hours as a Predictor of Health and Quality-of-Life Indicators

• Long Work Hours and Work-Family Conflict

• Work-Family Conflict as a Predictor of Health and Quality-of-Life Outcomes

• Work-Family Conflict as a Mediator

• Ramifications for the work-family interface
• Blurred work and family boundaries

3.1 Linkages’ between the work and family domains

A general tenet of the work-family scholarship is that individuals who are employed in workplaces that are designed as if work and family were separate spheres will experience higher work-family role conflict unless employers adopt policies to provide greater flexibility to support integration between work and home (Friedman, Christensen, & De Groot, 1998; Kanter, 1977).

As noted previously, models of work and family often incorporated work-family conflict as a central feature (Adams et al., 1996; Ayee et al., 1999; Bacharach et al., 1991; Frone et al., 1992; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Higgins et al., 1992; Koelman et al., 1983). Work family conflict is the form of inter role conflict in which work and family roles demands are incompatible, such that meeting demands in one domain makes it difficult to meet demands in other domain (Bruke & Greenglass, 1987; Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Greenhaus & Beutell 1985 identified three forms of work-family conflict, each of which can be explained using linkages’ between parallel constructs from work and family domains.

Time based conflict occurs when devoting time to the demands of one domain leaves insufficient time to meet the demands of other domain. Time is an ability people can use to fulfill demands. Therefore, time-based conflict implies a negative relationship between work and family abilities, whereby an increase in work time decreases family time and vice-versa (Frone et al., 1992). The negative relationship between work and family time is direct and intentional, driven by time allocation decisions of the person. Time based conflict further stipulates the drawing time from a domain leaves the demands of that domain unmet. This condition signifies demands-abilities misfit in which environmental demands exceed the abilities of the person.

The second type of work-family conflict described by Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) is strain based conflict, which occurs when strain generated in one domain makes it
difficult to meet demands in the other domain. Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) characterize strain as fatigue, tension, anxiety, depression, and irritability, each of which can reduce the ability of the person to meet role requirements. Hence, strain-based conflict implies that increased strain in one domain reduces abilities in the other domain. The effect of strain on abilities may be direct or indirect, mediated by general forms of strain such as overall physical exhaustion (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

The third type of work-family conflict discussed by Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) is behavior-based conflict, which occurs when behaviors exhibited in one domain are incompatible with demands in other domain and the person does not adopt his or her behavior when moving between domains. The behaviors described by Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) are manifestation of skills used by the person to fulfill role expectations. For instance, the work role may require skills that promote self-reliance, aggressiveness, and objectivity, whereas the family role may require skills that foster nurturing, warmth, and emotional expression (Eckenrode & Gore, 1990; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Behavior based conflict implies a negative relationship between work and family abilities, such that abilities developed in one domain are inappropriately transferred to the other domain, reducing abilities to meet demands in that domain (Frone et al., 1992). The relationship can be direct or indirect, as when domain specific skills become part of the persons general skills sets before being applied to the to other domain.

3.2 Works-Family Linkages: Conflict versus Enrichment

To understand how individuals perceive the relationship between work and family, researchers have proposed a number of ways in which the two domains may be linked (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1990), recognizing that more than one may be operating at the same time. Spillover theory suggests that work and family can influence each other positively or negatively through transfer of affect, values, skills, and behavior. For example, a good mood from a successful experience at work may
influence the employee's mood at home. According to the accommodation theory, employees may accommodate the demands of one role by reducing involvement in another role (Lambert, 1990). Compensation theory suggests that individuals attempt to compensate for dissatisfaction in one domain by pursuing more satisfying experiences in another (Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1990). According to segmentation theory, some employees intentionally segment their work and family roles such that when they are participating in one role they do not allow the other role to impinge on their thoughts, behaviors, or feelings (Greenhaus & Singh, 2004; Lambert, 1990).

By far the most common explanation for the nature of the relationship between work and family is derived from the scarcity theory of role accumulation, which suggests that the sum of human energy is fixed and that adding more roles creates a greater likelihood of overload, conflict, strain, and other negative consequences for well-being (Marks, 1977). Similarly, the role conflict perspective, based on role theory (Kahn, Wolf, Quinn, Slwek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978), suggests that multiple roles lead to role conflict and stress. I/O researchers predominantly have used the role conflict perspective as the underlying theoretical foundation for their research; indeed, most work-family researchers, whatever their background, tend to use the conflict perspective to understand the work-family interface (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Greenhaus & Powell, in press).

More recently, researchers have begun to consider possible positive links between work and family (e.g., Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, in press; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Rothbard, 2001; Thompson & Prottas, in press). Specifically, there is growing evidence that role accumulation can be beneficial for individuals such that experiences in one role can enhance the experiences in another role (Barnett & Hyde, 2001).

3.3 Individual Differences in Experiencing Work-Family Linkages

Psychologists have a rich history of examining individual differences, and this has recently carried over into the study of work and family. Specifically, there has been a
growing interest in examining the dispositional variables that relate to work and family linkages, particularly WFC. The dispositional variable that has been most frequently associated with WFC is negative affectivity (NA). Research has consistently demonstrated that individuals higher in negative affectivity also report greater WFC (Bruck & Allen, 2003, Carlson, 1999; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1993; Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002). Indeed, several studies examining multiple situational and dispositional predictors suggest that NA may be one of the strongest predictors of WFC (Allen, & Bruck, 2004; Carlson, 1999).

A few studies have examined the relationship between Type A and WFC, but the results have been mixed. Individuals who display Type A behavior are generally described as ambitious, competitive, impatient, and aggressive or hostile (Spence, Helmreich, & Pred, 1987). Burke (1988) found that police officers with more of a Type A personality were more likely to report WFC than were police officers with less of a Type A personality. However, Carlson (1999) did not replicate Burke's finding. Bruck and Allen (2003) used a multidimensional measure of Type A behavior that separated the construct into two components, impatience-irritability and achievement strivings. As expected, a significant correlation between the impatience-irritability aspect of Type A and WFC was observed. However, Type A did not contribute unique variance toward the explanation of WFC after controlling for other demographic and dispositional variables.

The Big Five personality variables have been examined in relation to WFC (Costa & McCrae, 1991). Not surprisingly, neuroticism, which is highly related to negative affectivity, has been associated with both forms of work-family conflict (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). In addition to neuroticism, there is some evidence linking agreeableness and conscientiousness with WFC. Specifically, after controlling for demographics and other dispositional variables, Bruck and Allen (2003) found that more conscientious individuals were less likely to report FIW, but found no relationship with overall WFC or with WIF. Wayne et al. (2004) found that more conscientious individuals were less likely to report both FIW and WIF. Wayne et al. also found that more agreeable individuals were less likely to report WIF. Neither
Bruck and Allen nor Wayne et al. found support for a relationship between extraversion and openness to experience with WFC.

Lesser research examined dispositional variables and work-family enrichment or facilitation. In their study that included the Big Five variables, Wayne et al. (2004) found that individuals who were more extraverted, less neurotic, and more open to experience were more likely to report that work facilitated family. More extraverted, agreeable, and conscientious individuals were more likely to report that family facilitated work. Thus their results demonstrate that the same dispositional variables that relate to WFC do not necessarily relate to work-family enrichment. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) also found that extraversion was related to positive spillover in both directions.

In Sum, the research concerning personality seems to indicate that dispositional factors may serve as either risk factors or protective factors against work-family conflict. Individuals with negative affectivity may be most at risk for work-family conflict while conscientiousness and agreeableness may serve as protective factors. Little data are available yet concerning dispositions and work-family enrichment, but the extant research seems to suggest that extraversion enhances the likelihood that individuals will report that work and family are mutually enriching. Moreover, it appears WFC and work-family enrichment has different dispositional antecedents. Thus, it should not be assumed that the dispositional variables that relate to WFC also relate to work-family enrichment.

Individual Role Management Strategies

Researchers have identified several strategies for coping with multiple role demands (Behson, 2002; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1986; Hall, 1972). In Hall's (1972) typology of coping, for example, individuals may choose to modify the stressful situation through direct action. That is, the employee must figure out the root cause of the stress and attempt to change the situation (e.g., others’ expectations) that produces the stress. Another strategy is to modify the meaning of the situation by changing their personal concept of role requirements or by changing self-expectations for career and family. This might involve establishing priorities (e.g., family comes first), overlooking less
important role expectations (e.g., not worrying about the house being a mess), and keeping things in perspective (e.g., focusing on the positive aspects of one’s life). Hall’s (1972) third type of coping is reactive coping, which involves trying to meet everyone’s expectations. Instead of trying to confront the source of the stress or change the meaning of the stressful situation, some individuals try to plan or schedule better, work harder to meet everyone’s expectations, or use no conscious strategy at all. Most research suggests that this third style of coping is not very effective (Hall, 1972; Kirchrneyer, 1993).

Some individuals cope by managing the symptoms of stress (e.g., by exercising, eating well, getting enough sleep, meditating, listening to music). However, while this strategy may alleviate stress symptoms, it does nothing to resolve the source of the stress (Latack, 1984). More recently, Behson (2002) found that an informal coping strategy of making temporary and informal accommodations to the employee’s usual work patterns attenuated the relationship between family-to-work conflict and work stress. In general, active styles of coping tend to be more effective than emotion-focused or passive coping (Behson, 2002; Kirchrneyer, 1993).

3.4 Work-Family Enrichment Perspective

Although the findings described above appear to support the scarcity theory of role accumulation (Marks, 1977), there is a growing body of research that suggests that individuals with multiple life roles (e.g., spouse, parent, employee) are less depressed, have higher self-esteem, and are more satisfied with their marriages and their jobs compared to women and men who are not married, are unemployed, or are childless (see Crosby, 1991, and Greenhaus & Powell, in press, for a review of this literature). In other words, up to a point, the more roles one participates in, the better one’s mental and physical health. Barnell and Hyde (200 I) argued that it is the quality of roles rather than the quantity of roles that matters. That is, there is a positive association between multiple roles and mental health when employees are satisfied with their jobs and satisfied with their home life. The greater the quality of the roles (e.g., a job that is
interesting and challenging and uses the employee’s skills and talents), the greater an individual’s self-esteem and freedom from depression (Barnell & Hyde, 200 I; Baruch & Barnell, 1987).

According to the enrichment theory of role accumulation (also referred to as work-family enhancement, positive spillover, and work-family facilitation), multiple roles may increase one’s energy by increasing sources of identity, self-esteem, rewards, and resources available to cope with the multiple demands (Barnett & Hyde, 200 I; Greeuhaus & Powell, in press; Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002; Thoits, 1987). For example, participating in multiple roles creates more opportunities for gratification, positive self-experiences, and subsequent enhanced feelings of self-worth (Ruderman et al., 2002). In addition, resources acquired in one role (e.g., connections, leadership skills) may be used to enhance functioning in another role (Sieber, 1974).

Consistent with a broader movement in psychology to examine not just mental illness but also mental health (e.g., Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), we need to expand our thinking about the positive connections between work and family. However, given the competing predictions of the role conflict and role enrichment perspectives, it behooves researchers to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework that can guide our examination of the positive and negative effects of combining work and family roles. That is, we need to determine which personal and organizational factors influence whether individuals experience their multiple roles positively or negatively, and we need to determine the process through which positive and negative outcomes occur.

Although Grzywacz (2002) has proposed a preliminary model of work-family facilitation, based on ecological theory, it focuses on positive interdependencies only. Similarly, Greenhaus and Powell (in press) have proposed a model of work-family enrichment, which they define as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (p. 6). While both models move the field toward a more complex view of the work-family interface neither proposes a process for understanding how and when certain role experiences lead to positive outcomes and how and when they lead to negative outcomes. To date, only Rothbard (200 I) has proposed a model that describes a process (i.e., psychological engagement in a role) through which work and family
roles might influence each other positively or negatively. However, future models need to include possible personal, job, and organizational factors that may influence the extent to which roles are experienced positively or negatively.

### 3.5 Work-Family Conflict Perspective

The work-family conflict approach has its origins in studies of inter-role conflict (e.g., Kanter, 1977; Sarbin, 1954) and has as its guiding assumption that work and family are in basic conflict. Moreover, the focus on incompatible role demands is coupled with the notion that human energy is a fixed and limited quantity. This notion is often referred to as the scarcity hypothesis (Barnett, Marshall, & Singer, 1992; Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). Accordingly, the more roles a person—usually a woman—occupies, the greater the pressure on her energy and the more depleted her reserves. As a result, incumbents who occupy roles in multiple spheres experience tension and conflict, which, in turn, exacts a cost. In this tradition, the cost of multiple-role occupancy is most often assessed in terms of such outcomes as psychological distress, decreased marital and job satisfaction, and such organizational outcomes as burnout and intention to leave one's current job. The work-family conflict approach remains the dominant perspective in the work-family literature.

It has as its first assumption that multiple roles are not harmful per se and are, in general, beneficial for women and men. Underlying this assumption is the belief that human energy is a potentially expanding resource. By engaging in multiple roles, one has the opportunity to increase one's energy supply. The benefits of multiple-role engagement are reflected in positive mental health, physical health, and relationship health. Because this body of literature is less well-known to work-family researchers, in this chapter, we devote disproportionately more space to this approach.

The phrase "work-family conflict" emerged in the 1980s, a time when married women's labor force participation experienced a Sleep increase. This increase represented the culmination of a long, 70-year trend beginning in the 1920s. Indeed, the massive movement of women into the labor force has been described as "one of the most
significant social and economic trends in modern U.S. history” (Hayghe, 1997). By 1970s, the 50-year reign of the Ozzie-and Harriet family was proclaimed to be definitely over (Coontz, 1997, p. 57). The clear boundaries between what had previously been seen as two distinct arenas of life—work (primarily the domain of men) and family (primarily the domain of women)—were eroding.

The prevailing sex-role attitudes in the 1970s and 1980s were more traditional than they are today. Briefly, there was general consensus that women's primary social role was wife and mother, whereas men's primary role was breadwinner. There was also a pervasive belief that multiple roles were "bad" for women; married women with children who took on the added role of employee were inevitably exhausted, highly vulnerable to stress-related problems, and unable to manage adequately the various demands of their complicated and energy-draining lives. Accordingly, the more roles a woman occupied, the greater the pressure on her energy and the more depleted her reserves. Thus, employed married women with children were assumed to be less resilient than men with the same role set and, therefore, at higher risk for such stress-related illnesses as depression and anxiety. They were also assumed to be shortchanging their husbands and children and purring them at risk for emotional problems as well.

The view of work and family as separate, conflicting spheres was reinforced by the dominant corporate culture that explicitly required family matters to be left at the workplace door. To be taken seriously on the job, women would have to conform to the traditional one dimensional view of men as worker drones. This bifurcated model is still unfortunately a part of the corporate landscape. Similarly, the traditional sex-role assumptions underlying this model still have a hold on our thinking. In addition, the scarcity model of energy is consistent with the then (and still) dominant management fixation on "face time" as a reflection of employee commitment and productivity. Because it is believed that family roles deplete employees' energy reserves, the best way to get the most out of employees is to keep them working long hours so that they will be unavailable for such activities.

Because of the dominant assumption that work and family are separate and in competition for such scarce resources as time and attention (Barnett, 1998), the work-
family interface has been characterized as involving constant tension and perpetual conflict, especially for employed married women with children. Each employee is viewed as caught in a zero-sum game in which resources expended in one sphere deplete those available for the other, leading inevitably to diminished role quality in the deprived sphere (Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). For example, excessive work hours have been related to increased marital tension (Hughes & Galinsky, 1994). Almost most studies of work-family conflict focus on competing time demands, such other aspects as energy, strain, and behavior (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; MacDermind et al., 2000) have also been identified. That is, the enactment of one role may (a) reduce the energy available for performing other roles; (b) increase strain, interfering with the ability to perform other roles; or (c) encourage behaviors that are incompatible with the performance of other roles.

3.6  Role Conflict Perspective

Work-family conflict (denoted WFC when referring to overall work-family conflict) is a type of inter role conflict in which the demands of the work role and the demands of the family role are mutually incompatible in some respect (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997a). When an employee is in a meeting at work, for example, it is physically impossible for her to attend her child’s soccer game. It is also possible that an individual is physically present but psychologically elsewhere (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Although originally conceptualized as a one-dimensional construct (e.g., Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983), more recent conceptualizations include two forms of conflict: work interference with family conflict (WIF) and family interference with work conflict (FIW; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992b; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999; Thompson, 1989).

