Work–Life Balance
A Psychological Perspective

\

Edited by Fiona Jones, Ronald J. Burke and Mina Westman

3 Research perspectives: managing the work–home interface

Nancy P. Rothbard and Tracy L. Dumas

Managing the interface between work and home has emerged as a central topic for both management practitioners and academics. With the growing numbers of women in the workforce and the increase of dual-earner couples (Burke and Greenglass, 1987; Lambert, 1990; Voydanoff, 1987), today's organizations face the challenge of implementing practices that allow their employees to achieve at work, while also engaging meaningfully in their homes and communities (see Chapter 1). As juggling multiple roles has become more prevalent for both men and women, organizational scholars have focused more study on the relationship between work and home and the ways individuals enact and navigate their roles in the two domains. These scholars have drawn primarily from the disciplines of psychology and sociology to provide the theoretical basis for examining characteristics of work and home roles, and much of the research has considered how the work–home interface may be related to critical outcomes such as stress, role conflict and multiple role participation.

Past research has addressed the ways work and non-work roles might influence one another, building on psychological constructs such as affect, cognition and values (see Edwards and Rothbard, 2000, for a review). For example, researchers have asked whether negative affect at home spills over and negatively influences a person's work role, or whether a person compensates by throwing him or herself into the work role to escape such negative affect. Prior research also has been very concerned both with role stress and its antecedents (e.g., Edwards and Rothbard, 2005; Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1986; Zedeck, 1992), focusing on role expectations (Higgins *et al.*, 1992), demands (Grandey and Cropanzano, 1999; Kopelman *et al.*, 1983, Frone *et al.*, 1992a) and fit between desired and actual environmental characteristics (Edwards and Rothbard, 1999). Moreover, a great many studies have focused on work–family conflict (Frone *et al.*, 1992a; see Chapter 5). Indeed a recent meta-analysis found a consistent negative relationship between work–family conflict and job and life satisfaction (Kossek and Ozeki, 1998).

Although much of past research in the work–family area focused on detrimental outcomes of actively participating in multiple roles such as

stress and conflict, more recently work–family researchers have begun to consider the potentially enriching effects of multiple roles (Kirchmeyer, 1992; Rothbard, 2001; Ruderman *et al.*, 2002; see Chapter 5). Such recent studies have relied on psychological theories such as self-regulation and self-esteem to explain why positive experiences in one role might carry over and enhance functioning in another role (Rothbard, 2001). The crux of this argument is that psychological resources accrued in one role boost self-esteem and confidence and thus enhance functioning in another role (Rothbard, 2001; Ruderman *et al.*, 2002).

Further developments in work–family research center around people's strategies for managing the boundary between these roles (e.g., Kossek *et al.*, 1999; Rothbard *et al.*, 2005; see also Chapter 6). Whereas past researchers have considered the characteristics of the boundary between home and work roles (Dubin, 1973; Hall, 1972; Hall and Richter, 1988), more recent research has begun to examine how integration or segmentation strategies for navigating the work–family boundary may affect an individual's psychological experience of work and family roles (e.g., Kossek *et al.*, 1999; Nippert-Eng, 1995; Rothbard *et al.*, 2005).

Finally, whereas most research addressing the work–home interface has historically addressed the management of work and family demands, this area of inquiry is rapidly expanding to consider various other aspects of employees' non-work lives such as community involvement and racial identity. Similarly, many companies have expanded the focus of their human resources policies from that of work–family balance to work–life balance to reflect the variety of non-work roles that employees may hold and enact. Among the studies addressing non-family, non-work roles are those of Kingston and Nock (1992), who examined working couples' community involvement, and, more recently, Dumas' (2003) examination of workers' involvement in community music organizations. In a similar vein, Phillips *et al.* (2002) addressed the role of racial diversity as a factor in people's preference for role boundary management strategies. These studies and others reflect emerging directions and research perspectives in the study of the work–non-work interface.

As reflected in the variety of studies addressing the work–non-work interface, this is a dynamic area of research that has changed dramatically in the past decade. In this chapter we review the progression of research on the work–non-work interface and explicate links to psychological constructs that underpin this research. We also identify important new developments and future directions in this critical field of study.

DOMINANT MODELS IN WORK–FAMILY RESEARCH

Through the 1980s and the 1990s the amount of research on work and family roles increased substantially. This proliferation of research led to

several models capturing the relationship between work and family roles. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) provide a review and integration of much of the existing research on the relationship between work and family roles. They identified six recurring linking mechanisms depicted in the work–family literature: spillover, compensation, segmentation, resource drain, congruence and work–family conflict. Of these six mechanisms, spillover, compensation, segmentation and congruence have been primarily used to explain observed relationships between work and family constructs, whereas resource drain and work–family conflict are primarily outcomes of work and family role enactment. Spillover, compensation and segmentation have emerged as the dominant models characterizing the linkage between work and non-work roles. Role conflict and stress have also emerged as dominant areas of research on the work–family interface. We first review spillover, compensation and segmentation and then turn to a discussion of work–family conflict and stress.

