OVERVIEW

Occupational stress and the role of the family and other non-work activities continue to be an important area of research for organizational scientists. In our sixth volume of Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being, we offer seven intriguing chapters that examine several key issues in work and non-work stress research. The theme for this volume is exploring the work and non-work interface.

The first chapter, by Kelly L. Zellars, examines an often overlooked variable, social anxiety, which has implications for both work and non-work strain. In her chapter, she examines how social anxiety, or social phobia, reflects a strong fear that one is in danger of behaving in an inappropriate fashion, with potentially disastrous consequences such as rejection from an important group or humiliation. She offers information on current research in this area as well as thoughts for future research.

The next chapter, by Jeffery A. LePine, Marcie A. LePine, and Jessica R. Saul, examines the concept of work and non-work challenge and hindrance stressors. They argue that stressors in one domain (e.g., work versus non-work) are associated with criteria in the same domain and across domains. Further, they suggest that the ability to manage the work and non-work interface involves balancing the indirect effects of both challenge and hindrance stressors.

The third chapter, by Cynthia A. Thompson, Steven A. Y. Poelmans, Tammy D. Allen, and Jeanine K. Andreassi, reviews the empirical literature on work and family stress and finds little systematic research that examines the process of coping within the work and family conflict framework. They develop and present a theoretical model that is specifically designed to emphasize the process of coping with work–family conflict. Further, they highlight both personal and situational antecedents.

The fourth chapter, by Jonathon R. B. Halbesleben and Anthony R. Wheeler, examines the costs and benefits of working with someone you love. They argue that examining these relationships allows researchers to study a rather unique situation within the work and non-work interface. They integrate research from a broader demands/resources perspective on stress and well being, and offer suggestions for future research in this area.
The fifth chapter, by Leslie B. Hammer, Ellen Ernst Kossek, Kristi Zimmerman, and Rachel Daniels, focuses on clarifying the construct of family supportive supervisory behaviors and offers new perspectives on conceptualizing this construct. They present their work on the conceptual development of family supportive supervisory behaviors and offer practical implications based on their conceptual model.

The sixth chapter, by Sherry E. Sullivan and Lisa Mainiero, provides a new framework for examining women’s stress across their lifespan. Specifically, they examine the linkage between the lifespan careers of women and their experienced stress. They develop the Kaleidoscope Career Model as a means of better understanding the complexities associated with women’s decision making about their careers and their experience of stress.

The final chapter, by Ronald J. Burke and Teal McAteer, examines the impact of long work hours and work addiction. They argue that working long hours is associated with several work and non-work balance issues as well as a number of dysfunctional consequences, including illnesses, injuries, fatigue, and heart rate. They also explore the motives for working long hours such as avoiding job insecurity, negative sanctions from a supervisor, and simply the joy of work. They suggest more research is needed, particularly in the areas of workaholism and work addition.

Together, these chapters offer tremendous insight into the phenomena of the work and non-work interface. Further, several chapters specifically challenge traditional thinking and offer some bright and exciting directions for future research. We hope you enjoy Volume 6 of Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being.

Pamela L. Perrewé and Daniel C. Ganster
Series Editors
SOCIAL ANXIETY: AN OVERLOOKED VARIABLE IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRESS LITERATURE

Kelly L. Zellars

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize and integrate a body of psychological literature regarding an individual difference related to the experience of anxiety that largely, and somewhat surprisingly, has been overlooked by organizational scientists. This variable, most often called social anxiety or social phobia, reflects a strong fear that one is in danger of behaving inappropriately, inadequately, or ineptly, with impending disastrous consequences such as rejection, humiliation, or ouster from a group (Trower & Gilbert, 1990). In providing a summary of the construct and ongoing investigations, the chapter offers ideas for future research into how this important variable may influence behaviors at work.

Social anxiety has been studied under a variety of labels including social anxiety, shyness, relationship anxiety, communication anxiety, embarrassment, and reticence. In 1982, Schlenker and Leary provided a self-presentation...
approach to social anxiety, and in the 1990s, two comprehensive cognitive models of social anxiety (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997) were proposed, generating significant renewed interest in the construct. A review of the psychological literature quickly reveals the substantial influence these studies have had on studies using a cognitive approach to examine the processes, antecedents, and consequences surrounding social anxiety. Although not the focus of this chapter, treatment recommendations also clearly favor a cognitive approach. Given the substantial body of research, which indicates that social anxiety can strongly influence individual emotions and behaviors outside of the work context, there is a need for organizational scientists to consider how social anxiety may influence behaviors at work and the resulting consequences for workers and their organizations.

THE PREVALENCE OF SOCIAL ANXIETY/PHOBIA

Social phobia (also called social anxiety disorder) represents anxiety that is sufficiently high to interfere with the individual’s daily life, occupational or academic functioning, or social life (Leary & Kowalski, 1995). The anxiety arises from fears accompanying interpersonal interactions or public performances. When the anxiety is excessive according to psychiatric criteria, the individual can be clinically diagnosed as socially phobic. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) (1980; 1994) defines social phobia as a “marked and persistent fear of one or more social or performance situations in which the person is exposed to unfamiliar people or possible scrutiny by others. The individual fears that he or she will act in a way (or show anxiety symptoms) that will be humiliating or embarrassing” (p. 411). This fear “causes the individual a significant amount of distress because he or she recognizes that the fear is excessive” (Crozier & Alden, 2005a, p. 2).

Social anxiety is associated with a fear of social situations, which can include the most commonly occurring types of situations such as face-to-face conversations and interactions in the hallway at work. Social situations also include more formal settings where one’s performance may be evaluated, such as giving a speech. Consider, for example, the distinction between fears about engaging in situations where one might be scrutinized by others (sometimes referred to as performance anxiety), versus fears about interpersonal interactions such as having lunch with coworkers (Heimberg, Mueller, Holt, Hope, & Leibowitz, 1992; Mattick & Clarke, 1998).
Interaction anxiety and performance anxiety are both features of the broader construct of generalized social anxiety (APA, 2000).

One study reported that nearly 8% of the U.S. population reported experiencing social phobia in the last 12 months, and more than 13% of the population meets diagnostic criteria for social phobia at some point in their lives (Kessler et al., 1994). A much larger percentage report exhibiting some of the symptoms of social phobia. This data suggests that social phobia is the third most common psychiatric disorder in the United States, following depression (17% lifetime prevalence) and alcohol dependence (14%) (Crozier & Alden, 2001). There is some research suggesting that social phobia is a “chronic and unremittent disorder” (De Wit, Ogborne, Offord, & MacDonald, 1999, p. 569). Although the statistics are not without criticism, given their reliance on survey reports rather than clinical records, there is widespread agreement among researchers that a significant number of individuals experience significant discomfort, arising out of fear of a negative evaluation in routine social situations (Crozier & Alden, 2001).

Individuals vary in the degree to which they worry about a negative evaluation in a social encounter. A large body of research indicates that individual differences in social anxiety impact both transitory encounters and longer term relationships (Crozier & Alden, 2005b). Like other dispositional characteristics the trait of social anxiety appears to be normally distributed: with most people occasionally experiencing moderate amounts of anxiety in particular social encounters, a few people experiencing no anxiety in such encounters, and a few people experiencing intense and frequent anxiety in social situations (Leary & Kowalski, 1995). Overall, however, “social anxiety is prevalent in the population, whether in terms of self-reported shyness or social fears or symptoms of social phobia” (Crozier & Alden, 2001, p. 18).

**DEFINITIONS AND DEGREES OF SOCIAL ANXIETY**

Social anxiety is triggered by situations involving an interpersonal encounter in which the individual may be evaluated by others for their appearance, their social skills, their communication, and a variety of other criteria arising from the particular interpersonal encounter (e.g., speech, office meeting). This type of anxiety is distinct from other types of anxiety that may involve fear of objects, bugs, heights, or even death but do not involve other people. One distinction is that the source of stress is often an ambiguous cue (unlike a crawling critter) arising in the encounter. A second distinction is that
unlike other fears, it is nearly impossible to avoid the source of fear for very long. If I am afraid of heights, I can avoid tall buildings. However, many activities in life, including purchasing groceries and going to work, require some level of interaction with the source of stress, that is, other people. The defining characteristic of social anxiety is “the prospect or presence of interpersonal evaluation in real or imagined social settings” (Schlenker & Leary, 1982, p. 642).

Anxiety is typically conceptualized as a response to a perceived threat (Beck & Emery, 1985) and reflexes triggered by a threat that likely served an evolutionary function, protection in a primitive environment (Trower & Gilbert, 1989). “However, when the danger is more imagined than real, these anxiety responses are largely inappropriate. Instead of serving a useful function, they often become further sources of perceived danger and in this way contribute to a series of vicious circles that tend to maintain or exacerbate social anxiety” (Clark & Wells, 1995, p. 70). Regardless of how others actually see the socially anxious person’s behaviors, the fear of a socially anxious individual arises from the potential threat of a negative evaluation by others.

Research indicates, “there exists a continuum from low to extreme degrees of concern over social evaluation” (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997, p. 742). Shyness describes the low to middle range of the continuum, social (anxiety) phobia is in the middle to upper range of the continuum, and “avoidant personality disorder” in the upper to extreme end of the continuum (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). The markers along the continuum that are used to indicate where the ranges start and stop are frequently unclear. A review of the literature reveals that there is considerable overlap in the terms and distinguishing between them can be quite arbitrary at times (Holt, Heimberg, & Hope, 1992).

Some researchers disagree with the continuum in that it overlooks key characteristics such as anticipatory versus reactive types of social anxiety, and contingent versus noncontingent encounters that trigger social anxiety (Leary & Kowalski, 1995). As the name implies, anticipatory anxiety refers to the cognitive processing of what might go wrong prior to engaging in a social encounter while reactive social anxiety arises out of the post-event rumination. In a contingent encounter, a person modifies his behavior according to what others say or do. Alternatively, a person’s behavior in a noncontingent encounter is primarily based on a preplanned script (e.g., public speech, musical performance). Individuals encounter both types of interactions in the workplace. For example, Bob may experience social anxiety about presenting the budget to the finance committee and later
experience social anxiety when he eats lunch with his coworkers or passes his boss in the hallway. Although the characteristics of the contexts and the influence of others’ behaviors are different in these situations, both may trigger social anxiety for Bob. Overall, self-attention appears to be a common element to different forms of social anxiety (Buss, 1980). An individual’s concern with threats to reputation or standing within a group appears to be a key element in social anxiety because it triggers the individual’s need to appraise and monitor how others evaluate their conduct (Crozier & Alden, 2005b).

Although there can be disagreement with the continuum structure, “most evidence suggests that social phobia is an extreme manifestation of ‘normal’ social anxiety, and that the differences between trait social anxiety and social phobia are primarily a matter of degree” (Leary & Kowalski, 1995, p. 104). Although some evidence is mixed regarding the qualitative differences between social anxiety and social phobia (Cheek & Melchoir, 1990; Turner, Beidel, & Townsley, 1990), the preponderance of studies indicates that social phobics experience more intense emotions in social encounters, try harder to avoid difficult social situations, and their anxiety leads to more severe consequences in their lives. Nevertheless, “the precipitating factors and behavioral consequences of social phobia are similar to those of trait social anxiety” (Leary & Kowalski, 1995, p. 104).

Finally, readers new to the social anxiety construct should be aware that the DSM IV (1994) divides social phobia into two subtypes, although the clarity of distinction is often debated in the literature. The first, the generalized type, refers to a fear of most social situations. Alternatively, a more restricted or limited type describes individuals who fear a few types of social situations or fear a specific type of social situations such as public speaking or other performance-oriented situations (Schlenker & Leary, 1982). The degree to which the generalized and specific forms of social anxiety differ quantitatively and qualitatively has been the subject of considerable debate (Heimberg, Holt, Schneier, Spitz, & Leibotwitz, 1993; Rapee, 1995). Nevertheless, even “those who argue for a qualitative difference would agree that the basic nature of the subtypes is essentially similar” (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997, p. 742). The core of both the generalized form and subtypes appears to be the same, a fear of a negative evaluation. Social anxiety could be called “evaluation anxiety” (Beck & Emery, 1985), but social anxiety is the most common term (Leary & Kowalski, 1995). For a thorough discussion of traits related to types of social anxiety (e.g., shyness, embarrassment), the reader is encouraged to see Crozier and Alden (2005b).
While recognizing that the generalized form and the subtypes of social anxiety may differ in degree of severity and recommended treatments, researchers have sometimes used the terms loosely or interchangeably. Given that the objective of this chapter is to provide a broad introduction to current research in social anxiety to organizational researchers, the next sections refer to studies using both the “anxiety” and “phobia” terms and a variety of measures. Interested readers are encouraged to pursue efforts that improve the clarity of how degrees of social phobia and anxiety impact an individual’s work behaviors. Such research is needed in order to improve the clarity of labels, terms, and measures, and to better understand the probable outcomes of social anxiety in the workplace.

MODELS OF SOCIAL ANXIETY

In sum, currently most experts in the field define social anxiety as a category of cognitive, emotional, and physical experiences that vary among individuals and reflect ongoing elevated levels of anxiety about social scrutiny. Current cognitive theoretical models of social anxiety posit that this type of anxiety occurs when an individual perceives his or her performance as inconsistent with what another person, group, or audience expects. “The core of social phobia appears to be a strong desire to convey a particular favorable impression of oneself to others and marked insecurity about one’s ability to do so” (Wells & Clark, 1995, p. 69). Individuals with heightened social anxiety frequently expect they will behave inappropriately, leading others to judge them negatively, and that the consequences of a negative social impression are great (Ashbaugh, Antony, McCabe, Schmidt, & Swinson, 2005). The fear of social encounters often persists despite regular exposure to unavoidable social encounters and the absence of explicit negative feedback from other people (Hirsch, Clark, Williams, & Morrison, 2005). Intensive high-quality research over the last three decades has provided significant data and theorizing to arrive at this brief summary.

Early seminal work in social anxiety focused on the role of embarrassment in the regulation of social encounters (Goffman, 1972) in which individuals are aware that the context and parties in the interaction create expectations for acceptable behavior. Fear about failing to meet the expectations creates social discomfort for some individuals and severe stress for others. In this self-presentation perspective of Goffman’s work, “the routine social encounters of everyday life… [is] a series of negotiations where the social identities of interactants are claimed, accepted, or challenged. These
A decade later, the role of self-presentation in social anxiety offered by Schlenker and Leary (1982) spurred renewed interest in examining why individuals feel more socially anxious in some situations than others. This model considers both characteristics of the situation and individual differences. The self-presentational theory of social anxiety proposes that anxiety arises when people are motivated to create the desired impression but are unsure they can do so (Schlenker & Leary, 1982). Not all situations trigger the motivation to create a desired image. It is in only those situations where favored outcomes are contingent on impressions are people motivated to create the desired image. Such situations are much more likely to create social anxiety for some individuals. Further, the self-presentational model of social anxiety proposes that people differ in the frequency and intensity with which they experience social anxiety because the degree of anxiety experienced by an individual depends on the level of confidence (or lack of confidence) to create the desired impression. Individuals “demonstrate a certain degree of consistency in how anxious they are across social situations and over time” (Leary & Kowalski, 1995, p. 102).

In the last decade, the most discussed model of cognitive processing in the social phobia literature is the model offered by Clark and Wells (1995; also see Wells & Clark, 1997). “The core of social phobia appears to be a strong desire to convey a particular favorable impression of oneself to others and marked insecurity about one’s ability to do so” (Clark & Wells, 1995, p. 69). Building upon earlier works (e.g., Beck, Emery, & Greenberg, 1985; Butler, 1985; Hartman, 1983; Heimberg & Barlow, 1988, Leary, 1983a, 1983b; Salkoviskis, 1991; Teasdale & Barnard, 1993; Trower & Gilbert, 1989), Clark and Wells (1995) proposed that because socially anxious individuals have a strong desire to create a specific image in the eyes of others, but fear they will be unable to do so, they engage in cognitive processing prior to entering a feared social situation. This anticipatory processing likely maintains the social phobia, through biased thinking, increased anxiety, and affective (e.g., mood) and physical (e.g., sweaty palms) responses (Clark & Wells, 1995).

Clark and Wells (1995) attempt to answer the question, “why are socially anxious individuals predisposed to expect social encounters to be threatening.” Consistent with the personality literature that suggests an individual’s behavior is the outcome of the interaction of environmental conditions and dispositional traits, Clark and Wells (1995) posit social phobics’
assumptions about themselves and social situations create expectations of threats to their well being. “It is a fundamental assumption of theories of social anxiety that individuals bring something to social situations, whether this is an inhibited temperament, self-schemata, mental representations of recurring social situations, learned habits, or coping behaviours” (Crozier & Alden, 2005a, p. 18). Emerging from the interaction of one’s disposition and experiences, individuals high in social anxiety believe (1) they are likely to behave clumsily or in an unacceptable manner, and (2) their behaviors will lead to severely negative consequences, including loss of status, worth, and rejection (Crozier & Alden, 2005b).

Such assumptions and perceptions lead to an “anxiety program” that is automatically and reflexively activated in social situations (Clark & Wells, 1995, p. 70). “As they start to think about the situation, they become anxious and their thoughts tend to be dominated by recollections of past failures, by negative images of themselves in the situation, and by other predictions of poor performance and rejection” (Clark & Wells, 1995, p. 74). The thoughts and evaluations of individuals with social anxiety appear to arise more form internal interpretation and self-images based on negative beliefs (Hirsch & Mathews, 2000) rather than external data or cues. In a sample of college students, this negative self-evaluative bias remained even after controlling for performance deficits reported by independent observers (Ashbaugh et al., 2005). This finding is consistent with other studies suggesting an exaggerated negative self-evaluation (e.g., Alden & Wallace, 1995; Norton & Hope, 2001; Rapee & Lim, 1992; Stopa & Clark, 1993).

In related research, Rapee and Heimberg (1997) focus on the attentional resources of socially anxious individuals and the importance of perceived threats. Their model of social anxiety begins with the assumption that people with social phobia assume others are inherently critical and are likely to evaluate them negatively (Leary, Kowalski, & Campbell, 1988). Further, for these individuals, it is very important to be appraised positively, and the generation of social anxiety is essentially similar regardless of whether the individual actually encounters a social/evaluative situation, or only anticipates such an encounter, or even retrospectively ruminates over an encounter (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). Basically, this model proposes that upon encountering a social situation, an individual forms a mental picture of how he/she appears and behaves in the eyes of others. Simultaneously, he (she) is devoting his (her) attentional resources on both internal and external cues that suggest potential threats in the environment.

Internal cues include information from prior experience, long-term memories, and physical symptoms such as feeling flushed, sweating palms, or a
rapid heartbeat. External cues include feedback from others in the interpersonal encounter, including oral statements and body language signals such as frowns, yawns, and low eye contact. In any given situation, an individual’s cognitive resources are limited, and individuals give their attention to the features of the situation that are most salient (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). For individuals higher in social anxiety, the most salient cues are those suggesting threat of a possible negative evaluation. It is well established that anxiety states are associated with increased attention towards threat cues, and anxiety triggers a greater likelihood of interpreting ambiguous information to be threatening (Matthews & MacLeod, 1994). In an organizational context, a manager’s frown or change in voice tone are likely to be salient cues for the socially anxious worker. As he (she) attempts to interpret internal and external cues in the present situation, the socially anxious individual simultaneously assesses what the standards for evaluation are likely to be, how their performance, appearance, or behavior compare to such standards, and the likelihood of a negative evaluation and the resulting consequences. It is important to note that a social-evaluative situation is any situation that contains “the potential for interaction or observation and hence the potential for negative evaluation” (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997, p. 744) by another person or group. Similar to Wells and Clark’s model, Rapee and Heimberg (1997) posit that the expected negative evaluation triggers anxiety, reflected in physiological, cognitive, and behavioral responses. The anticipatory cognitions of socially anxious individuals, and the accompanying biases of attentional resources, are key factors triggering an awareness of stressful emotions for the socially anxious individual. Studies among nonclinical participants indicate that negative self-imagery plays a causal role in the development and maintenance of social anxiety (Hirsch, Meynen, & Clark, 2004; Hirsch, Mathews, Clark, Williams, & Morrison, 2006).

ANTICIPATING FEARFUL ENCOUNTERS

Individuals high in social anxiety evaluate a situation prior to engaging in it and also worry about their performance in the situation later. The anticipatory and retrospective evaluations of individuals with social phobia reflect a consistent negative interpretation bias (Hirsch & Mathews, 2000), and anxious individuals preferentially allocate attentional resources to threat (Dalgleish & Watts, 1990). The activation of anxiety-related schema facilitate the processing of potentially threatening information, contributing to
informational processing biases, including interpretive biases (Beck & Emery, 1985). When faced with a threat, seeing danger when none exists is thought to be more acceptable than missing cues when threat does exist. Therefore, anxious individuals are more likely to opt for the latter situations, making false positive evaluations, interpreting neutral or ambiguous cues as threatening and potentially harmful (Constans, Penn, Ihen, & Hope, 1999). The threats for individuals high in social anxiety are social in nature and the possible negative outcomes are in a public arena, including humiliation, rejection, isolation, or ouster from a desired group (Trower & Gilbert, 1990).

Because individuals high in social anxiety may already be in a self-focused mode when they enter a social interaction, and anticipating failure, they are likely to give more resources to monitoring for threatening information. However, at the same time, socially anxious individuals are also monitoring their own self-image. Thus they are forced to “multi-task” in their monitoring, but the close monitoring of internal cues interferes with an individual’s ability to accurately monitor external cues from other parties or the environment, resulting in reduced processing of external social cues (Clark, 2001).

Given the predisposition of socially anxious individuals, the monitoring is not equally distributed between searching for positive, neutral, or negative cues. Socially anxious individuals are predisposed to scan their environment for negative information, perceive such cues quickly, and have difficulty disengaging attention from negative cues (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). As more resources are given to threat monitoring, such individuals may be less likely to notice positive or any signs of acceptance from others in the social encounter (Wells & Clark, 1995). They may also miss some cues about their performance because they engage in negative internal dialogues that divert their attention (Dodge, Hope, Heimberg, & Becker, 1988). Further, because most every day social situations have few if any overt negative cues, many of the cues that are noticed and recalled are ambiguous and open to a negative interpretation by socially anxious individuals (Clark, 2001). In examining the anticipatory processing of socially anxious individuals, Vassilopoulos (2004) found that they engage in longer anticipatory processing than low socially anxious individuals. Further, the anticipatory process included ruminations about the impending social encounters that were recurrent, intrusive, and associated with increased anxiety and a lessened ability to concentrate.

Earlier, Mansell and Clark (1999) conducted an experiment to examine the thought processes of socially anxious students. First, the students were
asked to write down how someone they just met or someone they knew would describe them (public self-referent), and how they describe themselves (private self-referent). The students were then told they should prepare to give a public speech shortly. A control group was not given this instruction. Shortly after, both groups were asked to recall the public and private self-referent words. The results indicate that when faced with the possibility of giving a public speech, high socially anxious students compared to low socially anxious students recalled less positive public self-referent words and more negative self-referent words. These results suggest that the possibility of a potentially threatening and evaluative situation (i.e., a public speech) can trigger selective recall of negative information about one’s observable self for individuals high in social anxiety.

Is it possible to inhibit the threatening cognitions and thus reduce stress for the socially anxious individual by purposefully engaging oneself in a distracting task? Addressing this possibility, Vassilopoulos (2005a) examined whether engaging in a distraction task prior to a stressful encounter reduced the negative consequences associated with anticipatory processing by socially anxious individuals. College students were divided into high and low social-evaluative groups based on their scores on the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (FNES, Watson & Friend, 1969). Research indicates that when participants from a normal population are divided into high and low socially anxious groups based on FNES scores, experimental manipulations reflect those found when clinical social phobics are compared to non-patient controls (Stopa & Clark, 2001). Following completion of measures of anxiety and social phobia, students rated their agreement with a list of words reflecting their public self-referent. The words were very similar to those used in the Mansell and Clark (1999) study discussed above. Half of the students were told they would be required to give a speech on a controversial topic in which they would be evaluated, rated, and videotaped for additional ratings by experts. These students also completed a measure that captured the anticipatory processing of what might happen during the speech, both positively and negatively. In the control condition, the remaining half of the students did not complete the measure of anticipatory processing but instead engaged in a distraction task which involved reading and putting sentences in the correct order to create a meaningful paragraph. After 8–9 min, the experimenter returned and all participants completed measures of anxiety and were asked to recall their ratings of the self-referent words. The results indicated that high socially anxious individuals (i.e., high FNES scores) were more anxious when engaged in the anticipatory processing than their counterparts engaged in the distraction task.
Vassilopoulos (2005a) posits that the results may indicate that anticipatory processing is not always problematic. Instead, it may be that the kinds of thinking during rumination are more important in determining strain outcomes. For example, dwelling on past failures may lead to negative effects such as sustained anxiety or reduced performance while thinking about how to solve a problem (e.g., organizing a series of sentences to create a sensible paragraph) and recalling past successes may generate beneficial results (Vassilopoulos, 2004) and renewed perseverance and coping. However, the question remains as to why are socially anxious predisposed to giving greater attention to negative cues rather than positive or neutral cues in the situation prior to a social interaction?

**PERCEPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL BIASES**

Unlike other more defined stressors (e.g., excessive work load, discovering your bank account is near zero), most of the cues in a social encounter are ambiguous. Individuals must infer the intentions, meanings, thoughts, and feelings of the other party. For example, a caustic or cynical joke at one’s expense may be interpreted as friendly sparring between two parties or as denigrating and offensive. Similarly, when an individual does not respond to a friendly greeting, we may assume they are angry with us, or simply preoccupied, tired, or hard of hearing. If an employee is speaking to his (her) supervisor and observes the supervisor yawning, how does he (she) interpret this cue? Is the supervisor tired from lack of sleep since he has a newborn at home or is he bored by the conversation?