Most research on work-family conflict has investigated the extent to which work interferes with family life rather than the extent to which family interferes with work, and in fact, the former appears to be more prevalent among employees (e.g., Eagle, Miles, & Icenogle, 1997; Frone, 2003; Gutek et al., 1991; Williams & Alliger, 1994). Bellavia
and Frone (2005) reviewed three large-scale, national surveys of the U.S. population that were conducted between 1990 and 1997 and found that between a quarter and a half of the population experienced some form of WIF. The prevalence of FIW was much lower (approximately 10 to 14%).

According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), there are three types of work-family conflict.

*Time-based conflict* occurs "when the time demands of one role make it difficult or impossible to participate fully in another role" (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997a, p. 4). For example, early morning breakfast meetings make it difficult for single parents to get their children to day care. *Strain-based conflict* occurs "when symptoms of psychological strain (e.g., anxiety, fatigue, irritability) generated by the demands of the work or family role intrude or 'spill over' into the other role, making it difficult to fulfill the responsibilities of that role" (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997a, p. 4). A production supervisor anxious about his child's illness may not be able to fully concentrate on his job; an accountant working long hours to meet the April 15 tax deadline may be irritable or too exhausted to fully respond to her family's needs. *Behavior-based conflict* occurs "when the behaviors that are expected or appropriate in the family role (e.g., expressiveness, emotional sensitivity) are viewed as inappropriate or dysfunctional when used in the work role" (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997a, p. 4), or when behaviors appropriate for work (e.g., aggressiveness) are dysfunctional at home. For example, a manager in a financial services organization may be expected to be aggressive and hard-driving to be accepted and promoted at work, yet these same behaviors can create conflict and tension at home.

*Antecedents of Work-Family Conflict.* There are numerous demographic, attitudinal, and workplace characteristics that are associated with both WIF and FIW. Not surprisingly, employees with young children or large families are more likely to experience conflict (Behson, 2000; Carlson, J 1999; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, l 1992b; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), as are employees whose aging parents need care. In one study, for example, employees who were caring for elderly dependents were more likely to experience work-family conflict and to have stress- and health-related problems
(Scharlach & Boyd, 1989). Higgins, Duxbury, and Lee (1994) found that gender and life-cycle stage were related to the experience of work-family conflict. For men, work-family conflict decreased as their families went through three stages: Stage 1, families with preschool children; Stage 2, families with grade-school children; and stage 3 with adolescents. For women, work family conflict did not decrease until the third stage, when their children were adolescents.

Other research also suggest that women experience more work-family conflict than men (Behson, 2002; Gutek et al., 1991; Wallace, 1999), which is not surprising as women are still responsible of the majority of household chores and child care activities, although men’s participation in household chores appears to be increasing (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2003). One recent large-scale, nationally representative study of the nation’s labor force found that on workdays, working mothers reported spending nearly an hour more than fathers caring for and doing things with their children (3.5 vs. 2.7 hours) and an hour more a day doing home chores (Bond et al., 2003). Nevertheless, some research suggests that there are no gender differences (Frone, 2003) or that men experience more conflict (Parasurarnan & Simmers, 2001). Indeed, a recent meta-analysis (Byron, in press) found that gender was not related to WJF and that gender was weakly related to FIW; however, the confidence interval for FIW included zero. These findings suggest that there is little difference in the degree that men and women report experiencing either form of work-family conflict.

Rather than looking at gender per se, some researchers have considered the attitudes that employees have toward women working. For example, employed mothers who held traditional attitudes about women working (i.e., belief that everyone is better off if the man earns the money and the woman takes care of the home and children) experienced more work-family conflict than women with less traditional attitudes (Bond et al., 1998). In another study, women who were highly involved in their jobs before deciding to stay home full-time with their infants tended to be more depressed and irritable compared to women who were not so involved in their jobs (Pistrang, 1984). In fact, women were least depressed when their decision to work or not work was consistent with their own and their husbands' preferences and most depressed when
they were stay-at-home mothers but wanted to be working (Spitze, 1988). Thus, the attitudes women have toward mothers working, the degree that they are involved in a job or career, and their own comfort level with working (or not working) while raising children appear to play important roles in predicting their level of conflict and well-being.

*Workplace characteristics* can also contribute to higher levels of work-family conflict.

Researchers have found that the number of hours worked per week, the amount and frequency of overtime required, an inflexible work schedule, unpredictability in work routines, unsupportive supervisors, and an inhospitable organizational culture for balancing work and family all increase the likelihood that employees will experience conflict between their work and family roles (Allen, 2001; Bond et al., 2003; Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; Fox & Dwyer, 1999; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). Having an unsympathetic boss or a job that requires heavy amounts of overtime or travel, for example, can make employees feel stressed and conflicted over the effect their job is having on their family. Part of the stress comes from employees feeling they have no control over their work life (Thompson & Prottas, 2004), and in fact, many employees tend to adjust their family or personal lives to accommodate work requirements (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Some "family friendly" policies and practices, described in a later section, are designed to give control back to employees. Supportive practices such as flexible scheduling and supportive supervisors have been shown to have a positive effect on employee perceptions of control and, ultimately, can reduce levels of work-family conflict (Galinsky et al., 1996; Thomas & Ganster, 1995).

Finally, certain characteristics of a person's job can affect the level of work-family conflict experienced. In two large-scale studies of the U.S. workforce, the Families and Work Institute found that employed parents experienced less conflict between their work life and their family/personal life when they had greater autonomy in their jobs, more schedule flexibility, less demanding, or hectic jobs, and more job security (Bond et al., 2003; Galinsky et al., 1996). Other job characteristics predictive of work-family conflict include non-challenging, routine, or unimportant tasks, role ambiguity, poor person-job fit; role conflict; stressful events at work; and boundary-spanning activities (Carlson &
Consequences of Work-Family Conflict. Although not everyone who attempts to juggle multiple work and non-work roles experiences conflict, a substantial number of employees do. Researchers have found that work-family conflict is related to job and life dissatisfaction, depression, anxiety, anger/hostility, hypertension, greater alcohol consumption and substance abuse, and perceptions of a lower quality of life (e.g., Bond et al., 2003; Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Frone et al., 1992b; Frane, Russell, & Cooper, 1997; Kelloway et al., 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). There are also unhealthy consequences for the organization such as absenteeism, tardiness, greater turnover intentions among employees, and actual turnover (Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, & Parasuraman. 1997; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Collins, 2001; Kossek, 1998). (Jen et al., 2000, and Eby et al., 2005, for comprehensive reviews of research on the consequences of work-family conflict.) As noted by Allen et al. (2000), psychological research consistently demonstrates a main effect for WFC on such organizational outcomes. What is needed now is to examine possible personal and organizational moderators that may affect the relationship between work-family conflict and its consequences.

3.7 Gender Differences in Work-Family Conflict

A number of studies indicate that men and women report similar levels of work-family conflict, a result that challenges the widely held belief that such conflict is higher among women. In one study of 954 employees, gender had far less impact on work-family conflict than did family structure (Krnec, 1999). In a study of 501 employees in four Finnish organizations, there were no gender differences in work-to-family conflict or in family-to-work conflict (Kinnunen & Manno, 1998). Men and women in dual-earner couples experienced similar levels of conflict and far less work-family stress than did heads of single-parent families. A study of a random sample of 650 parents conducted by the National Parenting Association found that mothers and fathers, by the same
percentage, say that work-family balance is their biggest concern (Charney Research, 2000). The 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce, using a nationally representative sample of 3,000 full-time employed men and women, actually found that men with families reported more work-family conflict than women in the same situation (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Protras, 2003).

3.8 Long Work Hours and Work-Family Conflict

There is scant empirical evidence linking long work hours to work-family conflict. Gutek and her colleagues (1991) found only weak relationships; that is, correlations ranging from .12 to .34, between time in a domain and the perception of conflict between that domain and others. These relatively low correlations indicate that the perception of work-family conflict is not simply a direct reflection of the amount of time expended (Gutek et al., 1991, p. 567). However, Voydanoff (1988) reported that, for both men and women, work hours was associated with work-family conflict, and van der Hulst and Geurts (2001) reported that overtime work was associated with work-family conflict.

In the above-mentioned within-couples longitudinal analysis (Barnett, Gareis, & Brennan, under review), the researchers also estimated the relationship between each partner’s average number of hours worked over the three waves of data collection and work-family conflict. The results provided some support for the direct-effects relationship between work hours and outcomes. The average number of hours husbands worked was related to their reports of work-family conflict. Among wives, increase in work hours over time was related to their experiences of work-family conflict.

3.9 Work-Family Conflict as a Mediator

Several studies in the work-family conflict tradition have conceptualized work-family conflict as a mediator of the relationship between stressful job conditions (e.g., long work hours) and stress-related health and quality-of-life outcomes (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Geurts, Kompier, Roxburgh, & Houtman 2003; Geurts, Rutte. & Peeters
That is, stressors at work are linked to negative stress-related outcomes at home only to the extent that they create work-family conflict. For example, Geurts and her colleagues (2003) found that work-home interference fully mediated the relationship linking workload to physical health complaints and to depressive mood and partially mediated the relationship linking workload to work-related negative affect. However, as discussed above, this model has been challenged by several empirical findings indicating weak links between work hours and work-family conflict (Gutek et al., 1991) and between work-family conflict and family distress (Frone et al., J 992a).

### 3.10 Moderators of WFC

Research in the field of work-family conflict has examined moderator effects in two distinct ways. First, some variables (e.g. gender) have been studied as possible moderators of the relationship between work or family demands/pressures and levels of inter role conflict. The moderator effect tested in these studies is that the impact of demands and pressures on work-family conflict variables will vary for different people i.e. males and females. The second potential moderator effects is on the relationship between work-family conflict variables (FWI and WFI) and certain “outcomes” such as psychological strain, and job and family satisfaction, with the prediction being that this relationship will again vary for different people (e.g. males V/S females). Diagrammatically these two possible moderating effects are depicted in Fig below:

Figure 3  Hypothesized models of relationships among family domain, work domain, and work-home interference variables
Compared with research on antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict, the volume of research on moderator effects is relatively small, and research using non-U.S. samples is very sparse indeed. Nevertheless, two potential moderator variables have received some attention: gender and social support. Moderating effects of gender have been the focus of several research projects. The so-called "gender role" hypothesis Gutek et al. (1991) is that level of work-to-family interference (WFI) will be greater among women than men for women, whereas family-to-work interference (FWI) will be greater among women than men. Furthermore, it is expected that family-related characteristics (such as the number of ages of children) will have more impact on FWI for women than for men, whereas work-related characteristics (e.g. Job demands) will
impinge more upon men's levels of WFI. These anticipated differences are sometimes explained in terms of asymmetrical boundaries between work and family for men and women (Pleck, 1977), which suggests that family factors will spill over into the job context more for women than for men, whereas the converse will be true for job related factors.

Recent research in the United States by Grzywacz and Marks (2000) illustrates the logic underlying the proposed moderating effect of gender. Using data from the National Survey of Midlife Development, these authors found that males and females did not differ in their reported levels of work-to-family and family-to-work negative spillover (interference). They then examined the interaction effects of gender, a range of family factors, work characteristics, and individual (demographic) characteristics on work-family conflict. Their findings demonstrated that low levels of social support at work were more strongly related to WFI for women than for men, In contrast support from the person's partner or spouse was more related to WFI for men than women; among women in their sample, there was no relationship between spouse support and negative spillover from work to family.

These findings illustrate two important issues. First, it is important to consider the direction of interference (WFI versus FWI) when examining possible gender moderation effects. In the Grzywacz and Marks (2000) study, no systematic gender moderation effects were observed for family-to-work interference, which is inconsistent with the traditional gender role hypothesis (predicting that family and work characteristics would be more strongly associated with FWI among women than men) but some moderation effects were found for WFI. Second, the mechanisms underlying work-family conflict may vary among individuals. For example, in their study, social support (from the partner/spouse) appeared to serve different functions for men and women, in terms., of its Impact on levels of work-family conflict. Further exploration of these differential patterns is clearly warranted.

Grzywacz and Marks (2000), along with other commentators (e.g., Frone, 2003), suggested that research on gender differences in work family conflict is by no means conclusive. As noted earlier, some studies found gender differences (Duxbury, Higgins,
& Lee, 1994), whereas others have not (Eagle, Miles, & Icenogle, 1997). More importantly in the context of possible moderator effects, no consistent picture has emerged from U.S.-based research on how gender moderates either antecedents-conflict or conflict-consequences relationships.

In contrast, studies of the moderating effects of social support have generated substantially more uniform results. Three sources of support have been considered: support from the family (often the partner/spouse), support from work colleagues and supervisors, and overall organizational support. In Hong Kong, Aryee, Luk et al. (1999) examined the potential buffering effect of social support from the spouse among a sample of Hong Kong Chinese males and females. As noted earlier in this chapter, these investigators observed that social support was directly associated with reduced work-to-family interference (WFI), but showed no significant relationship with family-to-work interference (FWI). However, they also found that support from the spouse buffered the direct relationship between parental overload and FWI. In other words, when individuals reported greater support from their spouse, the correlation between overload and interference was reduced. This finding is consistent with those obtained in a sample of Japanese female workers by Matsui et al. (1995), who also found that spousal support (in this case, support from their husband) served as a buffer between parental overload and family-to-work interference. Aryee et al. (1999), however, found no moderating effect of spouse support in terms of the relationship between work demands and work-family conflict, and Matsui et al. (1995) did not explore the contribution of work demands to work-family conflict variables.

Whereas Aryee, Luk et al. (1999) focused on the moderating effects of support on the relationship between work-family conflict and "outcomes," which is represented as moderator B in Figure 1.1, in another Hong Kong sample, Fu and Shaffer (2001) examined the role of social support in the relationship between domain-specific demands and role conflict. In addition to measuring spouse/partner support, these investigators asked respondents the extent to which they received support from their supervisor and coworkers. However, in contrast to the findings reported by Aryee, Luk et al. (1999), Fu and Shaffer (2001) found no significant moderating effect of spouse
support on FWI, nor was colleague support a buffer of relationships between work role stressors and WFI. Supervisor support, on the other hand, did alleviate the negative effects of conflict within the work role on work-to-family interference.

A study in the Netherlands by Jansen et al. (2003) also identified social support as a significant moderator of the relationship between demands and work-family conflict. Although their study did not distinguish between the two directions of interference, they observed that support from both coworkers and supervisors buffered the impact of high work demands on non-directional work-family conflict, especially for men. In addition, decision latitude in relation to job task completion was another moderator variable for men, but not for women.

Noor's (2002a) study of Malaysian female employees found that support from the partner or spouse can moderate some relationships but not others. For instance, in this study, spouse support moderated the impact of longer work hours on work-family conflict, but not the effects of other work stressors, such as work overload and lack of autonomy. Noor (2002a) suggested that these work-related stressors may fall outside of the spouse's ability to help. An implication of this finding is that to obtain a substantial moderator (buffering) effect for social support, there needs to be a match between the stressor and the source of support (Fenlason & Beehr, 1994).

The literature on work-family balance suggests that, in addition to support from specific individuals (such as partner/spouse or supervisors), more general support from the organization may also be an important contributor to employee well-being. To date, however, although there has been international research on the direct relationship between this kind of support and employee outcomes (see, for example, Richardsen et al., 1999 study of Norwegian professional and managerial women) there have been relatively few empirical investigations of the moderating effects of organizational support. Following the work of Allen (2001), who developed and validated a measure of perceived organizational family-supportiveness, a recent study in New Zealand (O'Driscoll et al., 2003) found that a key variable in the process is the individual's perception of the organization as being supportive of work-family balance, and that organizational policies and practices per se bore little relationship to levels of work-
family conflict or well-being. This perception would appear to be enhanced when the individual has supportive supervisors and managers.

Aryee, Luk and their colleagues (1999) assessed whether use of various coping strategies to ameliorate the effects of work family conflict on well-being. Specifically, they explored whether problem-focused coping and emotion-focused would function as buffering variables in this relationship. Their findings indicated, however, that problem-focused coping was ineffective in reducing the impact of either WFI or FWI on job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction. They suggested that this lack of buffering may be due to individuals feeling they had little control over the stressors that created work-family conflict, and that this feeling of low control might induce a sense of helplessness that cannot be alleviated by direct action. On the other hand, emotion-focused coping did display one significant moderating effect, on the negative relationship between FWI and job satisfaction. Aryee, Luk et al. (1999) suggested that FWI may negatively influence job performance and consequently the receipt of rewards associated with job performance. If so, then emotion-focused coping "may help to reduce one's expectations regarding the receipt of job rewards which minimizes the extent of job dissatisfaction".