Spillover, compensation and segmentation

Spillover

Spillover is a process whereby experiences in one role affect experiences in the other, rendering the roles more similar. Research has examined the spillover of mood, values, skills and behaviors from one role to another (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000), although the majority of this research has focused on mood spillover. The spillover model is supported when there is a significant positive relationship between measures of work and non-work experiences (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Lambert, 1990; Staines, 1980). Congruence is also represented by a positive relationship between measures of work and non-work experiences, but is caused by a third factor affecting both the work and non-work roles (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Spillover can take two forms. One is characterized by similarity between a work construct and a related construct in the non-work role, as when someone who is highly satisfied with his or her work organization becomes highly satisfied with his or her experiences in the family role. The second form of spillover entails the transference of experiences intact between work and non-work domains, as when fatigue from work is displayed at home; however, this second form must also entail the fatigue affecting family functioning for it to constitute spillover (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Existing research finds significant evidence of spillover (Lambert, 1990). In a key study of spillover, Williams and Alliger (1994) used experience sampling methodology to examine mood-related spillover on a daily basis, finding that working parents in their sample were more likely to bring work-related emotions home than they were to transfer family-related emotions to the workplace.

Compensation

A second process by which work and family roles may be linked has been termed 'compensation'. Compensation refers to a relationship between work and non-work roles whereby people attempt to make up for deficiencies in one role through greater involvement in another role (Champoux, 1978; Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992), and entails a negative relationship between constructs in the two roles (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Individuals can compensate for dissatisfaction in one role in a number of ways: they can reduce the importance ascribed to a less rewarding role or they can seek rewards and invest more time and attention in an alternative role (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Evidence for compensation has been found in a number of studies. Evans and Bartolome (1984) found that managers temporarily sought fulfillment in their family lives when they faced disappointment with their experiences at work. Tenbrunsel *et al.* (1995) also found a compensatory relationship between work and family roles for employed men. More recently, Rothbard (2001) found that women who experienced negative affect from family were more engaged with their work, consistent with a compensation story.

Segmentation

Unlike the compensation and spillover models, the segmentation model posits no systematic relationship between work and non-work roles (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Instead, segmentation has been used to describe the separation of work and family, such that the two roles do not influence one another (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Staines, 1980; Zedeck, 1992). Initially, segmentation was viewed as the natural division of work and family due to the physical and temporal separation of the two roles and to their innately different functions (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Dubin, 1973). However, given the more recent view that work and family are closely related domains of human life (Burke and Greenglass, 1987; Kanter, 1977; Voydanoff, 1987), segmentation has been reconceptualized as an active psychological process whereby people may choose to maintain a boundary between work and family (Eckenrode and Gore, 1990; Lambert, 1990; Morf, 1989; Near, 1984). For example, Piotrkowski (1979) found that some people may actively suppress work-related thoughts, feelings and behaviors while at home, and vice versa. Building on this notion of segmentation as an active psychological process, recent research has articulated the notion that segmentation may be a strategy for work and family boundary management (Kossek *et al.*, 1999; Rothbard *et al.*, 2005) for keeping work and non-work domains separate and maintaining an impermeable boundary between work and non-work roles (Nippert-Eng, 1995).

Work–family conflict and stress

Another research perspective on the work–family interface has examined the psychological consequences of actively participating in both work and family roles (see also Chapter 5). The majority of this research has examined the detrimental or depleting effects of actively participating in multiple roles (Rothbard, 2001). Research on work–family conflict and stress are situated solidly in this tradition, examining the conditions under which working parents or dual-income families are negatively affected by simultaneous work and home demands.

Role conflict remains of central concern to work–family researchers and has been documented in many working populations. Examining data from the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey, Pleck *et al.* (1980) found that many working adults experienced conflict between work and family roles. A decade later, Frone *et al.* (1992b) conducted structured interviews of 631 working adults in Erie County, New York, as part of a longitudinal study of stress processes. When asked about the prevalence of work–family role conflict in their lives, nearly 60% of the respondents reported that their work role interfered with their family role, and 22% reported that their family role interfered with their work role. In a related study, Frone *et al.* (1992a) found that high involvement in both work and family roles led to increased work–family role conflict.

Research on work–family conflict and stress has its roots in role theory (Merton, 1957) and incorporates notions of perception and cognitive appraisal. Borrowing from the role theory tradition, classic conceptualizations of work–family conflict (e.g., Kopelman *et al.*, 1983; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985) suggest that an individual encounters role conflict when the sent expectations or demands from one role interfere with the individual's ability to meet the sent expectations or demands from another role (Kahn *et al.*, 1964; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Merton, 1957). An example of role conflict is that of an employee who is simultaneously pressured to work overtime while family members urge that employee to come home. In a seminal article, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) pushed these notions of role conflict further and divided work–family conflict into three categories: time-based, strain-based and behavior-based (see Chapter 5). Time-based conflict occurs when time spent in one role precludes participation in another role. Strain-based conflict occurs when stressors arising in one role affect the individual's enactment of another role despite the fact that the roles may not conflict temporally. Behavior-based conflict stems from situations where expectations or norms for behavior in one role are incompatible with the expectations for behavior in the other role.