Social behavior is complex and interactions with others involve a number of verbal and nonverbal cues, positive, neutral, and negative, which must be monitored, evaluated, and interpreted to come to a conclusion regarding one’s social effectiveness. Interpretations of these common but open-ended interactions can range from benign to offensive to a severe threat to one’s self-esteem. Why do individuals with high levels of social anxiety form threatening interpretations of ambiguous events (Constans et al., 1999), resulting in increased anxiety (Clark & Wells, 1995)? Further, why are high socially anxious individuals, compared to low socially anxious individuals, more likely to interpret positive social events in a negative manner, and respond to unambiguous, mildly negative social events with catastrophic thoughts (Vassilopoulos, 2005b)? Researchers have attempted to answer these questions outside of an organizational context.
A large body of literature has examined the developmental influences on children’s social anxiety (e.g., shyness) but the findings are beyond the scope of this chapter given its focus on the potential consequences of social anxiety among working adults. However, readers interested in exploring the early influence of child development are encouraged to investigate this literature. Perhaps more relevant to working adults is the manner in which socially anxious individuals monitor their environments. As stated earlier in this chapter, individuals high in social anxiety closely monitor their own mental representations of themselves. Factors influencing the mental representation include pre-existing images of self, prior feedback from others, long term memory, and prior experiences. This mental picture is frequently a distorted picture of reality since the predominant input and the individual’s weighting of a particular input are influenced by the salience of the factor to the individual (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). Given its salience for socially anxious individuals, a key input into the mental picture of self is the person’s perception of his/her social performance. Studies have reported that individuals high in social anxiety underestimate the effectiveness of their social behavior relative to the ratings they receive from objective observers (Rapee & Lim, 1992; Stopa & Clark, 1993). Socially anxious individuals exaggerated the extent of their deficiencies compared to non-socially anxious individuals. Interestingly, this excessive criticism of one’s social performance by socially anxious individuals has not been found on non-social types of tasks (Efran & Korn, 1969). The tendency of individuals high in social anxiety to discount their effectiveness in social encounters contributes to their fear of social disapproval, a key component of social phobia (Rapee & Lim, 1992). Further, individuals high in social anxiety presume others are also devoting their attention to observing them. The thoughts of individuals with social phobia, such as “Am I boring?” may be the outcome of a biased inferential process resulting in a negative interpretation of ambiguous information that serve to increase or maintain social anxiety (Hirsch & Mathews, 2000).

A second factor contributing to a bias towards negative interpretations appears to be the monitoring of physical symptoms by socially anxious individuals. In addition to experiencing threatening cognitions, individuals high in social anxiety interpret the somatic symptoms (e.g., a racing heart) as evidence of impending loss of control and become preoccupied with the observable symptoms of stress (e.g., sweat on the brow, unsteady voice, shaky hands). The behavioral symptoms can “feed on each other,” escalating in frequency and intensity (Salkovskis, Clark, & Jones, 1986). Over time, the behaviors of socially anxious individuals (e.g., reticent to join in a group conversation) may cause others to be less friendly, confirming the
Some research has focused on the expected discrepancy between how socially anxious individuals think they will act and how others expect them to act. A third factor that may contribute to the socially anxious individual’s tendency to interpret social interactions as negative may rest on the standards they set for “acceptable” performance. Studies have reported that individuals with elevated social anxiety have excessively high standards for themselves (Alden & Wallace, 1995; Clark & Arkowitz, 1975; Leary et al., 1988; Rapee & Lim, 1992; Stopa & Clark, 1993; Wallace & Alden, 1995). The preponderance of findings suggests that socially anxious individuals are overly critical of their own performance compared to the standards they set. Further, in studies examining perfectionism, individuals high in social anxiety hold very high personal standards with regard to their concern for making mistakes (Antony, Purdon, Huta, & Swinson, 1998; Juster, Heimberg, Frost, & Holt, 1996). Finally, the perceptual errors may arise out of the inability to integrate diverse pieces of objective information about one’s social effectiveness (Rapee & Lim, 1992).

Although most of the evidence suggests that socially anxious individuals are predisposed to schema biased towards negative cues, some have suggested that individuals with high social anxiety do not necessarily have a consistent negative bias but rather lack the ability to exhibit a positive interpretation of ambiguous events. In a laboratory study, college students deemed socially anxious showed more threatening interpretations of ambiguous, interpersonal events when compared with their low-anxious counterparts. However, these differences manifested more as a lack of positive interpretation rather than a pronounced negative interpretation style (Constants et al., 1999). The different results may be due in part to differences in the measurement of schema and biases in the studies.

### MEASURING ANXIETY SCHEMA AND ATTENTIONAL RESOURCES

Individuals high in social anxiety appear to possess schema that directs their attention to selective types of information, particularly cues suggesting social failure (Hope, Rapee, Heimberg, & Dombeck, 1990). The most widely used method to study the attentional biases or schema of high anxiety individuals is the Stroop task, in which the individual is asked to choose a
word that matches a string of words. Researchers using this method have found that socially anxious individuals focus particular attention on words that imply a social threat (e.g., foolish, boring) (Hope et al., 1990).

A second related method is the modified Stroop task, which involves using negative evaluation words (e.g., stupid) and matched neutral words presented in various colors. In experimental studies, subjects are asked to ignore the meaning of the word and name the color in which the word appears as rapidly and accurately as possible. Researchers (e.g., Hope et al., 1990; Mattia, Heimberg, & Hope, 1993; McNeil et al., 1995) have consistently found that socially anxious individuals take longer to name the color of negative evaluation words than neutral or physically threatening words. The results of the revised Stroop test are frequently interpreted to mean that the attentional resources of socially anxious individuals are devoted more strongly towards negative evaluation information (Hope et al., 1990).

A specific type of evaluative anxiety frequently examined is test anxiety. Calvo, Eysenck, and Estevez (1994) examined that attentional biases related to test anxiety among students. They presented the students with incomplete sentences that implied a continuation of threat, and then immediately presented a timed word/nonword decision for probe words that were either consistent with the threatening continuation or disconfirmed it. The reasoning underlying this method is that if an individual has already made an inference about the likely outcome, he (she) tends to more quickly choose a word that matches his (her) inference. The researchers found that non-anxious controls were faster than anxious controls in choosing a word that disconfirmed a threatening inference. Nonanxious controls were more likely to make “real time” inferences about a positive outcome.

Perhaps more directly relevant to an understanding of organizational outcomes of social anxiety, Hirsch and his colleagues (Hirsch & Andrews, 1997; Hirsch & Mathews, 2000), examined the processing biases of anxious and nonanxious participants using a setting frequently associated with performance anxiety, an interview. Participants were community volunteers who indicated that they had experienced excessive levels of anxiety in social situations, such as job interviews, and scored high on a questionnaire designed to assess interview anxiety. The researchers also included a matched nonanxious control group.

In three experiments, volunteers read and imagined job interview scenarios that included emotionally involving details. The narrative text of the interview scenario incorporated key ambiguous sentences, consistent with either a negative or a positive interpretation, depending on the last word of the sentence. In the first experiment, participants read the scenario,
imagined being interviewed, and at key ambiguous junctures were asked to quickly make a timed decision about whether the last word could grammatically complete the sentence. For example, one sentence was “You tell the interviewer your idea and she seems to be...” Participants were offered the word interested and were required to decide quickly whether this word grammatically and properly completed the sentence. The researchers found that participants identified as severely anxious about interviews chose either threatening or benign words at about the same speed. Nonanxious controls responded similarly to threatening probe words. However, the nonanxious controls responded significantly more quickly to nonthreatening or positive probe words. Thus, the nonanxious control participants had faster response times to positive inferences in real time but not for threatening inference words.

In a second experiment, the researchers replaced the grammatical completion method with a lexical (word) decision task. Participants who scored either low or intermediate on interview anxiety were faster in choosing words that matched a positive inference rather than a negative inference. Participants who scored high in interview anxiety responded similarly to both threatening and nonthreatening probe words, and their response time to both were similar to the response time of the nonanxious participants’ responses to threatening probe words.

Finally, in a third experiment, the differences between the anxious and nonanxious groups disappeared when the position of the probe word was moved to irrelevant points in the text instead of the end of the sentence. The authors concluded that the results suggest that the differences in the first two experiments probably emerged because nonanxious individuals made an online positive inference. The volunteers who were anxious about their performance lacked the positive inferential bias that nonanxious individuals had at the time the ambiguous information was first encountered (Hirsch & Andrews, 1997). However, the authors of the study point out that the results do not suggest that interview-anxious individuals make online negative interpretations. Instead, the data may indicate that anxious individuals do not make online inferences at all, whether positive or negative. Nonanxious individuals exhibited a benign inferential bias at the time ambiguous information was presented but anxious individuals appeared to not have a similar inferential bias (Hirsch & Mathews, 2000). Similar results with students using reading-timed measures have been reported by Calvo, Eysenck, and Castillo (1997).

The results of these studies are consistent with those reported for clinical patients where nonanxious control participants appeared biased in favor of
nonthreatening interpretations but that this positive bias was absent in anxious groups (Eysenck, Mogg, May, Richards, & Matthews, 1991). Although the interview setting is more directly relevant to organizational research, there remains a need for further research examining the bias towards negative cues that more clearly resemble those likely to appear in a workplace setting. For example, Stroop or modified Stroop tests using words directly relevant to organizational settings (e.g., incomplete, poor, exceeded, surpassed) may provide insights into how high socially anxious individuals interpret and respond to cues at work. It is also important to gain a better understanding of how these cues impact cognitions after the social encounter takes place since such cognitions influence future interpersonal encounters.

**POST EVENT PROCESSING**

Individuals with social anxiety ruminate following ambiguous social events (post-event processing) (Field, Psychol, & Morgan, 2004). They tend to review distressing or embarrassing situations and encounters, and conduct a “post-mortem” of the events (Clark & Wells, 1995). During this post-event rumination, the individual’s anxious emotions and negative self-perceptions are likely to figure prominently because they were processed in detail and strongly encoded in memory (Rachman, Gruter–Andrew, & Shafran, 2000). Cues that are more salient to one’s predisposition or expectations take precedence over cues less salient. Ambiguous information is re-interpreted as negative (Stopa & Clark, 2000). College students high in social anxiety recorded more negative thoughts and counterfactual thinking (“if only” type of thoughts on how things could have been better) after reading vignettes about mistakes made in a public setting (e.g., party, classroom speech). Thus, for the socially anxious individual, social encounters are often perceived to be more negative than they were, leading to increased shame and ongoing anxiety.

In a sample of undergraduates, Rachman and colleagues (2000) found that following an anxiety provoking or embarrassing situation, socially anxious students engaged in post-event processing, and the recollections regarding the anxiety provoking interpersonal event tended to be recurrent and intrusive, interfering with their ability to concentrate. Further, the events were hard to forget even when the student actively attempted to resist thinking about the event. Furthermore, post-event processing appeared to worsen the anxiety of the individual high in social anxiety but not for those
low in social anxiety. High socially anxious individuals reported that they spent significant time trying to cancel out what happened, figuring out how to avoid similar situations, and wishing they “could turn the clock back” (Rachman et al., 2000, p. 616). Interestingly, experimental results suggest that it is the frequency (rather than the specific content) of post-event processing that perpetuates existing cognitive biases and contributes to a bias towards recalling negative self-related information (Mellings & Alden, 2000).

In the workplace, similar ruminations following an uncomfortable or embarrassing social encounter may lead the employee to purposefully avoid committee members, a particular supervisor, or even parts of their job requiring interpersonal interactions that may be subject to scrutiny and evaluation. Instead they may choose activities or alter their schedule to reduce the chance of being evaluated negatively. For example, staying late to finish a report may be more socially comfortable than working when coworkers or the supervisor are around and could possibly stop by for conversation. Altering one’s schedule may be problematic for the organization if it reduces organizational effectiveness. The impact of social anxiety, whether arising from the anticipatory or post-event processing, can be quite severe. Although the evidence thus far is based on non-organizational settings, the implications for the workplace are significant and worthy of future research.

CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL ANXIETY

In considering the potential consequences for an individual with social anxiety or an employer, it is important to remind the reader that the research thus far has examined this variable outside the organizational context, and perhaps, more importantly, the degree of social anxiety experienced can range from mild or infrequent to pervasive and extreme. Although few may ever experience such extreme social anxiety as to be clinically labeled as social phobic, exploring potential outcomes of mild to moderate social anxiety is important because of the interpersonal nature of many jobs and the relationship between high productivity and effective interpersonal interactions of workers.

For the individual, social anxiety triggers emotional strains, and such strains are sufficiently severe to interrupt the normal functioning of one’s daily activities. Imagine trying to complete the tasks of one’s daily life while consciously redoing one’s daily schedule to avoid interpersonal interactions that potentially could be evaluated by others. A simple example is worrying
about what one wears to work. More complex encounters such as conversations and teamwork come with additional criteria to evaluate; thus the socially anxious person attempts to avoid such encounters.

Social anxiety is accompanied by marked arousal, and socially anxious individuals are particularly hypervigilant for somatic symptoms that may be observed by others (Clark, 2001). Impairment to one’s life can range from severe (Rapee, 1995; Schneier et al., 1994) to significant interference with related problems such as performance anxiety (Beidel & Turner, 1988). Individuals with social phobia also report higher rates of depression and substance abuse (Schneier, Johnson, Hornig, Liebowitz, & Weissman, 1992). More directly relevant to organizational literature, individuals high in social anxiety report impairments to their career functioning (Phillips & Bruch, 1988; Turner, Beidel, Dancu, & Keys, 1986). Research indicates that individuals with the generalized form are more likely to exhibit more severe symptoms and report greater distress than individuals who fear specific situations. Nevertheless, even among subtypes, the degree of severity can vary (Turner, Beidel, & Townsley, 1992).

A second outcome of concern to organizations is the performance of socially anxious individuals. As discussed earlier, individuals with high social anxiety appear to set excessively high standards for success by the individual, thus creating greater anticipatory stress and lower perceived performance. In some situations, the performance of high socially anxious individuals may be lower, possibly reflecting a spiral of anticipated poor performance and higher anxiety, contributing to actual lower performance. During a public speaking task, high socially anxious individuals performed more poorly and appeared more anxious to observers (Ashbaugh et al., 2005), suggesting that such individuals do in fact have greater deficits in their social and performance skills (Creed & Funder, 1998; Norton & Hope, 2001) than low socially anxious individuals.

Another important outcome in organizational settings could be the interpersonal styles of such individuals. Unfortunately, there has been very little research on the interpersonal styles of socially anxious individuals. The few existing studies, conducted outside an organizational context, report that socially anxious individuals exhibit reticent social behavior, lack of assertiveness in groups, and feelings of inadequacy (e.g., Alden & Wallace, 1995; Alden & Phillips, 1990; Leary, Knight, & Johnson, 1987). If similar behaviors occur in the workplace, workers high in social anxiety are unlikely to voice their ideas in groups, speak up during conflicts, and avoid tasks that appear too challenging. “The fearful or avoidant interpersonal styles of socially anxious people can be attributed to feelings of inadequacy,
self-criticism, and fear of negative evaluation” (Darcy, Davila, & Beck, 2005, p. 172). A central criterion of avoidant personality disorder, a type of social anxiety, is a fear of a negative evaluation and discomfort in social or interpersonal situations (Turner et al., 1992). Thus individuals high in social anxiety intentionally avoid interacting with others (e.g., Dow, Bigland, & Glaser, 1985; Leary & Kowalski, 1995), which could lead to lower productivity for the individual, group, and organization. Such individuals are also likely to avoid asking questions for fear of looking incompetent or unprepared. They may seek out jobs or tasks that allow them to work alone.

Another line of research indicates that characteristics of fear, inadequacy, and self-criticism are associated with a dependent interpersonal style ranging from general personality orientations to severe personality disorders. For example, sociotropy, a personality style characterized by dependence on others and a need for relationships, and dependent personality disorder both exhibit themselves in feelings of inadequacy and fears of rejection and abandonment (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Social anxiety is associated with traits of dependent and avoidant personality disorders (Johnson, Turner, Beidel, & Lydiard, 1995; Turner et al., 1992), and avoidant and dependent personality traits frequently co-occur (Trull, Widiger, & France, 1987). The fearful avoidant pattern is characterized by an interpersonal style in which an individual steers clear of others due to fear of rejection. In contrast, the dependent style emerges as preoccupation pattern characterized by an “interpersonal style in which people are excessively dependent on relationships for emotional and tangible support” (Darcy et al., 2005, p. 172). Although this latter style appears to be at odds with a socially anxious style, both patterns of attachment to others arise from a negative self-evaluation (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), and the underlying characteristics of both avoidant and dependent patterns are associated with social anxiety (Eng, Heimberg, Hart, Schneier, & Leibowitz, 2001; Mickelson, Kessler, & Shaver, 1997).

The research on the relationship between social anxiety and dependent or avoidant styles has been conducted outside of the organizational context, examining the outcomes of social anxiety among children, young adults (college students), and clinical patients. However, it is feasible that socially anxious individuals may exhibit similar avoidant and dependent patterns at work where they engage in ongoing important relationships with others and where the relationships can determine important personal outcomes such as promotions, raises, and firings. Socially anxious workers may avoid one individual given the stress associated with the interaction (e.g., a supervisor) while becoming dependent on another person in the workplace as a source
of support. The problem with such a situation is that it may be that the supervisor is the person who can provide accurate advice or change a workload assignment, and the coworker upon whom the socially anxious individual is dependent is insufficiently skilled or empowered to improve the situation. Organizational effectiveness is hindered when workers fail to use the best channels of communication and seek out the best source of information. In the workplace, relationships with coworkers can change over time. Some researchers have examined how the closeness of a relationship influences the behaviors of socially anxious individuals.

Darcy and his colleagues (2005) posit that the most commonly feared social situations for socially anxious individuals (e.g., social gatherings, performance situations, and meeting new people) (Holt, Heimberg, Hope, & Leibowitz, 1992; Turner et al., 1992) typically involve strangers or acquaintances rather than close relationships. While socially anxious individuals may avoid strangers or lesser-known individuals, Darcy et al. propose that the extent to which socially anxious individuals avoid others who are in a closer relationship to them is unclear. There is at least some research that suggests anxious individuals look for support and “depend on close relationships to help them feel better in anxiety provoking situations” (p. 173). However, different close relationships are salient across time and situations. For example, among college students, peers may be closer than parents. Darcy and colleagues found that social anxiety was associated with both avoidant (fearful) and dependent interpersonal styles in relationships with a parent, peer, or romantic partner. Social anxiety was most clearly associated with a dependent interpersonal style in emerging and transitioning relationships, in this study, romantic relationships. This relationship remained significant after controlling for depression, trait anxiety, and anxiety sensitivity.

The findings of Darcy and colleagues suggest that in developing relationships where a specific outcome is desired but still uncertain, individuals higher in social anxiety may be more likely to exhibit a dependent interpersonal style. For example, given that the close relationship with a mother or father has been ongoing, the desired outcome (i.e., the approval or love of a parent) may be less uncertain. Fear of abandonment is likely to be less than fear of a new romantic partner ending a new relationship. In a relationship that is interpersonally close but less stable or certain (e.g., joining a new group, starting a new job, accepting a job transfer, working for a new boss), individuals higher in social anxiety may act in a way that not only reflects their desire for a positive outcome but also reflects their recognition of the uncertainty of the outcome. Given their goals and circumstances,
individuals higher in social anxiety may exhibit a dependent interpersonal style at times and an avoidant style at other times. Avoidance may occur when expected performance levels are perceived to be excessively high such that the chances of successfully meeting the standard, receiving a positive evaluation by a supervisor, or gaining the approval of committee members are perceived to be very low. For example, when one is fearful of public speaking with its given requirements of clear speech, expert content, and physical appearance, the standards of success are usually clear and the individual can more easily evaluate the chances of a successful performance.

Alternatively, when the desired outcomes arise in more ambiguous settings and the expected behaviors are less defined and the standards more subjective (e.g., being perceived to be friendly or interesting to coworkers), individuals higher in social anxiety may perceive their chances of success as still open to possible success and therefore engage in a dependent interpersonal style to gain approval of the target. In the workplace, socially anxious individuals may avoid situations where performance standards are more objective (e.g., leading a group project requiring goals and deadlines) and approach a target for approval when performance is more voluntary or subjectively appraised (e.g., organizational citizenship).

Another negative outcome for socially anxious workers may be reduced support. Because individuals higher in social anxiety have significantly reduced social interaction (Dodge, Heimberg, Nyman, & O’Brien, 1987), they are likely to receive less social support in the workplace. Further, given their deficiencies in interpersonal interactions, they are unlikely to be adept at building a network of support. Outside an organizational setting, researchers have established an association between social anxiety and a variety of indices of impaired interpersonal functioning in both clinical and nonclinical samples (Jones & Carpenter, 1986; Westenberg, 1998). In nonclinical populations, social anxiety in its various forms (e.g., shyness, dominant fear of negative evaluation) has been linked to reduced social support and lower quality relationships (e.g., Montgomery, Haemmerlie, & Edwards, 1991; Schmidt & Fox, 1995). Avoidance patterns, reticence to speak up, hesitance to approach others for assistance for fear of looking weak, and impaired social skills may all contribute to isolation in the workplace, preventing the development of social support networks.

Summerfeldt, Kloosterman, Antony, and Parker (2006) discuss the underlying links between social anxiety and impaired social functioning, focusing on interpersonal competencies. First, they point out that actual social skills deficits have been studied considerably, and there is evidence that social anxiety is associated with impaired social functioning in behaviors
required for interpersonal engagement (e.g., Creed & Funder, 1998). A second mechanism are the distorted cognitive self-appraisals, leading to inaccurate evaluations of one’s own and others’ social behaviors (e.g., Beck et al., 1985; Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). This mechanism does not always reflect an actual deficit but rather what the individual perceives to be deficits. Although these mechanism originate from different sources, they both may significantly influence an individual’s functioning, leading ultimately to “disruptive levels of situations, distress, the appearance of social ineptness, and negative evaluations by others” (Summerfeldt et al., 2006, p. 58). These mechanisms also influence how the individual controls his or her own emotional state during interpersonal interactions. Increased self-focus, anxiety over one’s emotional responses, and inaccurate appraisals of how others observe such responses are a critical component of cognitive appraisals of social anxiety (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997).

Overall, it is likely that individuals high in social anxiety exhibit some deficits in the manner in which they interact with coworkers, and the resulting emotional strain creates additional interference in effective interpersonal interactions.

Additionally, the hypervigilance of individuals high in social anxiety may disrupt their interactions at work and create additional strain. In the last decade, researchers have examined the role of emotional intelligence in interpersonal interactions. Emotional intelligence is “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189). Emotional intelligence reflects both intrapersonal (i.e., emotional) and interpersonal (i.e., appraisal, regulation, and expression of emotions to facilitate performance) competencies (Bar-On, 2000; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). A recent study looked at the relationship between emotional intelligence and social anxiety (Summerfeldt et al., 2006) and found that the intrapersonal domain of emotional intelligence was the best predictor of social anxiety. The intrapersonal domain captures emotional self-awareness and expression and the ability to use emotions in thinking through situations. These findings are consistent with cognitive models of social anxiety, which include the cyclical loop between problematic appraisals and managing one’s emotional state (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997; Wells, 1997). Summerfeldt and her colleagues (2006) posit that the accuracy of an individual’s perceptions of his or her emotions may be a critical component in social anxiety. “People high in social anxiety tend to be hypervigilant for possible signs of anxiety, have lowered flexibility in explaining their anxiety states, misjudge both their severity and visibility to others and
their likelihood of being evaluated by others in negative ways” (p. 64). Overall, the emotional stress felt by socially anxious individuals and their inaccurate perceptions regarding the visibility of their stress may prevent individuals from managing their emotional states, which is often necessary to achieve high performance levels.

Even when socially anxious individuals achieve performance standards, they often underestimate their own performance or use excessively high and personally critical standards (Leary et al., 1988; Rapee & Lim, 1992; Stopa & Clark, 1993, 2000; Wallace & Alden, 1995). The distorted self-evaluations, accompanied by hypervigilance for confirming information, may contribute to disrupted or reduced social performance (Rapee & Hamberg, 1997). Alternatively, individuals high in social anxiety frequently interpret neutral cues in social interactions as threatening (Amir, Foa, & Coles, 1998; Stopa & Clark, 2000). Increased levels of social anxiety are associated with decreased confidence in one’s ability to accurately interpret neutral social interactions (Stopa & Clark, 2000). If an individual worries about his or her ability to accurately perceive social interactions, he or she is more likely to withdraw from situations. Alternatively, interpreting neutral cues as negative are likely to increase levels of perceived conflict. Finally, worrying that one is unable to accurately assess a situation prevents one from choosing the best possible response or course of action.

Individuals high in social anxiety may be less likely to move forward after making a mistake given an impaired ability to learn from experiences involving ambiguous information (Amir, Beard, & Przeworski, 2005) and because they tend to use ruminative coping rather than distraction coping (Kocovski, Endler, Rector, & Flett, 2005). Research findings consistently report that post-event processing occurs following socially distressing events and is correlated with the severity of anxiety regarding social situations (Edwards, Rapee, & Franklin, 2003; Lundh & Sperling, 2002; Rachman et al., 2000). Ruminative coping focuses on felt emotions, a replay of events, and “what if” questions. Distraction coping refers to the extent to which an individual avoids being preoccupied with a problem (e.g., social anxiety) and can think about other more pleasant experiences and engaging in other activities (Kocovksi et al., 2005). Their inability to learn from mistakes and move on may prevent the socially anxious individual from progressing through the organizational structure. Using semi-structured interviews, Hinrichsen and Clark (2004) found that socially anxious individuals were more likely to recall and report on past social failures, dwell on ways to avoid future social situations, catastrophize about the possible consequences of a social encounter, preplan safety behaviors, and create negative and
distorted images of how observers might view them in the situation. Such cognitions could strongly encourage an individual to withdraw or leave an organization. Talented individuals unable to take the chance of publicly making another mistake may leave the organization. Dependent on their specific skills, the individual’s exit may be a significant loss of talent for the organization.

An important outcome for organizations concerns how socially anxious individuals evaluate others. As stated earlier, high social anxiety is associated with very high personal standards and critical self-evaluations. If socially anxious managers use similar standards to rate their subordinates, appraisals of employee performance will be biased. The good news at this point is that this does not seem to be the case. Self-report studies and experimental studies focused on conversational situations have indicated that socially anxious individuals are much more critical when setting performance standards for themselves versus those set for others’ performances (Alden & Wallace, 1995; Clark & Arkowitz, 1975; Roth, Antony, & Swinson, 2001). However, one exception is the research reported by Purdon, Antony, Monteiro, and Swinson (2001). In their study, they found college students with high social anxiety reported that observable signs of anxiety which in others can be indicators of less strength of character and reduced attractiveness. Such results may suggest that under some circumstances, socially anxious individuals do apply higher standards for others than low socially anxious individuals. One limitation of the research study is that it focused on conversations, a situation in which individuals may not automatically know or assume they are being evaluated. Conversations with others do not always carry the notion that what is being said will be evaluated by the other party.