A dispositional variable that has emerged in U.S. research as a potential moderator of strain relationships is negative affectivity. It was suggested (Moyle, 5; Jex & Spector, at negative affectivity (NA) moderates these relationships because individuals who score highly on NA are more vulnerable and less resilient to environmental stressors and may not utilize effective strategies for dealing with them. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Stoeva, Chill, & Greenhaus (2002) investigated the effects of negative affectivity among Hong Kong senior civil servants. Their study demonstrated not only direct associations between NA and Job/family stressors, but also a moderating effect of negative affectivity on the relationship between family stressors and family-to-work interference (FWI). However, there was no significant moderating effect of NA on the parallel relationship between work stressors and work-to-family interference (WFI). Stoeva and colleagues (2002) suggested that this differential moderation may be due to
Job stressors being more difficult than family stressors for individuals to contend with and that people may receive less support from the work domain.

Finally, Matsui et al. (1995) found that role definition can serve an important moderating function in respect to work-family conflict. Specifically, they found that Japanese women who were able to redefine their family role, for example, by changing their own and others’ expectations and delegating domestic chores were less likely to experience psychological strain as a result of interference between their family and work roles (FWI). Work-role redefinition, however, did not serve a parallel moderating function in terms of mitigating the impact of work-to-family interference (WFI). Given that the overwhelming majority of their sample were clerical workers, it is possible that redefining work roles was not available to them as a mechanism for reducing the effects of work-family conflict, whereas redefinition of family roles may have been more readily accomplished.

3.11 Research about the causes of work-family conflict

When one considers work-to-family conflict as an outcome, the research questions that spring to mind include, "Who experiences conflict?" and "How much conflict is experienced?" Many studies have focused on the prevalence and severity of work-family conflict, often via group comparisons. For example, researchers have compared conflict among men and women, finding mixed results (e.g., Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Pleck, Staines, & Lang, 1980) and overall more similarities than differences (Frone, 2003). Another popular strategy has been to base comparisons on family arrangements, such as earner status or children's age. For example, Higgins, Duxbury, and Lee (1994) found in a large study of private and public employees in Canada that gender and life cycle stage were both important. For men, work-family conflict was lower at each successive stage of the family life cycle (based on cross-sectional comparisons); for women, levels of conflict were similar in two early stages and lower in later stages.

Unlike gender and age, minority status is a social category that has received relatively little attention from work-family researchers. Underrepresented groups may be defined
by ethnicity, but also by religion, gender, sexual orientation, social class, disability, family structure, or other factors (Voydanoff, 2002; Marks & Leslie, 999). and minority status may increase the likelihood of stressful experiences in several ways. First, members of minority groups may be more likely to perceive—accurately or inaccurately—the occurrence of demands as a partial function of their underrepresentation, such as perceiving certain work pressures as being imposed on them because they have smaller numbers with which to resist. Due to their underrepresentation, the views of members of minority groups may differ from those of the majority population, which can create potentially stressful demands to conform or adjust. Finally, members of minority groups may feel that they constantly must manage their presentation of self to others so that they do not provoke negative reactions or reveal information that could be used to disadvantage them—over time, this can be draining and stressful.

On its own, membership in social categories such as gender, earner, or minority status has not proven very fruitful in revealing the causes of work-family conflict. The specific pressures that individuals face, in combination with the features of their niche in society, are more likely to account for their experiences of conflict (Frone, 2003). Research and theory on these specific pressures or demands is the next focus of our discussion.

Most measures of work-family conflict spring from a framework proposed by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). Based on Kahn et al.'s aforementioned theory, they defined work-family conflict 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). According to Greenhaus and Beutell, conflict may be time-based, where time pressure such as long or inflexible work hours in one role interfere with performance in the other; strain-based, where stress in role affects performance in the other; and behavior-based, when behavior in one role makes it difficult to fulfill expectations in another.

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) also endorsed Kahn et al.'s proposal that role conflict would be more severe when the roles generating pressure or demands were central to the individual's sense of self. Subsequent research suggests that this hypothesis may need to be fine-tuned. Using cross-sectional data from a randomly selected community sample of 795 employed adults, Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1995) found limited
support for the stress-exacerbating influence of role salience. High levels of salience exacerbated 3 of 10 relationships tested: between role ambiguity and physical health, role ambiguity and heavy alcohol use, and work pressure and heavy alcohol use. The researchers concluded that salience of the work role may not exacerbate the effect of all job stressors, only those that impede successful role performance. In the study mentioned earlier by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Collins (2001), however, salience of the work role among accountants had a moderating effect opposite the one found by Frone et al. (1995): Work-family conflict mattered most for turnover among accountants who were least involved in their careers. Perhaps role salience has different effects on work and family outcomes, or perhaps there is a level of salience beyond which job stressors no longer matter.

The Kahn and Greenhaus perspectives are "bottom-up" perspectives in that they focus very much on the relationships between specific roles. In contrast, Goode's (1960) "role strain" perspective focuses on the role system as a whole (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Defining strain as "felt difficulty in fulfilling role obligations" (Goode, 1960, p. 483), Goode argued that the role obligations of most individuals would at times exceed their capacity to respond. For Goode, total role overload was more important for psychological well-being than conflict or ambiguity within a role or between any pair of roles. Hecht (2001) put these ideas to the test in a comparison of overload and conflict in a cross-sectional study of 279 employed Canadian mothers. She accurately predicted that respondents would perceive conflict as more difficult to manage than overload, explaining that conflict is the result of simultaneous incompatible demands. She also correctly predicted that time spent in roles would be more strongly related to overload than conflict. Resources such as income, flexibility, child care, and emergency child care were significantly and negatively related to conflict but not to overload. Hecht's hypotheses and findings illustrate the importance of precise hypotheses driven by theory. Her results have strong practical implications because they suggest that resources and policies and programs might reduce conflict, but leave overload untouched until work hours are reduced.
As MacDermid (2005) and others have noted, several refinements to early formulations of work-family conflict gained popularity in the 1990s. Considerable evidence has now accumulated that it is productive to consider separately conflict that originates in the home and in the workplace (Frone, 2003; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). In their meta-analysis of relationships between conflict and satisfaction with work and with life, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) observed stronger findings for measures that clearly specified the direction of conflict than measures that did not do so. Findings generated by the use of directional measures suggest that work-to-family conflict and family-to-work facilitation are more common than family-to-work conflict and work-to-family facilitation (Frone, 2003; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Leiter & Durup, 1996). Although work-to-family and family-to-work conflict are correlated, they both appear to have implications for health or well-being (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1997).

Based on the available (mostly correlational) evidence, Frone (2003) concluded in a recent review that family-to-work conflict and work-to-family conflict are both positively related to time spent, psychological involvement, dissatisfaction or distress, conflict, ambiguity, and demands in the source domain (i.e., family is the source domain of family-to-work conflict). In turn, each type of conflict is associated with elevated dissatisfaction or distress and poor (self-reports of) performance in the outcome domain as well as general distress, poor physical health, and alcohol use. Higher levels of social support at work and higher levels of personal resilience, such as hardiness, extraversion, and self-esteem, are related to lower levels of conflict. One work outcome-turnover may violate this symmetrical pattern by being more strongly related to conflict emanating from work than from family.

A second refinement that has gained in popularity is to attend not only to conflicting but also enhancing or facilitating elements of the interaction between work and family, which Wayne, Musisca, and Fleeson (2004) defined as performance or functioning in one role being enhanced by virtue of participation in another (p, l l 0). A 30-year literature proposes that roles generate resources (Sieber, 1974), energy (Barnett & Hyde, 200 I; Marks, 1977), skills (Crouter, 1984), or positive mood (Stephens, Franks, & Atienza, 1997) for one another (Kirchneyer, 1992). In a recent study, Grzywacz &
Marks (2000) found that decision latitude and work anc family support at home were associated with less conflicting and more enhancing relationships between the domains. In contrast, pressure at work and disagreements at home were associated with more conflict and less enhancement.

Third, several recent studies have improved their precision by taking personality characteristics into account. Kahn et al. (1964) predicted that the vulnerability of workers (0 role conflict would be in part a function of their personality traits, and the accumulating evidence supports this prediction. For example, individuals with certain traits may be less likely to perceive demands as stressful. Wayne, Musisca, and Fleeson (2004) studied the role of the "big five" personality traits in the consequences of conflict and facilitation emanating from work and from family. They used a random-digit dialing procedure and two-stage sampling to assemble a sample of 2,130 employed individuals; the response rate was 70%. Personality characteristics accounted for about 15% of the variance in work-family conflict and 8% of the variance in work-family facilitation. Individuals who scored higher on neuroticism and lower on conscientiousness and agreeableness were more likely to report conflict between work and family. Individuals who scored high on extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness to experience were more likely to report facilitation between work and family.

In addition to main effect relationships, some researchers propose that certain personality traits may blunt the effects of conflict, playing a moderating or buffering role. Kinnunen, Vermulst, Gerris, and Makikangas (2003) studied 296 fathers in the Netherlands. In cross sectional data, more emotionally stable fathers (i.e., those with low neuroticism and negative affectivity) reported weaker relationships between work-to-family conflict and job exhaustion or depression. Fathers who scored higher on agreeableness displayed weaker relationships between family-to-work conflict and marital satisfaction. The authors concluded that emotional stability and agreeableness may protect fathers from negative consequences of work-family conflict.

Another improvement in the study of relationships between work and family life has been increasingly sophisticated attention to the characteristics of workplaces. Workers'
experiences are clearly related to the size and structure of their organizations (Kalleberg, Knoke, Marsden, & Spaeth, 1996). Workers in small workplaces generally report less work-family conflict, for example, than workers in larger workplaces (MacDermid, Hertzog, Kensinger, & Zipp, 2001). Other important environmental features include workers’ access to supportive programs, policies, or supervision (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Lambert, 1990). For example, McManus, Korabik, Rosin, and Kelloway (2002) studied the degree to which single and married mothers at different occupational levels were offered support by their organizations and their supervisors and the degree to which they made use of formal policies intended to reduce work-family conflict. They found that regardless of marital status and family demands, mothers in lower-level occupations reported less work-to-family conflict when they perceived higher organizational and supervisor support and made greater use of formal policies.

Workplaces are also social environments where workers share experiences, interactions and perceptions, and work-family researchers have paid considerable attention to the supportiveness of supervisors and workplace cultures. Until recently, it has been very difficult to incorporate collective perceptions and experiences of workers into statistical models. Now, multi-level analyses offer the important capability of incorporating both individual and shared experiences of demands and support without the statistical distortions that previously could not be avoided (e.g., Bliese & Castro, 2000; Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2002).

As with consequences, the map of the causes of work-family conflict and facilitation contains several uncharted regions. For example, Kahn et al. (1964) and Greenhaus and BeuteJl (1985) agreed that conflict between work and family is generated by simultaneous pressure from the two domains, and that work-family conflict would be strongest in the presence of negative sanctions for noncompliance with role demands. Researchers have rarely tested these propositions, although Greenhaus and Powell (2093) are an exception. They presented 207 MBA students with vignettes asking them to choose between an overtime work session and a surprise birthday party for a family member. The vignettes were constructed so that students were presented with varying
combinations of pressure and support from work and from home. Findings showed that students responded to the combined role pressures from work and from home when making their choices, and that they were especially responsive to pressure from salient roles.

The work-family literature has emphasized conflict between only these two roles as opposed to conflict involving other roles, but Barnett and colleagues have done considerable work to show that all roles are not created equal when it comes to compensating for or adding to the overall demands individuals face (Baruch & Barnett, 1986; Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992; Barnett, Marshall, & Sayer, 1992). More recently, Blanchard-Fields, Chen, and Hebert (1997) studied the roles of self, spouse, parent, and professional among 244 married adults recruited through community organizations and newspaper ads. They found that role combinations differed in the ways they appeared to generate conflict, in part as a function of employment status and gender. For example, employed mothers experienced more conflict than unemployed mothers—not with their professional role—but between the roles of spouse and parent.

In summary, research on the causes of work-family conflict has sometimes focused on membership in social categories, but this approach has yielded less consistent results than approaches that also consider the specific pressures faced by individuals. Conflicting or facilitating influences may originate in either the work or family role as a function of pressure, distress or dissatisfaction, time spent, and psychological involvement. Enhancing or facilitating influences appear to occur less frequently than conflict (according to current measures), and certain personality characteristics may elevate or reduce vulnerability to conflict. Conflict may be more troublesome when it involves highly salient roles, although findings from one study suggest the opposite pattern. Other research suggests that all roles are not equal when it comes to generating conflict or enhancement. Role conflict may be more strongly related than role overload to psychological well-being, and also may be more responsive than overload to supportive policies and programs within workplaces.
3.12 The Role of The Organization In Work And Family

Both I/O psychologists and management scholars investigate the programs and policies that organizations implement to help employees manage work and non-work responsibilities. There are four general types of work/life programs offered by companies to support employees (Lobel & Kossek, 1996). Time-based strategies help employees manage time pressures and include flexible schedules (e.g., flextime, compressed workweeks, permanent part-time work, telecommuting, or job sharing) and various leave programs (e.g., vacation time, sick leave, parental leave, child- or elder care leave, phased return to work, and unpaid or personal leaves of absence). Information-based strategies are policies and programs that provide information to employees to help them make decisions regarding balancing work and non-work responsibilities. They include resource and referral programs, support groups, stress and time management seminars, relocation assistance, dependent care provider fairs, preretirement planning, and employee assistance programs. Money-based strategies are programs that provide financial assistance to employees in managing their responsibilities, such as affordable health or long-term care insurance, flexible spending accounts (i.e., deposits of pretax wage dollars into company accounts designated to reimburse child- or elder care expenses), tuition reimbursement, and adoption assistance. Lastly, direct services include programs provided directly to employees from the company, such as onsite child or elder care, sick child care, emergency child-care services, holiday and vacation care programs, and before and after school programs.

However, offering programs or services such as those described above does not guarantee that employees perceive a company as "family-friendly" or ensure that their lives are any less stressful. In fact, several studies have found either nonexistent or weak relationships between benefits offered and/or used by employees and work-family conflict (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Thompson & Prottas, in press). As will be discussed in a later section, that having supportive bosses and a supportive organizational culture makes it more likely that the programs will have their intended effects in that the programs can be used without fear of negative job or career consequences.
Even supporters of work-family programs are somewhat guarded in their enthusiasm for options that require employees to "accommodate" their lives to work. Underlying the accommodation view is the assumption that traditional business practices (e.g., lengthy work hours and total commitment to the firm) are the norm, and family-friendly practices are paternalistic corporate welfare benefits that may have no or perhaps even negative relationships with the efficiency and profitability of firms. This assumption prevents us from challenging the more fundamental ways in which business strategies are highly unresponsive to families (Friedman & Johnson, 1996; Kingston, 1990).

For example, consider typical relocation policies in most companies. Many promotion decisions at mid- to upper-levels of management are contingent on an employee's willingness to relocate, the assumption being that one must have a variety of experiences in different parts of the organization in order to succeed in these positions. The psychological and social costs of such relocations are significant, especially for the dual-earner couple who also must consider the spouse's job-related needs. Many companies "accommodate" these couples' needs by providing job search assistance to the trailing spouse. However, a more fundamental approach to this problem would be to reexamine the need for relocation in the first place (Copper & Lewis, 1994). Viewing the work-family interface as an accommodation process prevents us from developing more creative solutions to these problems.

### 3.13 Organizational Adoption and Evaluation of Work-Family Programs

At the organizational level, recent research has focused on examining factors that lead to firm adoption of work-family programs and the effectiveness of such programs on organizational performance. Institutional and resource dependence theories provide useful frameworks by which to examine these issues. Institutional theory describes how Arms adopt policies and practices in response to pressures placed on them from forces in the institutional environment (e.g., state regulations, societal and /or professional norms and expectations, etc), while resource dependency theory describes how organizations minimize their dependencies on other organizations for the supply of
scarce resources (such as key human resources) and find ways of influencing the organizational environment to make these scarce resources available (Jones, 2004).