Work–family research has refined understanding of work–family conflict further by showing that role conflict is bidirectional (Crouter, 1984; Frone *et al.*, 1992a) and can be asymmetric or reciprocal (Tenbrunsel *et al.*, 1995). An example of asymmetric role conflict may be that of a working father

who feels that his work role interferes with his family role, yet does not feel that his family role interferes with his work role. Alternatively, an example of reciprocal role conflict could be that of a working mother who feels that her work schedule interferes with time she would like to spend with her child – and also feels that household responsibilities take away from the resources she has to fulfill work responsibilities. In each case these individuals encounter role conflict, the experience of one role interfering with enactment of another role.

Several studies have also linked work–family conflict with role stress (Anderson *et al.*, 2002; Frone *et al.*, 1992a; Grandey and Cropanzano, 1999). For example, Frone *et al.* (1992a) found that job stress increased work-to-family conflict whereas family stress increased family-to-work conflict. Drawing on Hobfoll's (1989, 1998) conservation of resources theory, Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) examined the relationship between stress and conflict and also found that work-role stress increased work-to-family conflict, which in turn led to greater job distress, whereas family-role stress led to greater family-to-work conflict, which in turn led to greater family distress. Anderson *et al.* (2002) similarly found that greater family demands increased the experience of role conflict from work to family and from family to work. In this study, both work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict were predictors of stress for the employees and expectations regarding career outcomes were key factors shaping employees' psychological experience of stress.

Research on work–family conflict and stress draws on psychological traditions to understand these phenomena through incorporating notions of perception and cognitive appraisal into models of work–family conflict. Indeed, several studies of work–family conflict and stress emphasize perception as a key mediator of the relationship between stressors and strain (Kopelman *et al.*, 1983; Higgins *et al.*, 1992; Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1986), reflecting the concept that objective stressors do not affect a person unless he or she perceives them subjectively (Kahn *et al.*, 1964; Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). A number of theoretical models and empirical studies have emphasized how individual demographic differences such as age and gender, and personal characteristics such as locus of control, type A behavior and self-esteem, influence these subjective assessments (e.g., Frone *et al.*, 1992a; Grandey and Cropanzano, 1999; Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1986). Indeed psychological resources have been found to decrease work–family conflict and strain (Grandey and Cropanzano, 1999). Other sources of subjective perception that have been studied include coping resources and the availability of social support (Burke and Greenglass, 1987; Eckenrode and Gore, 1990; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Voydanoff, 1987).

Research has also begun to incorporate the notion of cognitive appraisal into the study of work–family conflict and stress (see Edwards and Rothbard, 2005). Cognitive appraisal entails the evaluation of situational characteristics in relation to salient personal standards such as values, goals,

needs or desires in order to assess whether a situation is beneficial or detrimental to the individual (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). Building on stress research and person–environment fit theory, research on work–family conflict and stress has begun to examine how a person's assessment of fit or misfit in the environment influences stress and well-being in work and family roles (Edwards and Rothbard, 2005; Edwards and Rothbard, 1999). For example, Edwards and Rothbard (1999) found that well-being in both work and family roles increased as people's appraisal of their environment matched their desires.

Recent work on work–family conflict has also broken new ground by examining the individual's psychological decision processes when faced with competing role demands. Incorporating psychological constructs from research on stress, decision processes, self-esteem and identity into the study of work–family conflict and stress has yielded new insights into the nature of this relationship. In a cleverly designed vignette study, Greenhaus and Powell (2003) manipulated pressures applied by role senders for participating in competing work and family activities as well as the social support of role senders in each activity. They found that work and family pressures influenced participation choice as did the salience of the roles. Self-esteem also moderated the effect of role salience on activity choice.

GENDER DIFFERENCES AND THE WORK–HOME INTERFACE

Another important research perspective within the work–family literature has focused on gender differences. Gender has been found to affect career advancement (e.g., Stroh *et al.*, 1992), perhaps through differential access to valuable work networks (Ibarra, 1992), work and family time investment (Leete and Schor, 1994; Rothbard and Edwards, 2003), work–family conflict and role stress (e.g., Greenhaus *et al.*, 1987; Gutek *et al.*, 1991), and strategies for managing the work–family interface (Andrews and Bailyn, 1993).[1] These gender differences may be due to gender role socialization and different opportunity structures for men and women, which can lead men and women to have different psychological experiences of work and family roles (Rothbard and Brett, 2000).

Men and women have different perceptions of their work roles (Rothbard and Brett, 2000). Women's perceptions of their work role are often shaped by barriers to career advancement, compensation and networking opportunities (Rothbard and Brett, 2000). Such barriers start with sex typing of jobs (Blau and Ferber, 1992) and persist with differential access to development opportunities such as international assignments (Catalyst, 1996).