Results remain mixed as to how socially anxious individuals rate others. In an experiment with college students and videotaped presentations, Ashbaugh and her colleagues (2005) found no differences in the ratings of others between high and low socially anxious individuals, which is consistent with Clark and Arkowitz (1975). Purdon and colleagues (2001) found high socially anxious individuals had higher standards for others than low socially anxious individuals. Similarly, Christensen, Stein, and Means-Christensen (2003) found that individuals with high social anxiety tend to apply high standards to others; that is, they rated others more negatively than individuals with low social anxiety. Finally, Alden and Wallace (1995) reported that individuals with high social anxiety had a positive bias when evaluating others. The mixed findings may reflect the different methods and types of social interactions examined in the studies: self-reports, conversations with a
lab assistant, conversations with a fellow lab participant, and an actor in a video giving a speech. Further research examining how the type of social interaction influences how people with social anxiety rate others is needed to help clarify these inconsistencies.

FUTURE RESEARCH

In summary, the psychological literature has provided a significant body of research that discusses the cognitive processes and behaviors associated with social anxiety. Given that individuals bring their personal traits and worries to work, it is surprising that research on the effects of social anxiety has not been conducted in organizational settings. Although individuals with social anxiety do not always exhibit maladaptive social behavior (Leary & Kowalski, 1995), some situations are more likely to elicit such responses. Research is needed in an organizational context that examines the characteristics of situations at work that may contribute to ineffective interpersonal interactions for individuals with social anxiety. One such situation may be team-based work structures. Many organizations have adopted a team approach to increase productivity. Research regarding how high social anxiety influences the operation of team members and team effectiveness is needed.

Social anxiety also appears to have significant consequences for the emotional stress, motivation, and perseverance of individuals. Some evidence suggests that the anxiety generated by “costly” social situations occurs because social phobia is associated with perceptions of loss of control over anxiety symptoms (Hofmann, 2005). Perhaps training could alter the control perceptions of socially anxious individuals. Additional research at the individual level is needed to examine how training may help individuals high in social anxiety cope more effectively and also recognize their achievements, thus breaking the maladaptive cycle of anxiety, ineffective social interactions, performance deficits, and ongoing anxiety.

In this context, the political skill literature may provide some useful insights in how to help individuals cope with potentially stressful interpersonal interactions. Political skill is “the ability to understand others at work and to use that knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal or organizational effectiveness” (Ferris, Davidson, & Perrewé, 2005, p. 6). While individuals predisposed to be socially anxious may never exude the high levels of personal confidence associated with individuals high in political skill, training may increase their confidence to a level that buffers an individual’s tendency to experience stress (Perrewé et al., 2005) in social
situations. Political skill can be developed through a variety of methods including drama-based training, executive coaching, videotaped role-playing, and mentoring (Ferris et al., 2005). Future research is needed to clarify the role that political skill can play for the socially anxious worker.

The shyness literature may offer additional insights into the work outcomes for socially anxious individuals. Shy individuals have been rated more negatively on a variety of interpersonal characteristics (e.g., warmth, likeability, competence) and as less intelligent (e.g., Gough & Thorne, 1986) even though research has not found a relationship between social anxiety and intelligence. Socially anxious individuals often engage in “safety behaviors” (Clark, 2005) as a means to hide their anxiety. For example, fearing a negative evaluation of one’s opinion, an individual may stay silent in a group. “Social phobics’ tendency to continually monitor what they have said and how they think they have been received often makes them appear distant and preoccupied” (Clark, 2001, p. 410). If these findings are supported in studies conducted in an organizational context, the performance ratings of workers high in social anxiety may reflect a “global negative halo in others’ perceptions of socially anxious people” (Alden, 2001) rather than objective performance ratings. Alternatively, individuals high in social anxiety may engage in some types of organizational citizenship behaviors as “safety behaviors” to avoid a negative evaluation. Clearly, more research is needed to determine how the actions and inactions of the socially anxious worker influence the performance appraisal process.

Finally, issues of definition and measurement remain in the social anxiety literature. “Clearly, there is an onus on researchers to be explicit about the terms that they use … [and] to provide details on the measures that operationalize the definition” (Crozier & Alden, 2001, p. 17). Although much is known about social anxiety, there is a need for theoretical and empirical investigations in organizational settings.
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In this chapter we extend previous theory on the effects of stressors at the intersection of the work–family interface by considering the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework. Our central proposition is that stressors in one domain (work or non-work) are associated with criteria in the same domain and across domains through four core mediating variables. Through this theoretical lens we develop a set of propositions, which as a set, suggest that managing the work–family interface involves balancing the offsetting indirect effects of challenge and hindrance stressors.
The increased focus on work–family research in recent years has been sparked by the realization that the roles we fill are not independent of each other, and that participation in one role creates stressful demands that have implications for other roles that may be positive or negative (e.g., Gutek, Nakamura, & Nieva, 1981; Kanter, 1997; Kirchmeyer, 1995). For example, the demands of a high profile work assignment may trigger appraisals that foster positive emotions, which may be transferred to, and thereby enrich, the employee’s non-work roles. However, coping with the demands of this assignment might also require working extra hours, which reduces the time available for meeting important demands of the non-work roles. Being able to understand and predict the full range of positive and negative effects that role demands have may be important to the extent that the roles in which people engage are becoming more intertwined, and the number and intensity of stressful demands that people face in their lives are on the rise (e.g., Miller & Miller, 2005).

Scholars interested in relationships among demands in one role and outcomes in another role (henceforth cross-domain effects) have predominantly approached the issue from one of three general perspectives. The first perspective is that participation in a role results in the depletion of coping resources, and this sapping of resources serves to negatively affect other roles (Barnett, 1998; Eckenrode & Gore, 1990; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Haas, 1999; Rothbard, 2001). The second perspective is that knowledge, skills, and emotions accumulate from participating in one role, and this accumulation can be used to positively affect other roles (Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Marks, 1977; Seiber, 1974).

Although research from both these perspectives has advanced our knowledge regarding the work–family interface, neither perspective has considered that participation in one role may have both positive and negative consequences with respect to attitudes, cognitions, and behaviors in other roles, and also that these cross-domain consequences may be quite different than within domain consequences. In response to this shortcoming, there has been research suggesting that negative and positive cross-domain consequences of role participation occur through independent alternative paths (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 1992a, 1992b; Rothbard, 2001). Unfortunately, research from this third perspective has yet to consider whether and how specific types of stressful role demands influence the negative and positive mechanisms that link work and family. This is an important issue to address given that recent research has demonstrated that relationships among stressors and a wide range of criteria including...

Thus, the general purpose of this chapter is to propose a theoretical framework that could illuminate our knowledge regarding the broad range of consequences that work and non-work role demands have on outcomes in the non-work and work domains. We changed the order of the words “work” and “non-work” in the previous sentence purposefully to highlight that our model is intended to emphasize cross-domain effects – that is, we will offer propositions regarding relationships between work demands and non-work criteria as well as relationships between non-work demands and work criteria. To accomplish this purpose we draw directly from recent stress research that distinguishes among stressors with respect to whether the stressor is typically appraised as a challenge or a hindrance. We integrate this research with the research of work–family scholars (e.g., Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) to suggest that challenge and hindrance stressors have both depleting and accumulating effects on criteria through four mediating mechanisms: strains, affect, productive work time, and coping.

We begin by providing an overview of the three approaches that researchers have used to study relationships among role demands and non-work and work criteria. The overview is important, not only as a historical backdrop, but also because we draw heavily from this previous research in order to develop our theory and propositions. After that, we will overview the research that supports the categorization of work stressors into challenges and hindrances. We then integrate the work–family research with the challenge and hindrance stressor research, and identify mechanisms through which the two types of stressful work demands differentially impact work and non-work criteria. From there, we offer propositions regarding relationships among challenges and hindrances in the work domain and criteria in the work and non-work domains. Finally, we suggest the possibility that, similar to work demands, non-work demands can be classified into challenge and hindrance stressors, and that these non-work demands operate through the same four mediating mechanisms to differentially impact non-work and work criteria. Our proposed model is summarized in two figures – Fig. 1 depicts relationships among work stressors and work and non-work criteria, and Fig. 2 depicts relationships among non-work stressors and work and non-work criteria. We conclude with a discussion on the implications of the model, a few caveats, and suggestions for future research.
OVERVIEW OF THE LITERATURE LINKING STRESS TO NON-WORK AND WORK CRITERIA

There has been a large and increasing amount of research on relationships among work and non-work demands and non-work and work criteria (e.g., Byron, 2005; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005; Rothbard, 2001; Zedeck, 1992) and, as we stated in the previous section, this research can be grouped into three broad perspectives: role depletion, role accumulation, and research that considers both depletion and accumulation processes. Although the theory supporting each perspective is somewhat different, each perspective addresses how demands in one environment impact attitudes, cognitions, or behaviors in another environment. In this section, we briefly review the theory and research from each of these perspectives in order to have a foundation for our proposed integrative framework.

Fig. 1. Indirect Relationships of Work Challenge and Hindrance Stressors. Note. Solid lines represent positive relationships and dashed lines represent negative relationships.
Role depletion theory has its foundations in the conflict perspective (Barnett, 1998; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Haas, 1999) and theories of resource drain (Eckenrode & Gore, 1990; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Rothbard, 2001). At their core, these theories assert that people have fixed amounts of psychological and physiological resources (e.g., time and energy) to expend meeting demands and, accordingly, they need to make tradeoffs to accommodate these limited resources. In essence, using a certain amount of resources in one domain leaves fewer resources for activities in other domains.

There have been many applications of this perspective to understanding the effect that stress has on non-work and work domains, and most propose that stressors that originate in one domain produce strains and consume resources that hinder performance in other domains. As an example, Goode’s (1960) theory of role strain adopts the scarcity hypothesis in which role obligations exceed an individual’s capacity to respond to those
obligations. As another example, role stress theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964) was applied by Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly (1983) to propose a model linking stressors including work conflict, family conflict, and interrole conflict to satisfaction with work, family, and life. They concluded that all three types of conflict were negatively related to their corresponding satisfaction domain (e.g., family conflict–family satisfaction). As a more recent example, Frone, Yardley, and Markell (1997) extended the work of Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992) to illustrate how role overload fostered dissatisfaction in both the work and non-work domains.

As a final example of research from the role depletion perspective, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined role conflict as occurring when stressful demands from one role create strain for an individual that inhibits functioning in the other role. Specifically, they proposed that individuals are faced with stressful demands in both the work (e.g., ambiguity, conflict, low leader support) and family (e.g., low spousal support, husband–wife career dissimilarity) domains, and they hypothesized that stressors in one domain can result in resource depleting strain symptoms, such as anxiety, irritability, fatigue, and depression, which hinder the individual’s ability to meet demands in the other domain. Importantly, although work–family scholars have considered an overwhelming number of constructs that could explain role depletion effects that result from role conflict, Greenhaus and Beutell synthesized the list of possibilities into three categories: strains, time, and behavior. Strains such as tension, anxiety, fatigue, and irritability result in role pressure incompatibility when strain produced by one role makes it difficult to fulfill obligations in another role. Similarly, physical presence or time spent in one role makes it difficult to fulfill obligations in other roles. Finally, the inability to adjust behavior that must be exhibited in one role (aggression at work) makes it difficult to fulfill obligations in another role where different behaviors are expected (loving parent).

**Role Accumulation**

In contrast to the role depletion perspective, theories of role accumulation have their foundations in expansionist theory (Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Marks, 1977; Seiber, 1974), whereby participation in multiple roles can produce positive outcomes for individuals. In general, the three explanations for these positive outcomes at the individual level are positive spillover (e.g., Crouter, 1984; Rice, Frone, & McFarlin,
1992), enhancement (e.g., Seiber, 1974), and enrichment (e.g., Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Positive spillover refers to an increase in the homogeneity of two role domains through the transfer of moods, skills, values, and behaviors (Crouter, 1984). As an example, an individual who is satisfied in the context of her work role will experience feelings of well-being that will translate to satisfaction in the context of her family role (e.g., Rice et al., 1992). Enhancement refers to the benefits that accrue as a result of the learning that occurs as people cope with challenges throughout their life (Seiber, 1974). In essence, enhancement suggests that participation in multiple roles builds resources that safeguard individuals from distress or dissatisfaction in roles that they fill. Finally, enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) refers to the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life (with respect to performance and affect) in the other role through either instrumental (i.e., direct) or affective (i.e., indirect) paths.

Although the spillover, enhancement, and enrichment explanations for role accumulation are distinct, each suggests that the resources (e.g., skills and perspectives, flexibility, psychological and physical resources, social capital, and materials) that are gained (as opposed to lost) as a consequence of trying to cope with stressful demands in one role can be applied to meeting the demands of other roles. In studies focusing on the relationship between stressors and role accumulation, several scholars have shown that stressful demands in the work context such as job scope, discretion, and complexity have positive linkages to home environment, marriage, and child outcomes (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Haas, 1999; Voydanoff, 2001). Similarly, there are studies that indicate that non-work stressors can have positive relationships with work outcomes. As one example, Kirchmeyer (1992b) concluded that organizational commitment and job satisfaction were higher for individuals who spent more time participating in non-work roles such as parenting, recreation, and community work.

In summary, research from several related areas suggests that the resources that are accumulated through participation in one role may be useful in other roles. In essence, therefore, this perspective suggests that the linkage between stressors and criteria across different role domains can be explained by the functional utility of resources with respect to role accomplishment. So, what are these resources and what function do they serve? Carlson et al. (2006) considered the potential set of resources that may be gained through role participation, and concluded that there were four main categories: development, which reflects resources gained through skills and perspectives; affect, which reflects resources gained through a positive
emotional state or attitude; capital, which reflects resources gained through a sense of security, confidence, accomplishment or self-fulfillment; and finally efficiency, which reflects resources gained through a sense of focus or urgency.

Research that Accounts for Both Role Depletion and Accumulation

The research efforts discussed above as a set seem to offer a fairly comprehensive set of explanations for cross-domain effects. Unfortunately, this research does not consider the possibility that stressful demands may result in both negative and positive consequences. However, three related and somewhat recent theoretical perspectives would seem to account for these types of effects: person–environment fit, complementary paths, and alternative linking mechanisms.

Person–Environment Fit

Person–environment fit theory would appear to be well suited to examine the effects of role demands that are both negative and positive. According to this theory, it is not the environment that causes positive or negative effects, but the congruence or fit between the individual and the environment (Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998; French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; French, Rogers, & Cobb, 1974; Holland, 1997). Specifically, when demands in a given role fit the individual’s abilities, or when the environment fulfills the individual’s needs, the individual experiences satisfaction and is more effective in that role. However, when demands in a given role do not fit the abilities of an individual, or when the environment does not fulfill the individual’s needs, the individual experiences dissatisfaction and is less effective in that role (Sacco & Schmitt, 2005).

Edwards and Rothbard (2005) applied the person–environment fit theory to work–family conflict, and suggested that stress arises from the subjective misfit between the person and the environment, not from one or the other separately. Specifically, stress occurs when the environment does not provide adequate supplies to meet the person’s needs, or when the person’s abilities do not meet demands in the environment that are necessary to receive supplies. According to their theory, stress reflected by person–environment misfit leads not only to strains and illness, which are the person’s immediate response to the misfit, but also coping and defense, which are the individual’s attempt to resolve the misfit. However, by casting stress as reflecting misfit that causes sets of negative responses, the person–environment fit perspective does not seem to provide for potentially
positive effects of role accumulation or related positive responses that might result as a consequence of an individual’s misfit with demands that are appraised as being stressful yet challenging (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Complementary Paths
In contrast to the person–environment fit perspective, other research has viewed the role depletion and role accumulation perspectives as complementary paths through which demands associated with role participation in one context impact important outcomes in another context. Kirchmeyer (1992a, 1992b), for example, noted the importance of examining reciprocal influences of multiple role participation, and her results support the idea that being a part of both work and non-work roles can have positive as well as negative consequences. Furthermore, the negative (conflict) and positive (enrichment) paths from work-to-family and from family-to-work may be independent, and thus work and family roles can be conflicting in some respects and enriching in others (Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Kirchmeyer, 1992a, 1995). As another example, Rothbard (2001) found that depletion as well as enrichment processes operated through affect in explaining the relationship between engagement in one role and engagement in the other role.

Alternative Linking Mechanisms
Finally, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) recast the numerous theoretical explanations that scholars have used to link work and family into causal relationships among clearly specified constructs in the two domains. Their review article culminated with an integrative model that included negative as well as positive mechanisms through which role performance in the work and family role domains are connected. The authors also noted that future research should examine conditions under which the alternative linking mechanisms occur. To the extent that our research casts different types of stressful demands as factors that differentially influence the negative and positive mechanisms that link work and non-work, our research is a response to Edwards and Rothbard’s suggestion.

In the next section, we describe the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework. We do so in order to provide the grounding for our propositions that will link different types of stressors to criteria in both the work and non-work domains. Although the framework is yet to be applied to understand cross-domain relationships, it has considered some of the same linking mechanisms that have been used in role depletion and role accumulation research.
THE CHALLENGE STRESSOR–HINDRANCE STRESSOR FRAMEWORK

The traditional stressor–strain perspective suggests that stressors are the stimuli that induce the stress process, and strains such as anxiety, tension, and exhaustion are the fairly proximal and negative outcomes of this process (Jex, 1998). From this perspective, stressors are generally hypothesized to have negative relationships with criteria generally thought to be beneficial to the individual or organization (e.g., satisfaction, commitment, retention, performance, and health and well-being) because strains sap resources and trigger negative feelings and thoughts (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). However, recent research has revealed that, at least within the work domain, stressors tend to be differentially related to work criteria, and that these differential relationships are a function of whether the stressor tends to be appraised by most people as a hindrance or a challenge (Boswell, Olson-Buchanan, & LePine, 2004; Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000; LePine, LePine, & Jackson, 2004; LePine et al., 2005; Podsakoff et al., In press).

Hindrance stressors refer to stressful demands that people tend to appraise as constraining their personal growth, development, and work related accomplishment. Examples of hindrance stressors in the work context include constraints, hassles, resource inadequacy, role ambiguity, role and interpersonal conflict, role dissensus, role interference, role strain, role clarity (reverse coded), role overload, supervisor-related stress, and organizational politics. Challenge stressors refer to stressful demands that people tend to appraise as potentially promoting their personal growth and work-related achievement. Examples of challenge stressors in the work context include qualitative and quantitative workload, time pressure or urgency, responsibility, and job complexity. Although the underpinnings of the distinction between hindrance stressors and challenge stressors have precedence in the stress literature (Selye, 1976; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), researchers have tended to rely on stressor composites that include both challenges and hindrances (e.g., Ivancevich & Matteson, 1983; Sandman, 1992) or narrow stressor measures (most often role conflict and role ambiguity) that are used to indicate the presence of “stress” or the level of that particular stressor. Perhaps as a consequence of this approach to conducting research on stressors, empirical relationships with many important work criteria have been weak and inconsistent (LePine et al., 2005). However, results of two recent meta-analyses provide support for this two-dimensional work stressor framework in terms of clarifying relationships with several important work criteria.
In the first meta-analysis, LePine et al. (2005) used the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework to explain inconsistent research findings regarding the relationship between work stressors and performance. The results of this study demonstrated that hindrance stressors were negatively associated with performance and challenge stressors were positively associated with performance. Importantly, the authors also found that although both stressor dimensions were positively associated with strains that detracted from performance, the two dimensions were differentially related to motivation, which in turn, promoted performance. Specifically, whereas hindrance stressors had a negative indirect relationship with performance through motivation, challenge stressors had a positive indirect relationship with performance through motivation.

In the second meta-analysis, Podsakoff et al. (in press) used the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework to explain inconsistent research findings regarding the relationships among work stressors and a variety of retention related criteria. In general, results indicated that whereas hindrance stressors tended to have dysfunctional relationships with these criteria, relationships with challenge stressors tended to be the opposite. Consistent with the previous meta-analysis, the differential relationships with the more distal criteria were explained by two offsetting mechanisms. Both types of stressors were positively associated with strains that tended to result in higher levels of withdrawal behavior (lateness and absenteeism) and turnover. However, whereas hindrance stressors detracted from job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which in turn increased withdrawal and turnover, challenge stressors promoted these two attitudes, and in turn decreased withdrawal and turnover.

When considered together, the results of these two meta-analyses suggested that hindrance stressors and challenge stressors have differential relationships with most important work criteria, and that the differential relationships can be attributed, at least in part, to three different mediating mechanisms: strains, affect, and motivation. Although to date no one has examined the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework with regard to relationships with criteria in the non-work domain, as described in the previous sections, work–family scholars have considered the role that these, or highly similar, mediating mechanism might play. Thus, it is possible that work stressors are related to non-work criteria in a way that reflects role depletion or accumulation depending on the nature of the stressor under consideration. In the next section, we integrate the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework with the work of those who have identified mechanisms through which role depletion and role accumulation occur.
(e.g., Carlson et al., 2006; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) to propose differential stressor effects across work and non-work domains.

LINKING WORK STRESSORS TO WORK AND NON-WORK CRITERIA

In this section we integrate the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework with work–family research to propose relationships among work stressors and both work and non-work criteria. Although previous research has examined relationships among stressors and work criteria, we offer propositions regarding these relationships for the sake of completeness and symmetry. Moreover, we offer propositions regarding these relationships to illustrate how the stressor effects might have positive relationships with criteria in one domain and negative relationships with criteria in the other domain, and how these effects potentially flip-flop depending on which category of stressor is being considered.

Before moving on, we note that we limited ourselves to considering criteria that have been studied most often in the work and family domains (see Table 1) and that have generally been found to be beneficial to the individual, organization, or family (henceforth “Positive Work Criteria” and “Positive Non-Work Criteria”). Therefore, positive work criteria include job, career, and work satisfaction; job and organizational commitment; reduced turnover intentions and turnover; reduced withdrawal behavior; and job performance. The domain of positive non-work criteria is somewhat more limited due to the breadth of the existing literature. However, this domain includes life, family, marital, and non-work satisfaction; family commitment; reduced absence from home; and general health. We recognize that the non-work criteria are relatively broad and potentially expand across several roles within the non-work domain. However, a focus on more narrow criteria and complex role effects within the non-work domain and across domains is beyond the scope of this chapter. Nevertheless, we briefly discuss the importance of developing and studying narrow non-work criteria later in the Discussion section.

Mediating Mechanisms

As we noted earlier, stress researchers have shown that hindrance and challenge stressors in the work context have effects on work criteria through at least three mechanisms: Strains (e.g., anxiety, burnout), affect
### Table 1. List of Common Stressors and Work and Non-Work Criteria in Work–Family Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Stressors</th>
<th>Non-work Stressors</th>
<th>Positive Work Criteria</th>
<th>Positive Non-work Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge stressors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenge stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job/work time demands</td>
<td>Off-job/work (time) demands</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours work</td>
<td>Hours spent in non-work</td>
<td>Career satisfaction</td>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours overtime</td>
<td>Total hours/week – household/family chores, family pursuits, sports, organized social activities, community activities, social engagements, hobbies, self-education</td>
<td>Work satisfaction</td>
<td>Marital satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work time commitments</td>
<td>Family time commitments/demands</td>
<td>Work commitment</td>
<td>Non-work satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work demands</td>
<td>Parental/childcare demands (time/responsibility focus)</td>
<td>Reduced turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work responsibility</td>
<td>Family/household demands (time/responsibility focus)</td>
<td>Reduced turnover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community demands (time/responsibility focus)</td>
<td>Reduced absenteeism/ tardiness from work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hindrance stressors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hindrance stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work role stress</td>
<td>Family role stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work role ambiguity</td>
<td>Family role ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work role conflict</td>
<td>Family role conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work role/work overload</td>
<td>Family/parental overload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work constraints</td>
<td>Family/spouse conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childcare concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental/childcare demands (Age of youngest child; number of children; misbehavior of children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e.g., happiness), and motivation (LePine et al., 2005; Podsakoff et al., In press). Work–family researchers have concluded that similar concepts underlie relationships at the work–family interface. Research from the role depletion perspective has focused on the role played by strains in explaining cross-domain relationships (e.g., Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Research from the role accumulation perspective has focused on the role played by affect in explaining cross-domain relationships (e.g., Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Finally, research from at least two perspectives has focused on the role of motivation in explaining cross-domain relationships. First, consistent with the role depletion perspective, motivation can be cast as the amount of effort, involvement, or time directed toward the demands of one domain at the expense of the other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Second, consistent with the role accumulation perspective, the cognitions and behaviors in one domain that reflect high motivation and problem-focused coping could transfer to and positively impact attitudes, cognitions, and behaviors in the other domain (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). In our model, we distinguish between these two aspects of motivation, and we henceforth refer to them as productive work time (to reflect productive time in the work domain) and coping (e.g., control and escape).

Although researchers in the work–family domain have identified additional means by which cross-domain effects occur, we focus on the four mechanisms described in the previous paragraph (strains, affect, productive work time, and coping) as the basis for our model. We selected these four mechanisms because they have been studied in the context of both stress and work–family research, and as a set, they would appear to balance the potentially positive effects of role accumulation through affect and coping, with the potentially negative effects of role depletion through productive work time and strains. That being said, we do recognize that our model is incomplete in that there are likely to be additional mechanisms through which cross-domain effects occur. Thus, rather than being the final word on cross domain stressor effects, our model should be thought of as the foundation for future theoretical and empirical work on the topic. Next, we consider how hindrance and challenge stressors should relate to each of the four mechanisms, and through these mechanisms, to work and non-work criteria.

**Linking Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Strains**

*Work Stressors to Strains*

Emotional and cognitive effort associated with the appraisal of and coping with stressors results in strains, and the results from two meta-analyses
suggest that this is true regardless of whether the stressor is a challenge or a hindrance (LePine et al., 2005; Podsakoff et al., in press). Although the overall relationship between stressors and strains can be characterized as being strong, the empirical evidence suggests that the relationship with hindrance stressors may be stronger than the relationship with challenge stressors. Consistent with the results of this research, the first links in our model that we propose are:

1a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to strains.
1b. Work hindrance stressors will be positively related to strains.