Goodstein (1994, 1995) and Ingram and Simons (J 995) have used institutional theory to examine firm variations in dealing with pressures to adopt work-family policies and programs. Goodstein (1994) found that companies were more likely to adopt family-friendly practices (i.e., workplace flexibility practices and child-care benefits) when the practice was broadly diffused in an industry, when the organization was large and employed a large percentage of women, and when the practice was expected to result in significant benefits to the firm in terms of productivity and performance outcomes. In a later study on implementation of eldercare practice.,Goodstein (1995) found that issue visibility in the industry, assessment of eldercare needs, scope of other work-family benefits offered, and the perceived importance of eldercare in increasing employee productivity resulted in greater employer adoption of eldercare practices. Similarly, Ingram and Simons (1995), taking an institutional and resource dependence view of work-rami ly benefits adoption, found that factors within the institutional environment and important stakeholder demands for work-family practices (i.e., firm size, percentage of women and women managers employed in the firm, public sector organizations, greater diffusion of the practice in the industry, and firms in industries with low unemployment rates for women) were related to firm responsiveness to work-family issues. More recently, Arthur (2003) found a significant and positive relationship between Arm adoption of work-family initiatives and share prices, with these relationships being higher in high-tech industries and in those that employ higher proportions of women

In addition to institutional and resource dependence effects, Milliken, Martins, and Morgan (1998) examined the role of human resource executives in framing work-family issues for the firm. They found significant differences across industries in adoption of work-family programs (e.g., health care and financial industries offered more than manufacturing); no significant differences across firms based on the percentage of women employed in the organization; and significant differences across firms based on how salient work-family issues were to human resource executives and the degree to
which these executives believed that organizational performance would be detrimentally affected if programs were not offered. Therefore, it appears that human resource staffs play a critical role in framing the importance of adopting work-family programs for effective organizational performance.

Osterman (.1995) framed the adoption of work-family programs as one element of an organization’s employment strategy to implement a high-performance (high-commitment) work system. He found that organizations that adopt such high-performance systems are more likely to adopt work-family programs. Along with Milliken et al.’s findings, the research suggests that work-family programs need to be conceptualized as an important part of a whole human resource strategy that focuses on building high-commitment workplaces.

In an attempt to determine if adoption of work-family programs results in positive organizational performance, several researchers have examined the effects of "bundles" of work-family benefits. Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) examined the effects of work-family bundles as a strategic human resource initiative that could provide competitive advantage to Arms. Using data from 527 U.S. firms, these researchers found that firms that offer more extensive work-family policies are perceived to have higher overall performance as measured by quality of products, ability to attract essential employees, relations between managers and employees, market share, profit, and sales growth. These effects may be stronger in older firms and Arms that employ more women. In addition to providing strategic advantage, Perry-Smith and Blum suggested that work-family bundles serve as "positive symbols" (p. 1114) that signal to employees that employers care about their well being and value their contributions, which in turn may increase their commitment and loyalty. Lambert’s (2000) research, found positive relationships between employee perception of the usefulness of work-family benefits and organizational citizenship behaviors, lends support to this interpretation. Further support for the view of the symbolic nature of work-family benefits comes from Kopelman, Pottas, Thompson, and Jahn (2003), who found that at both the individual and work-unit levels, offering more rather than fewer work-family practices
had positive effects on perceived organizational family support and affective commitment.

In an investigation of the effects of work-family programs on profits, using data from the 100 best companies for working mothers, Meyer, Mukerjee, and Sestero (2001) found that overall, work-family programs have a positive effect on profitability, but not all programs added equally to the profit equation. Specifically, job sharing and child-care subsidies were more costly than the benefits that they provided, whereas allowing workers to take time off when family members were sick and telecommuting strongly contributed to profitability. This study implies that organizations need to conduct more sophisticated analyses of the organizational benefits of work-family programs and implement and retain those that provide the most cost effective solutions for working families.

3.14 Impact of Work-Family Practices and Supportive Culture on Organizational Outcomes

Recent research has focused on examining the effects of supportive organizational culture and climate on employee work attitudes and performance. For example, Thompson et al. (1999) developed a measure of work-family culture (i.e., the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the degree to which the organization supports and values work-family integration) and discovered three dimensions of work-family culture: managerial support for work-family balance, career consequences associated with using work-family benefits, and organizational time expectations that may interfere with family responsibilities. They found that employees were more likely to use work-family benefits when the culture was supportive, and that both the availability of work-family benefits and supportive work-family culture were positively related to affective commitment and negatively related to work-to-family conflict and turnover intentions. Furthermore, the effects of work-family culture on employee attitudes remained significant even after controlling for availability of work-family benefits. In addition, the three dimensions of work-family culture had different relationships with the
outcomes measured: lower organizational time demands were related to higher affective commitment, greater managerial support and fewer negative career consequences were related to lower intentions to leave, and fewer negative career consequences and lower organizational time demands were associated with less work-to-family conflict.

Allen (2001) examined the role of family-supportive organization perceptions (FSOP) in managing work-family integration. These perceptions were significantly related to the number of work-family benefits offered, their usage, and perceptions of supervisory family support. In addition, Allen found that FSOP accounted for significant variance in work-family conflict, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, above and beyond the effects of work-family benefits and supervisor support. Furthermore, FSOP mediated the relationship between work-family benefits and employee attitudes and behavioral intentions, as well as between supervisor support and work-family conflict. Other research by Kossek, Colquitt, and Noe (2001) examining the effects of work-family climate on caregiving decisions, and by Clark (2001) on the reciprocal nature of the relationship between work-family culture and work-family balance, further underscores the promise associated with continuing research on the role of work-family culture in helping employees achieve work-family integration.

3.15 Family friendly programs and work-life integration

The importance of work and family programs is increasing due to an influx in the number of female's workers, in addition to a rise in the number of dual-earner families, single-parent households, and employees managing the care of both elders members and children. As a result, individuals are expressing growing concerns about responsibilities at home, which still require their attention and time. For example, recent reports have indicated that 90% of working adults expressed a concern about not spending enough time with their family (Lockwood, 2003). A recent study found that if organizations maintain comparable or heavier workloads, organizational policies will do little to relieve pressure for employees and productivity may not increase; thus family
friendly human resource policies will be effective only if organizations can help employees manage over work demand (Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001)

In an effort to help employees manage their time between work and home, many organizations have implemented family-friendly programs. Broadly defined family friendly programs are designed to alleviate individual conflict between families (Arthur & Cook, 2003). Some examples of family-friendly programs include job sharing, flexible scheduling, on-site day care, elder/child care provisions and condensed work weeks.

As noted in many articles written about family-friendly conflict, there are two types of conflict individual’s face: work-to-family and family-to-work. Work to family conflict occurs when involvement in a work-related activity interferes with participation in a competing family Activity (Greenhaus & Powell, 2002). Some of the workplace characteristics that may impact work-to-family conflict include lack of support from management and coworkers, limited job autonomy, increased job demand and overload, inflexible working schedules, and increased number of hours worked (Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001).

Alternatively, work-to-family conflict occurs when involvement in a family activity interferes with participating in a work activity (Greenhaus & Powell, 2002). This type of pressure is common to many working partners. It may be something as clear as one partner being required to travel often, or it may be scenario in which the employee is responsible for taking the children to after school programs. Other factors to impact work-to-family conflict include: spousal support, equity in the division of labour at home, adequacy of child-care or eldercare provision, gender and marital status of the person working (who is experiencing family-work-conflict), impairment level of adult care recipients, and ages of dependent children (Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001).

Generally speaking, there are two areas of research related to family-friendly programs. One area of research is interested in the conflicts of individuals face as a result of involvement in multiple roles. The other area is specifically concerned with the examination of family-friendly programs and their impact on the individual (Arthur & Cook, 2003). Researchers have tried to integrate the findings from these two research
areas to understand why family-friendly programs intend to eliminate work-life conflicts are not always effective in reducing conflict. There appear to be at least two key reasons why organizations are not effective in reducing WLC. First, organizations adopt family friendly programs with little regard for operational efficiencies (i.e. who will administer? does Organization climate support such programs?). Second, existing programs do not always meet the needs of employees.

Traditional research on the work-family interface has tended to focus on the negative outcomes associated with work and family roles (Hanson, Colton, & Hammer, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004). That is, most researchers have focused on the conflict associated with the management of these two roles (e.g., Prone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). The widely accepted and used term work-family conflict focuses on the fact that engaging in one role makes participation in the other role more difficult (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). It is defined as a type of interrole conflict in which the competing demands of work and family roles are incompatible (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Recently, however, researchers have begun to address the fact that the potential benefits of engaging in work and family roles have largely been overlooked (Brockwood, Hammer, & Neal, 2003; Hanson et al., 2003). Researchers who have studied the positive side of the work-family interface have called the positive correlate of work-family conflict "enrichment" (Rothbard, 2001), "facilitation" (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003), and "positive spillover" (Brockwood et al., 2003). In contrast to the difficulties associated with work-family conflict, enrichment occurs when having multiple roles provides benefits to the individual (Rothbard, 2001). We feel that it is important to address both the positive and negative outcomes that can be associated with managing work and family roles and will use the term conflict to address the negative aspects of the work-family interface and the term enrichment to address the positive ones. It is important to note that there is limited research on the enriching potential of multiple roles (Rothbard 2001) Thus, while we refer more research related to work-family conflict in this that we do not argue that work-family conflict is any more likely or influential than work-family enrichment.

Several researchers (e.g., Carlson, 1999; Lockwood, Casper, Eby, & Bordeaux, 2002; Sumer & Knight, 2001; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004) have suggested that
personality be given greater consideration in understanding how an individual views and experiences multiple life roles. The ways in which personality may influence how individuals feel about and react to the interface between their work and family lives. While researchers believe that the model can be applicable to how disposition influences engagement in multiple life roles, we focus our discussion on work and family roles due to a more abundant literature to draw upon in illustrating influences. Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) propose a model that describes the differential pathways by which personality can influence stress. They use a stressor-strain model in which stressors exist as environmental realities, whereas strain is the emotional experiences that result from the stressors (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995). First, they suggest that personality can influence what they call “differential exposure” to stressors. That is, personality may influence the actual number or type of events that a person experiences that can cause stress. Second, personality may lead to "differential reactivity," or individual differences in the felt intensity or reaction to stressors (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995). Two subcomponents of differential reactivity, according to Bolger and Zuckerman (1995), are "differential coping choice," in which individuals with different personality types may select different means of coping with stressors, and "differential coping effectiveness," in which certain coping strategies may be more effective for people with certain personality traits or people with certain dispositions may be more skilled at using certain coping strategies.

This stressor-strain model will serve as the foundation for this chapter on the influence of personality on the work-family interface. First, they describe and elaborate on the model as it applies to engaging in work and family roles. Next, provide illustrations to delineate the possible ways in which personality can influence an individual's experience of and reaction to work and family roles. Main goal is to show how personality can affect both the depleting and enriching processes that arise from engaging in multiple roles. Finally, to take a step back to discuss broader issues with operationalizing some of the elements of the model.

Conflict between work and family is a widely researched topic in contemporary organizational behavior research. The origin of this research domain can be situated in
the late 1970’s with the seminal works of Rapoport & Rapoport (1969), Renshaw (1976), Kanter (1977), Pleck (1977), an Handy (1978). However one could argue that this domain has its roots in research examining the mutual impact of employment and family life [Marshall, 1992a, 1992b]. A major theme in this literature is that both work and family claim time and energy. Work is an important source of income, financial security and status, whereas the family functions as a nucleus, where two partners find intimacy and support and raise children. Hence, work and family are not independent (Kanter, 1977) and consequently conflicts will inevitably arise.

Since the pioneering work of Pleck (1977), there is a general consensus that work and family influence each other in a positive and negative way: time, tasks, attitudes, stress, emotions, and behavior spill over between work and family (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). A distinction was made between the work–family interface (work influencing family) and family-work interface (family influencing work) (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus, 1988; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). It was founded that the interface is asymmetric: work tends to influence family more than vice-versa (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Hall & Richter, 1988; Wiley, 1987). Several scholars concluded that these two types of conflict are conceptually and empirically distinct constructs (Duxbury, Higgins & Lee, 1994; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992a; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992; Wiley, 1987).

The field has been dominated by role theory, which was derived from the seminal Michigan study of organizational stress [Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964]. According to role theory, conflicting expectations associated with different roles have detrimental effects for well-being. This rationale basically fits the logic of a stressor-strain model (Cohen & WUls, 1985; Karasek & Theorell, 1990), with work-family conflict as stressor. Many published studies tests a theoretical model that links antecedents, moderators, and consequences (Bedeian, Burke, & Moffet, 1988; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). Frone, Yardley, and Markel (1997) offer a general integrative framework of the work-family interface. Structural equations analysis supported their model, which integrates social support, time commitment and overload (both at work
and in the family) as antecedents, work-family conflict, and family-work conflict as core variables, and distress, dissatisfaction, and performance as outcomes.

Another influential theory is spillover theory (Piotrkowski, 1979; Staines, 1980; Zedeck & Mosier, 1990), based on Pleck’s (1977) early notion of asymmetrically permeable boundaries between the life domains of work and family. These studies invited scholars to consider other types of interfaces between work and family, such as compensation (Champoux, 1978), independency, and instrumentality (Evans & Bartolome, 1981). Lambert (1990) and more recently Edwards and Rothbard (2000) reviewed all different linkages, specifying the sign and causal relationships and how these are influenced by personal intent.

Only very recently have authors started to formulate propositions that explicitly address cultural differences in the experience of work family conflict. Yang, Chen, Choi, and Zou (2000) were among the first to suggest that cultural values, and more specifically individualism – collectivism could be used to explain cultural differences in the experience of work-family conflict. Authors speculate on other macro-socioeconomic factors and cultural values that may be used in explaining differences among citizens in different parts of the world. Cultural values that are proposed to be relevant include individualism-collectivism (Poelmans et al., 2003; Korabik, Lero, Ayman, 2003).

As pointed out above, theoretical models of the work-family interface differentiated two directions of work-family conflict: work to family interference (WFI) and family-to-work interference (FWI). Investigations in Western countries, particularly the United States, identified higher prevalence of the former (WFI) than the latter (FWI), suggesting that family "boundaries" are prearranged than job boundaries (Carlson & Frane 2003). In other words, individuals may perceive that they have more flexibility in terms of engaging family commitments and responsibilities than they do for work commitments. Specifically, time on the job is frequently dictated by the person’s employment contract or the organization, whereas family time is more discretionary. Hence, there is a greater likelihood that people will perceive negative spillover from job to the family environment rather than the converse. Nevertheless, this does no imply that the impact of FWI on
people's attitudes, behavior, and well-being will necessarily be greater than the effect of WFI.

Involvement in job and family extends beyond time. Carlson and Frone (2003) also discussed psychological involvement, which reflects "the investment of cognitive and emotional resources" in each domain, that is, "the degree to which individuals identify with a role domain, and see it as important to their self-concept" (p. 521). A high degree psychological involvement in a role (e.g., job role, the family role) will result in the person being somewhat mentally preoccupied with their performance in that role and perhaps being influential by events that occur in that context. As noted by Carlson and Frone (2003) however, research investigating the relationship of Psychological involvement with work-family conflict has obtained very inconsistent results. Although some research has confirmed a positive relationship between involvement in one role and conflict between two domains, other studies have obtained no significant association between these variables.

There may be multiple explanations for this inconsistency in findings including use of different measures of both psychological involvement and work-family conflict. In addition, the assumption that involvement in one role (e.g., the job) necessarily precludes attention to another (e.g. family), or leads to interference between role commitments, is not inherently logical. It would be quite possible, for instance, for an individual to have high levels of psychological involvement in both job and family and to adopt coping strategies that prevent negative spillover between the two domains. To date, research has not explored these possibilities in any systematic fashion. Carlson and Frone (2003) found that both psychological involvement and behavioral (time) involvement in the job were significantly related to WFI, but the same did not apply for the relationship between family involvement and FIW: Clearly, more research is required to explore the dynamic interplay between psychological involvement and work-family spillover before definitive conclusions can be drawn about the role of psychological involvement in the work family conflict process.

A comprehensive overview and discussion of work-family conflict and work-family "balance" was provided recently by; Frone (2003), who summarized findings from the
(overwhelmingly U.S.-based research in this area. Frone noted that family boundaries may be more permeable than job boundaries and hence levels of work-to-family interference (WFI) are typically reported as being higher or more intense than those for family-to-work interference (FWI). Numerous empirical studies in United States and other Western countries have confirmed this finding. These studies frequently examined two categories of antecedents to work-family conflict: (a) work-related and family related conditions in which individual’s functions and (b) personal or dispositional factors relating to levels of conflict between work and family. Most of the research in this field has examined (a), characteristics of work and family environments which may have an impact on people's experience of WFI and FWI.