Men and women's experience of family roles is similarly affected by different sets of expectations for role enactment. Societal norms and gender

role socialization suggest that women are expected to identify more with the family role (Aryee and Luk, 1996; Lobel, 1991) and spend more time on household activities (Bielby and Bielby, 1989; Hochschild, 1989). Indeed research suggests that there is a substantial gender gap in household work between men and women (up to 19 hours per week) such that women engage in household work to a much greater extent than do men (South and Spitze, 1994). Studies in the work–family arena also provide evidence for the idea that women participate more in the family role than men do. For example, a recent study of time investment in work and family roles found that women devoted 7 hours more per week to family than did men (Rothbard and Edwards, 2003).

Gender differences also exist in the ways that participation in work and family roles affects one another. For example, Tenbrunsel *et al.* (1995) found that, unexpectedly, men's work involvement increased their family involvement, but that women's work involvement had no effect on their family involvement. Rothbard and Edwards (2003) found that family time investment decreased work time investment for women, but did not affect work time investment for men.

Men and women also differ in the ways they manage the boundary between work and family roles. Men are more likely to segment or compartmentalize work and family roles, whereas women tend to integrate these roles (Andrews and Bailyn, 1993). This gender difference in management of the boundary between work and family is thought to stem from differences in mental models men and women have about work and family roles, as well as from different societal expectations regarding how men and women ought to handle work and family roles (Andrews and Bailyn, 1993; Rothbard and Brett, 2000).

Although much research has found gender differences in work–family relationships, it is important to note that some researchers have not found these differences. For example, Frone *et al.* (1992a) did not find significant gender differences in the antecedents and outcomes of work–family conflict. Likewise, Frone *et al.* (1992b) did not find gender differences in the permeability of the work–home boundary. Further, Anderson *et al.* (2002) did not find differences between men and women in the experience of work–family conflict. Thus, the gender findings are mixed, and require further study to understand the circumstances under which they emerge and those where they do not seem to be meaningful. Moreover, it is also important to note that much of the research that found gender differences has focused on the relationship between work and family roles rather than work and non-work community-based roles. Recent research that has considered other non-family aspects of the work–home interface has failed to find significant gender differences (Dumas, 2003; Phillips *et al.*, 2002). A fruitful avenue for future research should consider whether gender differences persist in the experience of work and non-work roles other than the family role.

EMERGING PERSPECTIVES ON THE WORK–HOME INTERFACE

Past research perspectives have contributed greatly to our understanding of the work–home interface, yet we still grapple with understanding the psychological and behavioral challenges people face when engaging in and navigating multiple roles. Further, new issues and challenges that warrant consideration are developing. As a result, several new streams of research have begun to emerge within the domain of the work–home interface. We address three new research perspectives that have emerged. First, we discuss a research perspective focusing on the potential enriching aspects of multiple roles – a perspective that emphasizes the notion of psychological resources that are accrued in role participation. This research perspective has been fueled by the question of how people respond to actively participating in multiple roles, and by a challenge to the work–family area's heavy emphasis on role conflict and stress. We next discuss an emerging research perspective that focuses on the strategies people use to manage the boundary between work and family roles. This research focuses on people's preferences for integrating or segmenting work and family roles. Finally, we address an emerging research perspective on role identity and identity navigation amongst multiple roles.[2]

Enrichment

Although role conflict and stress are possible psychological outcomes of participating in multiple roles, another potential psychological consequence of participating in multiple roles is enrichment. The enrichment perspective that has begun to emerge in the work–family literature (Rothbard, 2001; Ruderman *et al.*, 2002; see also Chapter 5) is based on the premise that roles provide individuals with psychological resources that can be beneficial to them in other life roles. This research builds on theoretical insights from sociologists Sieber (1974) and Marks (1977), who posited that individuals are likely to benefit from holding multiple roles.

Sieber's (1974) discussion of role accumulation suggests four mechanisms through which individuals benefit from holding multiple roles because they can (1) amass role privileges across their various roles, (2) achieve overall status security by allowing roles to serve as buffers or compensate for each other, (3) receive additional resources for status enhancement and improved role performance, and finally (4) experience personality enrichment and ego gratification through the psychological experience of occupying multiple roles. Marks (1977) goes further and posits an expansion model of human energy, allegiance and personal resources through enactment of multiple roles. He contends that individuals' enactment of multiple roles may actually create more energy or personal resources rather than deplete finite reserves. Combining these insights with theories of self-esteem

and psychological resources, several recent studies have found evidence for the enriching aspects of multiple role enactment.

Foundational research on the enrichment perspective emphasized that participating in multiple roles can be beneficial to overall mental health. In two studies, Thoits (1983, 1986) found that individuals who hold multiple role identities report significantly less psychological distress. Similarly, Barnett *et al.* (1992) found that multiple roles can serve as buffers against psychological distress. Specifically, Barnett *et al.* (1992) interviewed female nurses and social workers in Massachusetts over a two-year period regarding their job role quality and psychological distress. They found that family roles buffered women from the negative effects of changes in job role quality on mental health. Barnett *et al.* (1992, p. 635) suggest that the multiple role involvement benefited these women because it gave them various sources of 'role-related rewards that directly influence psychological well-being'.