**Work Stressors to Work Criteria through Strains**

Strains that result from stressors reflect a reduction of physical energy and mental capacity, and in turn tend to be negatively related to a broad array of positive work criteria (e.g., satisfaction; commitment; reduced turnover intentions; turnover and withdrawal behaviors; and performance). In their meta-analysis, for example, LePine et al. (2005) reported negative indirect relationships between both categories of stressors and performance through strains. As another example, the Podsakoff et al. (in press) meta-analysis indicated dysfunctional indirect challenge and hindrance stressor relationships through strains when predicting retention-related criteria including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intentions to turnover, turnover, and withdrawal behavior. Consistent with the results of this research, we propose that:

2a. Work challenge stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria (e.g., satisfaction; commitment; reduced turnover intentions; turnover and withdrawal behaviors; and performance) through their effect on strains.
2b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on strains.

**Work Stressors to Non-Work Criteria through Strains**

Indirect relationships among work challenge and hindrance stressors and positive non-work criteria (e.g., life, family, marital, and non-work satisfaction; family commitment; reduced absence from home; and general health) through strains have not been explicitly examined. However, according to Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) theory of work–family conflict and research from the resource drain perspective (e.g., Eckenrode & Gore, 1990; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Rothbard, 2001), strains in one domain may make it difficult to meet demands in another domain. Physical,
cognitive, and emotional energy that is drained as a result of stressors in the work domain cannot be applied to demands in the non-work domain resulting in negative effects on positive non-work criteria. In support of the negative relationship between strains and positive non-work criteria, Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000) found moderate negative relationships between work-to-family strain-based conflict and both family and life satisfaction. As more direct support, Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) found that strain in the form of job distress mediated the relationship between work role stress and two non-work outcomes – life distress and physical health. Thus, because work challenges and hindrances positively impact strains, and because strains are negatively related to positive non-work criteria, we propose:

3a. Work challenge stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria (e.g., life, family, marital, and non-work satisfaction; family commitment; reduced absence from home; and general health) through their effect on strains.

3b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on strains.

Linking Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Affect

Work Stressors to Affect

The idea that stressors evoke emotional responses has a long history, and many scholars have noted that the specific nature of the emotional response depends on the nature of the stressor and the way it is appraised (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Lazarus, 1991, 1993; Selye, 1976). On one hand, hindrance stressors tend to evoke negative emotions and attitudes because people tend to appraise them as potentially thwarting their personal growth and goal attainment. On the other hand, challenge stressors tend to evoke positive emotions and attitudes because people tend to appraise them as potentially promoting their personal growth and goal attainment. Although the specific nature of emotional response depends on the relevance and ego-involvement of the demands that are encountered (Lazarus, 1991), negative emotional responses to hindrance stressors include anger, anxiety, and disgust, whereas positive emotional responses to challenge stressors include happiness, joy, and pride.

4a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive affect.
4b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive affect.
Work Stressors to Work Criteria through Affect

Research from several areas suggests that positive affect has positive effects on most work criteria. Results from a recent meta-analysis, for example, suggested that “happy” individuals (i.e., individuals experiencing positive affect) tend to be more successful at work than less happy individuals (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005) and the authors of this meta-analysis noted that “positive emotion, even in the midst of stress or challenge, may be associated with … particular good outcomes” (p. 830). In terms of how affect impacts specific work criteria, positive emotions tend to promote positive job attitudes such as job satisfaction (e.g., Ilies & Judge, 2002), which in turn is beneficial in terms of fostering organizational commitment, and reducing withdrawal and turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Moreover, positive affect appears to have positive effects on expectancy motivation and this, in turn, translates to improved performance (Erez & Isen, 2002).

Given the research outlined earlier suggesting that challenge and hindrance stressors are differentially related to affect, together with the research suggesting that affect promotes positive work outcomes, we expect that challenge stressors and hindrance stressors should have differential indirect effects on positive work criteria through affect. Although there is no direct support for this expectation in the literature, Podsakoff et al. (in press) found that hindrance stressors were negatively associated with job satisfaction and, through this effect, positively associated with withdrawal and turnover. In contrast, challenge stressors were positively associated with job satisfaction and, through this effect, negatively associated with withdrawal and turnover.

5a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive work criteria through their effect on positive affect.
5b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on positive affect.

Work Stressors to Non-Work Criteria through Affect

According to Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theory of enrichment, positive affect is a psychological resource that, when generated in the work domain, may impact outcomes in the non-work domain. Carlson et al. (2006) suggested that when individuals are in a positive mood when they leave work, they likely respond more positively, patiently, and happily to family members, ultimately leading to positive outcomes in the non-work domain. Thus, because hindrance stressors and challenge stressors in the work context evoke negative and positive affect, respectively, and because affect
influences attitudes, cognitions, and behaviors in non-work settings, we propose:

6a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on positive affect.
6b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on positive affect.

Linking Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Productive Work Time

Productive work time, or time spent engaged in work related tasks, is the third factor we propose that underlies relationships among work stressors and criteria in work and non-work domains. Productive work time refers to the physical and cognitive activities that are directed toward the completion of work-related tasks, duties, and responsibilities. Although we draw from research on concepts such as “time spent at work” (e.g., Byron, 2005; Frone, Yardley, & Markell, 1997; Frye & Breaugh, 2004; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992; Spector et al., 2004) and “job involvement” (e.g., Baltes & Heydens-Gahir, 2003; Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; Frone et al., 1992; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1994; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996) to develop our hypotheses relating to the mediating role of productive work time, these concepts are subtly distinct. First, whereas time spent at work could involve any number of activities involving a broad array of motivations, productive work time explicitly reflects motivation directed toward work activities. Second, whereas job involvement reflects a focus on work resulting from an individual’s psychological identity with work (Brown, 1996), productive work time does not imply such a cause for the focus of attention.

Work Stressors to Productive Work Time

As previously noted, challenge stressors are appraised by most people as promoting personal growth and work-related achievement. Accordingly, individuals should be more likely to invest productive work time and energy at work into meeting challenging demands because doing so is believed to be instrumental to achieving intrinsically and extrinsically satisfying outcomes (LePine et al., 2005). In contrast, hindrance stressors are appraised by most people as constraining personal development and work-related accomplishment. Because individuals are not likely to believe that a positive payoff could result from effort expended to meet these types of demands,
individuals should be less motivated to invest their time and energy at work trying to meet them. In addition, because individuals are likely to spend time ruminating about these demands even if they are not actively trying to cope with them, less attention can be focused on meeting other task focused demands.

Although research has not directly examined relationships among challenge and hindrance stressors at work and productive work time, research examining stressor relationships with job involvement and task motivation (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995; Lambert, 1991) provides indirect support for the expected differential relationships. First, several studies in the work–family domain reveal a positive relationship between what could be categorized as work challenge stressors and job involvement. For example, Carlson and Perrewé (1999) found a significant positive relationship between work time demands and job involvement. Research findings are more mixed on the relationship between work hindrance stressors and job involvement, however. As an example, Baltes and Heydens-Gahir (2003) and Carlson and Perrewé (1999) found non-significant relationships between job involvement and stressor measures that appear to reflect hindrances (i.e., Baltes and Heydens-Gahir used a composite measure that included role overload, lack of autonomy, and role ambiguity; Carlson and Perrewé examined work role ambiguity and work role conflict). In the context of research examining the relationship between the two types of stressors and motivation, LePine et al. (2005) reported that work challenge stressors were positively related to work motivation and hindrance stressors were negatively related to work motivation. Consistent with the reasoning outlined in the previous paragraph together with the results of empirical research reported in this paragraph, we propose:

7a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to productive work time.
7b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to productive work time.

*Work Stressors to Work Criteria through Productive Work Time*

The role that productive work time plays in mediating relationships among work challenge and hindrance stressors and positive work criteria has not been directly examined in research, at least to our knowledge. However, researchers have shown that hours at work are positively associated with objective and subjective indicators of career success such as salary, promotion, and career satisfaction (Ng, Eby, Sorenson, & Feldman, 2005).
Because these career success variables reflect positive outcomes in the context of work (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) and because challenge and hindrance stressors should positively and negatively impact hours at work and motivation, challenge and hindrance stressors should have differential indirect effects on positive work criteria through productive work time. The results of the LePine et al. (2005) meta-analysis provide indirect support for this expectation in that challenge stressors and hindrance stressors had significant indirect effects on performance through motivation that were positive and negative, respectively. Accordingly, we propose that:

8a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive work criteria through their effect on productive work time.
8b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on productive work time.

Work Stressors to Non-Work Criteria through Productive Work Time

As we noted earlier, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) and others have suggested that time devoted to demands in one domain reduces the time available for meeting demands in other domains. Thus, if work challenge stressors lead to increased productive work time, time available for non-work demands should be reduced resulting in a negative effect on positive non-work criteria. In contrast, if work hindrance stressors lead to decreased productive work time, time available for non-work demands should be increased resulting in a positive effect on positive non-work criteria. Thus, we propose that:

9a. Work challenge stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on productive work time.
9b. Work hindrance stressors will be positively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on productive work time.

Linking Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Coping

As we mentioned earlier, research from the role accumulation perspective suggests that moods, values, behaviors, and skills that are developed in one context transfer to the other context and influence attitudes, cognitions, and behaviors in that other context (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). As an example, if a job required that employees engage in teamwork behavior, these teamwork behaviors might transfer to the non-work settings and facilitate working together with a spouse to solve household problems.
In the context of our research that draws heavily from the stress literature, we suggest that the coping strategies that are used to address stressors in the work context spill over to the non-work context and impact non-work criteria.

Coping can be defined as a set of strategies that people use to manage stressful demands and the emotions that are associated with the demands (Folkman, Lazarus, Dunkel-Schetter, Delongis, & Gruen, 1986). Although coping can take many specific forms (Latack & Havlovic, 1992), most scholars agree that it is necessary to separate coping that is intended to meet the demand – henceforth, control coping – from coping that is intended to regulate emotions that are associated with the demand – henceforth, escape coping (Kahn et al., 1964; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Control coping involves pro-active take-charge behaviors and cognitions (e.g., working harder, thinking positively about capabilities) whereas escape coping involves withdrawing from the situation in order to create emotional distance (Latack & Havlovic, 1992). Of course, the choice of coping strategy has important implications with regards to how effective people can be in different contexts. Specifically, whereas control coping allows individuals to meet demands they face, escape coping only allows individuals to psychologically adapt to or accept not being able to meet the demands.

**Work Stressors to Coping**

To a large degree, the choice of coping strategy depends on the beliefs people have regarding whether they could meet the demand if they put forth the effort. When people believe they can address a demand, they are more likely to use a control strategy, and when people believe that they cannot address a demand, they are more likely to use an escape strategy. Although there is no direct research that compares the relationship between work challenge stressors and hindrance stressors and coping strategies, we believe that individuals should be more likely to use control coping when confronted with challenge stressors and less likely to use control coping when confronted with hindrance stressors.

Challenge stressors are likely to be associated with control coping because people tend to appraise challenging demands as being more controllable (Boswell et al., 2004) and also because the instrumentality of effort intended to meet the demand is higher (Dewe & Ng, 1999; LePine et al., 2004; Rotondo, Carlson, & Kincaid, 2003). In contrast, hindrance stressors are likely to be associated with escape coping because people tend to appraise hindering demands as being less controllable (Boswell et al., 2004), and because the instrumentality of effort intended to meet these demands is lower (LePine et al., 2004).
10a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to coping using control strategies.
10b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to coping using control strategies.

**Work Stressors to Work Criteria through Coping**
Research on coping suggests that a variety of coping strategies may be effective depending upon the appraisal of the situation (Dewe & Ng, 1999). When a challenge stressor threatens a work goal, control coping is likely to be used, and likely to be more effective with respect to the reduction of strain (Koeske, Kirk, & Koeske, 1993) and the elimination of barriers to positive work outcomes. Moreover, this method of coping results in skills that may be valuable resources when dealing with similar or non-similar work stressors in the future (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

In contrast, although escape strategies may result in some reduction of the strains associated with hindrance stressors (Rotondo et al., 2003), the outcomes from the use of this strategy are generally detrimental to individual (Koeske et al., 1993) and work outcomes (Rotondo et al., 2003). Particularly detrimental would be the use of escape strategies in situations in which control strategies would be most beneficial (e.g., situations in which there is some level of control). Thus, the transfer of skills developed through escape coping to non-similar work stressors would lead to a spiraling effect that would result in negative work outcomes. Thus, because challenge stressors tend to evoke functional control coping, and because hindrance stressors tend to evoke dysfunctional escape coping, we propose that:

11a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.
11b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.

**Work Stressors to Non-Work Criteria through Coping**
As previously noted, Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theory of enrichment suggests that resources generated in the work domain, such as coping skills, may be directly related to high performance in the non-work domain. Building on enrichment theory, we propose that the use of control strategies associated with challenge stressors will be positively related to positive non-work criteria through the transfer of skills gained through effective coping. In contrast, we propose that the use of escape strategies associated with
hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through the transfer of skills that are generally less effective in any situation and clearly ineffective when strategies such as control coping would be optimal. That is, the negative spillover of escape coping behaviors that have either become ingrained as habits or scripts in the work domain or are triggered by similar situational cues in the non-work domain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2005) will influence coping behaviors across domains and result in negative outcomes.

12a. Work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.
12b. Work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.

LINKING NON-WORK STRESSORS TO WORK AND NON-WORK CRITERIA

As we previously noted, research has supported the existence of work challenge and hindrance stressors and their differential relationships with important work criteria (LePine et al., 2005; Podsakoff et al., In press). In the previous section, we proposed that work challenge and hindrance stressors will also have differential relationships with criteria in the non-work domain. In this section, we propose that the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework can be applied to stressors in the non-work domain. There are three reasons why we believe this proposal is reasonable. First, as Table 1 illustrates, individuals engage in a variety of non-work roles and activities that involve demands that most people would appraise as being stressful. Indeed, anyone who cares for children or aging parents, builds or remodels a home, or even coaches a little league team, understands how non-work demands can be appraised as taxing or exceeding their capacity or resources.

The second reason why it seems reasonable to extend the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework to the non-work context is based on results of empirical research. Essentially, there appears to be empirical evidence that supports differential relationships among criteria and non-work stressors that could be categorized as challenges and hindrances (e.g., Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005; Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; Parasuraman et al., 1996). These relationships will be discussed in the following section.
Finally, and maybe most important, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) never suggested that the primary appraisal process was restricted to work demands. Thus, theoretically it should be possible to categorize stressors in the non-work domain into challenge and hindrance stressors by applying their respective definitions. People face non-work demands that they would likely appraise as potentially promoting personal or relationship growth and non-work related achievements and so the existence of non-work challenge stressors seems likely. Stressors that relate to non-work time demands and responsibilities (e.g., family demands, family responsibilities, time commitment to family) could possibly fall in this category. Examples of these stressors might include having to balance several non-work related tasks (e.g., balancing children’s extra-curricular activities and quality family time), having a lot to do (e.g., preparing meals, maintaining a clean house, caring for children), having a high level of non-work responsibilities (e.g., responsibilities associated with caring for children or managing household finances), and having to multi-task non-work related duties (e.g., preparing meals while caring for children). Coping with these types of stressors effectively may bolster a sense of pride and may build skills that can reflect personal growth. These non-work stressors also appear to parallel stressors in the work domain that we categorized as work challenge stressors (e.g., job time demands, work responsibility, and time commitment to work).

When we apply the definition of hindrance stressors to the non-work domain, it is also apparent that there are stressors that people would tend to appraise as potentially constraining their personal or relationship development and non-work related accomplishments. Similar to our categorization of hindrance stressors in the work domain, it seems reasonable to suggest that non-work stressors that relate to non-work overload, conflict, and ambiguity (e.g., parental overload, family-role overload, family-role stress, family-role conflict, and family-role ambiguity) could fit in this category. Examples of these stressors might include not having enough resources (e.g., time, assistance from others, money) to accomplish non-work goals (e.g., needing but not receiving the assistance of the spouse or others for the care of children), having to behave in a certain way to please family members (e.g., taking a high number of unnecessary calls or drop-in visits from family members), and having unclear or ambiguous instructions or tasks (e.g., taking children to after school activities with unclear instructions of where the activities are located or at what time the activities begin). Each of these demands would seem to result in a restriction to one’s personal sense of accomplishment, and they parallel work hindrance stressors such as role overload, work-role conflict, and role ambiguity.
Although we suggested examples of potential non-work challenge and hindrance stressors in the paragraph above, we need to point out that this has not been the subject of any empirical research to date, and the reader should keep this limitation in mind. Future research needs to determine whether it is appropriate to categorize non-work stressors into challenges and hindrances, perhaps following methods used by Cavanaugh et al. (2000). Briefly, the first step would be to develop a comprehensive list of non-work stressors (as identified by researchers and people who are familiar with stressful demands in the non-work domain). Second, this set of non-work stressors could be given to individuals who would then sort the non-work stressors into one of the three categories based on the following definitions: (1) non-work related demands that, although possibly stressful, have associated potential gains for individuals, (2) non-work related demands or circumstances that tend to constrain or interfere with individuals’ personal growth or achievement and that do not tend to be associated with potential gains for the individual, or (3) does not clearly fit either category. Third, researchers could calculate agreement across individuals to provide support for the categorization of non-work stressors into challenges and hindrances.

Of course, it may also be important to examine how individual differences affect the appraisal of non-work stressors as challenges or hindrances (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Although there is evidence that people tend to categorize work stressors as challenges and hindrances with some consistency (e.g., LePine et al., 2005), individual differences may have a non-trivial impact on how individuals appraise non-work demands. As an example, gender impacts the content and level of non-work role demands, and has been found to be an important moderator of relationships studied in work–family research (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). We will return to this point later in the chapter.

In summary, we propose that the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework can be extended to the non-work domain. As in the previous section, we will develop and present propositions for both within and cross-domain effects of challenge and hindrance stressors on non-work and work criteria through the same four mediating mechanisms: strain, affect, productive work time, and coping. Specifically, we will propose that it is through strains that non-work challenge and hindrance stressors are similarly related to non-work and work outcomes; and it is through affect, productive work time, and coping that non-work challenge stressors and hindrance stressors will be differentially related to non-work and work outcomes. The specific relationships are shown in Fig. 2 and the specific propositions are discussed in the following section.
Linking Non-Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Strains

As with work stressors, we propose that there will be negative indirect relationships between non-work challenge and hindrance stressors and non-work and work criteria through strains. Regardless of the context of the demand, the process of appraising and coping with stressors should result in strains, and as we noted previously, strains sap resources that make it more difficult to be effective both within the same domain as the stressful demand and, because of resource drain, across domains as well (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Although the research on indirect effects of non-work stressors that could be categorized as challenges and hindrances is all but non-existent, there are research findings that indirectly support the proposed relationships. In terms of relationships among non-work stressors and strains, Frone et al. (1997) reported a small positive relationship between parenting time (i.e., percentage of time spent on child-related tasks), which we would expect to be a challenge stressor given the focus on time, and family distress. Frone et al. (1992) found a strong positive relationship between family stressors and family distress using a composite measure of family stressors that captured four dimensions of which three would clearly be classified as non-work hindrance stressors (i.e., extent of children’s misbehavior, lack of spouse support, and degree of tension or conflict in the relationship). As another example, Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) found a positive relationship between family role stress, which we would categorize as a hindrance stressor, and family distress. In the end, although there is research that has reported negative relationships among non-work stressors and strains (e.g., O’Driscoll et al., 1992) the majority of the research we are aware of reports positive relationships between what could be categorized as non-work challenge or hindrance stressors and strains.

The research evidence supporting our expectations regarding relationships among non-work challenge and hindrance stressors, strains, and non-work and work criteria is even rarer. In one study, however, Carlson et al. (2000) reported a pattern of relationships that is generally supportive. In this study, there were significant negative relationships between family-to-work strain-based conflict and family satisfaction, life satisfaction, and job satisfaction.

13a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to strains.
13b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be positively related to strains.
14a. Non-work challenge stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on strains.
14b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on strains.
15a. Non-work challenge stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on strains.
15b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on strains.

Linking Non-Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Affect

Research in the work domain indicates that challenge stressors evoke positive feelings and that hindrance stressors evoke negative feelings, and there is no reason to expect differences in the non-work domain. For example, although guiding a small child toward new milestones can be stressful, most people would consider the outcomes of this effort (e.g., the first step or “I love you”) to be rewarding. Accordingly, because these types of time or responsibility demands are viewed as being potentially associated with highly satisfying outcomes, they are likely to evoke positive emotions. These positive emotions, in turn, should motivate people to devote energy towards their children which would promote positive non-work outcomes and, because of the role accumulation processes described earlier, there should be benefits to work outcomes as well. As another example, consider the emotions associated with non-work hindrance stressors such as managing unreliable household service contractors (maid service, lawn and garden service, pool cleaning, repair services, pest control, the cable guy). Making arrangements to be at home for appointments during service hours can certainly be a hassle and evoke some anxiety and frustration, but when the service provider does not show up for an appointment, hot emotions like anger and hostility can result. Regardless of the specific emotions, however, the negative affect that results from hindrances like the one just described should result in negative outcomes in both work and non-work role contexts.

Although we could locate no research which has directly examined the degree to which affect mediates relationships between non-work challenge and hindrance stressors and non-work and work criteria, there are studies that report results that indirectly support this structure of relationships. As one example, Aryee et al. (2005) found that parental work overload, a stressor that we would categorize as a hindrance, was negatively related to
optimism, and that optimism promoted family to work facilitation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and reduced levels of family-to-work conflict. As another example, Parasuraman et al. (1996) reported a significant positive relationship between time commitment to family, most likely a challenge stressor, and family satisfaction. Finally, Carlson and Perrewé (1999) reported moderate negative relationships between two non-work hindrance stressors (family role conflict, family role ambiguity) and family satisfaction. Although there are research results indicating contradictory evidence (e.g., Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; McManus, Korabik, Rosin, & Kelloway, 2002; Parasuraman et al., 1996), these relationships tend to be less consistent, small, or non-significant. Moreover, none of this research was conducted with the intent of studying the role of affect in explaining relationships among criteria and non-work challenge and hindrance stressors. In summary, we propose that,

16a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive affect.
16b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive affect.
17a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on positive affect.
17b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on positive affect.
18a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive work criteria through their effect on positive affect.
18b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on positive affect.

*Linking Non-Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Productive Work Time*

Similar to our earlier propositions, we expect differential relationships between non-work challenge and hindrance stressors and non-work and work criteria through productive work time. However, in contrast to our earlier propositions, the direction of these differential effects will be reversed. That is because non-work challenge stressors should have a negative relationship with productive work time (again, productive work time refers to the amount of energy and time directed toward work tasks) and non-work hindrances should have a positive relationships with productive work time.
On one hand, non-work challenge stressors should be appraised by most people as promoting personal growth and non-work-related achievements and, therefore, individuals are likely to invest time and energy trying to meet these demands. Consistent with resource depletion research (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), more time and energy expended in the non-work domains means that less time and energy is available for meeting demands in the work domain. On the other hand, non-work hindrance stressors should be appraised as potentially thwarting personal development and non-work-related accomplishments and, as a consequence, individuals may be less likely to invest their time and energy trying to meet non-work demands. Moreover, individuals may seek to avoid the hindrances by expending less time and energy in the non-work domain and for two reasons they may end up spending more time and energy in the work domain. First, the workplace may represent a context where individuals can fulfill needs that cannot be met in non-work contexts filled with hindrance stressors. Second, withdrawing from non-work roles by spending more time at work can be rationalized by both the individual and by others in the individual’s non-work role set.

Although the mediating role of productive work time in the relationships among challenge and hindrance stressors and work and non-work criteria has not been studied to our knowledge, there is research on job involvement that indirectly supports the relationships outlined in the previous paragraph. As an example, Parasuraman et al. (1996) found that time commitment to family (a stressor that appears to fit the definition of a challenge stressor) was negatively related to job involvement, and job involvement was negatively (but not significantly) related to family satisfaction and positively related to career satisfaction. In another study, family role conflict (a stressor that appears to fit the definition of a hindrance stressor) was positively related to job involvement, and job involvement was negatively related to family satisfaction and positively related to job satisfaction (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999). Although there is likely to be some contradictory evidence in the literature, there is at least some support for our expectations that non-work challenge stressors have a positive indirect effect on positive non-work criteria and a negative indirect effect on positive work criteria through productive work time, and that non-work hindrances have a negative indirect effect on positive non-work criteria and a positive indirect effect on positive work criteria through productive work time. Thus, we propose:

19a. Non-work challenge stressors will be negatively related to productive work time.
19b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be positively related to productive work time.
20a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on productive work time.
20b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on productive work time.
21a. Non-work challenge stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on productive work time.
21b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be positively related to positive work criteria through their effect on productive work time.

Linking Non-Work Stressors to Work and Non-Work Criteria through Coping

The research that supports systematic differences in coping strategies as a consequence of the way stressors are appraised is not limited to work contexts (Lazarus, 1991). Accordingly, we expect that coping plays a similar role in mediating relationships between non-work stressors and criteria as it did in mediating relationships with work stressors and criteria. First, non-work challenge stressors should result in coping in the form of control strategies, whereas non-work hindrance stressors should result in coping in the form of escape strategies. Also, as previously mentioned, control coping is likely to promote positive outcomes in the non-work domain through the active elimination of barriers; through spillover of coping behavior to other settings, there should be similar effects in the work domain (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). In contrast, escape strategies generally result in outcomes that are detrimental to individuals in the non-work domain (Koeske et al., 1993). Assuming that spillover of coping behavior occurs, non-work hindrance stressors should evoke escape strategies in the work setting, which should in turn result in negative work outcomes. In summary, we propose that:

22a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to coping using control strategies.
22b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to coping using control strategies.
23a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.
23b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive non-work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.
24a. Non-work challenge stressors will be positively related to positive work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.
24b. Non-work hindrance stressors will be negatively related to positive work criteria through their effect on coping using control strategies.

DISCUSSION

There appears to be increasing popular interest in work–family issues (Miller & Miller, 2005). However, although research on the topic has been plentiful, there is room for theorizing that acknowledges the complexities involved in understanding relationships across the two domains. In their content analysis and review of the work–family literature, for example, Eby et al. (2005) urged scholars to examine domain-specific as well as cross-domain effects, explore potential mediating mechanisms, and develop theory and models that could be used to test these relationships. To a large extent, we believe that our research represents a response to these three suggestions.