Of the personal variables, gender is the most obvious candidate as a predictor of work-family conflict. Some commentators (e.g, Pleck, 1977; Gutek et al., 1991) suggested that because of their different roles and responsibilities, men and women may experience different levels of inter role conflict, with men exhibiting greater interference between work and family (WFI and Women reporting more interference from family to work (FWI). However although some studies report significant gender differences, with females showing greater FWI and males more WFI, this pattern has not been uniformly replicated across studies, and man have founds no gender differences at all in either WFI or FWI (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Few international studies have sought to compare males and females directly; Senecal, Vallerand, and Guay (2001) found no differences between males and females in their levels of work-family conflict. In one of the few cross-national studies that have been conducted to date, Yang et al. (2000) found that men in China reported higher levels of work-family conflict than their female counterparts, but the measure of work-family conflict used in this study was non directional, hence It is not possible to determine whether one direction of conflict was experienced more by men than women. However, in another Chinese study (among Hong Kong workers), Fu and Shaffer (2001) did obtain gender differences; with women displaying higher levels of FWI and men more WFI. This finding was explained in terms of gender role expectations in Chinese families with women being expected to take the major responsibility for household and family chores; hence there is a greater likelihood that they would experience interference from these family commitments with their work.
In contrast according to Fu and Shaffer (2001), the predominant expectation is that men will be the major breadwinners, and hence males may invest more time in their jobs, with a consequent negative spillover to family life.

There have been a few recent investigations of other dispositional antecedents to work-family conflict, in particular personality factors. Some researchers (e.g., Bernas & Major, 2000; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) illustrated that high levels of hardiness, extraversion, and self-esteem are linked with reduced work-family conflict (both directions), whereas neuroticism may be positively associated with work-family conflict (Grzywacz Marks, 2000). Following an earlier study by Carlson (1999), Bruck and Allen (2003) examined relationships of negative affectivity, Type A behavior disposition, and "big five" personality variables with both work-to-family and family-to-work interference. In their research, after controlling for demographic variables and hours worked per week, negative affectivity was single most predictive variable of both FWI and WFI. Other dispositional variables included in their hierarchical regressions displayed no consistent significant relationships with the two directions of conflict. A similar result was obtained when Bruck and Allen disaggregated time-based, strain-based, and behavior based work life conflict. Again, although its contribution was significant only in the case of strain-based conflict, negative affectivity showed the highest beta weights in the hierarchical regressions. As a set, the dispositional variables accounted for most variance in strain-based conflict and least in behavior-based conflict, confirming Carlson's (1999) supposition that different forms of work-family conflict may be predicted by different antecedents.

The above research by Carlson (1999) and Bruck and Allen (2003), as well as an earlier study by Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1993], which obtained similar findings, was conducted in the United States. An online literature search identified few international investigations of the relationship between personality factors and work-family conflict. A notable exception is a study reported recently by Stoeva, Chlu, and Greenhaus (2002], who examined the role of negative affectivity among a sample of executive civil servants in Hong Kong. Consistent with the U.S. findings, Stoeva et al. (2002) found that negative affectivity was significantly, but modestly, correlated with both WFI and FWI,
although the contribution of this variable diminished once job stressors and family stressors were entered into the regression equation. It was also observed that a moderator effect of negativity was generalized.

Although the existing evidence is suggestive of the potential impact of dispositional factors on people's experience of work-family conflict, clearly more systematic investigation is required before we can definitely conclude that variables such as negative affectivity play a major role in determining levels of WFI and FWI, and in the relationship between these and other variables. Frone (2003) observed that personality characteristics may exacerbate (e.g., negative affectivity, neuroticism) or ameliorate (e.g. resilience) both WFI and FWI. International investigation that considers the interactions between dispositional and cultural variables e.g., (cultural values) would be particularly valuable. We are aware of no international studies to date that have systematically examined these interactions. As with gender, an understanding of the role of dispositional factors would be enhanced by explicitly incorporating personality variables into research on work-family conflict in diverse cultural contexts.

Evidence from the united states studies consistently demonstrated that work demands, work-related stressors, and strain are predictive of work-family interference, whereas family responsibilities and stressors (such as conflict within the family) appear to contribute more directly to family-to-work interference (Frone, 2003). In addition, social support (in both domains) has been associated with reduced work-family conflict. Work-related social support (e.g., from one’s supervisor or work colleagues) is more associated with reduced FWI, and family support (e.g. from partner or spouse) correlates more closely with reduced FWI. Hence, social support would seem to be a primary determinant of (reduced) levels of work-family conflict. Frone (2003) concluded that research has illustrated that the two directions of inter role conflict are separate albeit interrelated, that antecedents of WFI reside primarily in the job domain, whereas antecedents of FWI lie mainly in the family domain, that “both dimensions of work-family conflict are affected by similar types of role characteristics, such as behavioral involvement, psychological involvement, stressors, and resources”. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) also found that social support at work and from one’s spouse were
negatively related to levels of work-family conflict. Low levels of support at work were strongly correlated with negative spillover from work-to-family (WFI), especially women. Another interesting gender difference was that spouse effectual support appeared to have more influence on reduced WFI for men than for women. Spouse support was also closely related to reduced negative spillover from family to work (FWI) for both men and women. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) suggested that building supportive relationships at work and also at home may be more effective antidotes to the negative effects of work-family conflict than other strategies such as flextime and increasing control-decision latitude.

Several international studies also examined the antecedents of work-family conflict in different countries. Internationally, one of the most prominent research programs over the past 10 years or so was developed by Samuel Aryee and his colleagues in Hong Kong (Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999). Their studies largely confirmed findings that emerged from research in the United States. For example, Aryee, Fields, and Lute (1999) examined within-job and within-family role conflicts, along with job involvement and family involvement as predictors of WFI and FWI. This study was conducted to partially replicate a model and findings presented by Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992a) in the United States. Aryee et al.'s (1999) results were similar to those obtained by Frone and his colleagues, in that WFI and FWI were reciprocally related. Within-job conflict predicted WFI and Within-family conflict predicted FWI. However, in contrast to Frone et al.'s (1992a) results, Aryee and his colleagues (1999) did not obtain significant paths from job and family involvement to the two forms of work-family conflict. They attributed these differences to the overall importance of family life in Chinese culture (compared with the United States culture) and "the lack of significant relationship between family involvement and family-work conflict ......may occur because the centrality of the family in Hong Kong leads to perceptions that investment of time in the family does not interfere with work responsibilities" (p. 508). No explanation was provided for the finding that increased job involvement was not significantly associated with work-to-family interference, except that the authors noted that among Chinese employees, commitment to the work role may be a means to an end (that is, family security) rather than an end in itself.
In another study published in the same year, Aryee, Luk et al. (1999) studied the potential impact of work overload and parental overload on inter role conflict among employees in dual-earner families. As with their previous research, Aryee, Luk et al. 1999 found a reciprocal relationship between the two directions of work-family conflict. They also observed that WFI was significant higher than FWI, and that males reported higher levels of WFI whereas females experienced more FWI. A key issue in is study, however, was the impact of role stressors on both WFI and FWI. Work overload was the primary contributor to both forms of interference, but parental overload also contributed to increased FWI (but not WFI). Aryee, Luk et al. (1999) also explored the potential impact of social support from the spouse, both as an antecedent of (reduced) work-family conflict and as a potential moderator of the relationship of work and family overload with WFI and FWI. It was found that spousal support was negatively related to work-to-family interference, but not with family-to-work interference, suggesting that provision of a supportive home environment by spouses/partners may have a positive impact on spillover between family and work life, but cannot ameliorate the negative effects of work interfering with family life.

Family-specific factors (such as hours spent on household work, parental demands, and whether or not the persons spouse was also in paid employment) were found to significantly predict time based family-to-work interference (FWI), but not strain based or behavior based FIW. On the other hand job role demands stressors (especially role conflict, role overload and hours spent at work) contributed to all three forms of work-to-family interference (WFI). Although again the contribution of these predictors to time-based WIF was greater than it was to the other forms of WIF. Other forms of conflict included were job-spouse conflict, job-parent conflict and job-homemaker conflict (Frone et al.’s (1992a). Of these, interferences between job and home maker roles were found to be most intense form of conflict. Job stressors (a conglomerate of work pressures, within role-ambiguity, and conflicting demands allied with the entrepreneurial role, along with business related problems) were more closely linked with the three forms of conflict than were family stressors. However, age of children correlated positively with job-parent conflict, which is somewhat contrary to previous research, which has found a negative correlation between children's age and work-family conflict. Kim and ling noted
that the majority of women in their sample had adolescent children and that this may be a difficult age for parents and place high demands on their coping ability. Finally, as in other studies, level of support from the (male) spouse was negatively related to job-spouse conflict.

Research implemented in Western countries, other than the United States, reflects similar trends to those observed in the above Asian investigations. For instance Burke and Greenglass (1999) examined the impact of restructuring (particularly downsizing) of Canadian organizations on both WFI and FWI front. The prediction which was confirmed was that the stress associated with restructuring would lead to increased WFI whereas demographic variables (such as age and whether or not the respondent had children) would be closely associated with FWI but unrelated to WFI. In this study, social support from spouse contributed to FWI but not to WFI.

Elloy and Smith (2003) reported findings from a comparison of dual-career and single-career lawyers and accountants in Australia. As noted by these authors, the increasing prevalence of dual-earner and dual-career couples requires organizations to consider the possibly differing needs of individuals functioning in these relationships, compared with their counterparts who function in a single-career family. Their research did not differentiate between WIF and FIW, but used the measure of overall inter role conflict constructed by Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly (1985). Although dual- and Single-career individuals differed on some variables such as the amount of stress reported work overload, work role ambiguity, and role conflict they did not differ substantially on levels of overall work-family conflict. Elloy and Smith (2003) suggested that organizations need to take account of the differential impact of role demands and stressors on employees whose work-family contexts may differ.

Jansen, Kant, Kristensen, and Nijhuis (2003) conducted a longitudinal study of the antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict in the Netherlands. They observed that the reported prevalence of work (family-conflict was considerably lower (males 11 % and females 9%) in their sample of over 12,000 Dutch workers than had been reported in the United States (Frone et al.’s 1992a) and Finland (Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998). Nevertheless, similar antecedents to work-family conflict were found to
those reported in the United States and other countries with work demands, job insecurity and interpersonal conflict. With peers and supervisors being major contributors to inter role conflict for men, and physical work demands, overtime, commuting time and having dependent children contributing to inter role conflict for women. One limitation of this study however, is that it utilized a Single-item measure that did not differentiate between work-to-family and family-to-work interference.

Some of the above research has illustrated the positive benefits of social support from one's partner or spouse, especially for women. As noted previously, Kim and Ling (2001) found that social support from the spouse was associated with reduced work-family conflict in a sample of Singaporean female entrepreneurs. A Japanese study by Matsui, Ohsawa, and Onglatco (1995) also examined husband support among employed women (although in this case the respondents were office employees rather than entrepreneurs). Matsui et al. (1995) examined both directions of work-family conflict, and observed that (consistent with U.S. findings) reported levels of WIF were greater than those for FIW. A major finding of their study was that parental demands were closely associated with FIW; but not significantly related to WIF. Unfortunately, however, they did not include work related demands in their research design: hence it was not possible to determine if the converse applied for work demands. Support from the respondent's husband was associated with reduced family-to-work interference (FWI), but bore no relationship to work-to-family interference (WFI). Husband support also exhibited a moderator effect on the relationship between parental demands and FWI, which will be discussed later in this chapter. Similar findings were reported by Noor (2002a), who identified the number of work hours and work role overload as significant predictors of all undifferentiated measure of work-family conflict among Malaysian employed married women. Further more lack of spouse social support also contributed significantly to conflict between job and family. Lack of autonomy, however, was not a significant correlate of work-family conflict in this study.

A somewhat different approach to the issue of work-family interface was proposed by Senecal. Vallerand, and Guay (2001), whose research was mentioned earlier. Senecal et al. (2001) discussed work-family conflict from a motivational perspective. Their model
suggests that being motivated to engage in family activities and work play a key role in determining levels of family commitment. A person who lacks what they refer to as "self-determination" (an intrinsic motivational force) will experience alienation from their family, which in turn induces feelings of work-family conflict. Their research on French-Canadian professionals supported the notion that motivational factors contribute to feelings of alienation from family and that family alienation leads to heightened work-family conflict. Although this process was replicated among both males and females in their study, who reported similar levels of work-family conflict, unfortunately the measure of conflict utilized did not distinguish work-to-family from family-to-work interference.

3.16 Consequences

The negative effects of work-family conflict have been extensively documented and can be categorized in four main groups (a) health (mental and physical), (b) satisfaction, (c) performance, and (d) Commitment both in work domain (e.g., burnout, work productivity, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions) and family-general life domain (e.g., anxiety, performance in parental role, marital satisfaction, and divorce intentions), respectively. In addition, authors such as Frone and his colleagues suggested domain-specific paths of antecedents and consequences for work-to-family conflict (affecting family outcomes) and family-to-work conflict (impacting work; Frone et al., 1992a), and feedback mechanisms between work and family life (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton (2000) conducted a valuable meta-analysis of the consequences of work-family conflict in the United States.

3.16.1 Health Outcomes

The most studied dependent variable is undoubtedly strain or mental health experienced by the person, in Frone, Russell, and Yardley's model (1997) referred to as work and family distress. A person occupying multiple roles has been associated with
role strain, psychological distress, and somatic complaints (Cooke Rousseau, 1994; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1991, 1992a; Menaghan & Parcel, 1990). Burke (1988) tested a model in which work-family conflict leads to psychosomatic symptoms and negative feeling states. Interference between job and family life has also been related to depression, irritation, and anxiety in married female managers (Greenglass, 1985). O'Dnscoll et al. (1992) found a positive association between work/non work conflict and general psychological strain. Frone (2000) found work-family conflict to be related to having mood, anxiety, and substance dependence disorder. Boles, Johnston, and Hair (1997) linked work-family conflict with emotional exhaustion and job dissatisfaction in salespersons, and they found that these two consequences were in turn related to the propensity to leave one's job.

These detrimental effects were also found in non-US respondents. Burke, and Mikkelsen (1999) found that work-family conflict was associated with emotional exhaustion and psychosomatic complaints in Norwegian female managers. Grant-Vallone and Ensher (1998) studied expatriates and reported that work interference with personal life resulted in reduced Vitality and depression. Matsui et al. (1995) found that both WFI and FWI were significantly related to vocational, psychological, interpersonal and physical strain in married women working full-time in mostly clerical jobs. In a sample of 310 Malaysian employed women studied by Noor (2002b), work family conflict was a significant predictor of psychological distress.

Geurts, Rutte, & Peeters (1999) tested a comprehensive model of work-home interference WHI among medical residents in an academic hospital in the Netherlands. The results showed that WHI was positively associated with psychosomatic health complaints and sleep deprivation (i.e., general health indicators), and with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (i.e., work-related health Indicators). Jansen et al. (2003) found that work-family conflict has important mental health Implications, such as the development of an elevated need for recovery from work and prolonged fatigue. Using the General Health Questionnaire (assessing, for example, mental health, coping with difficulties in life, and enjoyment of daily activities, Rosenbaum and Cohen (1999) conducted a study assessing the effect of WFC on the level of distress of Israel mothers.
of young children who had fulltime outside employment. It was found that women who had at least one resource (resourcefulness self-control skill or spousal support) were less distressed than women who did not have either of these resources.

The impact of work-family conflict on well-being has also been demonstrated in a few qualitative and longitudinal studies. Frone, Russell, and Cooper's (1997) study of employed parents is one of the few longitudinal studies of the effects of work-family conflict. They found that FWI was related to elevated levels of depression and poor physical health and to the incidence of hypertension. In contrast, WFI was related to elevated levels of heavy alcohol consumption. The results of the study of Grzywacz & Bass (2003) suggest that higher levels of both work-to-family and family-to-work conflict are associated with poor mental health (depression, anxiety disorder). Another frequently studied work-related psychological consequence is burnout (Burke, 1988; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998; Montgomery, Peeters, Schaufeli, & Den Ouden, 2003; Netemayer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Allen et al. (2000) reported a weighted mean correlation of 0.42 between burnout and work-family conflict.

3.16.2 Satisfaction Outcomes

Kossek & Ozeki's (1998) meta-analysis shows that regardless of the type of measure used, a consistent negative relationship exists among all forms of work-family conflict and job and life satisfaction. Work family interference has been associated with a decrease in life satisfaction in North American samples Bedetan et al., 1988; Judge et al., 1994; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992), and in a Malaysian sample of female researchers (Ahmad, 1996), but not in a Hong-Kong sample (Aryee, Luk et al., 1999). Family-work interference has been associated with job dissatisfaction (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Judge et al., 1994; Kopelman et al., 1985). Ahmad (1996), Aryee, Luk et al. (1999), Chiu (1998), and Ngo & Lui (1999) confirmed in Malaysian and Hong Kong samples the finding of Adams. King and King (1996) that work-family conflict is also associated with job dissatisfaction. Bruck, Allen and Spector (2002) examined the relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction using both global and
composite measures of job satisfaction. Their results indicated that WFI related significantly to both types of job satisfaction, but the relation was significantly stronger to composite job satisfaction than to global job satisfaction. Ayree et al. (1999) found that neither WFI nor FWI were associated with family dissatisfaction the family is the central unit of society taking precedence over individual members, but work is prevalent to cope with a high cost of living and is considered as instrumental for family purposes. Therefore, conflicts between work and family are not associated with family dissatisfaction, because engagement in work is viewed as instrumental to family well-being. Interestingly, Ahmad (1996) also found a lack of relationship between work-family conflict and family dissatisfaction in Malaysia suggesting that the instrumentality model may apply across (at least some) Asian cultures.