In another early study in this emerging research perspective, Kirchmeyer (1992) surveyed alumni of an undergraduate business program in a western Canadian university regarding their work and non-work roles. The 122 respondents held a variety of non-work roles including community work, recreation groups and families. In this study, Kirchmeyer (1992) found significant support for the enrichment model such that increased time spent in community work and parenting was associated with greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment. She also found that time devoted to community work was associated with greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In contrast, she found no support for the depletion model, noting that increased time and involvement with non-work activities did not reduce organizational commitment or job satisfaction. Additionally, Kirchmeyer's (1992) respondents reported that their participation in non-work roles yielded the benefits outlined in Sieber's (1974) model of role accumulation. More specifically, their involvement in multiple roles provided them with security against the failures and strains of work, enhanced their status and developed skills and perspectives useful for work. Kirchmeyer (1992) also found that resource enrichment from involvement in community and recreation roles was positively related to organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

More recently, research has begun to examine the psychological mechanisms by which one role might be enriching to another role. Examining whether engagement in work and family roles was enriching or depleting, Rothbard (2001) drew on psychological theories of emotion and self-esteem to explain why positive and negative affect in response to one role might carry over and increase or decrease engagement in another role. She surveyed workers of various types at a large public university in the USA. Overall, she found that both enrichment and depletion can occur as a result of engagement in multiple roles. She also found gender differences in the effects of engagement in work and family roles such that women's work-

related negative affect was depleting to family engagement, whereas men's work-related positive affect was enriching to family engagement. Moreover, women's work engagement was positively influenced by both positive and negative family-related affect. Rothbard (2001) suggests that the affective experience of work and family roles are key determinants of whether holding multiple roles is enriching or depleting.

Ruderman *et al.* (2002) also examined the psychological mechanisms that determine whether holding multiple roles is beneficial for individuals. They conducted both an exploratory qualitative study as well as a quantitative survey examining how non-work roles contributed to women's managerial roles. Women managers interviewed by Ruderman and colleagues reported that their non-work roles provided them with better interpersonal skills and psychological benefits such as increased self-esteem and confidence. Further, Ruderman *et al.* (2002) found that commitment to multiple life roles was positively related to feelings of psychological well-being.

This more recent work examining the positive effects of participation in work and home roles is expanding the study of the work–home interface and providing more detailed explanations of the psychological mechanisms fostering enrichment. More specifically, recent work has built upon the earlier resource accumulation of multiple role theories to include the impact of affect, cognitive appraisal, emotion and self-esteem (Rothbard, 2001; Ruderman *et al.*, 2002).

Role boundaries and the work–home interface

A second emerging research perspective has focused on how individuals enact or manage the boundary between home and work. Whereas much of past research in this area addressed issues of the permeability of the boundary between home and work (Hall and Richter, 1988; Pleck *et al.*, 1980), this new perspective focuses explicitly on integration versus segmentation as strategies for coping with work and family roles (Ashforth *et al.*, 2000; Kossek *et al.*, 1999; Rothbard *et al.*, 2005). Segmentation is a strategy by which a person separates work and non-work time, artifacts and activities, whereas integration is a strategy whereby the person overlaps these role experiences (Nippert-Eng, 1995).

In an early study that focused explicitly on the strategies people use for managing their multiple roles, Hall (1972) examined female college students who were also wives and mothers. Among the role management strategies he observed were role integration and partitioning. He described role integration as 'redesigning roles so that they can be performed simultaneously in a mutually reinforcing manner' and role partitioning as choosing 'not to attend to one role while performing another' (Hall, 1972, pp. 476–477). Although this early study identified clear role management strategies, it was not until the 1990s that a new body of studies emerged to more fully examine this perspective.

Consistent with the findings in Hall's initial work, Nippert-Eng (1995) and Perlow (1998) also found evidence that people actively manage the work–non-work boundary using integration or segmentation. Nippert-Eng (1995) studied employees at a research and development firm. She found that the scientists and other professional workers led very integrated lifestyles. They handled personal matters such as paying bills or making doctors' appointments during work time. The scientists that Nippert-Eng studied took work home, kept many work-related materials such as journals in their homes and conversely received personal mail at their work addresses. Additionally, some reported that colleagues were indistinguishable from friends. Conversely, Nippert-Eng also found that other employees in the same organization segmented their work and non-work lives. These workers never mentioned their non-work activities at work, nor did they have pictures of family at work. Similarly, they did not see co-workers outside of work or take work home in any way. Perlow (1998) observed similar diversity of boundary management strategies among software engineers. Some took work home regularly and accepted phone calls at home in the evenings and at weekends, whereas other workers chose to leave all work activities in the workplace.