First, we presented a model that considers both the depleting and accumulating within- and cross-domain effects of challenge and hindrance stressors. Although there has been some recent research that considers both role depletion and accumulation in the same model, our research suggests that this is an absolute necessity. This is because challenge and hindrance stressors likely evoke both role accumulation and role depletion through several different mediating mechanisms, and also because the nature of these indirect effects differ depending on the focal domains of the stressors and the criteria.

Second, we drew from the stress and work–family literatures and suggested four variables that likely mediate stressor–criteria relationships within and across the work and non-work domains. Although considering four mediators allowed us to account for a fairly large number of positive and negative indirect relationships, there are other potential mediators that we did not take into account. For example, Rothbard and Edwards (2000) considered the mediating role played by work and family rewards in their model. We also recognize that these four mediators may be correlated, they may interact with each other, and they may be casually connected. For example, positive affect may be associated with control coping (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005), productive work time may lead to greater strains, and control coping may lead to increased productive work time. Although these types of relationships may exist among the proposed mediators, our purpose was
simply to articulate the possibility of offsetting indirect relationships while holding the other relationships constant. Nevertheless, a more fine-grained examination of these mediators and relationships among them may be necessary in order to move this research forward.

Finally, we offered testable propositions regarding relationships among work challenge and hindrance stressors and work and non-work criteria, and also among non-work challenge and hindrance stressors and non-work and work criteria. Although we acknowledge that support for some of the proposed relationships is more tenuous than others, the model depicts a set of relationships that illustrate the complexity involved in trying to understand how different types of stressors in different domains are likely to differentially impact criteria within and across domains. Moreover, our model specifies relationships among concepts that have been or can be operationalized, and thus the model is presented in a way that is conducive to empirical testing.

Related to the previous point, Eby et al. (2005) suggested that researchers should move away from using objective characteristics of the individual’s work (e.g., number of hours working) and non-work (e.g., number of children, number of hours spent on non-work tasks) roles when predicting work–family outcomes, and instead use detailed conceptualizations of the quality or nature of work and family roles when making predictions. As pointed out by Eby et al. (2005), Zedeck (1992) made essentially the same recommendation over a decade earlier, but researchers still tend to focus on objective characteristics, particularly in the non-work domain. The challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework that we drew from in this chapter seems to provide a basis for understanding the qualitative differences among various work and non-work role demands and, from this understanding, it may be possible to illuminate hidden relationships among stressors and a wide variety of work and non-work criteria.

Limitations and Future Research

Eby et al. (2005) noted that work domain variables are more strongly represented in work–family research than non-work domain variables. Our reading of the literature was consistent with this conclusion and, as a result, we needed to extrapolate from the literature in order to offer tentative sets of non-work stressors that might apply to the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework. We note, however, that the research supporting this categorization scheme in the non-work context is non-existent and, thus, researchers must examine the degree to which people categorize the
non-work stressors into challenges and hindrances along the lines of what we suggested.

Another potential weakness of our research is that we did not include potential moderators in our model. Indeed, research has shown that variables such as gender (Byron, 2005; Eby et al., 2005; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991), family structure (Byron, 2005; Eby et al., 2005), support both at work and home (Byron, 2005; Frye & Breaugh, 2004), and flexibility may impact work–family relationships. As a specific example, Byron (2005) found in a meta-analysis that the percent of females in the sample related significantly to the study effect size for over half of the relationships studied. As another example, Rothbard (2001) found gender differences with respect to the number of work–family linkages (men’s roles were more segmented; women’s role were more integrated), depletion (depletion was found only for women and only in the work to family direction), and enrichment (enrichment was found for men in the work to family direction and for women in the family to work direction). As an example of the potential moderating role played by family structure, Byron (2005) found that the percent of parents in a sample related significantly to the study effect size for over 30 percent of the relationships studied. Finally, given that resources are an important aspect of our model, it is possible that we should have considered the moderating role played by variables such as support and flexibility (Eby et al., 2005). One recent study that examined the effects of family-friendly policies and supervisor support (Frye & Breaugh, 2004) found that both family-friendly policies and supervisor support were significantly negatively related to work–family conflict. Moreover, Byron (2005) found meta-analytic support for significant negative relationships between work support and schedule flexibility and work interference with family and family interference with work, as well as significant negative relationships between family support and family interference with work and work interference with family. Although a full discussion and examination of these moderators is beyond the scope of this chapter, we note the importance of them as potentially affecting the appraisal of non-work stressors as challenges or hindrances and/or affecting the relationships among work and non-work challenges and hindrances and positive work and non-work criteria.

We also note the importance of recognizing that, especially within the non-work domain, individuals may be in several roles simultaneously (e.g., father and little league coach) and challenge stressors and hindrance stressors may have differential effects on the criteria within that domain (e.g., spending more time as a little league coach may increase satisfaction...
and performance for that role but result in reduced family time). Our focus on broad non-work criteria did not enable us to examine these complexities. Future research should focus on the development and study of more narrow criteria within the non-work domain to examine within domain challenge and hindrance stressor effects as well as more specific cross-domain effects.

Finally, we did not address the simultaneous and reciprocal effects of the challenge and hindrance stressors across work and non-work domains. As an example of a situation where the effects would be fairly obvious, the presence of high hindrance stressors in both the work and non-work domains would result in negative outcomes across both domains. However, it is much less clear what would occur if there were high levels of challenge stressors and high levels of hindrance stressors in both the work and non-work domains. Although it is possible to follow the paths in Figs. 1 and 2 to account for the sum of the proposed effects, it may be impossible to accurately estimate the overall effect because the path weights are unknown and also because the effects are likely to be somewhat non-recursive. Although specifying and testing a model that includes each of the potential reciprocal indirect relationships may be impossible, research should at least attempt to begin to account for this type of complexity.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our theorizing suggests that managing the work–family interface involves balancing the offsetting indirect effects of challenge and hindrance stressors in both the work and non-work domains. We proposed that although challenge and hindrance stressors have negative effects within and across domains through strains, challenge stressors may have positive effects within domain, and positive or negative effects across domains through productive work time, coping, and affect. Hindrance stressors, which primarily have negative effects in both domains through strains, coping, and affect, may have positive effects across domains through productive work time. Although our model of cross-domain stressor effects appears to be somewhat complex, it may be necessary to increase the complexity further by considering additional mediators and moderators. Nevertheless, attempts to test our model, at least in part, may broaden our understanding of how work and non-work roles relate to one another. At the very least, we hope that our model serves as the impetus for much needed research in the area.
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ABSTRACT

In this chapter, we review empirical research evidence regarding coping and work–family conflict. Limitations and gaps associated with the existing literature are discussed. Of special note is the finding that there is little systematic research that examines the process of coping with work–family conflict. Building on the general stress and coping literature, we present a theoretical model that is specifically focused on the process of coping with work–family conflict, and highlight presumed personal and situational antecedents. Finally, the chapter concludes with an agenda for future research.

Research on work and family has grown exponentially over the last twenty years. Much of this research focuses on situational characteristics in the
workplace (e.g., role ambiguity, role overload) and at home (e.g., number of dependents, spouse work demands) that affect the level of stress and work–family conflict (WFC) experienced by employees, and more recently, on the factors that enhance or detract from the potential benefits of balancing multiple roles (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). Additionally, work–family researchers have examined what organizations can do, in terms of offering supportive policies and practices, to help their employees manage competing work and family demands (Allen, 2001; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). This research underscores the notion that the organization is a significant source of the problem and that the organization should be a significant part of the solution.

Unfortunately, not all organizations offer supportive work–life policies, provide a supportive environment for taking advantage of these policies, re-design jobs to be more conducive to having a life outside work, or train supervisors to be more understanding of employees’ work–life needs. For employees who work in these kinds of non-supportive environments, a better understanding of how to cope with competing work–family demands and conflicts would be most beneficial to them personally as well as professionally. Unfortunately, while there is a large body of research on coping in the stress literature (see Folkman & Moskowitz, 2004, for a recent review), research that examines coping in the specific context of work and family is limited and fragmented. In their comprehensive overview of the field of work and family, Eby et al., (2005) found that less than 1% of research examined coping as a predictor of work–family conflict. And while there may be an overlap between general styles of coping and specific styles of coping with work–family conflict, researchers have yet to determine whether this is the case. Perhaps more importantly, general models of stress do not reveal the specific characteristics of a stressful episode and its resolution: what happened, how the situation was perceived, what type of coping was used, and the extent to which the coping method was effective (Elfering et al., 2005). As such, we believe that there is a need for a more comprehensive, yet specifically focused, model of coping with work–family conflict than has been examined to date.

In the following sections, we will provide a brief overview of coping as historically and currently viewed in the stress literature, define work–family conflict and describe the current state of research on coping with work–family conflict, and describe the limitations of this research. We will then present a model of the coping process as it relates to work and family, incorporating relevant antecedents from general models of stress and coping, and tailoring them to a situation-specific stressor: work–family conflict.
COPING: THE CONSTRUCT AND ITS HISTORY

According to Folkman and Lazarus, “coping consists of cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person” (Folkman & Lazarus, 1991, p. 210). Our understanding of coping can be enhanced by briefly reviewing the history of coping research because the context in which the research took place over the years has had an impact on its definition and conceptualization. Coping research has gone through several schools of thought, beginning with an emphasis on stable traits, moving toward a more transactional perspective, and most recently, a reconsideration of the role of dispositions in the coping process.

Psychodynamic Perspective

In 1937, Freud argued that coping was a defense mechanism, which included dissociation, repression, and isolation. The researchers during this time focused on coping as relatively stable, consisting of both adaptive (e.g., rational action) and maladaptive (e.g., hostile reactions) mechanisms (e.g., Goldstein, 1973). This approach lost popularity in the 1960s, in part because at the time, personality was thought to be a poor predictor of behavior (Mischel, 1968, as cited in Costa, Somerfield, & McCrae, 1996).

Transactional Approach

The transactional approach was the dominant approach from the 1960s through the early 1980s. It was promoted by Folkman and Lazarus, who maintained that coping was a transactional process, or exchange, between individuals and their surroundings (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Suls, David, & Harvey, 1996). They conceptualized coping as consisting of two types: emotion-focused and problem-focused coping. Whereas problem-focused coping is directly aimed at the source of one’s distress, emotion-focused coping is directed at managing emotions that arise from the stressor (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980). According to this approach, cognitive appraisal of the situation, consisting of primary and secondary appraisals, affects coping. In the primary appraisal stage, the person asks “What do I have at stake in this encounter?” and in the secondary appraisal, asks “What are my coping options and how will the environment respond to the action I take?”
The answer to the secondary appraisal influences coping: problem-focused coping is used if the situation is perceived as changeable, and emotion-focused coping is used in situations viewed as unchangeable (Folkman & Lazarus, 1991). For example, under the assumptions of this model, an employed mother who has a sick child but who also has a supportive parent living nearby, might actively solve the problem by asking her mother to provide back-up care. However, if her mother is unavailable, she might perceive this situation as uncontrollable, decide to stay home with her child, and call her good friend to vent her frustration (emotion-focused coping).

Current Approach: Personality and Situation

The current research approach (1980s to the present) has re-considered the role of personality in the coping process. It is very different from coping research during the transactional era, which for the most part, ignored the role of dispositions. According to Suls et al. (1996), there are two reasons for the renewed interest in the role of dispositions in the coping process. The first is the growing evidence that personality has a strong relationship with behavior (e.g., see Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006). Second, the development of the Big Five by Costa and McCrae (1985) has enabled a more comprehensive approach to understanding the role of personality in coping (Suls et al., 1996). As a result of these developments, current research focuses on the role of both the situation and the person in the coping process. As noted by Costa et al. (1996, p. 47), “for some hardy individuals, all life’s problems are taken in stride; for very vulnerable individuals, even minor disturbances of daily routine can be traumatic.”

Despite the current focus on the person and the situation in understanding coping, there is an on-going debate about the degree to which coping is dependent on the situation versus dependent on personality. In support of the transactional approach to coping, which emphasized that coping involves an interaction between individuals and their surroundings, some research suggests that coping is dependent on the situation. For example, Folkman and Lazarus (1980) conducted a 12-month longitudinal study on occupational stress, coping, and emotions. Each participant described, on average, 15 stressful episodes; each of these was coded for coping style used. Consistency in coping pattern was calculated as the proportion of coping style repetitions within each person. The proportions ranged from 0.073 to 1.00, with a mean of 0.265. The authors concluded that there was more
variability across situations than there was consistency, supporting the situational influence on coping.

There is also research supporting the conceptualization of coping as influenced by personality. For example, Amirkhan, Risinger, and Swickert (1995) looked at the influence of extraversion, optimism, and pessimism on coping. In a study of psychology students at a southern university, each student was randomly assigned to one of four stressor conditions. They were asked to describe a personal stressor that had occurred within the last six months (e.g., personal relationship, difficulty with a school assignment), and indicate how they coped with it. Individuals high on extraversion and optimism were significantly more likely to seek support and less likely to use avoidance coping. Conversely, those who scored high on pessimism used less problem solving and more avoidance types of coping. The type of situation did not change the degree to which personality related to coping mechanisms, supporting the notion that coping is dispositional in nature.

Cross-situational consistency was also found in a study of married couples who were asked to keep a diary for 21 consecutive days indicating problems encountered and coping method used (Stone & Neale, 1984). In general, they found that when the same problem was encountered on multiple occasions, subjects were consistent in their coping style.

Nevertheless, in a recent comprehensive review of coping research, Folkman and Moskowitz (2004, p. 747) argued that “coping is a complex, multidimensional process that is sensitive both to the environment, and its demands and resources, and to personality dispositions that influence the appraisal process of stress and resources for coping.” They further argued that the success of coping efforts needs to be evaluated in the specific context creating the stress, as what is effective in one stressful situation might not be effective in another. Building on this line of thought, we will focus the remainder of the chapter on developing an understanding of the coping process as it relates to managing a specific stressor situation, that of conflict between work and family.

*Coping and Work–Family Conflict*

Work–family conflict has been defined as the extent to which experiences in work and family roles are mutually incompatible (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Recent meta-analytic research supports the conceptualization of work–family conflict as bi-directional, that is, family can interfere with work (FIW) and work can interfere with family (WIF) (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran,
Some authors have suggested that for work–family conflict to occur there must be cross-role interference in performance (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). However, we view work–family conflict as a situation in which demands from one role make it difficult, but not necessarily impossible, to meet requirements in the other role. That is, an episode of work–family conflict may or may not result in a performance decrement. Indeed, we suggest that it is the way in which an individual responds to a particular work–family conflict, what we refer to as episodic coping, that contributes to whether a decrement in performance occurs. That is, some conflicts may be resolved without impacting performance in either role. For example, an employee’s manager asks an employee to work on a Saturday to meet a deadline. That Saturday is also the day the employee is hosting an 80th birthday party for his mother. Thus, the employee is faced with a situation in which work interferes with family. To resolve the conflict, the employee could negotiate with his boss so that he works late each weekday night prior to that Saturday in order to meet the deadline but also be home for the Saturday birthday party. In this case, a work–family conflict occurs, but through an active coping strategy of negotiating with his manager, the employee is able to avoid any decrement in performance in the work or home domain.

In addition to situation-specific episodic coping, individuals might also engage in longer-term, preventive coping. That is, individuals may engage in actions or make decisions that serve to increase or decrease the opportunity for work–family conflict to occur. For example, the employee who turns down a promotion that would require extensive travel because she does not want to spend that much time away from the family is engaging in a preventive coping strategy. Previous research (Nippert-Eng, 1995; Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999; Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000) has shown that individuals proactively manage multiple roles using boundary management strategies tailored to their individual needs for more or less role spillover. These consciously planned strategies can be situated on a continuum ranging from segmentation (i.e., clearly keeping work and family roles separated) to integration (i.e., blurring boundaries between roles in order to be more flexible and available for whatever demands may arise). Thus, we can think of coping in terms of proactive or preventive strategies that individuals take to avoid future work–family conflict as well as more reactive strategies that focus on an immediate conflict (e.g., as when an employee getting ready to leave for work gets a call that the babysitter is sick). Clearly, regardless of the preventive strategies used, some experiences of work–family conflict are likely to take place for individuals engaged in multiple roles, and as a result, a more immediate, reactive form of coping is needed.
Coping with Work–Family Conflict: Research to Date

Research on coping with work–family conflict has spanned over 30 years (see Table 1 for a summary of this research). It began with Hall (1972), who developed a typology of coping based on the role process theory by Levinson (1959). Levinson’s theory included three components: (1) structurally given demands (i.e., norms, expectations, and pressures that guide, impede, or support the functioning of a person in a specific position or role), (2) personal role conception (i.e., the person’s “inner definition” of what someone in his or her position is supposed to think and do), and (3) role behavior (i.e., the ways in which a person acts in relation to organizational norms). Based on these three components, Hall derived coping strategies that could intervene at each level to handle the multiple demands of working parents.

Type I coping, or *structural role redefinition*, involves altering structurally imposed expectations held by others about appropriate behavior. It is considered active coping because the individual is directly attacking the source, or root, of the problem, and is attempting to modify or change the situation (e.g., changing a spouse’s expectations). Research suggests that structural role redefinition is the most effective way of managing work–family conflict (e.g., Kaitz, 1985).

Type II coping, *personal role redefinition*, involves changing one’s attitudes and perceptions of role demands rather than attempting to change the demands themselves. With this strategy, individuals 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 setting priorities (e.g., work supports the family so it comes first), changing one’s perception of what it takes to be “successful” at work or at home (e.g., ignoring social pressures to bake cookies from scratch for the school bake sale), and keeping things in perspective (e.g., focusing on the positive aspects of one’s life).

Hall’s third type of coping, *reactive role behavior*, 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, 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 as it does nothing to change the source of the stress (e.g., Gray, 1983; Hall, 1972).

Much of the research on coping with work–family conflict has used Hall’s typology to conceptualize coping (e.g., Amatea & Fong-Beyette, 1987; Beuttell & Greenhaus, 1982; Kirchmeyer, 1993; Matsui, Ohsawa, & Onglatco,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) and Date</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method, including operationalization of WFC and coping</th>
<th>Research Question or Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams and Jex (1999)</td>
<td>(n = 522) working adults enrolled as part-time students in three universities (52% response rate); 64% female</td>
<td>Survey; used 4-item scale measuring WIF and FIW; 33-item scale measuring time-management behaviors (setting goals, engaging in time management, having a preference for organization)</td>
<td>Do the three types of time management behavior have direct and indirect relationships with WFC?</td>
<td>Some of the time management behaviors had both direct and indirect relationships (through perceived control) with WIF, but only indirect relationships with FIW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amatea and Fong-Beyette (1987)</td>
<td>(n = 135) professional women employed at a southern university</td>
<td>Survey; used open-ended question asking them to describe a role conflict situation and how she coped with it; coping responses were categorized by focus (problem- or emotion-focused) and mode (active or passive)</td>
<td>How do professional women cope with interrole conflict?</td>
<td>The women were more likely to use problem-focused coping strategies (e.g., increase planful role behavior) vs. emotion-focused coping (e.g., tension reduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreassi (2006)</td>
<td>(n = 291) employees in diverse industry settings (response rate ranged from 19–72%); 68% female</td>
<td>On-line survey; used 12-item scale measuring both directions of strain-based and time-based WFC; 12-item scale measuring active and passive coping styles</td>
<td>Is coping the mediator of the relationship between personality and work–family conflict and which coping style is most related to lower levels of work–family conflict?</td>
<td>Passive coping was related to higher levels of WFC (strain and time, in both directions); Active Coping was unrelated to WFC. Passive coping mediated the positive relationship between neuroticism and strain-based conflict and FIW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryee et al. (1999)</td>
<td>n = 243 Hong Kong Chinese employed parents (40% response rate); 55.6% female</td>
<td>Survey; used 10-item scale measuring WIF and FIW; 8-item scale measuring problem-focused and emotion-focused coping</td>
<td>Do emotion- and problem-focused coping moderate the relationship between WIF and FIW and job, family, and life satisfaction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltes and Heydens-Gahir (2003)</td>
<td>n = 241 individuals who filled out a web-based survey (55% response rate); resulting sample was heterogeneous but not random; 69.5% female</td>
<td>On-line survey; used 10-item scale measuring WIF and FIW; 12-item scale measuring selection, optimization, and compensation (a life management strategy of setting goals, acquiring the means to achieve the goals, and determining alternative means to achieve blocked goals)</td>
<td>Is the use of SOC behaviors in the work (family) domain related to lower levels of job (family) stressors? Use of SOC behaviors was related to lower levels of job and family stressors, and lower levels of WIF and FIW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behson (2002), Study 1</td>
<td>n = 141 employees at 10 locations of a large telecommunications company (28% response rate); 54% female</td>
<td>Survey; measured FIW only (items not specified); used 16-item measure of informal work accommodations to family (IWAF), a type of problem-focused coping</td>
<td>Does IWAF moderate the relationship between FIW and work stress?IWAF moderated the positive relationship between FIW and work stress; i.e., employees experiencing FIW experienced less stress when they used informal work accommodations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beutell and Greenhaus (1982)</td>
<td>n = 115 married women with at least one child; the women in the sample were students; husbands also completed a separate survey</td>
<td>Survey; used open-ended questions asking the wives to describe up to three role-conflict situations and how they coped with it; coping responses were classified according to Hall’s three categories</td>
<td>Are women with an external locus of control more likely to use Type III (passive) coping strategies? Is a woman’s role involvement negatively related to Type III coping? Type III coping was not related to locus of control or role involvement; Type III coping was negatively related to the number and importance of non-home roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s) and Date</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Method, including operationalization of WFC and coping</td>
<td>Research Question or Hypotheses</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beutell and Greenhaus (1983)</td>
<td>$n = 115$ married women with at least one child; the women in the sample were students; husbands also completed a separate survey</td>
<td>Survey; used open-ended questions asking the wives to describe up to three role-conflict situations and how they coped with it; coping responses were classified according to Hall's three categories</td>
<td>Is the positive relationship between work–home conflict intensity and Type III coping stronger for women with traditional sex role attitudes? Which type of coping is perceived as more successful?</td>
<td>Women with traditional sex-role attitudes used reactive coping (Type III) more often to deal with role conflicts; Reactive coping was perceived as less successful than more active coping (Types I and II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brink and de la Rey (2001)</td>
<td>$n = 110$ successful South African women of all races (48% response rate); all were married and had at least one child</td>
<td>Questionnaire; used 12-item measure of work–family interaction strain; used 66-item Ways of Coping questionnaire; asked subjects to rate how they would respond to a hypothetical work–family conflict situation; also measured cognitive appraisal (13 items) and perceived control (2 items)</td>
<td>What types of coping strategies do women use to handle work–family “interaction strain?” To what extent does cognitive appraisal influence interaction strain and choice of coping strategy?</td>
<td>Participants preferred to use both problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies, including positive reappraisal, planful problem-solving, self-control, and seeking social support. Cognitive appraisal and perceptions of control were related to lower work–family strain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elman and Gilbert (1984)</td>
<td>$n = 97$ women employed full-time in dual-career families with preschool children; 72% response rate; 52% met inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Survey; used one-item measure of role conflict “How much conflict do you typically experience between your parental and professional roles?” Coping</td>
<td>How do women manage role conflict; which coping strategies are rated as most effective?</td>
<td>Two coping strategies were related to the highest ratings of coping effectiveness: increased role behavior and cognitive restructuring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dimensions included: (1) Structural role redefinition, (2) Personal role redefinition, (3) Increased role behavior (e.g., work more efficiently), (4) Cognitive restructuring, and (5) Tension reduction

Frone et al. (1991)  
$n = 596$ employed individuals randomly selected from a community in NY; 56% female  
In-depth, structured interviews, included both interviewer and self-administered sections; used 4-item scale measuring WIF and FIW; Coping was operationalized as active coping (8 items) and social support (24 items); “mastery” (akin to perceived control) and self-focused attention were also measured  
Hypothesized that active coping, social support, and mastery will moderate (attenuate) the relationship between work stressors, family stressors, WIF and psychological distress (i.e., depression and somatic symptoms); Hypothesized that self-focused attention will exacerbate the relationship  
Hypothesis was not supported for the psychosocial resources of active coping, social support, and mastery (a personality trait); however, self-focused attention had a stress-enhancing influence on the stressors, including WIF

Gilbert and Holahan (1982)  
$n = 57$ females and 28 males enrolled in a large university (82% response rate)  
Survey; used open-ended question asking respondents to describe a role-conflict situation; authors developed a 32-item measure of coping strategies; 8 dimensions were assessed; 1 item measured perceived coping effectiveness  
Hypothesized that the various coping strategies would be differentially related to individuals who viewed themselves as effective copers versus those who viewed themselves as ineffective copers  
High effective copers (both genders) were more likely to use coping strategies of perspective taking; surprisingly, problem-solving was used by both high and low effective copers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) and Date</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method, including operationalization of WFC and coping</th>
<th>Research Question or Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray (1983)</td>
<td>$n = 232$ married professional women (80.6% response rate)</td>
<td>Survey; plus interviewed 15 women in the sample; developed a 16-item measure based on Hall’s typology of coping, other items, questions not specified</td>
<td>What coping strategies are linked to role satisfaction?</td>
<td>Women satisfied with the way they dealt with role strain were more likely to lower their standards for role performance, share household tasks, schedule very carefully; those dissatisfied had no conscious strategy, overlapped roles, attempted to meet all role demands, or kept roles separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall (1972)</td>
<td>$n = 170$ women, a subset of the original sample of 261 female college graduates (58% response rate)</td>
<td>Survey; open-ended questions were used to assess role conflicts and coping; coping responses were categorized according to three coping dimensions determined through an earlier pilot study: structural role redefinition (Type I), personal role redefinition (Type II), and reactive role behavior (Type III)</td>
<td>Is coping style related to satisfaction with coping?</td>
<td>Type I and II coping style and satisfaction were positively (but weakly) related to satisfaction with coping; Type III coping was negatively related to satisfaction, and this relationship was stronger for those who were employed part time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harrison and Minor (1978)  

Survey; used 3 items to assess conflict between 3 roles: wife, mother, and worker (e.g., “Do you see conflict between your role as a mother and your role as a worker?”); Open-ended questions assessed how they coped with conflict

Hypothesized that choice of coping strategy (Type I, II, III) would vary depending on the type of conflict (e.g., wife role vs. worker role; mother vs. worker role)

Type of interrole conflict was related to choice of coping (e.g., for wife vs. worker role, most used Type I coping; for mother vs. worker role, most used Type II)

Kirchmeyer (1993)  

Survey; used 8-item measure of FIW (labeled negative spillover); 16-item scale based on Hall’s 3 types of coping; factor analysis revealed one dominant factor that included items from all three types; also measured positive family-to-work spillover

Hypothesized that more active coping would be related to less negative spillover (FIW) and more positive spillover

The dominant coping factor (combination of Hall’s three types of coping) was positively related to positive spillover and negatively related to negative spillover

Lapierre and Allen (2006)  

Survey; used 12-item scale measuring both directions of time- and strain-based WFC; 6-items measured general problem-focused coping (e.g., becoming more efficient, setting priorities, organization and asking for help); 20 items measured emotional sustenance and instrumental support from the family; 3 items measured family-supportive supervision

Examined how various types of coping are related to work-family conflict as well as affective and physical well-being.