Ayree (1992) more closely examined three specific types of work-family conflict (job-spouse conflict, job-homemaker conflict, and job-parent conflict) in a sample of married professional women. He found that job-homemaker conflict had little or no influence on three measures of satisfaction (marital, job, and life satisfaction), whereas job-spouse conflict had a significant impact on all three types of satisfaction. This high impact of job-spouse conflict on job, marital, and life satisfaction was also confirmed by a study among Singapore women entrepreneurs (Kim & Ling, 2001). Surprisingly, Aryee (1992) found a relationship between job-parent conflict and job satisfaction and marital satisfaction, but not with life satisfaction. We could have expected though that a conflict between the job and the role as a parent would result in life dissatisfaction. The author does not offer an explanation for this intriguing finding and points out that "there is nothing distinctive about the experience of work-family conflict among married professional women in Singapore, an Asian country" (Ryan, McFarland, Baron, & Page, 1999); and that his findings "highlight the generality of the phenomenon of work-family conflict as a characteristic of modern industrial societies" (Aryee, 1992).

An important type of satisfaction in family domain is marital satisfaction. Several studies have provided support for the impact of work-family conflict on marital well-being (Campbell & Snow, 1992; Coverman, 1989). Greenglass, Pantony, and Burke (1988) found a clear association between role conflict and marital dissatisfaction in both men
and women. According to Kingston and Nock (1987), the time that couples spend together is determined by the number of hours they work, whereas socio cultural and life cycle variables have little influence. This is important because the researchers also found a clear relationship between hours together and marital satisfaction. Burley (1995) stated that social support from the partner and an equal distribution of domestic tasks between partners plays an important mediating role in the relationship between work-family conflict and marital satisfaction in men and women. Barling (1990) found that job satisfaction was related to marital satisfaction and work stress to marital dysfunction. Matthews, Congers, and Wickrama (1996) demonstrated that work-family conflict affects marital quality and stability via increased levels of distress and marital hostility and decreased marital warmth and supportiveness.

Research outside the United States has confirmed marital satisfaction as a consequence to be taken into account when studying work-family conflict. In a survey of mostly female Singaporean workers, Skilmore Sariati Ahmad (2003) found that work-family conflict serves as a link between work-related stress and marital dissatisfaction. Chiu (1998) also found work-family conflict to negatively affect marital and life satisfaction and job satisfaction. Mauna and Kinnunen (1999) gave a more detailed picture of this relationship in a sample of Finnish dual-earner partners; painting out that work-family conflict is indirectly associated with marital satisfaction, through the mediation of job exhaustion and psychosomatic health. However, they did not find crossover effects, contrary to their expectations.

Another work-related satisfaction measure is career satisfaction. Results here are controversial. Whereas Peluchette (1993) found that multiple stresses in the work and family domain were associated with more subjective career dissatisfaction, Ayree and Luk (1996a) did not find any significant relationship with career satisfaction in their research on Hong Kong dual-earners. They explained this with the fact that many Chinese dual-earners COW1t on paid domestic workers, thereby insulating especially the women from the stresses of combining work and family roles. The reason may be simply that their measure (adopted from Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1985) only
captured work-to-family interference (WFI), whereas the significant impact on career satisfaction is expected to come from the interference of family with work (FWI).

### 3.16.3 Performance Outcomes

Frone, Yardley and Markel (1997) showed that WFI is associated with family performance and FWI with job performance, respectively. Aryee (1992) examined the relationship of three types of work-family interference with work quality and found that only job-parent conflict was related with lower work-quality, but not job-homemaker and job-spouse conflict.

The influence of work-family conflict on job performance is not so clear cut. Netemeyer et al. (1996) found a negative relationship only between family-work conflicts and self-rated performance, whereas Frone, Yardley, and Markel (1997) reported a negative relationship between conflict originating from both domains and a performance measure that corresponds basically to an evaluation of the overall in-role behavior.

Career progression typically signals the success and performance levels of employees. Linehan and Walsh (2000) found that work-family conflict prevented many female European international managers from progressing to senior management. Ngo & Lui (1999) confirmed those findings in a sample of 772 managers in Hong Kong. Work-family interference, but not family interference with work, had a significant negative impact on job satisfaction, subjective career achievement, and perceived work pressure. A case study of East Asian Airlines (EM) conducted by Ng, Fosh, and Naylor (2002) reported a sharp decrease in the number of women, especially women with families, in EM's higher grades. This finding, coupled with the finding that men with dependent children had relatively greater work-family conflict, suggests that this sharp decrease may be due to women with family responsibilities quitting EAA employment. Alternatively, this decrease may be due to women lower in career ambitions and not seeking promotion to higher grades in anticipation of intolerable work-family conflict if they ardently pursue an organizational career.
A range of studies has demonstrated that work has an indirect but clear impact on family performance. Work stressors such as long working hours cause strain in the employee, which can spill over into home life, where it is source of many problems: physical (e.g., fatigue, headache, tension) or mental (e.g., absentmindedness, worries, irritation). Thus, the impact is indirect and goes via the employee, who feels strained and consequently performs less well in a partner or parent role (Atkinson, Llem, & Liem, 1986; Dew, Brornet, & Shulberg, 1987). Bowes discusses the impact of work on family from a family research perspective. Here we only briefly highlight some of the consequences not mentioned earlier.

Important are consequences for children’s performance in school Goldberg, Greenberger, and Nagel (1996) studied the influence of the number of working hours and work involvement of the mother on the development and school performance of the child. A higher number of working hours per week was related with weaker teachers' evaluations of school performance, work habits, and performance related personality traits, but better school performance in girls, and weaker school performance, work habits and self-control in boys. A higher work motivation in the mother was associated with more support of the mother for the performance of the child and a stronger motivation in girls. Crouter, Bumpus, Maguire and McHale (1999) found that the effects of work pressure on adolescent well-being were mediated by parental role overload and parent-adolescent conflict. We found no references in studies outside the United States to the impact of work family interference on children’s well-being. This is clearly an avenue for future research.

3.16.4 Commitment Outcomes

Organizational commitment, and particularly affective commitment, is another attitudinal outcome that has been associated with negative interaction between work and family life. The results are highly comparable to those concerning job satisfaction. Conflict between both domains was found to be negatively associated with organizational commitment by Allen et al. (2000) and Netemayer et al. (1996).
Withdrawal behaviors represent the opposite of commitment to one's work. It has been suggested that WFI and FWI have distinct paths leading to withdrawal behavior, with WFI leading to withdrawal from the family and FWI to withdrawal from work (MacEwen & Barling, 1994). Relationships with work-family conflict were found for both temporary withdrawal behavior, such as lateness and absenteeism (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003; MacEwen & Barling, 1994; Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990) and permanent withdrawal behavior, such as turnover intentions (Allen et al., 2000; Ayree, 1992; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Netemeyer et al., 1996) and actual turnover (Greenhaus, Collins Singh, & Parasuraman, 1997). Whereas Thomas and Ganster (1995) did not find a relationship between work-family conflict and absenteeism, Goff et al. (1990) and Hammer et al. (2003) did. The latter authors also found significant crossover effects for both types of work-family conflict on withdrawal behaviors, meaning that conflict in one spouse causes withdrawal behavior in the other spouse. Whereas Ayree (1992) found that two specific types of work-family conflict (job-parent and job-spouse conflict) were related with turnover intentions in Singaporean married women, Shaffer, Harrison Gilley, and Luk (2001) found that work-family conflict was associated with assignment withdrawal cognitions in expatriates in a diverse set of countries, especially among those with greater affective commitment. In other words, "when an expatriate has devoted a great deal of personal or psychological resources to his or her organization, it exacerbates the risk of WFC leading to plans for premature departure". Gignac, Kelloway, and Gottlieb (1996) found in a Canadian study that FWI was associated with withdrawal from employment (both permanent and temporary).

3.16.5 Other Outcomes

Work-family conflict not only has a negative effect on job and life satisfaction, but also is also related to less emotional and instrumental support from the family. Buelens and Poelmans (1996) found in a sample of Belgian professionals and managers that social support from the spouse is more associated with family satisfaction and support from the supervisor with job satisfaction. This means that the negative impact of work-family conflict is double and self-reinforcing. Not only does it have a direct impact on
satisfaction but also it increases the levels of stress by undermining social support from the family-hence work-family conflict also decreases the most important buffer against stress and social support. We will now explore these buffering or moderating effects more systematically.

3.17 Outcomes Related To Work-Family Research

This section addresses various outcomes related to work/family research. Our objectives are to describe several general categories of outcomes, identify specific outcomes that have been or should be measured in work/family research, and encourage work/family researchers to adopt a framework that recognizes the need to consider outcomes of interest to multiple stakeholders and multiple disciplines. Unlike other chapters in this section, this chapter does not focus on a specific research method, such as experimental interventions or case studies. Instead, we describe several measures that can be used in a variety of research designs above (para needs modification)

3.18 Work-Family Initiatives And Work Outcomes

We have organized work outcomes into four categories: employee attraction and retention, work performance, work behavior, and cost-related measures. Within each of these categories, we have provided what we believe are the primary constructs of interest. However we recognize that there are other constructs that may be of interest; our list is not exhaustive.

3.19 Work-Family Initiatives And Family Outcomes

We turn next to research that provides insights into how the family lives of employees can be affected by employers' work-family policies and practices. To organize the research relevant to the family domain, we have grouped studies into two major
categories: employees' psychological reactions and outcomes that more directly reflect an employee's family role performance.

### 3.19.1 Psychological Outcomes

Employees' psychological reactions to issues that arise from involvement in work and family roles are too numerous to list. However, those that have drawn the most attention from researchers can be easily categorized into three types: the experience of conflict, strain, and relationship/marital satisfaction.

**Role Conflict.** Although early research on work/family conflict did not distinguish between conflict that emanates from work and affects family and conflict that originates at home and affects work, the bi-directional nature of such role conflict is now widely accepted. Thus, work/family research includes measures of work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict, even though the subject of the research may only specify work/family conflict. For purposes of this discussion, we refer to work/family role conflict as the general construct related to conflict flowing either into or out of work and we refer to work-to-family and family-to-work conflict as the directional measures related to the construct.

A great deal of the existing literature on work/family conflict has examined such conflict as a predictor of various outcomes. A meta-analytic review of 34 sample groups examined the relationship of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict on the outcomes of job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Other recent studies have also considered work/family conflict as a predictor (e.g., Boles, Howard, & Donofrio, 2001, O'Driscoll et al., 2003). However, work/family conflict also is an important outcome itself. A recent study examined the effects of telecommuting on work/family conflict (Madsen, 2003). Another study examined the effects of a supportive work-family culture on work-family conflict (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999).

Work/family conflict is an individual level construct that is generally measured using self-reported data. Many reliable, valid scales have been developed and used by
organizational researchers. For example, Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996) developed and validated work-to-family and family-to-work measures. In addition to addressing the bi-directional nature of work/family conflict, Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000) took a multi-dimensional approach to the development of a work/family conflict measure by identifying three forms of work-family conflict: time, strain, and behavior-based. The lack of consistency among measures of work/family conflict may be responsible for differences in research results (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). ‘Avoiding measurement variation was the purpose of Carlson et al.’s (2000) development of a comprehensive measure that followed Kossek and Ozeki’s (1998) suggestion to distinguish between altitudinal and activity-based measures of work-family conflict.

**Strain** Psychological strain and self-reported symptoms of related health problems have been studied as work/family outcomes for many years. For example, Cooke and Rousseau (1984) examined the effects of holding work and family roles on role strain, psychological distress, and somatic complaints. Today, research on the effects of work/family conflict on psychological strain and stress continues, but with various mediating and moderating factors taken into account. For example, like earlier researchers, O’Driscoll et al. (2003) found an overall correlation between work/family conflict and psychological strain, but they did not find that family-supportive organizational policies and mediated this relationship.

Psychological strain is measured at the individual level. Most researchers have used preexisting scales to measure such strain. For example, O’Driscoll et al. (2003) used a 13-item measure developed by Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau (1980). In the marketing literature, Boles, Johnston, and Hair (1997) used an adaptation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) to measure emotional exhaustion in relation to work/family conflict. A study by Hammer, Saksvik, Nytro, Torvann, and Bayazit (2004) measured job stress by using Cooper’s Job Stress Scale (Cooper, 1981). This study also included subjective health symptoms, which were measured using a scale from the European Foundation (1997). Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1997) also studied physical manifestations of stress, including overall health and hypertension.
Relationship/Marital Satisfaction. This psychological outcome has traditionally been thought of as marital satisfaction; however, as organizations increasingly recognize domestic partnerships, more inclusive measures of relationship satisfaction may become commonplace. Unlike most work/family measures, marital satisfaction is most useful when considered in studies of couples. Those studies in which marital satisfaction is not a focal construct are most likely to measure only one partner's level of marital satisfaction (e.g., Chiu, Man, & Thayer, 1998). Studies that focus on marital satisfaction more often include data from both partners. For example, Schulz, Cowan, Cowan, and Brennan (2004) used the validated Marital Adjustment Test (MAT; Locke & Wallace, 1959) to measure husbands' and wives' marital satisfaction in their study of the impact of workday experiences on couples' interactions. Although Roehling and Bultman (2002) also focused on couples, their measure of marital satisfaction was much simpler. They used a single item that asked respondents to rate on a scale from 0 (not satisfied at all) to 100 (absolutely satisfied) how satisfied they were with their current relationship. Such single-item measures generally are not recommended because it is impossible to separate the different sources of variability in the indicator (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

3.19.2 Family Performance

Although family performance includes the ability of individuals to fulfill all of their family roles, the work and family literature focuses primarily on outcomes related to children. This is largely due to debates on the effects of parental employment, specifically maternal employment, on children. Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) developed a model to explain how work affects the ability of parents to care for their children. The outcomes in this model are parental performance, parental satisfaction with child care, children's health, and children's school performance. We focus our discussion on childhood-related outcomes and collapse other outcomes into a category labeled 'accountability to family.'
Child General Health. The physical and mental health of children can be affected by parental employment. General health may be improved as a result of the income produced from a parent’s employment due to improved access to medical care (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). However, most research on child health focuses on mental health and development.

Child adjustment. Behavioral functioning of children also has been shown to be related to parental employment. Much of the research on such child adjustment comes from the psychology literature. For example, past research includes measures of short-term memory and attentiveness, compliance, behavior problems, and self-esteem (Harvey, 1999; Vandell & Ramanan, 1992). These measures are individual level self-report scales, scales that are completed by the child's mother, or child assessment scores. The child's mother completes the Behavior Problems Index (BPI; Peterson & Zill, 1986). It assesses peer conflicts, hyperactivity, and anxiety, along with other behavior problems (Yandell & Ramanan, 1992). Self-esteem is measured with the Self Perception Profile for Children (Harter, 1985), which is a self-report questionnaire for children ages 8 and older. Compliance is reported by the mother using a temperament scale developed specifically for the NLSY (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics).

Child Cognitive Development. Studies on early maternal employment have found negative effects of maternal employment on child cognitive development, although these effects generally are not universal and are sometimes offset by positive effects of later maternal employment (e.g., Blau & Grossberg, 1992; Harvey, 1999; Waldfogel, Han, & Brooks-Gunn, 2002). Most of the research on the effects of parental employment relies on achievement test scores to measure cognitive development or intellectual ability. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPYT) and Peabody Individual Achievement Tests (PIAT) for math and reading are commonly reported in the literature. These and other assessments of cognitive development are included in the NLSY child surveys.

Accountability to Family. In addition to child health, adjustment, and development, work/family balance can affect other outcomes in the family domain. The availability for various household chores is one potential outcome. Creating a supportive home environment is another. The NLSY has included the Home Observation Measurement
of the Environment (HOME) for one cohort that it tracks. This inventory assesses the quality of a child's home environment, as measured by such factors as the ways in which parents spend time with their children, emotional support, and access to educational materials (Earle, 2001). Other studies have used questionnaires to measure outcomes such as paternal contribution to child care, housework, and percentage of overall family income (Almeida, Maggs, & Galambos, 1993; Deutsch, Lussier, & Servis, 1993). For example, husband's contribution to housework was measured with a seven item scale and husband's contribution to child care was measured by a five-item scale, both of which were completed by both husbands and wives in a study that focused on paternal participation in child care and housework as the outcomes of interest (Deutsch, Lussier, & Servis, 1993).