Expanding the body of research on boundary management strategies, Kossek *et al.* (1999) developed a theoretical framework synthesizing research on these strategies. They focused on choice of strategy, either segmentation or integration, as a dependent variable. They hypothesized that gender differences, personality, caregiving resources and organizational climate would influence a person's choice of role boundary management strategy.

More recent empirical work has built on these foundations and focuses on the outcomes of using either a segmenting or integrating boundary management strategy. These studies have focused on outcomes such as role conflict (Dumas, 2003), satisfaction (Dumas, 2003; Rothbard *et al.*, 2005), commitment (Rothbard *et al.*, 2005) and attraction to different organizational settings (Rau and Hyland, 2002). Many of these studies have taken a contingency approach to the effects of boundary strategy on various outcomes. For example, Rau and Hyland (2002) studied MBA students and found that those with low role conflict were more attracted to companies that offered telecommuting arrangements (a more integrating policy), whereas those with high role conflict were more attracted to companies that offered flexitime arrangements (a more segmenting policy). This is because integrating might exacerbate the effects of conflict when people have high degrees of role conflict. Other research on work–family boundary management has drawn on psychological concepts such as congruence and cognitive appraisal to explore the fit between strategy and preference. Individuals have preferences for boundary management strategies (Edwards and Rothbard, 1999; Rothbard *et al.*, 2005); however, these preferences may not be congruent with organizational policies (Rothbard *et al.*, 2005). In a survey study, Rothbard *et al.* (2005) found that when employee

preferences for how they would like to manage the boundary between home and work were incongruent with company policies and practices – many of which foster a blurred boundary between home and work – employees experienced lower satisfaction and commitment.

Identity navigation

A third emerging research perspective revolves around role identity and the ways that people navigate multiple role identities. Individual identity is closely related to the roles people hold (Stryker and Serpe, 1982; Thoits, 1983). Further, the extent to which any individual identifies with a given role affects their enactment of that role (Lobel, 1991; Lobel and St Clair, 1992) as well as role outcomes (Frone *et al.*, 1995). Several studies have found support for the effect of role identification on role participation. For instance, Lobel and St Clair (1992) surveyed former students of an executive education course and found that those with a higher reported career identity salience reported greater work effort. Likewise, Rothbard (2001) found that identification with a role was associated with increased engagement in that role. Rothbard and Edwards (2003) surveyed employees at a public university, sampling a diverse population including both men and women, as well as a variety of job types. They found that increased identification with a family role was associated with greater time invested in the family role, and that increased work identification was associated with greater time invested in the work role.

The existing research described above has established role identification as a key factor affecting the outcomes of enactment of work and non-work roles. Recent studies have also progressed beyond examining absolute levels of role identification and have begun to explore a person's relative identification with work and non-work roles. Specifically, in a theoretical piece, Thompson and Bunderson (2001) assert that individuals identify unequally with work and non-work roles and that one role will serve as an anchor identity role. In other words, the anchor identity role is more salient and central to the individual's self definition than the other roles they may hold (Thompson and Bunderson, 2001). Further, these authors consider whether experiences in the anchor or non-anchor role are identity-affirming or identity-discrepant. They then predict different role outcomes depending on whether experiences in the non-anchor and anchor roles are identity-affirming or identity-discrepant. They theorize that when experiences in both the anchor and non-anchor roles are identity-affirming, the individual will experience increased enrichment and reduced conflict between roles. They also theorize that when the anchor role is identity-affirming, and the non-anchor role is identity-discrepant, the individual will retreat to the affirming anchor role.

In a recent study, Dumas (2003) also studied relative identification with work and non-work roles. Unlike Thompson and Bunderson's (2001)

framework, Dumas (2003) allowed for the possibility that individuals might identify equally with their work and non-work roles. She then compared outcomes of those who identified equally and unequally with their work role and their role in a community-based volunteer orchestra. She hypothesized and found an interaction between the individual's relative identification and role boundary management strategy such that those who identified more equally with their work and non-work roles experienced greater role conflict when integrating rather than segmenting their roles.

Research on role identification underscores how an individual's sense of self may affect the work–non-work interface. Understanding how people navigate and make sense of multiple role identities is a central challenge for work–family and organizational scholars. This is especially true as organizations become populated by people with a diverse set of family and other non-work identities that can be salient and affect the way work gets done. Related to research on work and family identities is research on how non-work racial or ethnic identities might affect people's experience in the workplace.

Increased corporate globalization and advances in civil rights have boosted the racial and ethnic diversity of many corporations. The issue of role boundary management and identity navigation may be particularly useful for addressing the impact of demographic diversity on the work–home interface (Phillips *et al.*, 2002). As diverse groups of people come together, they often must decide how much of their 'selves' should be included in their work organizations (Berg, 2002). The reality of diversity poses many questions for scholars and practitioners. How do different cultural norms fit together in the workplace? How should those in the minority ethnic group balance their racial identity and community allegiance with their work 'selves'? How should individuals from minority religious traditions observe religious holidays and customs while also adhering to company policy? How does this influx of different cultures and norms affect the enactment of 'work self' for those of the dominant culture? A study by Phillips *et al.* (2002) partially addressed these questions with a survey of MBA students regarding their preferences for management of the work–home boundary, and the demographic diversity of their workgroups. Phillips *et al.* (2002) found that individuals in racially diverse groups reported greater preferences for segmentation of home and work roles. They argued that this result was due to the individual's need to preserve their racial identity through role segmentation.