Family and work support (i.e., from supervisor) and use of problem-focused coping were most related to lower levels of WFC and increased well-being. Telework may actually increase the degree to which family time demands interfere with work responsibilities.
### Table 1. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) and Date</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method, including operationalization of WFC and coping</th>
<th>Research Question or Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matsui et al. (1995)</td>
<td>$n = 131$ Japanese married working women</td>
<td>Survey; used 10-item measure of both time-based and strain-based WIF and FIW; 4-item scale measuring two forms of Hall’s Type I coping, structural role redefinition (i.e., work-role and family-role redefinition)</td>
<td>Hypothesized that structural role redefinition would moderate the relationship between WIF and life strain (i.e., the relationship would be weaker when the participants coped via structural role redefinition)</td>
<td>Use of family-role redefinition coping was more common in this sample than work-role redefinition; family-role redefinition moderated the relationship between WIF and life strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paden and Buehler (1995)</td>
<td>$n = 336$ married, employed parents (46% response rate)</td>
<td>Survey; 20 items measuring work-to-nonwork “role spillover,” which they referred to as role overload (e.g., spillover into parent-child relationships, marital relationship, leisure activities); 4 items for role conflict developed for the study (items appeared to be general conflict between work and family); 48 items for coping strategies, which yielded five factors (e.g., planning, withdrawing)</td>
<td>Hypothesized that most of the coping strategies would buffer the harmful effects of role strain, and a few (e.g., withdrawing) would exacerbate the effects, on well-being</td>
<td>For women, planning and cognitive restructuring buffered the influence of role overload/conflict on emotional affect and physical symptoms; for men, cognitive restructuring and withdrawal buffered the relationship role overload and physical symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polasky and Holahan (1998)</td>
<td>n = 103 married professional women, employed full-time, with young children</td>
<td>Survey; 1-item measure of interrole conflict; coping measured as structural role redefinition (11 items) and “Superwoman” strategy (similar to Hall’s Type III coping; 7 items); 1-item measure of coping effectiveness</td>
<td>Hypothesized that participants would use the superwoman strategy more than structural role redefinition</td>
<td>Participants reported using the “Superwoman” strategy more than structural role redefinition (active problem-solving); both strategies were positively related to perceived coping effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotondo et al. (2003)</td>
<td>n = 173 full-time employees of various organizations; 61% female</td>
<td>Survey; 12-item scale measuring both time-based and strain-based WIF and FIW; 24-item scale measuring 4 styles of coping at work or at home: positive thinking, direct action, help-seeking, avoidance/resignation</td>
<td>Hypothesized that positive thinking, direct action, and help-seeking would be negatively related to WIF and FIW, and that avoidance/resignation would be positively related to WIF and FIW.</td>
<td>Help-seeking and direct action were associated with lower FIW. Avoidance/resignation was associated with higher WIF and FIW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinn et al. (1989)</td>
<td>n = 644 full-time employees with children; 23% single mothers, 45% married mothers, 32% married fathers</td>
<td>Survey; 10 items measuring emotion-focused coping, 5 items measuring problem-focused coping; outcomes measured were family (work) satisfaction, family (work) distress, and overall life satisfaction; social support was also measured</td>
<td>Hypothesized that coping would be less effective in the work domain compared to other domains, and that social support would be more helpful in the domain from which the support came</td>
<td>Coping was the most powerful predictor of outcomes, with problem-focused coping associated with positive outcomes (e.g., family satisfaction) and emotion-focused coping associated with negative outcomes (e.g., family distress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s) and Date</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Method, including operationalization of WFC and coping</td>
<td>Research Question or Hypotheses</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiersma (1994)</td>
<td>$n = 24$ (9 men, 15 women) in dual-career couples; white middle-class sample</td>
<td>Interviews; open-ended questions asking them to describe work-home dilemmas, what they did to solve the problem, and the result of their action.</td>
<td>Qualitative study with no hypotheses.</td>
<td>Author created a taxonomy of behavioral strategies for coping with six work-home dilemmas (e.g., conflict or overload due to domestic chores; competition between spouses); coping strategies varied depending on nature of dilemma (e.g., for domestic chores: hire outside help, cognitive reappraisal; for competition: one partner changes careers to avoid conflict).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coping with Work–Family Conflict

For example, Matsui et al., (1995) examined work–family conflict (both WIF and FIW) and coping behavior among a sample of Japanese working women. They defined coping as structural role redefinition, and measured both work–role redefinition (e.g., negotiate with supervisor to alter work activities to be more accommodating of family demands) and family–role redefinition (e.g., change expectations of family members to be more realistic about what can be accomplished domestically). Matsui et al. found that family–role redefinition was effective in moderating the relationship between family–work conflict and life strain, but that work–role redefinition was not.

Kirchmeyer (1993), in a study of Canadian managers, assessed all three types of coping behaviors proposed by Hall (1972) but found that, when the 16-item scale was factor analyzed, only one dominant factor emerged. She referred to this general factor as active coping, and found that it was negatively related to family–work conflict and positively related to positive spillover. Beutell and Greenhaus (1982) asked 115 married women with children to describe three role-conflict situations and how they coped with it, and categorized their coping responses according to Hall’s typology. They found that Type III coping (i.e., reactive or passive coping) was negatively related to life satisfaction, but only when the woman’s husband was dissatisfied with his own life.

Some work–family researchers have conceptualized coping in terms of Folkman and Lazarus’ (1980) two categories of coping: problem-focused and emotion-focused coping (e.g., Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999; Brink & de la Rey, 2001; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Shinn, Wong, Simko, & Ortiz-Torres, 1989). As discussed earlier, problem-focused coping involves addressing the problem directly, and emotion-focused coping involves attempts to reduce or eliminate the negative emotions associated with the problem. In one study, Aryee et al. (1999) examined both emotion-focused and problem-focused coping in a sample of Chinese employed parents in Hong Kong. They found that both forms of coping had direct effects on job and family satisfaction, but not life satisfaction, and that emotion-focused coping moderated the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction only.

Brink and de la Rey (2001), in a study of successful South African women, found that the women preferred to use both problem-focused (e.g., planful problem-solving, accepting responsibility) and emotion-focused (e.g., positive re-appraisal, escape-avoidance) coping strategies. Those who accepted responsibility, normally considered a problem-focused coping style, had higher levels of work–family strain. The authors suggested that perhaps the women in the sample felt responsible for getting their families in a difficult
predicament of work–family conflict, implying that the women felt guilty as a result. Additionally, women who appraised the conflict situation as controllable had lower work–family strain, perhaps because they were less likely to choose escape/avoidance as a coping strategy. The results must be interpreted with caution, however, as the study participants were responding to a hypothetical conflict situation.

Finally, Lapierre and Allen (2006) found that problem-focused coping was negatively related to strain-based family interferes with work conflict (FIW), but not to strain-based work interferes with family conflict (WIF), nor time-based FIW or WIF. Andreassi (2006) found that active coping (planning, direct action, and suppression of competing activities) was unrelated to WFC (both directions), and that passive coping (denial, behavioral disengagement, and mental disengagement) was related to higher levels of WFC (strain-based, time-based, WIF and FIW). In general, research suggests that active, problem-focused styles of coping tend to be more effective than emotion-focused or passive coping (Behson, 2002; Kirchmeyer, 1993).

Other researchers have used alternative ways of conceptualizing coping (e.g., Adams & Jex, 1999; Baltes & Heydens-Gahir, 2003; Behson, 2002; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1991; Gilbert & Holahan, 1982; Paden & Buehler, 1995). For example, 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 FIW and work stress. Baltes and Heydens-Gahir (2003) examined whether the life management strategy of setting goals, acquiring means to achieve the goals, and determining alternative means to achieve blocked goals (what is called the selection, optimization, and compensation (SOC) model of adaptive behavior) would be helpful in managing work–family conflict. They found that individuals who used SOC behaviors were more likely to experience lower levels of family and work demands, and as a result, lower levels of WIF and FIW.

Gilbert and Holahan (1982) developed items to measure cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of coping. Their efforts yielded a 32-item scale that assessed nine dimensions of coping: perspective-taking, problem-solving, recognition of societal influence, expression of feelings, ask others to change, lessen self-demands, calling time out, short-term tension reduction, and depression. Individuals who viewed their coping efforts as effective were more likely to engage in perspective-taking and recognition of societal influences (e.g., “I realize the role of society’s expectations”) than in the other forms of coping. Paden and Buehler (1995) developed a measure of coping
that assessed planning, talking, withdrawing, cognitive restructuring, and limiting job responsibilities. They found weak direct effects of coping on measures of well-being (i.e., emotional affect and psychosomatic symptoms), moderating effects of planning and cognitive restructuring for women, and moderating effects of cognitive restructuring and withdrawing for men. Rotondo, Carlson, and Kincaid (2003) assessed four dimensions of coping, based on Havlovic and Keenan (1991) measure of coping with work stress – direct action, avoidance/resignation, positive thinking, and help-seeking – and found that help-seeking behavior used for family stressors was related to lower time-based FIW, and direct action coping with family stressors was related to lower time- and strain-based FIW. On the other hand, neither help-seeking behavior nor direct action coping focused on work stressors was related to any form of WIF. Avoidance/resignation coping was related to higher FIW and to WIF. Positive thinking was not associated with either form of conflict.

Finally, some researchers have created their own dimensions of coping based on data gained from interviews with women and men struggling with work and family demands (Becker & Moen, 1999; Wiersma, 1994). For example, using the critical incident method, Wiersma (1994) interviewed 24 women and men in dual-career families about work–home dilemmas they had experienced, and how they managed the dilemmas. He classified the critical incidents generated into seven categories of work–home conflict: division of household labor, maintaining social relations, role cycling (it is not clear how this is a conflict versus a strategy for coping), normative dilemmas (e.g., conflict associated with departing from societal expectations), competition between spouses, and relocation. For each category, he created a taxonomy of behavioral coping strategies used by the interviewees to solve the problem. For example, for conflict around domestic chores, strategies included hiring outside help, setting priorities, dividing chores among family members, and cognitive reappraisal.

In summary, despite 30 years of research on coping with work–family conflict, there is still much to be learned. Because researchers have used many different conceptualizations of coping, our ability to cogently integrate existing research is hampered. However, there are some common themes among the studies. In particular, active, problem-focused types of coping appear to be related to lower levels of FIW but not WIF (e.g., Matsui et al., 1995; Kirchmeyer, 1993; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Behson, 2002). However, as mentioned previously, there is some evidence that active coping styles are only effective when the situation is controllable (Vitaliano, DeWolfe, Maiuro, Russo, & Katon, 1990; Valentiner, Holahan, & Moos,
It may be that aspects of the family role are more controllable than work, thus making problem-focused coping tenable (e.g., an employee can hire a babysitter to help pick up a child from daycare, but might not be able to hire an additional employee at work due to budget constraints). Finally, there is fairly consistent evidence that passive coping is related to higher levels of both WIF and FIW (Andreassi, 2006; Rotondo et al., 2003), as well as to decreased life satisfaction (Beutell & Greenhaus, 1982).

**Limitations of the Research**

Although the body of research on coping with work–family conflict has increased and grown more sophisticated over the past several decades, there are several aspects to the existing research that limit our understanding of the phenomenon. For example, because the measurement of coping with work–family conflict has been so varied (e.g., one dimension versus multiple dimensions, generic measures of coping versus situation-specific measures) and the focus of the coping has also varied (e.g., in some studies, respondents were asked to think of a time when they had a conflict, in others they were asked to describe how they generally cope with work–family conflict, and in yet others, they were given a work–family conflict scenario and asked to describe how they would cope with it), it is difficult to compare the findings across studies. Further, the samples on which taxonomies or categories of coping were developed were often small, not representative, and drawn from largely white, middle-class, managerial-level employees (Frone, 2003), thus limiting the generalizability of the research.

Probably the most important limitation of existing research is the absence of longitudinal studies examining the relationship between coping, work–family conflict, and coping effectiveness, thus hampering our ability to draw conclusions about causality. Although it may seem self-evident that a negative correlation between, for example, problem-focused coping and work–family conflict suggests that this coping method is effective, an alternative explanation for this relationship is that because the employee experiences less stress he or she is able to use strategies that are problem-focused in nature. Similarly, perhaps highly stressful conflict situations call for emotion-focused coping initially, but as the crisis abates, problem-focused coping emerges as the appropriate response. It is also possible that certain poorly chosen coping strategies lead to greater levels of work–family conflict. In short, because coping is a dynamic, on-going process, a snapshot at one point in time cannot capture the richness of the interaction between a stressful work–family dilemma and an employee’s response to it, and the subsequent outcome.
Another limitation of existing research is that the relationship between coping and coping effectiveness is still not well understood. Although some researchers have asked participants questions like, “How effective do you think you are at managing the conflict between your professional and parental roles?” (Polasky & Holahan, 1998), the possibility for response bias (e.g., self-serving attributions) is great. Further, assuming that a positive relationship between coping behaviors and well-being is indicative of coping effectiveness ignores the possibility that a third variable explains the relationship. For example, it is likely that certain personality traits (e.g., extraversion) related to coping choice also explain variance associated with well-being. Relatedly, few researchers have examined the conditions under which certain coping behaviors might be more effective than others, and whether certain coping behaviors are more suited for the family domain and others for the work domain (see Rotondo et al., 2003 for an exception). Only one study has examined the extent to which a person’s appraisal of the situation (i.e., the demand or conflict) influences choice of coping behavior (Brink & de la Rey, 2001).

In short, the complexity of the process through which individuals appraise the seriousness of the conflict, evaluate resources available to manage the conflict, and choose the method of coping with the conflict, is not well understood within the context of work and family. To address the above deficiencies, we next present a model of the coping process that has the potential to advance the state of our knowledge to a level more commensurate with the complexity inherent in coping with stress and work–family conflict.

A MODEL OF COPING WITH WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT

Fig. 1 illustrates an extension of Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) model of the stress and coping process, tailored to a situation-specific stressor, work–family conflict. As described earlier, coping refers to the thoughts and behaviors that people use to manage the demands of a situation that are appraised as stressful (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2004). Briefly, the model proposes that when a work–family conflict occurs, individuals first appraise the conflict in terms of whether it is a threat (or not), then secondly, they appraise the situation in terms of what they can do to resolve the conflict. Thirdly, they choose a method with which they attempt to either solve the conflict or manage the emotions associated with the conflict. To illustrate, we build on the example cited earlier regarding an employee asked to work...
on Saturday. When asked by his manager to work on Saturday, the employee would initially appraise the situation in terms of what is at stake. Knowing that he is hosting a family birthday party on Saturday, the manager’s request would be viewed as threatening to the employee’s family role performance. The employee would then consider what he could do to resolve the conflict. This would consist of an evaluation of coping resources available. In this case the employee may consider his manager as a source of social support if the manager has demonstrated consideration for family needs in the past. Lastly, the employee would choose a coping strategy. In our example, the employee chooses to negotiate with his manager regarding the timing of the work that needs to be done. The three phases of appraisal are influenced by individual differences as well as by aspects of the situation. When the choice of coping method fits the situation and resolves the conflict, we can say that the coping method was effective. If effective, work–family conflict should be reduced, role performance should be improved or unaffected, and the strain associated with conflict should abate.

In the next section, we review the three phases, and then describe ways in which the stress and coping process may be influenced by (1) individual differences, including personality, values, and role salience, and (2) the situation, including the degree to which the situation is controllable, or changeable, the supportiveness of the organizational culture, and aspects of the job itself. Specifically, we will examine (1) the ways in which these factors
may influence both the primary and secondary appraisal, as well as an individual’s choice of coping strategy, and (2) how the fit between the situation (e.g., degree of controllability) and the choice of coping strategy (e.g., problem- versus emotion-focused) may influence important work–family outcomes such as role performance, work–family conflict, and strain.

**Phases of the Appraisal Process**

In the *primary appraisal* phase, according to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), individuals appraise the environment to determine whether the event, in this case work–family conflict, is a threat or a challenge to their well-being, or if it is harmless. For example, if the conflict has the potential to constrain or inhibit the attainment of important values (e.g., career success, family harmony), then the conflict may be viewed as a threat, and thus invoke behavior motivated to reduce or manage the threat. In fact, Perrewe, Hochwarter, and Kiewitz (1999) found that a general measure of value attainment mediated the relationship between WIF, FIW, and job and life satisfaction, suggesting that when work–family conflict is perceived as threatening value attainment, job and life satisfaction are compromised. Further, Folkman and Moskowitz (2004) argued that appraisal of events as threatening induces a negative emotional response, which in turn prompts a secondary appraisal.

In the *secondary appraisal*, individuals evaluate the demands, constraints, and resources of the environment, as well as their perceived ability to manage them. Potential existing resources may be social (e.g., spouse support), material (e.g., financial resources) or personal (e.g., ability) in nature. In Lazarus’s model of stress and coping, an individual’s *perception* of the situation’s controllability is an important factor in the secondary appraisal (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). As such, individual differences may factor into the equation of how resources, and one’s ability to handle the threat, are appraised. In addition, the situational context, including the objective degree of controllability as well as the supportiveness of the organizational culture, may influence the secondary appraisal and the subsequent choice of coping strategy.

The third phase of the appraisal process involves *choosing a coping strategy*. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), after a situation has been appraised as a threat, and after resources have been evaluated, individuals select a coping strategy in an attempt to regulate the stressor. These coping strategies include a range of possible actions, and as described earlier, can
generally be categorized as problem-focused or emotion-focused. Finally, emotions are present throughout the stressful encounter. If the encounter has a successful resolution, positive emotions will predominate; if the resolution is unclear or unfavorable, negative emotions will predominate (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2004).

The Person: Impact on the Stress and Coping Process

As noted earlier, the stress and coping literature has long recognized that individual differences influence the stress and coping process. As shown in our model, individual differences can affect exposure to work–family conflict, primary and secondary appraisal, and choice of coping response.

Link Between Individual Differences and WFC

Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) argue that personality influences what they call “differential exposure” to stressors. That is, personality may influence the actual number or type of events that a person experiences and that can cause stress. Within the work–family literature, recent research supports this link between personality and work–family conflict. For example, research consistently shows that individuals higher in negative affectivity (NA) report greater WFC (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Carlson, 1999; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1993; Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002). Indeed, Bruck and Allen (under review) found that NA was the dominant predictor of WFC among a host of known work-related (e.g., work overload) and family-related (e.g., family overload) variables associated with WFC. This is not surprising in that NA has been consistently associated with reports of stressors in the general stress literature (Spector, Zapf, Chen, & Frese, 2000; Staw, 1984). More recently, research has found that self-evaluation traits (i.e., adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, self-esteem) were related to both WIF and FIW, although more strongly to WIF (Beauregard, 2006).

The personality traits that comprise the Big Five have also been associated with work–family conflict. Neuroticism, which is highly associated with NA, has been linked to both WIF and FIW (Andreassi, 2006; Bruck & Allen, 2003; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Wayne, Musica, & Fleeson, 2004). Grzywacz and Marks (2000) found a higher level of extraversion was associated with less negative spillover (both WIF and FIW). Additionally, several studies have found that more conscientious individuals report less WFC and that less agreeable individuals were more likely to reported WFC (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004).
Link Between Individual Differences, Appraisal and Coping Choice

Research examining the influence of individual differences on the appraisal and coping choice process within the work–family context is rare. However, based on the extensive personality and stress literature, we can safely predict that individual differences will relate to the reactions and coping choices individuals make when faced with a work–family conflict. This literature is briefly reviewed in the following sections.

**Personality.** Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) demonstrated that, in addition to differential exposure, personality may lead to “differential reactivity,” or individual differences in the felt intensity or reaction to stress. For example, **locus of control** (LOC) has been associated with various aspects of the stress and coping process, including appraisal and choice of coping (Petrosky & Birkimer, 1991; Sandler & Lakey, 1982). LOC is a belief system regarding the extent to which one’s outcomes and rewards in life are due to factors outside of one’s control, such as luck or fate (external locus of control), or by one’s own actions, such as effort or skill (internal locus of control). Research suggests that LOC may affect the primary appraisal of whether the situation is threatening or not. Specifically, the stronger an individual’s perception of control, the less likely he or she is to appraise a specific situation as harmful or threatening (Folkman, 1984; Rotter, 1975; Schan & Abelson, 1977). Thus, individuals with an external LOC may be more likely to view incidents of work–family conflict as threatening. In addition, LOC may be directly related to secondary appraisal as well as to choice of coping strategy. For example, Petrosky and Birkimer (1991) found that an internal locus of control was related positively to direct coping. Conversely, an external locus of control was related positively to suppression (or avoidance) and negatively to direct coping.

**Self-esteem** also helps shape control beliefs, and ultimately choice of coping strategy. Stress research indicates that self-esteem is an important resource that influences cognitive appraisal and the use of active, problem-focused coping strategies, and as a result, is related to positive coping outcomes (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1989; Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989; Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). Individuals with low self-esteem have been shown to over-generalize the negative implications of failure (Brown & Dutton, 1995). For example, after a failure to successfully negotiate a conflict between work and family, low self-esteem individuals may generalize that failure experience and consider future attempts to negotiate these roles as futile. Judge, Erez, and Bono (1998) found that individuals high in generalized self-efficacy (conceptualized as a combination
of low neuroticism, high self-esteem, and high self-efficacy) had higher job performance. It may be that when faced with a stressful situation at work, someone with a poor self-concept may appraise the situation as one they cannot handle, thus decreasing motivation to solve the problem and resulting in poor performance (Judge et al., 1998). Low self-esteem individuals facing a work–family dilemma may react in a similar manner.

Of the Big Five personality variables, neuroticism and extraversion have received the greatest research attention with regard to choice of coping strategy. For example, Watson and Hubbard (1996) reported that neuroticism was most related to a focus on venting emotions, followed by mental disengagement, behavioral disengagement, and denial. Similarly, Penley and Tomaka (2002) reported that neuroticism was significantly and positively related to defensive and emotional regulation coping styles. McCrae and Costa (1986) report that neuroticism was related significantly to the use of hostile reactions, escapist fantasies, self-blame, sedation, withdrawal, wishful thinking, passivity and indecision, coping styles, which Kardum and Hudek-Knezevic (1996) refer to as immature or neurotic coping. It is also associated with the use of avoidance and distancing coping behaviors, for example, making conscious efforts to avoid thinking about a source of stress in hopes that it will resolve itself (Vollrath, Torgersen, & Alnaes, 1995). Most recently, in a diverse industry sample of employees, Andreassi (2006) found that people high in neuroticism coped more passively, and not surprisingly, had higher levels of FIW and strain-based WIF.

Watson and Hubbard (1996) found that extraverts were more likely to seek social support (consistent with extraverts being sociable) and were positive in their coping style. Nakano’s (1992) results also suggest that extraversion is associated with seeking social support. On the contrary, Penley and Tomaka (2002) found that extraversion was not significantly related to any of the coping styles. This may have resulted from a lack of social resources to draw upon in the short duration of the study.

Watson and Hubbard (1996) discovered that people high in agreeableness were more likely to use positive reinterpretation and planning, while Penley and Tomaka (2002) found that agreeableness was related to higher levels of social support seeking and passive endurance. Individuals high in conscientiousness were more likely to engage in planning and active problem solving and refrain from passive maladaptive coping (Jelinek & Morf, 1995; Vollrath, Banholzer, Caviezels, Fischli, & Jungo, 1994; Vollrath et al., 1995). Penley and Tomaka (2002) found that conscientiousness was related to more active coping. Watson and Hubbard (1996) also found that conscientiousness was significantly and positively associated with active coping,
but conscientious individuals were more likely to engage in suppression of competing activities.

The fifth dimension of the Big Five, *openness to experience*, has also been associated with choice of coping strategy (Jelinek & Morf, 1995; Watson & Hubbard, 1996). For example, Watson and Hubbard (1996) found that openness to experience was most related to a greater propensity to plan, positive reinterpretation and growth, and decreased tendency to turn to religion as a way to cope. Similarly, Penley and Tomaka (2002) found that openness to experience was related to active coping and greater propensity to plan, a component of problem-focused coping.

*Values and Role Salience.* The importance or value that individuals place on work and family has been described by various terms like work/family values or priorities, role salience, and work/family involvement (we will use the term role salience). Role salience influences the interpretation, or primary appraisal, of a work–family dilemma as either a non-event (no problem, or no negative emotion aroused) or as a threat that must be managed. The more salient a role is to an individual, the more time and emotion are invested in the role (Burke & Reitzes, 1991; Lobel, 1991; Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; Stryker & Serpe, 1994), and the more likely it is that the stakes are perceived to be higher in the domain in which the conflict occurs. For example, a person whose work role is most salient may view a request from his boss to stay late as reasonable and thus hardly conflictive, while an individual whose family role is most salient may interpret the same request as a threat to one’s values or one’s family relationships, and consequently, a conflict. And yet, Carlson and Kacmar (2000) found that when individuals valued work over family, they experienced greater FIW and less family satisfaction, which suggests that there is also a direct relationship between values and work–family conflict. Finally, when both family and work salience are high, research suggests that high family salience can counteract the effect of high work salience in its influence on the selection of a family activity (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). When the salience of the work role is low, individuals tend to select a family activity regardless of the salience of their family role.