3.20 Work-Family Initiatives And Career Outcomes

As mentioned previously, the career outcomes of employees are of concern to employers and employees alike. Many employees consider advancement to be an important reward for doing well, and employers understand that frustration over lack of advancement is one of the primary reasons for turnover among top performers. Thus, both have a common interest in work practices that facilitate the ability of employees to advance at an acceptable rate over time. Similarly, maintaining high levels of employee satisfaction serves both employees, who benefit directly, and employers, who benefit from the improved work performance and reduced costs associated with work behaviors that are associated with dissatisfaction.

One reason for the lack of development of such measures may be the fact that advancement can be measured objectively with organization data. If an organization tracks job titles or uses a tier system that classifies jobs by level, researchers can easily compute a measure of advancement by looking at changes in individuals' jobs (see Dreher & Bretz, 1991, or Lyness & Judiesch, 2001, for examples). Tharenou (1999) used a three-item measure that was the average of managerial level, salary and managerial promotions, with each of the three measured on a six-point scale. However,
some researchers try to measure advancement using surveys. Such research often asks respondents for information regarding their advancement intentions (e.g., Cutler & Jackson, 2002). The Power and Fast Track Job (PITJ) scale was developed to address job advancement potential and was found to be valid and reliable by its authors (Kelly & Marin, 1998). Although such measures of behavioral intentions are important, research also should examine the relationship between advancement intentions and actual advancement.

Satisfaction

There are several forms of satisfaction that are relevant to work/family research. Job satisfaction is most closely related to work, whereas career satisfaction and life satisfaction are outcomes associated with the personal domain.

*Job Satisfaction.* Although job satisfaction can be classified as a work-related outcome, we have categorized it as a career outcome because of the potential impact of such satisfaction on an individual’s career. It is an individual-level construct that has generally been measured by self-report surveys. Kossek and Ozeki’s (1998) meta-analysis found that the studies included in the analysis used preexisting measures of job satisfaction, but unlike life satisfaction, there was no consistency in the measures of job satisfaction that were used.

*Career Satisfaction.* Work/family conflict has been suggested to have important effects on individuals’ career satisfaction (Powell & Mainiero, 1992). As an individual-level attitude, such satisfaction has been measured using self-reported survey instruments. Martins, Eddleston, and Yeiga (2002) used a three-item measure that drew from earlier measures of career satisfaction. Burke (2002) also relied on a previously developed measure.

*Life Satisfaction.* One of the advantages of studying life satisfaction as an outcome is its comprehensiveness, as it relates to all life domains. It is an individual-level construct and has traditionally been measured by self-report surveys. In Kossek and Ozeki’s (1998) meta-analysis on job and life satisfaction in relation to work-family conflict, almost all of the included studies used Quinn and Staines’ (1978) measure of life
satisfaction. Other studies have examined quality of work life, which includes an assessment of life satisfaction (e.g.; Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987).

Income

Another outcome with both work and family implications is income. Surprisingly, work/family research often excludes this construct, despite debates in the literature about whether it is possible to "have it all" in terms of work or family, or whether sacrifices must be made in one realm or the other. Two notable exceptions to the dearth in the literature are studies by Schneer & Reitman (1990, 1993), which tracked the income of MBA couples and examined differences in the couples working patterns. Income can be measured at the individual level or the family level. Self-reports or organizational records are straightforward approaches to collecting income data.

3.21 Long Work Hours as a Predictor of Health and Quality-of-Life Indicators

Several studies challenge the assumed link between long work hours and negative outcomes. Some studies find either no relationship or a positive relationship between number of hours worked and outcomes. To illustrate, the more hours worked by women and men in full-time employed couples, the lower their distress (Barnell & Shen, 1997; Ozer, Barnett, Brennan, & Sperling, 1998). And, number of hours worked was unrelated to sexual satisfaction, frequency, or desire in married women, regardless of whether they were homemakers or employed part or full-time (Hyde, Delarnarer, & Hewitt, 1998). Among employees working excessively long hours, some studies do indicate a relationship between work hours and negative outcomes (Gutek et al., 1991), while others do not (Hyde et al., 1998). Inconsistent findings, along with a growing body of research demonstrating work-family synergy (Bailyn, 1993; Greenhaus & Powell, in press) and, as we discuss below, salutary effects of multiple-role involvement (Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Marks & MacDermid, 1996; Thoits, 1992), also challenge the inevitability of the zero-sum assumption.
The preliminary results form Barnett, Gareis, & Brennan indicate that the relationship between the average number of hours worked and change over time in work hours and four mental health and quality-of-life outcomes—marital-role quality, parent-role quality, work-family conflict, and psychological distress. Among both husbands and wives, increase in wives work hours over time was related to increase in psychological distress and, surprisingly, increase in parent-role quality. For marital-role quality, increase in spouse’s work hours over time is related to decrease in marital-role quality for husbands.

3.22 Work-Family Conflict as a Predictor of Health and Quality-of-Life Outcomes

It is important to note that, in acknowledging the bi-directional nature of work-family effects, researchers have distinguished two components of work-family conflict, work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict, each assumed to have different antecedents and consequences (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992a; Gutek et al., 1991). The findings from several studies support such a distinction (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1997; Gurek et al., 1991; Kinnunen, Vermulst, Gerris, & Makikangas, 2003; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996).

In a meta-analysis of studies linking work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) found that measures incorporating elements of both family-to-work conflict and work-to-family conflict performed better than measures assessing each type separately. In attempting to identify the antecedents and correlates of work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict, there is a critical asymmetry: More studies have focused on work-to-family conflict than on family-to-work conflict, and most have looked at job-related as compared to health and quality-of-life indicators. With those caveats in mind, there is general agreement that work-to-family conflict appears to be more strongly related than family-to-work conflict to outcomes such as life satisfaction and job satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Work-to-family conflict also appears to be more prevalent than family-to-work conflict. According to Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992b), work-to-family conflict is three times more common than is family-to-work
conflict, and this-is equally true for women and for men; other researchers have found similar results (Frone et al., 1997; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998).

Although the distinction between work-to-family and family-to-work conflict is conceptually useful, results have not always shown the hypothesized relationships between family-to-work conflict and work-to-family conflict and the predicted cross-domain outcomes. For example, Frone et al. (1992a) reported that family-to-work conflict predicted job distress, but work-to-family conflict did not predict family distress, at least among white collar workers. In a study by Adams et al. (1996), work-to-family conflict failed to predict job satisfaction. Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) found in a sample that family-to-work conflict had negative consequences for family well-being, and work-to-family conflict had negative consequences for occupational well-being. Allen, Herst, Bruck, and Sutton (2000) reported very mixed and inconsistent effects of work-to-family conflict on marital and family outcomes.

### 3.23 Employee Attraction and Retention

Organizations offering family-friendly policies have been recognized by publications such as *Fortune* and *Working Mother*. These organizations have publicized their placement on popular magazine lists as a recruiting tool. As the composition of the workforce has changed to include more dual-career couples and single parents, attracting such individuals to an organization has become increasingly important. Person-organization fit (Chatman, 1991) may result in applicants choosing organizations that offer family-friendly policies. Subsequently, satisfaction with work/family balance may influence employees' decisions about whether to remain with the organization.

*Attracting Employees.* We are aware of only two studies that have examined attraction of potential employees as an outcome related to offering family-friendly policies. This is surprising because it implies that many organizations are offering family-friendly policies without having evidence that suggests that such policies do indeed improve the organization's reputation as an employer and thereby increase applicant attraction.
Honeycutt and Rosen (1997) found that individuals were attracted to an organization with flexible career paths and policies, but that differences in attraction existed with regard to individuals’ salient identities (career primary or family primary). Rau and Hyland (2002) found that attraction to organizations offering flexible work arrangements varied according to level of role conflict and the type of work arrangement offered.

Both Honeycutt and Rosen (1997) and Rau and Hyland (2002) created their own measures of attraction to the organization. Other measures exist in the more general recruitment literature (e.g. Cable & Judge. 1994; Schwoerer & Rosen, 1989). Measures of organizational reputation may be of particular value for understanding how work/family practices influence the perceptions and employment choices of actual and potential job applicants (for a discussion of these and other measures that can be used to assess recruitment activities, see Harris & Lasson. 2003). As applicant attraction is an individual level construct, existing measures use self-reported, individual level data. Clearly, measures of applicant attraction assess the effects of recruitment efforts (Barber, 1998) and it has been found to be related to applicant beliefs later in the hiring process as well as performance and turnover (Barber, 1998; Cable & Judge. 1994; Edwards, 2000).

Retaining Employees. Many employers offer or have considered offering family friendly policies as a retention strategy (Batt & Valcour, 2003). However, relatively few studies have specifically examined employee retention (or its opposite-turnover) as an outcome of work-family conflict (Boyar, Maertz, Pearson, & Keough, 2003). Recent research on turnover in relation to work/family polices also is quite limited. Batt and Valcour (2003) found that access to flexible scheduling predicted lower turnover intentions; yet, as predicted, dependent care benefits were not related to turnover intentions. Early research on flexible work arrangements found mixed results (e.g., Golembiewski & Proehl, 1978; Nollen & Martin, 1978; Ramsower, 1985), while early research on dependent care benefits generally found that turnover was reduced when such benefits were available or used (Milkovich & Gomez, 1976; Youngblood & Chambers-Cook, 1984).
Although a vast and long-standing literature on turnover exists outside of the work-family arena, there still is no consensus on how to best measure turnover. First, there is the difficulty of measuring actual turnover because individuals who have already quit will not be available to complete interviews or questionnaires. Second, there are challenges related to measuring turnover intentions, because even though most research finds a positive relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover (e.g., Prestholdt, Lane, & Matthews, 1987; Steel & Ovalle, 1984), the two are not perfectly correlated. Third, despite the fact that turnover models have been developed and tested for over 20 years, a recent re-conceptualization of the turnover decision process suggests that past models have not accurately captured the decision of an individual to leave an organization (Steel, 2002).

Turnover is an individual-level construct. Though actual turnover data are most readily garnered from organizational records, managerial reports and individual self-report data can be used to measure turnover. At the most basic level, turnover is measured as a dichotomous variable. However, richer measures may include whether the turnover was voluntary or involuntary as well as more detailed reasons for the separation (e.g., found another job, spouse's job relocated, poor performance, position el imitated).

Lyness and Judiesch (2001) used archival organizational data to measure turnover as voluntary or involuntary, with family-related reasons considered to be voluntary. Two recent studies from the work/family literature measured turnover intentions rather than actual turnover. Batt and Valcour (2003) used an additive scale that consisted of five items. Each item received a score of 0 to 4, with lower scores indicating a serious intention to quit. Boyar, Maertz, Pearson, and Keough (2003) used four items to create a turnover intentions scale. The coefficient alpha was .90. Other studies have used previously existing measures (e.g., Mobley, Homer, & Hollingsworth, 1978).

Although all turnover and turnover intentions measures must begin at the individual level, departmental or organizational turnover rates can be calculated by aggregating individual-level turnover data. These rates are generally computed as the percentage of employees who leave within a 1-year period; however, other time frames could be used.
Work Performance

Traditionally, researchers interested in measuring the performance of employees assessed how well they accomplished the core tasks that comprised an employee's "job." As the nature of work has changed, managers and researchers alike have gradually adopted a broader view of effective work performance (Arvey & Murphy, 1998; Ilgen & Pulakos, 1999; Murphy & Jackson, 1999). In addition to performing core tasks, the best employees are able to adapt to continuously changing organizational conditions and are willing to accept a broad array of responsibilities associated with being good organizational citizens. In other words, total work performance includes task performance, adaptive performance, and contextual performance also referred to as organizational citizenship behavior.

Task Performance. Task performance focuses on core tasks, rather than organizational citizenship that may fall beyond basic performance of one's job duties. Although understanding the distinction between task-performance and organizational citizenship is important for all disciplines that study performance, it is especially important for work/family research. Employees participating in certain work/family programs, such as flexible work arrangement, may have difficulty engaging in citizenship behavior due to time restrictions related to their work arrangement, yet they still are able to excel in their task performance. Therefore, using a measure that combines task performance with citizenship behavior may underestimate benefits or overestimate problems associated with a work/family program. For example, if one studied the effect of flextime on overall performance, results may suggest that the effect on overall performance is small. However, if performance is dissected into task performance and organizational citizenship, it may be discovered that flextime has a positive effect on task performance but a negative effect on organizational citizenship, which results in a small effect on overall performance.

Task performance can also be distinguished from productivity, which is the ratio of production divided by the time required for that production (Calvasina & Boxx, 1975), yet
not all studies have made this distinction (e.g., Kim & Campagna, 1981). Some organizations have taken the more straightforward approach of measuring sales per employee as a measure of performance (O'Connell, 1996). For many organizations, behavioral measures such as absenteeism and lateness are relevant. Absence and lateness can be highly disruptive for organizations when jobs are designed around teams of employees who are highly interdependent. For employees in jobs that involve providing customer service, absence and lateness interfere with rapid and reliable customer response times. Task performance can be studied at the individual or group level. Employees would be the target of individual-level analysis and work groups would be the target of group level-analysis. We were unable to identify any studies that examined the effects of work-family practices on group-level performance. However, research on individual performance is plentiful. (Although researchers have not always stated that they measured task performance as such, readers can often determine whether the performance measure focused on the task and/or encompassed citizenship behavior.)

Work/family research that studied task performance as an outcome variable has found mixed results. A meta-analysis by Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, and Neuman (1999) found differing effects of various flexible work arrangements on performance or productivity. For example, flextime was found to have positive effects, whereas compressed work weeks had a negative effect on productivity. Supporting earlier work by Milkovich and Gomez (1976), Kossek and Nichol (1992) found no direct effect for using onsite child care on performance.

To measure task performance, many organizations rely on the subjective performance ratings of supervisors and peers. One of the greatest methodological challenges of measuring task performance is obtaining ratings that are reliable, unbiased, and valid. The challenges associated with measuring performance are not solely methodological; however-defining the appropriate domain to be measured can also be a challenge (Arvey & Murphy, 1998). Ultimately, the choice of measures should depend on the research objective. At times, theoretical considerations may dictate the decision of how to measure performance. When the objective includes influencing how an organization
manages its employees, however, researchers may find it most effective to use the performance measures that the organization has adopted for use in its own internal decision making (Atkins & Wood, 2002).

**Contextual Performance.** Several terms have been used to describe the notion of good organizational citizenship, including extra-role performance, pro-social behavior, and contextual performance. Regardless of which term is used, the focus is the beneficial things that people do at work that are beyond the scope of their required work. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) suggest that individuals feel obligated to reciprocate when they receive something from another individual or entity. If workers feel the need to reciprocate for the organization offering them work-family benefits, discretionary contextual performance may be the preferred form of reciprocal payment (Lambert, 2000; see also Lambert, 1999).

Contextual performance has traditionally been measured at the individual level (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Although some studies have tried to measure the contextual performance of work groups (e.g., Bachrach, Bendoly, & Podskaoff, 2001; Bommer, Miles, & Grover, 2003), we are unaware of any work-family studies that have considered contextual performance at any level other than the individual level. Even research on individual-level contextual performance is rare in the work-family arena. Lambert (2000) found that workers’ perceptions of the usefulness of work-family benefits were positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors. Her study used three measures: a four-item index of helping behaviors, a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not an individual had submitted any suggestions as part of a company suggestion system during a 2-year period, and attendance at lunch hour quality meetings. Again, the dearth of work-family research in this area may be due to the fact that many individuals believe that work-family benefits and contextual performance should not have a positive relationship; yet according to Lambert's (2000) study, this is not the case.

**Adaptive Performance.** Unlike task performance and contextual performance, both of which have been studied a great deal, adaptive performance has only recently been proposed as an important dimension of work performance (CampbelJ, 1999; Hesketh &
Adaptive performance can be loosely defined as the ability to manage new experiences by adapting or being flexible. However, recent research suggests that this construct is more complex than implied by this simple definition. Pulakos et al. (2000) developed a taxonomy of adaptive performance that takes into account multiple dimensions, such as handling emergencies or crisis situations and handling work stress. These researchers also developed a psychometrically sound measure of this outcome, called the Job Adaptability Inventory (JAI).