CONCLUSION

The changing face of the workforce, particularly the increase in the number of employed women and dual-income families, was the impetus for work–family policies and much of the work–family research of the 1980s and

1990s. Researchers and organizations sought to understand how best to manage employees who had childcare or eldercare responsibilities. Accordingly many research questions and perspectives focused on the issue of managing the demands of work responsibilities and tasks with home caregiving tasks. Although there remains much to understand about how to help employees manage demands of their work and family roles, other societal changes have introduced additional challenges to managing the work–home interface that go beyond role conflict to identity navigation. Accordingly research on the work–home interface has begun to address these challenges through new research perspectives on role boundaries and the challenges and rewards of holding and navigating multiple role identities.

NOTES

1 Gender differences are considered in further detail throughout this volume; for example Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11.
2 Further discussion of the relationships between work–family 'enrichment' and the related concepts of 'facilitation', 'enhancement' and 'compensation' can be found in Chapter 5, as well as further relevant research findings.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., and Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: links to work–family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management, 28,* 787–810.

Andrews, A., and Bailyn, L. (1993). Segmentation and synergy: two models linking work and family. In J. C. Hood (ed.), *Men, work and family* (pp. 262–275). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Aryee, S., and Luk, V. (1996). Balancing two major parts of adult life experience: work and family identity among dual-earner couples. *Human Relations, 49,* 465–487.

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., and Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 25,* 472–491.

Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., and Singer, J. D. (1992). Job experiences over time, multiple roles, and women's mental health: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62,* 634–644.

Berg, D. N. (2002). Bringing one's self to work: a Jew reflects. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 38,* 397–415.

Bielby, W. T., and Bielby, D. D. (1989). Family ties: balancing commitments to work and family in dual earner households. *American Journal of Sociology, 54,* 776–789.

Blau, F. D., and Ferber, M. A. (1992). *The economics of women, men and work* (2nd edn). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Blood, R. O., and Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives.* New York: Macmillan.

Burke, R. J., and Greenglass, E. (1987). Work and family. In C. L. Cooper and I. T. Robertson (eds), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 273–320). New York: Wiley.

Catalyst (1996). *Women in corporate leadership: Progress and prospects.* Research report. Itasca, IL: Catalyst.

Champoux, J. E. (1978). Perceptions of work and non-work: a reexamination of the compensatory and spillover models. *Sociology of Work and Occupations, 5,* 402–422.

Crouter, A. C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: the neglected side of the work family interface. *Human Relations, 6,* 425–442.

Dubin, R. (1973). Work and non-work: institutional perspectives. In M. D. Dunnette (ed.), *Work and non-work in the year 2001* (pp. 53–68). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Dumas, T. L. (2003). When to draw the line: effects of identity and role boundary management on interrole conflict. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University.

Eckenrode, J., and Gore, S. (1990). Stress and coping at the boundary of work and family. In J. Eckenrode and S. Gore (eds), *Stress between work and family* (pp. 1–16). New York: Plenum Press.

Edwards, J. R., and Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: an examination of person–environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77,* 85–129.

Edwards, J. R., and Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 25,* 178–199.

Edwards, J. R., and Rothbard, N. P. (2005). Work and family stress and well-being: an integrative model of person–environment fit within and between the work and family domains. In E. E. Kossek and S. J. Lambert (eds), *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural and psychological perspectives in a global world.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Evans, P., and Bartolome, F. (1984). The changing pictures of the relationship between career and family. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 5,* 9–21.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., and Cooper, M. L. (1992a). Antecedents and outcomes of work family conflict: testing a model of the work–family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 65–78.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., and Cooper, M. L. (1992b). Prevalence of work–family conflict: are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13,* 723–729.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., and Cooper, M. L. (1995). Job stressors, job involvement and employee health: a test of identity theory. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 68,* 1–11.

Grandey, A. A., and Cropanzano, R. (1999). The Conservation of Resources model applied to work–family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54,* 350–370.

Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian, A. G., and Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experience, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 200–215.

Greenhaus, J. H., and Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*, 76–88.

Greenhaus, J. H., and Parasuraman, S. (1986). A work–non-work interactive perspective of stress and its consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, *8*, 37–60.

Greenhaus, J. H., and Powell, G. N. (2003). When work and family collide: deciding between competing role demands. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *90*, 291–303.

Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., and Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 560–568.

Hall, D. T. (1972). A model of coping with role conflict: the role behavior of college educated women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*, 471–486.

Hall, D. T., and Richter, J. R. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: what can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management Executive*, *2*, 213–223.