There are several aspects of the situation that appear to influence the coping process. An important factor is the *controllability* of a stressor, as it can affect the secondary appraisal (What can I do?), the choice of coping strategy, as well as the extent to which a particular coping strategy is effective.
Situations that are controllable are amenable to change, whereas situations that are not controllable, by definition, cannot be changed. An attempt to change an uncontrollable situation would most likely lead to frustration and greater stress. In fact, research has found that active coping styles are most adaptive in situations that are perceived as controllable and passive styles are most adaptive in situations perceived as uncontrollable (Compas, Malcarne, & Fondacaro, 1988; Forsythe & Compas, 1987; Vitaliano et al., 1990). This research suggests a “goodness of fit” between coping style and controllability. When a situation is uncontrollable, the normally adaptive active coping style may be maladaptive because one is attempting to change the source of the stressor when in fact it cannot be altered.

Another important aspect of the situation is the supportiveness of the organization’s culture, as it can affect work–family conflict directly as well as affect the primary and secondary appraisal, and ultimately the choice of coping strategy. Employers offer family-supportive benefits and policies (e.g., flexible work schedules, telecommuting) to help their employees manage work and family, and to symbolize their commitment to work–life balance, but research on the effectiveness of these policies for reducing work–family conflict is mixed. Some research suggests that the policies are related to lower levels of work–family conflict (e.g., Allen, 2001; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Thompson et al., 1999) while other research has found weak or non-existent relationships (e.g., Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, Jahn, Kopelman, & Prottas, 2004; Thompson & Prottas, 2006).

What appears to be more important than specific benefits is how supportive the organizational culture is toward work–life balance (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). A supportive work–family culture allows employees to feel more comfortable using family-friendly benefits like flextime, as they are less likely to worry about possible negative career consequences. Supportive cultures are more likely to have supportive supervisors, thus making it more likely that an employee will feel comfortable requesting help when a conflict between work and family occurs. Finally, a supportive culture is less likely to require workaholic hours of its employees, thus reducing the likelihood that work–family conflict will occur in the first place. As such, a supportive culture can serve a preventive function in the stress process as well as enable employees to more easily manage work–family conflicts after they arise. In fact, employees who work in organizations with supportive work–family cultures report lower levels of work–family conflict (e.g., Allen, 2001; Anderson et al., 2002; Behson, 2005; Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2003; Thompson et al., 1999).
Finally, the nature of the employee’s job may influence the coping process. In particular, research has demonstrated that job autonomy (i.e., discretion over when, where, and how the work is done) is related to the experience of stress, FIW, and positive spillover (Clark, 2001; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2005; Thompson & Prottas, 2006; Voydanoff, 2004). High levels of job autonomy contribute to an employee’s ability to control demands in the workplace, and like a supportive culture, may serve a preventive role in the stress and coping process as well as allow an employee to more easily cope with work–family conflict once it occurs.

Fit Between the Situation, the Person, and Choice of Coping Strategy

Finally, we must consider the importance of the fit between the situation, personality, and choice of coping strategy. For example, at first glance, it may appear that having an internal locus of control is most ideal, yet having an internal locus of control in an uncontrollable situation can lead to frustration and adverse outcomes (Krause & Stryker, 1984; Noor, 2002). Spector, Cooper, and Sparks (2001) and Spector et al. (2002) found in a 24-country study that having an internal locus of control was beneficial for well-being, irrespective of the country or level of individualism. However, their study focused on managers. At lower socio-economic levels, having an internal locus of control may be detrimental because lower salaries, less access to paid domestic help, little or no organizational support, and higher family demands are factors that may contribute to the perception that the situation is uncontrollable or unchangeable.

Another instance where we can see the importance of a fit between individual and situational factors is in the availability and use of coping resources at work, such as flexibility and leave policies. The perceived adequacy of resources, and the subsequent choice of coping strategy, is likely moderated by personality or personal preferences. As suggested earlier, employees may be concerned with possible negative career consequences for using work–family benefits (Anderson et al., 2002; Thompson et al., 1999). People with certain personality traits, such as neuroticism and conscientiousness, may be more concerned about such consequences. In addition, personal preferences may play a role in the perceived adequacy of certain coping resources. In his multi-level fit model of work and family, Poelmans (2003) suggested that high levels of resources may not neutralize high levels of demands if the resources do not fit the demands. For instance, an extensive bundle of flexibility policies (work resources) may not neutralize the aversive effects of unpredictable work hours (work demands). What the employee needs is a specific, relevant fit between demands and resources,
such as a financial compensation for the extra hours and specific childcare support during the hours when he or she is unexpectedly “called for duty.”

A study by Rothbard, Phillips, and Dumas (2005) also demonstrates the need to consider fit. They found that the desire for segmentation moderated the relationship between the policies offered by the organization and individual’s job satisfaction and commitment to the organization. Segmentors, individuals who prefer to keep their work and family roles separate, were less satisfied and committed when they had greater access to integrating policies (e.g., on-site childcare) than when they had less access to these policies. They were more satisfied and committed when they had access to segmenting policies (e.g., flextime). For integrators, individuals who prefer to blend their work and family roles, access to on-site childcare was positively related to job satisfaction. This effect held even after controlling for a wide range of demographic variables.

It is clear that a contingency approach for coping with work–family conflict is needed if we want to predict a bigger portion of the variability in outcomes. Work–family conflict may persist and satisfaction may decrease, even in the ideal and probably rather exceptional circumstance where organizational resources such as work–life policies and managerial support are available, because these policies do not fit with personal preferences. Unfortunately, little or no research has examined the fit between personal and situational factors as it pertains to work–family conflict and coping.

**DISCUSSION**

Although there is a rich body of literature on general stress and coping, the research on coping with work–family conflict as a stressor is underdeveloped. To help guide future research, we presented a process model of coping with work–family conflict, and reviewed factors that may influence coping at three different stages: (1) appraising work–family conflict as a threat, (2) evaluating demands, constraints, and resources of the environment, as well as perceived ability to manage them, and (3) choosing a coping strategy. In addition, we discussed various personal and situational factors that researchers might want to consider as they attempt to more fully understand the stress and coping process as it pertains to WFC. Indeed, an important feature of our coping model is that it is a contingency model. We consider the fit between the situation, personal characteristics and preferences, and the choice of coping strategy, whether episodic or preventive, to be a vital,
Directions for Future Research

Most of the work–family coping literature to date has focused on episodic coping, that is, coping directed at an immediate conflict. However, some of the coping strategies that have been investigated appear to assess preventive coping strategies (e.g., planning). Although this chapter focuses primarily on episodic coping, in our model we distinguish episodic from preventive coping strategies. As noted by Aspinwall and Taylor (1997), proactive (or preventive) coping is one of the missing links in the general stress and coping literature, and this appears to be true in the work–family literature as well. We believe it is important to distinguish between the two forms of coping, as they may be more or less effective depending on when the individual uses them. Future researchers should examine the nature of strategies aimed at preventing the development of work–family conflict versus strategies aimed at addressing specific, unexpected conflict, and compare each in terms of their relative efficacy.

Additionally, more research is needed that examines the effectiveness of various types of strategies used to cope with work–family conflict (e.g., problem-focused, emotion-focused, active versus passive coping), including both short-term and long-term effects. For example, turning down the increased responsibilities associated with a promotion to prevent work–family conflict may have short-term benefits in terms of psychological health, but long-term negative career consequences. Moreover, to predict coping success, we need to think more deeply about what is meant by success. Importantly, effectiveness should be viewed not only from the perspective of the individual experiencing the work–family conflict, but also from other stakeholders such as family members and co-workers. Strategies that benefit family members may not be in the best interest of co-workers, and vice-versa.

To more fully understand work–family conflict and the coping process, it may be useful to consider coping at the level of the couple, in addition to the individual level. Previous research has shown that couples develop joint strategies to deal with work–family conflicts (Gupta & Jenkins, 1985; Becker & Moen, 1999). It may be important to take into account the quality of the marital relationship in terms of trust, communication, and mutual support to understand the likelihood that WFC will occur as well as which coping strategies will be effective for the couple, jointly and individually.
Future researchers may also want to examine family stage as an individual difference variable. The presence and age of children is likely to make a difference in how individuals appraise and react to a work–family conflict, as well as the particular coping strategies selected. Specifically, work–family conflicts that pose a challenge to family life will likely be viewed as more threatening when young children are in the home. Researchers should also consider an individual’s values and role salience, as individual priorities toward career versus family shift at different life stages.

The role of emotions, particularly guilt, in the work–family conflict and coping process is an important topic for future research. As described earlier, emotions are embedded within the appraisal process. However, the role of emotions in the context of work–family conflict has rarely been theoretically explored or empirically examined (see Aycan & Eskin, 2005; Korabik, Lero, & Ayman, 2003, for exceptions). Emotions such as guilt are frequently discussed in association with work–family conflict in the popular press (e.g., Shellenbarger, 2003), and it is surprising that work–family researchers have not explored this powerful emotion. Guilt is an inward-focused emotion that can be defined as a regretful response to real or imagined wrongdoings (e.g., Eisenberg, 2000; Zahn-Waxler, Kochanska, Krupnick, & McKnew, 1990). In the work–family context, guilt may occur over choices made favoring one role over the other when conflicts occur (e.g., missing work when a child is sick) (McElwain & Korabik, 2005).

Research assessing how guilt drives the work–family conflict coping process would be a good place to start in terms of examining emotions. Incorporating emotions into work–family conflict research may also help explain the link between work–family conflict and a variety of health outcomes and behaviors (see Greenhaus, Allen, & Spector, 2006 for a review). For example, research on alcohol abuse has shown that a dominant motive for consuming alcohol is to cope with negative emotions (Cooper, Russell, Skinner, & Windle, 1992).

To further understand the process of coping with work–family conflict, researchers may want to consider emerging theory and research on decision-making in situations of work–family conflict (e.g., Kossek et al., 1999; Greenhaus & Powell, 2003; Poelmans, 2005). Like coping, decision-making is a process that develops over time and is influenced by both individual and situational factors, but focuses more on the cognitive process of how people rationally and actively resolve conflict.

Additionally, emerging theory and research on the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll, 2001) is another potential
avenue for exploration. According to the COR model, individuals seek to acquire and maintain resources, including objects (e.g., shelter), personal characteristics (e.g., self-esteem), conditions (e.g., social support, financial security), and energies (e.g., stamina, knowledge). Stress occurs when there is a loss of resources, or a threat of loss. Resource loss is detrimental because it makes future stressors more difficult to handle, thus creating a spiraling effect of increasing strain, as individuals have fewer and fewer resources to handle stressful situations.

Westman, Hobfoll, Chen, Davidson, and Laski (2005) suggest that COR theory is useful for expanding the theoretical underpinnings of work–family conflict. They argue that WFC represents an especially detrimental form of threat and loss because “the conflicting demands are interdependent; loss of resources in one domain may exacerbate further loss in the other” (p. 185). For example, strain from the work role may drain physical and/or mental energy needed for the family role (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Lapierre & Allen, 2006). By examining coping methods in terms of whether and how they minimize resource loss and/or enhance resource gain, we may increase our understanding of how best to cope with WFC. Further, because of the potential insights of the theory about resources and resource gain/loss, future researchers should consider combining the Lazarus appraisal model and COR theory to enhance our understanding of the coping process. For example, we may find that we should modify our model (Fig. 1) to show that resource availability has a direct effect on work–family outcomes (e.g., having money to hire a babysitter alleviates conflict in having to pick up a child from daycare) as well as indirect effects (e.g., having money increases one’s appraisal that the situation is not threatening and that one can handle it). Examining the two frameworks together may increase our understanding of the complex process involved when coping with work and family stressors.

To address these issues, more methodologically sophisticated studies are urgently needed. Our model suggests that coping is a complex phenomenon that develops over time. Most research to date has relied on self-report survey data collected at one point in time and therefore has not been able to unravel the process. Clearly, more longitudinal and qualitative research is needed to understand the relevant factors influencing coping at different developmental stages. Research programs that include a variety of methods such as qualitative interview studies, experience sampling, critical incident analysis, and experimental designs would bring us closer to an understanding of the process of coping with work–family conflict. In addition to self-report research, we would benefit by using multiple source data
(e.g., evaluation of the effectiveness of coping strategies by the spouse) as well as objective indicators of work–family conflict reactions such as endocrinological assessments. For example, a great deal has been learned about the physiological effects of job stress by examining differences in employee cortisol levels on working and non-working days (see Sonnentag & Fritz, 2006 for a review).

Relatedly, efforts are needed to develop a psychometrically sound measure of coping with work–family conflict. Instead of simply measuring the strategies used by the employees, the instrument should be designed to assess coping as a process. It might, for example, include measures of the frequency, recurrence, and intermediate success of coping strategies, and how this information feeds back into the appraisal of WFC as well as how it affects future choice of coping strategy. Researchers might also consider developing measures tailored to specific stages of the coping process.

Finally, research is needed to test our model in different cultures. As citizens of Western countries we are submerged in rather individualistic and gender egalitarian cultures and may therefore be biased toward coping as a variable to be studied at the individual or dyad level of analysis, with an emphasis on individual antecedents. We call for rigorous cross-cultural research investigating how perceptions of threat, demands and resources, as well as use of strategies are embedded in cultural values. In poor, developing countries with collectivistic values and traditional role expectations, role salience, perceptions of controllability, and the fit between personal characteristics and adequacy of available resources may be of a whole different nature.

To conclude, there is surprisingly little systematic research that examines the process of coping with work–family conflict. We hope that our proposed model will inspire researchers in the growing field of work and family to embark on multi-stage, longitudinal research programs incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods, focusing on theory and instrument development, and distinguishing between episodic and preventive coping. The relevance of this research is clear: The vast majority of employees around the world do not have access to governmental or organizational support, and as a result have to rely mostly on individual, couple or family-based strategies. We encourage future researchers to test and refine our understanding of coping so that ultimately, we can offer models to guide teachers, social workers, family psychologists, and HR professionals to alleviate stress in the fast-growing collective of dual-earner and single-parent families, and improve the harmony between two vital facets of our life: work and family.
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THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF WORKING WITH THOSE YOU LOVE: A DEMAND/RESOURCE PERSPECTIVE ON WORKING WITH FAMILY

Jonathon R. B. Halbesleben and Anthony R. Wheeler

ABSTRACT

Changing work/family dynamics and economic developments have made it more likely that an employee might work with a family member or spouse. Such working relationships offer a unique perspective by which to understand the work/family interface; however, relatively little research has explored the implications of working with family for employee stress and well-being. In this chapter, we review the existing research concerning stress associated with working with family. We integrate this research into broader demand/resource perspectives on employee stress and well-being, highlighting the manner in which working with family provides unique demands and resources through differences in work–family linking mechanisms. We conclude with suggestions for future research that might enhance our understanding of the work/family interface by considering the dynamics of working with family.
Over the course of the last 50 years, ushered by changes in the demographics of the workforce, work and family roles have shifted dramatically. Once considered independent, work and family roles have become more connected (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Increasingly, employees are working with those they love, whether working with parents, siblings, or a spouse; the interconnectedness of work and family roles are particularly salient to these employees. Despite an increase in this type of working arrangement, there has been relatively little research exploring the implications of working with family members for employee stress and well-being.

The goal of this chapter is fourfold. First, we consider the exceptional experience of those employees who work with family members, with the objective of developing a framework by which to understand the unique demands placed and resources gained by those working in such arrangements and the impact this unique situation has on the stress and well-being of individuals who work with their family. Second, we review the existing literature that explores the stress and well-being of those who work with their family, focusing our attention on the literature concerning family business and marital working status. Third, we develop a framework, based on the notions of work–family linkages and demands and resources, to direct future research concerning the stress and well-being of individuals who work with family. Finally, we conclude the chapter by presenting a research agenda of unanswered research questions concerning the impact of working with family on employee stress and well-being. This final portion of the chapter includes potential research directed at the individual, group, and organizational levels of interest.

**PHENOMENA OF WORKING WITH FAMILY MEMBERS**

Prior to a review of the existing literature on stress and working with family, it is germane to briefly specify the population on which we focus in this chapter. We define working with family as a situation where an employee performs job duties either (1) in the same workplace or (2) in the same occupation as someone directly related to them. That is, we are not concerned with the experiences employees who work in a family business have that are not directly related to the other employees, although we address the need for future research in that context later in the chapter. Instead, we focus on relationships falling under the two definitions stated above, as these two working contexts share similar implications in understanding the work–family interface. Thus we begin our review of the existing literature on
stress and working with family. We will focus on two contexts: family businesses and same-career couples.

Family businesses are those in which the owner and at least one family member work (Ward, 1987; Ward & Aronoff, 1990). Estimates suggest that as high as 90 percent of American businesses are family businesses (Zheng, 2002) with similar figures in other parts of the world (Litz, 1995). As such, they represent a critical aspect of the world economy. Moreover, as a large workforce constituency, individuals working in such arrangements offer a unique, yet abundant opportunity to explore the manner in which the work–family interface is altered by the relationships with others at work. While exploration of the work–family interface represents the bulk of research on this topic, a growing trend, that of dual-career couples, presents similar opportunities to explore the demands and resources of the work–family interface.

Fifty years ago, the notion of a dual-career couple was a relatively unique concept in society and had received relatively little attention from academic researchers (cf., Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969). Now that such arrangements have become the norm in Western society (Brett, Stroh, & Reilly, 1992; Gilbert, 1993), attention has diverted from the uniqueness of dual-career couples to the specific relationship between working couples and their work. We have gone beyond simply trying to understand marital status and are now more concerned about marital working status, or the specific type of work done by each of the spouses in a relationship. One relatively new variant in this exploration is the notion of the “same-career couple,” defined by Halbesleben, Zellars, Carlson, Rotondo, and Perrewe (2005) as a situation where both spouses not only work, but work in the same occupation (e.g., both are teachers) or at the same workplace (e.g., both work at the same manufacturing facility). As noted by Halbesleben et al., being a same-career couple offers unique insights to the relationship between work and family. In the next section of this chapter, we review the existing literature on stress within family business and dual-career contexts, focusing on the unique demands placed on family members in such settings.

**STRESS AND WELL-BEING OF THOSE WORKING WITH FAMILY MEMBERS**

*Family Business*

One reason for unique stress experiences among those in family businesses is the possibility of greater role conflict, or incompatibilities between role
expectations (Kahn, Wolfe, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). In a family business setting, the roles of family member and coworker/employee may conflict, increasing the experience of stress. Beehr, Drexler, and Faulkner (1997) suggest that of specific interest is the interrole conflict, or “conflict between demands from people with whom the employee interacts on the basis of two different roles” (p. 298; see also King & King, 1990). They argue that it is not uncommon for work and family roles to have reciprocal impact on each other (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Gupta & Beehr, 1981; Kabanoff, 1980; Schmitt & Bedeian, 1982), but in family business settings, this impact may be more pronounced, because the same people (family members) are involved in both roles (see also Burack & Calero, 1981; Davis & Stern, 1980; Kanter, 1989; Nelton, 1986; Ward, 1987).

Beehr et al. (1997) cited differences between family and business cultures as a key reason for interrole conflict in family organizations (see also Dumas, 1989; Friedman, 1991; Hollander & Bukowitz, 1990; Lane, 1989; McCallom, 1990; Prince, 1990, Rosenblatt, 1991). For example, they note that family expectations with regard to reward distribution (e.g., equal distribution among family members, favored status of family members over nonfamily members) do not typically fit with business values for reward distribution (e.g., based on merit). Such a situation could lead to increased stress for those charged with distributing rewards, family members who may get favored status or who believe they are more deserving than their peer family members, and the nonfamily members who may be frustrated working in what they perceive is an unjust distribution system.

Beehr et al. (1997) tested the notion that work–family conflict and interpersonal conflict would be higher among individuals (both family members and nonfamily members) in family businesses and in nonfamily businesses using a sample of participants from family businesses (51 of which were members of the family, 73 were not family members) and nonfamily businesses (n = 98). Interestingly, they found no differences across the groups. In other words, family members in family business experienced no greater conflict than nonfamily members in a family business or those working in a nonfamily business. Moreover, family members did not differ in psychological strain (measured using Banks et al., 1980 General Health Questionnaire). Their findings call into question the notion that working with family members actually leads to higher stress; in fact, Beehr et al. (1997) note that working with family might have more advantages than disadvantages from this perspective (a point we will revisit). At the very least, their research suggests a need for more research into the presumed increase in stress that is possible when working with family.
As a relatively new area of study, there have been few studies exploring the implications of working in the same occupation or workplace as one’s spouse. The impetus for Halbesleben et al.’s (2005) initial investigation of this phenomenon was to explore the relative influence of sources of social support (e.g., work-related such as coworker support vs. nonwork-related such as spouse support; see also Halbesleben, 2006) and type of social support (e.g., instrumental support vs. emotional support). Research suggests that work-related sources of social support are better at reducing stress and strain, primarily because they are better suited to provide instrumental support that helps to address the source of stress (cf., Halbesleben, 2006). When working with one’s spouse, it would appear that the spouse is in a better position to provide instrumental support than someone who does not work with his or her spouse. As a result of higher overall instrumental support, one would expect spouses in same-career relationships to demonstrate lower levels of strain than those employees not in such relationships. Indeed, in their sample of 609 working adults (149 of which were considered in same-career relationships), it was found that participants in same-career relationships experienced higher perceived social support and lower burnout than their dual-career counterparts.

Further, Halbesleben and Zellars (2006) proposed research directions to consider that have implications for same-career couples. For example, while it appears from the early research that there are benefits of being in a same-career relationship, they noted the possibility that spillover of stress might be facilitated because of less clear boundaries between work and family roles among couples in a same-career relationship, something we expand upon in our model. The broader point is that as researchers continue to study this issue, it will be increasingly important to consider both the positive and negative aspects of being in a same-career relationship. Moreover, as with the study of family business context, the study of dual-career couples needs further theoretical and conceptual grounding. In the next section of this chapter, we develop a theoretically grounded conceptual model for understanding the impact of working with those you love.

A GENERAL FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF WORKING WITH THOSE YOU LOVE

Taken together, the literature on the impact of working with family on employee stress and well-being is currently undeveloped. While a number of
studies have been conducted, we still lack a comprehensive understanding of
the unique experiences of those who work with family. Such an understand-
ing is critical given the large percentage of the workforce that falls into
this situation, whether working in a family business or as part of a same-
career relationship. To help motivate future research on the impact of
working with family on employee stress and well-being, we have developed a
framework for understanding the unique demands and resources faced by
those who work with family.

Our review of the literature concerned with the stress implications of
working with loved ones suggests that such arrangements offer both unique
demands and resources. We acknowledge that the demands and resources
we have discussed are not necessarily unique to the literature (e.g., there are
scores of studies that have investigated social support or role conflict).
However, the manner in which these demands and resources are experienced
is unique among those in family business and same-career situations. As
such, understanding the unique experiences with regard to demands and
resources of employees in these situations is useful not only for illuminating
the experiences of people in these situations, but also in more completely
understanding theories of the work–family interface. In this section, we
integrate the literature involving work–family research that has been pub-
ished to propose a framework on the work–family interface based on the
demand–resources dimension of Person–Environment Fit (PE Fit; Edwards,
1996).

WORK FAMILY LINKAGES AND WORKING WITH
FAMILY

As we rely upon a demand–resources perspective, which is an outgrowth of
the Person–Environment (PE) Fit literature, in this chapter to develop a
more integrated model of the family–work interface, we first must explain
the theoretical framework from which this perspective developed. PE Fit
describes the extent to which the individual and the organization fulfill and
satisfy each party’s needs and demands (Edwards, 1996). Modern concep-
tualizations of PE Fit derive their theoretical foundation from Dawis, Eng-
land, and Lofquist’s (1964) Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA) and from
Holland’s (1959) Theory of Vocational Choice (TVC). Whereas TWA ex-
plores the importance that individuals place on the congruence between
individual needs and organizational supplies, TVC seeks to predict applicant
self-selection into vocations and subsequent jobs within organizations where
applicant personality can be expressed. Research derived from each theory generally agrees that PE Fit is comprised of two dimensions (Tinsley, 2000), supplies-values fit (SV Fit; Edwards, 1992) and demands–resources fit (DR Fit; French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982). SV Fit refers to the fit between an individual’s values and the supply of those values by the organization or the general working environment (Edwards, 1992). DR Fit refers to the extent to which the ability or resources of the individual meet the demands implied by the job, organization, or general work setting (French et al., 1982). Consequently, should the organization fail to supply an individual’s preferred values or should the individual fail to marshal the resources to meet the demands of the job, then strain, stress, and dissatisfaction ensue (Edwards, 1996). Recently, PE Fit, specifically the demands–resources component, has been applied to understand impact of the work–family interface on the individual and the outcomes associated with this interface, namely stress.

Edwards and Rothbard (2000) provided a review and integration of the mechanisms by which work and family are linked. Interestingly, they assumed that in order to describe the linking mechanisms between work and family, there is an underlying assumption that work and family are conceptually distinct. Moreover, they treat these as psychologically distinct facets of an individual’s existence. As a result, they specifically excluded from their review situations, such as family businesses, where work and family were very closely interrelated. We acknowledge that the boundaries between work and family are certainly more blurred when working with family; however, this does not mean that work and family are too integrated to understand the relationships between the two domains in these cases. In fact, one could argue that the mechanisms are actually quite similar in highly integrated situations, only that they provide even stronger linkages between work and family because of the uniqueness of the situation.

There has been a great deal of attention in the literature regarding the manner in which work and family roles can be integrated and strategies that organizations can take to facilitate that integration (e.g., Kofodimos, 1995; Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Polach, 2003; Solomon, 1994). Interestingly, when we consider people who work with family, we have a group of individuals who already have a great deal of integration between the two roles, largely because of the individuals in each role overlap. Therefore, in this section, we summarize the linking mechanisms found in the work–family interface literature, discussing the unique variants of each mechanism vis-à-vis working with family and the high degree of work–family role integration that occurs as a result.
Spillover and Crossover

Spillover refers to situations where one domain has an influence on the other domain that is either positive or negative (Crouter, 1984; Wallace, 1997). Spillover between work and family can emerge in affect, values, skills, or behaviors (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). For example, if excessive fatigue at work were to limit the ability of someone to perform demands inherent in his or her family role (e.g., caring for one’s children), this would be a case of fatigue from work spilling over to the family (Eckenrode & Gore, 1990). On the other hand, an argument with a family member (e.g., death, divorce, sickness, etc.) could cause distraction from one’s work duties (and perhaps lower job performance), leading to spillover from the family role to the work role.