Work Behaviors

Although many consider performance to be the ultimate work outcome, work behaviors also are important to measure, either because they are known to be antecedents to performance or because they are considered valued outcomes in and of themselves. Absenteeism and tardiness are two work behaviors often discussed in the work-family literature. Presumably, work-family benefits have the potential to alleviate otherwise incompatible role pressures that may result in high rates of absenteeism or lateness (see Katz & Kahn, 1978, for a detailed discussion of role theory.) Some work-family benefits, such as flexible work arrangements, may even alter the relevance of absenteeism and lateness as they are traditionally measured if such arrangements do not require employees to be working at specified times or on specified days. Cooperativeness is another potentially important work behavior; employees may be more cooperative at work if stress in their home life is reduced by work-family benefits.

Absenteeism. On a typical day in the United States, 2 to 3% of employees fail to show up for work, costing employers millions of dollars in lost productivity. A long tradition of research has shown that having children is positively related to absenteeism, and more recent research has shown that having elder care responsibilities also is positively related to absenteeism (Boise & Neal, 1996).

Although measuring absenteeism may seem straightforward, there are different approaches to doing so. One decision that researchers must make is whether they want to measure all absenteeism or only absenteeism related to family matters. For example,
Anderson, Coffey, and Byerly (2002) used the measure designed for the National Study of the Changing Workforce (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1998), which asked respondents about the frequency of their absenteeism due to (a) the need to care for a sick child, (b) because their usual child care was not available, or (c) for other family reasons. Hammer, Bauer, and Grandey (2003) used a one-item measure that asked respondents how many days they have missed work due to family/personal-related issues. Both of these examples point out another important component of an absenteeism measure: One must determine the relevant period of time to be included. For the previous examples, Bond et al. (1998) asked respondents to base their response on their experience in the previous 3 months, and Hammer et al. (2003) asked respondents to consider the previous 4 months. Another possibility for measuring absenteeism is to use organizational records. This approach has the advantage of being more objective than the self-reported measures. However, unless the organization collects data on the reason for an employee’s absence, such organizational data cannot serve as a measure of family-related absenteeism, but rather must serve as an overall measure of absenteeism. Interestingly, in a meta-analysis on personality and absenteeism (not specific to the work-family literature), only non-self-report measures of absenteeism were included (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 2003). Most were from organizational records and a few were from supervisory records. Although supervisory reports could yield richer data than organizational records, this would require that the supervisors know whether or not an employee’s absence was due to family reasons. Kossek and Nichol (1992) used such a measure by having supervisors report their perception of the degree to which child care affected employee attendance, including partial absences such as lateness. The authors stated that they chose this measure because organizational records did not permit the distinction between absence related to child care and other causes.

Like other individual behaviours, absence behavior can be aggregated to study group level phenomenon. It is possible that the true effects on absence of work-family initiatives would be more accurately captured by studying absence rates for work units. As many organizations have learned, programs that reward and recognize employees with outstanding attendance records are one effective approach to minimizing
absenteeism. When work-family initiatives make it possible for more employees to maintain better attendance records, organizations may find that they can raise the criteria used in such programs (e.g., require longer records of perfect attendance or lower the number of allowed absences in order to receive recognition or a reward). If the criteria for excellence are raised for the work unit, it is likely that absenteeism for the unit will decline.

Lateness. Like absenteeism, lateness is a type of work withdrawal behavior (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003). Some researchers have identified lateness as a form of partial absence (e.g., Hepburn & Barling, 1996). Other aspects of partial absence include leaving work early and non-work telephone conversations. Studies have found that work-elder care conflict is related to partial absenteeism (Barling, MacEwen, Kelloway, & Higginbottom, 1994; Hepburn & Barling, 1996). In a study of dual-earner couples, Hammer and colleagues (2003) found that work-family conflict is related to wife lateness but not husband lateness. Blau (1995) pointed out that in the management literature, lateness has experienced "empirical neglect" compared to other withdrawal behaviors, such as absenteeism and turnover (p. 1483).

Lateness can be measured from self-report data, managerial report data or organizational records, although for upper-level employees, the organization may not track lateness. One early study on lateness (Adler & Golan, 1981) used time clock records to obtain an objective measure of lateness. Lateness was defined by organizational policy (which was being more than 7 minutes late in the sample organization). As with absenteeism, the authors needed to determine the relevant time frame over which to examine lateness. They chose a 1-year period. Another study (Blau, 1995) used a 9-month period. Both Adler and Golan (1981) and Blau (1995) used frequency (the number of times an individual was late) and duration (the total number of minutes the individual was late) measures for lateness. However, Adler and Golan (1981) measured duration as the number of minutes late per incident, whereas Blau (1995) measured the total number of minutes late for the 9-month period. Following his earlier work (Blau, 1994), Blau calculated an overall lateness score by multiplying
frequency by duration. As with absenteeism, there does not seem to be a readily apparent way to calculate group-level lateness.

Cooperativeness. Although we were unable to find any work-family studies that considered cooperativeness as an outcome of interest, we feel that this construct is worthy of a brief discussion as a work behavior. Both the academic and practitioner literatures address many employers' desire to be recognized as a "great place to work." Such places are characterized by positive relationships between employees and their managers and coworkers (Great Place to Work Institute, 2004). Establishing a culture in which people cooperate is beneficial for employers, who can invest less in managing conflict and the problems that arise when employees fail to work as an integrated team or work unit. We feel that this construct could be informative for work-family research because cooperativeness is possible even when employees have flexible work arrangements or dependent care arrangements that result in rigid schedules. Including measures of cooperativeness in future research would be relatively easy, as several measures of this construct have already been developed and used in psychological research (e.g., Ross, Rausch, & Canada, 2003).

Cost-Related Measures

During the last decade, human resource managers have experienced increasing pressure to document the effects of HR Practices on the “bottom line”. Among researchers who study HR practices, the most well-developed approaches to estimating the cost-effectiveness HR practices are utility analysis (e.g., Schmidt, Hunter, MacKenzie, & Muldrow, 1979; Boudreau, 1991; Boudreau, 2003; Boudreau & Ramstad, 2003) and cost accounting (see Cascio, 2000; Flarnholtz, 1999). The goal of both approaches is to determine whether the dollar value of the benefits associated with introducing a new practice (e.g., a work-life initiative) is greater than the total dollar value of all costs associated with the new practices. Essential to both utility analysis and cost accounting is the ability to accurately determine the true costs and all benefits of both current practices and the new initiatives being considered.
Regardless of the technical merits of utility analysis and cost accounting and their potential usefulness, these methods for assessing the effectiveness of HR practices-including work family initiatives-have not been widely adopted by organizations. Instead, most firms continue to rely on subjective estimates and intuition when assessing the effectiveness of their HR practices (Becker, Huselid, & Ulrich, 2001). Undoubtedly, there are many explanations for the slow adoption rate of utility analysis and cost accounting methods, including the fact that these measures may not reflect fundamental strategic objectives or the concerns of a broader set of important stakeholders (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Jayne & Rauschenberger, 2000).

Recently, however, there has been renewed interest in developing cost-related metrics for evaluating workforce management practices. HR consultants now offer a broader variety of more sophisticated measures intended to assess HR effectiveness, including measures that estimate the economic value added or return-on-investment for a variety of activities (e.g., see Becker et al., 2001; Fitz-Enz, 2002). Much of this work adopts the perspective of human capital theory. The crux of this theory is that people are of value to the organization to the extent they make it productive (Becker, 1964; Becker & Huselid, 1998; Lepak & Snell, 1999). Thus, organizations make decisions about investing in people just as they make decisions about investing in machinery, viewing them as a form of capital. Costs related to attracting, training, retraining, motivating, and monitoring the organization's workforce are viewed as investments in the human capital of the firm, just as maintenance of machinery would constitute an investment in the capital of the firm (Flamholtz, 1999; Wright et al., 1994; Wright, Dunford, & Snell, 2001). This reasoning suggests that the value of human resource management practices can be estimated using macro-level financial indicators of firm performance, such as stock price or the ratio of the market-to-book valuation.

A recent study illustrates the type of research associated with this more macro-level approach to evaluating HR practices (see Arthur, 2003). The investigator focused on firms that appeared in the annual list of Fortune 500 companies for the years 1971 through 1996. For these firms, the investigator used public announcements of work-family initiatives as predictors of the firm's performance in the stock market. The results
showed that shareholder returns increased significantly on the day a work-family initiative was announced. Furthermore, this effect remained over the subsequent 3-day trading period. The effect was somewhat stronger for high-tech firms and those that employed more women. Presumably, these stronger effects were found because attracting and retaining talent was more challenging for these firms and being successful was more likely to lead to improved firm performance over time. A similar methodology was used by Cascio (2004) in a study that found that the *Working Mother* Best 100 companies had superior stock performance to the S&P 500 companies. Hannon and Milkovich (1996) also studied firms identified as one of "the best" companies for working mothers and found that being on this list resulted in stock price gains of 69%.

Research strategies such as those just described are quite new and interpreting the results of such studies is fraught with many challenges. Nevertheless, such findings may help to shift researchers away from a narrow focus on estimating the more interesting question of why investors are willing to pay premium to own stock in family-friendly firms.

### 3.24 Ramifications For The Work-Family Interface

Globalizations, the expansion of the service industry and advances in technology have contributed to the changing nature of work, resulting in new relationships between employees and their employers. These macro- and more micro-level changes have implications for the work-family interface, in particular greater boundary permeability between the two domains and more individualized work-life management strategies. Each is discussed in detail below

**Blurred work and family boundaries**

Many of the repercussions from the changing nature of work have resulted in greater permeability of work into the family domain. Telework is an excellent example of the manner in which advances in communication technologies have impacted how, where and when work gets done, infiltrating space and time more typically reserved for family
and personal life. Alternate work schedules and advancements in information technology create tensions between greater flexibility and continuous accessibility.

**Telework**

The terms telework and telecommuting tend to be used broadly to refer to working outside of the traditional office through the use of one or more communication technologies (Nilles, 1998). Sparrow (2000) reports that at the beginning of this century, between 10% and 30% of large organizations in the USA, Canada, northern Europe and Australia used telework as an employment arrangement. Harpaz (2002) indicates that the USA has the greatest percentage of teleworkers in its labor force (i.e., more than 25%), followed by Finland with approximately 17%, Sweden at about 15%, the Netherlands at about 14%, Denmark with just over 10%, the UK with around 7%, and Germany with about 6%. In Spain, Italy, Ireland and France, less than 5% of the labor force telecommutes.

In 2001, 19.8 million Americans reported that they did some work at home as part of their primary jobs. Half of these workers were employed in managerial and professional occupations, while one in five worked in sales occupations (US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002b). Similarly, among occasional teleworkers in the UK, 91% fall into three occupational groups: managers (37%), professionals (37%), and associate professional and technical occupations (17%; HOP Associates, 2002). While equal numbers of men and women are teleworking in the USA (US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002b), 67% of the teleworkers in the UK are men. The gender difference in the UK is related to the jobs that teleworkers hold. Jobs that are more conducive to teleworking (e.g., managers, professionals and information technology workers) are predominantly occupied by men (HOP Associates, 2002).

For both organizations and individuals, a consistent set of potential telework advantages are discussed in the literature. From the organizational perspective, the potential advantages include increased productivity, increased human resources, decreased absenteeism and tardiness, savings in direct expenses, increased motivation and satisfaction, and creation of a positive organizational image (Harpaz, 2002; Sparrow,
Potential advantages to the employee include flexibility, autonomy and independence, control over time, savings in travel time and commuting expenses, opportunity to work with fewer distractions and greater availability to family (Harpaz, 2002; Kurland and Bailey, 1999). In a survey of 9000 employees of a large multinational corporation, US employees reported numerous benefits associated with telework (Sparrow, 2000). Of those employees engaged in telework, 75% felt that it had a positive impact on their productivity, 60% reported an improved ability to concentrate, 66% reported a positive effect on morale and 48% indicated a heightened commitment to their employer.

Potential disadvantages of telework are also discussed in the literature. Teleworking employees may experience social isolation, lack of professional support and visibility, impeded career advancement, difficulty in separating work and family, and over-availability (Cooper and Kurland, 2002; Grosswald et al., 2001; Harpaz, 2002; Hughes and Hans, 2001). Organizations may find that their teleworking employees feel less committed, that it is difficult to create team synergy and that non-teleworkers are resentful (Kurland and Bailey, 1999; Nord et al., 2002). The extent to which either these disadvantages or the aforementioned advantages are realized probably depends a great deal on the frequency of telework (Bailey and Kurland, 2002; Harpaz, 2002; Kurland and Bailey, 1999). For instance, professional and social isolation are unlikely when telework is relatively infrequent but more likely when an employee is engaged in telework full time. Kurland and Bailey (1999) argue that a key advantage of occasional telework is that it may provide employees with a distraction-free environment away from phones, co-workers and office demands. The need for freedom from distractions is apparently great. According to the 2002 NSCW report, 43% of the sample said that frequent interruptions during the work day make it difficult to get work done (Bond et al., 2002). However, home may not provide a distraction-free environment when it is a full-time workplace. For full-time teleworkers, there is less opportunity to separate work and personal life, as well as the potential for friends, relatives and neighbors to equate being home with being available.
Like other types of alternate and flexible working arrangements, organizations currently appear to lack clear policies and procedures for implementing telework (Kurland and Bailey, 1999). Access to telework, its frequency and the conditions under which it occurs are often negotiated between employees and their supervisors. Thus, telework accessibility and arrangements can vary a great deal even within the same work environment. For the individual employee, creating desirable telework arrangements may hinge on the quality of the relationship with the supervisor and his or her own negotiation skills.

Is there time for anything other than work?

While it is clear that the changing nature of work has blurred the boundaries between work and family life, it is less clear whether the effects are positive or negative from a family perspective. For instance, although the 80% of teleworkers in Sparrow’s (2000) sample indicated that the practice improved work-life balance, only 33% felt they were involved in their children’s educations; 40% indicated that they had difficulty managing work-life, 50% reported feeling drained at the end of the day and 62% said they simply had too much work to do. Data from the 2002 NSCW tell a similar story (Bond et al., 2002). In that sample, 35% indicated that they are overwhelmed by the amount of work they have to do, and 45% reported that they experience some or a lot of work interference with family (an increase from the 34% reporting the same levels in 1977), despite increased flexibility.

A recent review of the occupational health literature concludes that choice regarding work hours is a key factor in promoting well-being (Sparks et al., 2001). Yet, there is evidence of large disparities between how much people would like to work and how much they actually do work. The Cornell Couples and Career Study shows that across every life stage at least 75% of men and women are working more hours than they would like (Clarkberg and Merola, 2003). Moreover, the gap between actual and preferred work hours is substantial with a median from 9 to 15 hours too much per week across all groups. These data suggest that alternate work schedules and greater flexibility have not been coupled with the reduction in work hours that most people desire. Several studies suggest that overwork is particularly high among well-educated
professionals and managers (e.g., Clarkberg and Merola, 2003; Clarkberg and Moen, 2001; Jacobs and Gerson, 1998) and that this group is also most likely to experience negative spillover from work to family (Grzywacz et al., 2002).

Work-family researchers posit that assumptions about how work must be structured, organizational demands and lack of negotiation account for rising time pressures experienced by employees. According to one participant in Nord et al.’s (2002) study, ‘It seems that the general perception is that working exorbitant hours is a good thing. Our director makes comments about working 20-h days, and it gives the impression that if you are not working that many hours, there is something wrong with you. Lack of efficiency is rewarded more often than efficiency in working’ (p. 229). Clarkberg and Moen (2001) contend that employer demands and institutionalized features of the work environment have conspired to create work in pre-packaged units where 0 and 40+ are the most common options. In interviews with their sample, Clarkberg and Merola (2003) discovered that most professionals never imagined that they might be able to negotiate a different work arrangement than they currently had. They seemed to perceive that excessive hours were simply an inherent part of the job.

Of course, work hours are influenced by societal factors as well as organizational norms. Differences in national economic and political conditions create large cross-cultural disparities in work time. For instance, in the Netherlands, Norway, France and Germany there is a strong commitment to work-time reduction. From 1979 to 2000, these countries have experienced work-time reductions of 10% or more (Hayden, 2003). Compared to the USA, work hours have also fallen in South Korea and Japan. Several countries, including France, Denmark, Norway and Belgium, have reduced the standard workweek to below 40 hours per week (Hayden 2003). Consistent efforts to reduce the workweek are also underway in Portugal, Greece and Spain (Hayden, 2003). Work-time reduction has failed to gain political support in the USA (Fagan, 2001). American employees have the distinction of being ‘world leaders’ in hours worked (Hayden, 2003; Olson, 1999).