Higgins, C. A., Duxbury, L. E., and Irving, R. H. (1992). Work–family conflict in the dual-career family. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, *51*, 51–75.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: a new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 513–524.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1998). *Stress, culture, and community: The psychology and philosophy of stress*. New York: Plenum.

Hochschild, A. R. (1989). *The second shift*. New York: Avon.

Ibarra, H. (1992). Homophily and differential returns: sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *37*, 422–447.

Kahn, R. L, Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., and Snoek, J. D. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Katz, D., and Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Kingston, P. W., and Nock, S. L. (1992). Couples' joint work status and community and social attachments. *Social Science Quarterly*, *73*, 862–875.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1992). Non-work participation and work attitudes: a test of scarcity vs. expansion models of personal resources. *Human Relations*, *45*, 775–795.

Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. J., and Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: a construct validation study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *32*, 198–215.

Kossek, E. E., Noe, R. A., and DeMarr, B. J. (1999). Work–family role synthesis: individual and organizational determinants. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *10*, 102–129.

Kossek, E. E., and Ozeki, C. (1998). Work–family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: a review and directions for organizational behavior human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*, 139–149.

Lambert, S. J. (1990). Processes linking work and family: a critical review and research agenda. *Human Relations*, *43*, 239–257.

Lazarus, R. S., and Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, coping, and adaptation*. New York: Springer.

Leete, L., and Schor, J. B. (1994). Assessing the time-squeeze hypothesis: hours worked in the United States, 1969–89. *Industrial Relations, 33,* 225–243.

Lobel, S. A. (1991). Allocation of investment in work and family roles: alternative theories and implications for research. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 507–521.

Lobel, S. A., and St. Clair, L. (1992). Effects of family responsibilities, gender, and career identity salience on performance outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 1057–1069.

Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 921–936.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure.* New York: Free Press.

Morf, M. (1989). *The work/life dichotomy.* Westport, CT: Quorum.

Near, J. P. (1984). Predictive and explanatory models of work and nonwork. In M. D. Lee and R. N. Kanungo (eds), *Management of work and personal life: Problems and opportunities* (pp. 67–85). New York: Praeger.

Nippert-Eng, C. E. (1995). *Home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Perlow, L. (1998). Boundary control: the social ordering of work and family time in a high-tech corporation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43,* 328–357.

Phillips, K. W., Rothbard, N. P., and Dumas, T. L. (2002). It's not that I don't like you: preferences for segmentation and engagement in organizational activities. Paper presented at the *Annual National Academy of Management meeting,* Denver, CO.

Piotrkowski, C. S. (1979). *Work and the family system.* New York: Free Press.

Pleck, J. H., Staines, G. L., and Lang, L. (1980). Conflict between work and family life. *Monthly Labor Review, 103,* 29–32.

Rau, B. L., and Hyland, M. A. (2002). Role conflict and flexible work arrangements: the effects on applicant attraction. *Personnel Psychology, 55,* 111–137.

Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46,* 655–684.

Rothbard, N. P., and Brett, J. M. (2000). Promote equal opportunity by recognizing gender differences in the experience of work and family. In E. A. Locke (ed.), *The Blackwell handbook of principles of organizational behavior.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Rothbard, N. P., Phillips, K. W., and Dumas, T. L. (2005). Managing multiple roles: work–family policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science, 16,* 243–258.

Rothbard, N. P., and Edwards, J. R. (2003). Investment in work and family roles: a test of identity and utilitarian motives. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 699–730.

Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., Panzer, K., and King, S. N. (2002). Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal, 45,* 369–386.

Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review, 34,* 567–578.

South, S. J., and Spitze, G. (1994). Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review, 59,* 327–347.

Staines, G. L. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: a review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork. *Human Relations, 33,* 111–129.

Stroh, L. K., Brett, J. M., and Reilly, A. H. (1992). All the right stuff: a comparison

of female and male managers' career progression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*, 251–260.

Stryker, S., and Serpe, R. T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience and role behavior: theory and research example. In W. Ickes and E. S. Knowles (eds), *Personality, roles and social behavior* (pp. 199–216). Springer-Verlag: New York.

Tenbrunsel, A. E., Brett, J. M., Maoz, E., Stroh, L. K., and Reilly, A. H. (1995). Dynamic and static work–family relationships. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *63*, 233–246.

Thoits, P. A. (1983). Multiple identities and psychological well-being: a reformulation and test of the social isolation hypothesis. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 174–187.

Thoits, P. A. (1986). Multiple identities: examining gender and marital status differences in distress. *American Sociological Review*, *51*, 259–272.

Thompson, J. A., and Bunderson, J. S. (2001). Work–non-work conflict and the phenomenology of time: beyond the balance metaphor. *Work and Occupations*, *28*, 17–39.

Voydanoff, P. (1987). *Work and family life*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Williams, K. J., and Alliger, G. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perception of work–family conflict in employed parents. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 837–868.

Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (ed.), *Work, families, and organizations* (pp. 1–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.