A related issue is that of crossover, a situation that occurs when the attitudes or behaviors of one person affects another person (cf., Westman, 2001; Westman & Etzion, 1999). This is differentiated from spillover in that spillover occurs over work domains rather than over people (Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluk, 2002). Crossover has implications for work–family linkages, particularly when the crossover occurs between spouses. Westman and Etzion (1995) proposed that crossover could occur between spouses because of the interactive influence of demands and moods between spouses. For example, demands on one spouse could create new demands on the other, demands on one spouse could influence the mood of the other, the mood of one spouse could create additional demands for the other, or the mood of one spouse could impact the mood of the other. In a study of 101 couples, they found that burnout scores of one spouse were associated with later burnout scores of the other spouse, suggesting a crossover effect of burnout.

Of course, spillover and crossover can also be positive. For example, positive affect in one role can positively influence the other role. A strong positive relationship between work and family satisfaction has been a common finding in the literature (Gutek, Repetti, & Silver, 1988; Judge & Wantanabe, 1994; Near, Rice, & Hunt, 1980); recent work by Heller and Watson (2005) suggested a spillover from job satisfaction to marital satisfaction (and back) using a diary study. In their study of burnout crossover, Westman and Etzion (1995) also found that sense of control was a key factor in reducing burnout and crossover of burnout. Their findings suggest that resources that help to deal with stress (in this case, sense of control) can crossover, just as stress-related variables had.

Interestingly, Williams and Alliger (1994) found that negative moods were more likely to spillover than positive moods. In their diary study of 41 working parents, they found that unpleasant mood states such as fatigue...
and distress were predicted in one role after they had existed in the opposite role, even after controlling for the trait of negative affectivity. On the other hand, positive states, in particularly elation, only spilled over from family to work domains. They provided a number of possible explanations, including the possibility that the transition from one role to the other is more likely to disrupt positive states than negative states because of the additional demands that are caused by the transition (Mandler, 1990). An implication of these findings, and the suggested mechanism, is that negative states are more likely to spillover, whereas positive states may be more likely to spillover if the transition from one role to the other role is less disruptive. Such may be the case where there is greater integration between work and family, such as when individuals work with family.

Edwards and Rothbard (2000) presented causal models to better understand the four primary types of spillover (mood, values, skills, and behaviors). When applying these models to working with family, it would seem that in such situations, spillover may be facilitated by the increased integration of work and family roles. In this section, we discuss each of the types of spillover and the manner in which working with family serves as a moderator to the causal relationships as elucidated by Edwards and Rothbard. In Fig. 1, we depict the specific nature of the moderating relationships for the four types of spillover.

**Mood Spillover**

Edwards and Rothbard (2000) suggested that mood spillover could work through a variety of paths. First, they specified a positive direct path from work mood to family-role performance to family rewards to family mood (see p. 186 in Edwards and Rothbard for a visual depiction) based on research by Barling and Macewen (1992). In short, a negative mood regarding work would lead to lower performance in the family role, which would make the family role less rewarding, leading to a more negative mood about the family. However, they also noted the possibility of an indirect path, where work mood influences general mood, and that general mood influences family-role performance (see Madjar, Oldham, & Pratt, 2002). Edwards and Rothbard (2000) note that these relationships can work either from family to work or from work to family.

We propose that the links between work and family mood will be altered when working with family because of the higher integration between work and family roles. Specifically, we propose that working with family will moderate the direct relationship between work mood and family-role performance, such that those people who work with family members will
have an enhanced relationship between these two constructs (see Fig. 1). Relationships with people at work can have an influence on mood at work (e.g., Eby, Butts, Lockwood, & Simon, 2004); the personal nature of the relationships with family members makes it more likely that mood will spillover in situations where one is working with family (Goodman & Shippy, 2002).
Moreover, because of the integration of work and family roles, we believe that working with family will also moderate the relationship between work mood and general mood and the relationship between general mood and family-role performance. Due to the high degree of integration between work and family roles, mood changes related to either role are more likely to influence general mood and vice versa. As such, we predict that working with family will have a moderating effect whereby it increases the positive relationship between work (or family) mood and general mood and the relationship between general mood and family (or work) role performance.

**Value Spillover**

Similar to mood spillover, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) predicted both direct paths between work values and family values and an indirect path through general life values. They suggested that one’s work values could directly influence family values (or vice versa), citing as examples the literature finding strong relationships between values on the job and in parenting (cf., Kohn, 1963; Pearlin & Kohn, 1966). However, they also recognize that work and family values together can have an influence in creating a system of general life values that reciprocally influence values in specific domains (Repetti, 1987).

Again, we propose a moderating mechanism influencing the relationships between work and family value spillover (see Fig. 1). Similar to the arguments with regard to mood spillover, the higher integration of work and family roles among family members will facilitate the translation of values from one domain to the other. As such, for individuals who work with family, the relationship between work and family value systems should be greater.

Similarly, the integration of roles in light of working with family should facilitate the relationship between work and family value systems and an individual’s general life values. To integrate this linking mechanism with another, we might expect the moderating effect of working with family on spillover of values to influence work–family conflict. Carlson and Kacmar (2000) proposed a moderating effect between life role values, defined as the relative centrality, priority and importance of work and family, and work–family conflict. For example, centrality of one role over the other was predicted (and found) to increase the likelihood of work–family conflict. If we integrate this with our current thinking regarding working with family, it would suggest reduced work family conflict among those with working with family because of a higher integration of the work and family domain. That integration reduces the likelihood that either work or family would be come hold greater centrality, importance, or priority.
Skill Spillover
Similar to values, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) proposed two pathways, one direct and one indirect, to explain skill spillover between work and family roles. The indirect path suggested that skills from one domain could be integrated into an individual’s general knowledge structure (Lord & Kernan, 1987; Lord & Maher, 1991). They utilize learning transfer research to suggest that skill transfer (spillover) is more likely when it can be abstracted into a general skill set (Guberman & Greenfield, 1991).

Again, it seems that working with family can facilitate skill spillover; as such we predict a similar moderating effect as with mood and value spillover (see Fig. 1). The work/family-role integration allows for easier integration of skills from one domain into the general knowledge set of the individual. For example, social skills learned at work with regard to communicating with coworkers should rather easily transfer to family, in part because the coworkers may be the same people with which the skill was originally learned. In this case, the similarity of the situations (consistency of actors) increases the likelihood that the skill will be integrated into the larger skill set.

Behavior Spillover
As with values and skills, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) proposed both direct and indirect (through habits, scripts, and styles) causal paths between behaviors and work and with family. The direct path is reflected when behaviors from one domain directly translate to the other domain; they argue that this is more likely when situational cues between the two domains are similar (Mischel, 1977); for example, a teacher’s interactions with children in the classroom and with their own children are likely similar because the situational cues are so similar (Ipsa, Gray, & Thornburg, 1984). However, behaviors can have a less direct spillover by developing into habits or styles of interaction. For instance, if an employee develops a very formal interaction style with his or her coworkers, he or she may develop a habit for such an interaction style that translates to changes in the manner in which he or she interacts with family members. As with values and skills, we argue that working with family can increase the likelihood of behavioral spillover (see Fig. 1). Because of the similarity in situations in the work and family domains inherent in these situations, one would expect an increased likelihood of spillover.

In summary, we predict that working with family will moderate the spillover of mood, values, skills, and behaviors because of the greater integration of the work and family roles. As such, we contend that Edwards and Rothbard’s (2000) exclusion of contexts involved in working with family is a
key omission, as understanding the moderating effect of working with family provides a greater understanding of spillover generally.

**Proposition 1.** Spillover of mood, values, skills, and behavior is moderated by working with family such that working with family increases the likelihood of spillover.

**Compensation**

Compensation occurs when someone seeks to make up for negative aspects of one domain (family or work) by relying more on the other domain (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992). Compensation may take a number of forms. For example, a person who finds one domain particularly dissatisfying may increase their participation or involvement in a more satisfying (or at least less dissatisfying) domain (Champoux, 1978; Evans & Bartolome, 1984; Lambert, 1990; Staines, 1980). Edwards and Rothbard (2000) regard this as an attempt to reallocate the importance of domains for the person; by spending more time or attention on one domain it indicates that the domain is more important to the individual (Lobel, 1991; Small & Riley, 1990).

Similarly, someone who is dissatisfied with one role domain may seek out rewards in the other domain in order to bolster one’s overall collection of rewards across domains (called supplemental compensation; Evans & Bartolome, 1986; Kando & Summers, 1971). This might be the person who has very little power at work; to compensate they attempt to exert extra power in their family. Alternatively, a person with a negative experience in one domain could attempt to address that negative experience in the other domain (called reactive compensation; Kando & Summers, 1971). An example would be the employee who rests at home after a particularly busy day at work. Note that the reallocation of importance and seeking out rewards are interrelated strategies, as greater involvement may increase the possibility of rewards and greater rewards may increase the motivation to reallocate involvement (Edwards, 1992; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

The literature on the self-concept provides insight into the issue of compensation, whether supplemental or not. Donahue, Robins, Roberts, and John (1993) found that individuals categorize their self-concept (e.g., who they are) by utilizing several distinct categories that roughly relate to the roles to which the individuals ascribe. Linville (1987) identified several categories, such as social roles, relationships, traits, and goals. Importantly,
this categorization of the self-concept allows individuals to shift emotional resources between the roles so that a negative event impacting one distinct role can be offset by shifting resources to the impacted facet of the self-concept (Linville, 1987; Margolin & Niedenthal, 2000). Furthermore, linking self-concept research to the idea of compensation in the work–family interface, the ability to shift emotional resources between facets of the self-concept has been found to increase psychological well-being in the form of bolstering self-esteem (Crocker & Major, 1989; Donahue et al., 1993). That is, when a negative event impacts a role to which an individual ascribes (e.g., mother or father), that individual can reallocate emotional resources from unaffected roles to the affected role.

Edwards and Rothbard (2000) modeled the causal relationships between work and family variables in the compensation process. As with spillover, they detailed different processes depending on the nature of the compensation that was occurring. In Fig. 2, we depict the causal relationships specified by Edwards and Rothbard, adding in the effect of working with family. Due to the similarity of the effect across the four types of compensation, we will discuss them as a group. The primary idea behind Edwards and Rothbard’s causal specifications was that an aspect of the work role (e.g., satisfaction, rewards, etc.) would positively influence characteristics regarding the work role (e.g., satisfaction with the work role is associated with greater time spent in that role); the change in the work role
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*Fig. 2. Structures for Compensation between Work and Family Accounting for Working with Family.*
characteristic would subsequently negatively influence the family role (e.g., time spent at work is negatively associated with time spent with family). As with their other models, Edwards and Rothbard state that the model can be reversed to understand links from family to work.

We contend that working with family moderates the relationship between the work role characteristic and the family-role characteristic. For example, in the case of work time influencing family time, in cases where one works with family, the time spent at work may actually be time spent with family. As such, working with family moderates that relationship, reducing the negative association between the two variables. In general, because of the intricate connection between work and family, compensation between work and family domains becomes less likely. Instead, people who work with family may seek to compensate in other domains, so as to truly escape the negative consequences of the work or family domain.

**Proposition 2.** Compensation between work and family is less likely for those who work with family as working with family moderates the inverse relationship between work and family structures (e.g., work time and family time).

**Segmentation**

Segmentation occurs when an individual actively seeks to maintain a separation between work and family roles (Eckenrode & Gore, 1990; Lambert, 1990). The motivation behind such a boundary may vary; it may be seen as a means for coping with stress of one role (extending to our earlier discussion, perhaps as a way to minimize spillover; Piotrkowski, 1979). Alternatively, this could be seen as an attempt to maintain a comfortable distance between the roles. Rothbard, Phillips, and Dumas (2005) examined the relationship between desired segmentation, organizational policies concerning work and family, and outcomes such as satisfaction and commitment. They found that since people wanted more segmentation between work and family roles, integrating policies (such as onsite childcare) was associated with lower satisfaction and commitment while segmenting policies (such as flextime) was associated with higher commitment, after controlling for a variety of demographic variables. Similar findings were reported by Kreiner (2006), who found that a greater degree of match between employee segmentation and their segmentation experiences at work was associated with lower work–home conflict, lower stress, and higher job satisfaction. These studies highlight the benefits of fit between desire for segmentation and policies that support segmentation.
Turning again to social psychological research on the self-concept, research suggests that individuals can indeed segment portions of their lives as to not affect other portions. Showers (1992) described compartmentalization as an individual’s ability to isolate and wall-off negative events impacting one facet or role of an individual’s self-concept from other unaffected facets of the self-concept. Indeed, Donahue et al. (1993) and Margolin and Niedenthal (2000) found that the ability to isolate negatively affected facets of one’s life led to greater psychological stability. In fact, this research suggests that individuals have the ability to expand and collapse the number of categories ascribed to their self-concept in response to salient environmental cues. That is, they delineate a strategy whereby an individual who experiences relative harmony between roles will actually reduce the number of roles to which that person will self ascribe; in contrast, when the individual experiences a threat or a negative event to his or her heretofore collapsed self-concept, that individual will quickly expand the number of roles or categories as a means to buffer or minimize the impact of the event on that individual’s well-being (Donahue et al., 1993; Margolin & Niedenthal, 2000; Showers, 1992). So, when someone experiences a negative event at work, he or she will simply mitigate or compartmentalize that event by, in essence, devaluing that role.

In their conceptualization of the causal relationships describing segmentation, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) suggested that suppression of work mood or work behavior would moderate the transfer of mood or behavior from the work domain to the family domain, effectively keeping the two domains separate. In Fig. 3, we present adapted versions of their model including the role of working with family. Basically, they suggest that segmentation is an active process to keep spillover from occurring. When considering the role of working with family, we suggest that working with family is negatively associated with suppression of work characteristics (mood, behavior, etc., see Fig. 3). As segmentation is an intentional attempt to avoid spillover, we propose that individuals who work with family will be less likely to avoid spillover knowing that such an attempt is likely fruitless given the extreme integration of work and family roles. In fact, rather than becoming a coping mechanism for addressing a comfortable separation between work and family, attempts at segmentation could be a stressor for those working with family, particularly as segmentation becomes an outcome that is unattainable due to the integration of work and family roles.

**Proposition 3.** Working with family will be associated with a lower likelihood of segmentation because those individuals are less likely to suppress work mood and behavior.
Resource drain involves transferring resources from one domain to another; typically, the resources involved are finite resources such as time or attention (Piotrkowski, 1979; Tenbrunsel, Brett, Moaz, Stroh, & Reilly, 1995). While similar to compensation, resource drain differs in that it may not have an underlying motivation such as dissatisfaction. For example, work overload may require someone to spend time at home working on a work project; this time drain from family to work may have little to do with dissatisfaction with family life (though one could argue that such dissatisfaction could increase willingness to drain time from one domain to another).

Rothbard and Edwards (2003) found that the time drain from work to family and from family to work is not symmetrical. In a study of university employees, they found that participants were more likely to allow work to impede on family time than they were to allow family time to interfere with work time. They speculated that this finding could be the result of societal
norms that allow (or even encourage) work time to interfere with family time with the justification that additional work time indirectly supports the family (e.g., through additional pay or job advancement).

In specifying the causal linkages involved in resource drain, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) presented relatively simple models with negative associations between related work and family constructs (e.g., work time is negatively associated with family time). Similar to compensation, working with family serves a moderating role, where the negative association between work and family constructs is reduced because of the level of integration for those working with family (see Fig. 4). For individuals working with family, time spent with family and time spent at work are not necessarily mutually
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**Fig. 4.** Structures for Resource Drain between Work and Family Accounting for Working with Family.
exclusive. As such, working in such arrangements reduces the likelihood of resource drain.

**Proposition 4.** Working with family will be associated with a lower likelihood of resource drain because work and family resources are not mutually exclusive.

**Congruence**

The notion of congruence suggests that work and family roles may be similar more because of a spurious third variable rather than a causal relationship (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Zedeck, 1992). Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1994) tested this hypothesis using structural equation modeling (by testing the noncausal correlation between the disturbance terms of job and family satisfaction), finding support for the possibility of a spurious, noncausal relationship between job and family satisfaction. They suggested, for example, that trait affectivity could account for the spurious relationship.

In effect, the causal relationships for congruence modeled by Edwards and Rothbard (2000) are similar to the indirect paths modeled for spillover, but with a reversal in the direction of the causal arrows such that the indirect variable causes both of the more specific family and work constructs (these relationships are modeled in Fig. 5). However, despite the change, the logic underlying the role of working with family remains consistent: the high level of integration between work and family roles moderates the relationship between general constructs and more specific constructs (see Fig. 5). As such, when we consider the linkages between affective disposition, work mood, and family mood, the high degree of work and family integration leads to stronger relationships between affective disposition and each of the more specific mood states.

**Proposition 5.** Working with family increases the likelihood of congruence by moderating the relationship between more general constructs (e.g., affective disposition) and more specific constructs (e.g., family mood) to strengthen their relationship.

**Work–Family Conflict**

The final work–family linking mechanism reviewed by Edwards and Rothbard (2000) was work–family conflict. Work–family conflict is defined as an incompatibility in role demands such that meeting the demands in one
domain makes it difficult, if not impossible, to meet demands in another role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Of the linking mechanisms, it has seen the greatest level of research interest. In their seminal work, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) described three types of work–family conflict. Time-based conflict occurs because time is finite; it is a situation where time taken in
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activities related to one domain results in less time to address the demands in another domain. *Strain-based* conflict occurs when strain in one domain reduces the ability to address the demands in another domain. Finally, *behavior-based* conflict occurs when behaviors in one domain are inappropriate, but difficult to avoid, in another domain. All three types of conflict are similar to other linking mechanisms (spillover and resource drain in particular); however, all add the component that the role conflict makes it more difficult to satisfy the required domains of a domain.

**Time-Based Conflict**

In their causal modeling of time-based conflict, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) proposed that work demands were inversely associated with family time and attention while family demands were positively associated with family time and attention. Family time and attention were subsequently positively associated with family-role performance and negatively associated with work time and attention, which was positively associated with work role performance.

We propose that working with family has two moderating effects in the time-based strain process (see Fig. 6). First, working with family moderates the inverse relationship between work demands and family time or attention. Specifically, because work and family are highly integrated for those working with family, work demands are less likely to be negatively associated with time and attention given to family. Second, working with family reduces the inverse relationship between family time or attention and work time or attention. Similar to our arguments for resource drain, in those people who work with family, time spent with family and time spent at work are not as mutually exclusive and thus the inverse association between the two variables is reduced.

**Proposition 6a.** Working with family reduces the likelihood of time-based work–family conflict by moderating the relationship between family time/attention and work time/attention as well as the relationship between work demands and family demands.

**Strain-Based Conflict**

Edwards and Rothbard (2000) proposed that work strain was inversely associated with family capabilities and overall well-being. The reduced level of family capability due to strain then impacted family-role performance accordingly. We propose that working with family moderates the relationship between work strain and family capabilities, such that for those that work with family, the relationship is stronger (see Fig. 6). In other words, when an individual who works with family experiences work strain, it
further deteriorates their family capabilities because the cause of the work strain is more likely to be family-related.

**Proposition 6b.** Working with family increases the likelihood of strain-based work–family conflict by moderating the relationship between work strain and family capabilities.

**Behavior-based conflict**

In their model of behavior-based strain, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) posited that work behavior was positively associated with family behavior and the overall habits, scripts, and style of the person. Yet, because these
behaviors are misapplied to the family setting, the positive association between work and family behaviors actually leads to lower family-role performance. We suggest that working with family moderates the relationship between work behavior and family behavior, because the behaviors at work are more likely to be translated to the family role because of similarity of the actors in each role (other family members; see Fig. 6). However, we further propose a second moderating effect where working with family reduces the inverse relationship between family behavior and family-role performance. The logic here is that the transfer of behavior from the work role to the family-role is less likely to be seen as inappropriate in situations where one works with family because the actors in either situation are the same and thus behavioral expectations of the situation are similar. As such, it is less likely that transfer of behavior from the work role to the family role will lead to lower family-role performance.

Proposition 6c. Working with family reduces the likelihood of behavior-based work–family conflict by moderating the relationship between work behavior and family behavior as well as the relationship between family behavior and family-role performance.

THE ROLE OF WORKING WITH FAMILY IN UNDERSTANDING WORK–FAMILY ROLE DEMANDS AND RESOURCES

In the previous section of this chapter, we reviewed the manner in which work and family roles are linked utilizing Edwards and Rothbard’s (2000) causal framework, highlighting the manner in which working with family influences the causal structures linking work and family. The general conclusion is that working with family changes the work–family linking mechanisms in predictable ways; the changes to the linking mechanisms imply that those individuals who work with their family will also see different results from the linking mechanisms in terms of stress and well-being. For example, the facilitation of mood spillover could actually lead to higher stress if negative moods spill over from work to family domains. On the contrary, the ease of spillover of positive moods may lead to positive (in a qualitative, not causal sense) outcomes for a family member in a family business. With this in mind, we turn now to a discussion of a general framework for understanding the stress and well-being of those who work with family.
Our model, depicted in Fig. 7, suggests that the work–family linking mechanisms described above lead to roles and demands that are unique to the relationship between work and family. Demands/resources frameworks are common in the stress and strain literature (cf., Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Hobfoll, 1988; Karasek, 1979). Of particular interest in this chapter are the work–family demands and resources that are unique to those people who work with family. For example, while work–family conflict impacts many employees, the manner in which work–family conflict leads to stress for employees may be very different for those who work with family. In this section, we discuss the unique work–family demands and resources that are evident for those individuals who work with family and make a variety of propositions regarding the relationships between these demands and resources and employee stress.

**Resources Gained from Working with Family**

**Work–Family Enrichment**

Work–family enrichment refers to the “extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in another role” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 73). In the literature, enrichment has also been called positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 1992), facilitation (Frone, 2003; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004) and enhancement (Ruderman, Ohlott,
Panzer, & King, 2002). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) recently reviewed the literature and proposed a model of work–family enrichment. In the model, they suggest that resources generated in one role (e.g., the work role) lead to higher performance in another role (e.g., the family role) both directly and indirectly through the higher positive affect generated from the original role.

A key moderator in the process of work–family enrichment was the consistency of role requirements and norms between the two roles. It is at this point in the model where working with family becomes relevant. Since the consistency across the two domains is so high, facilitation between work and family roles among those who work with family is more likely. A second key moderator is the salience of the second role. As we have noted, due to the high integration of roles in those working with family, salience of the family role will be high when such individuals consider their work role. Taken together, these two moderating relationships suggest that work–family enrichment is more likely for those who work with family. We argue that this is a critical beneficial resource to those who work with family and will lead to lower stress among such individuals.

**Proposition 7.** Working with family increases the likelihood of work–family enrichment because of increased facilitation between work and family roles and greater salience of the family role when considering the work role.

**Social Support**

There is reason to believe that those who work with family experience higher levels of social support, a key resource in the reduction of stress and strain (Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986). For example, Halbesleben et al. (2005) found higher levels of instrumental spouse support among the participants in same-career couples. They argued that while the support from family members typically would not have as strong an impact as work-related sources of social support in addressing stress (based on the findings of Halbesleben, 2006), working with family represents a unique opportunity whereby family members have an intimate understanding of the work of the individual. Because of that understanding, they are in a better position to provide instrumental support, support that targets the source of the stress and allows for more effective coping with stress. As a result, those who work with family should experience lower levels of stress. To support this notion, Halbesleben et al. (2005) found lower levels of emotional exhaustion (a form of strain that results from chronic work stress) among participants in same-career relationships.
Carlson and Perrewé (1999) found that social support (both family support and work support) helps to alleviate stressors that cause work–family conflict. In this sense, the support is having an influence on the nature of the link between work and family domains. Given the higher levels of social support among individuals who work with family, this suggests that those who work with family might experience less work–family conflict as a result. While more research is needed to support this claim, it suggests further benefits for those who work with family.

Proposition 8. Working with family increases the social support

Demands from Working with Family
While we have cited a number of benefits to working with family in terms of employee stress, our discussion of work-family linkages suggests that they can lead to unique additional demands that derive from working with family. These demands are unique in that they are specifically work–family role demands, rather than the tradition work demands or family demands.

Demands Due to Segmentation
As we discussed earlier, attempts at segmentation could be a stressor for those working with family, particularly as segmentation becomes an outcome that is unattainable due to the integration of work and family roles. This could be particularly problematic for those individuals who seek high levels of segmentation but work in situations where that desire cannot be fulfilled (Rothbard et al., 2005); we propose that working with family is one such situation. As a result, attempts at segmentation among individuals who work with family are a source of demand that can lead to higher stress.

Demands Due to Spillover
Our above discussion of work-family enrichment goes both ways. Just as positive spillover can occur, spillover of negative moods, incompatible values, or inappropriate skills or behaviors can occur, leading to demands for the individual. As we argued above, spillover is more likely among those who work with family. As such, the demands inherent in negative spillover are likely to be exacerbated among those who work with family.

Facilitated Resource Drain
As we noted above, working with family may facilitate resource drain. This has a number of important negative implications. Foremost is the possibility that resource drain becomes habitual, perhaps expanding to the point of
becoming workaholism. Once deemed an issue more suited for popular press, recent academic studies of workaholism have found that it has significant negative consequences in terms of higher burnout and work–family conflict (Burke, Richardsen, & Martinussen, 2004; Taris, Schaufeli, & Verhoeven, 2005). We argue that as resource drain is facilitated by working with family, the boundary between work and family becomes eroded. As a result, spending inappropriately high levels of time or attention on work may result. While workaholism can be interpreted differently depending on whether one considers its impact on the individual, organization, or society (Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997), the influence of workaholism on one’s well-being is widely considered negative.

Proposition 9. Working with family increases the likelihood of some work–family role demands.

In conclusion, working with family offers both unique demands and unique resources. The combination of these, occasionally within the same situation, shapes the stress experiences of employees in family business and those in same-career couples. As such, we propose a model whereby working with family moderates a number of relationships between the work and family role. Moderators to the relationships between work and family roles have been rarely studied (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; see Grimm-Thomas & Perry-Jenkins, 1994 and Rothbard, 2001 for notable exceptions); we believe that consideration of working with family as a moderator is an important advance in understanding the relationships between roles. The model we have proposed has not been empirically tested; we offer it as a framework for future researchers to consider. However, in addition to the model, we turn now to a number of additional suggestions for future research that will assist in understanding role relationships by understanding the impact of working with family.

FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS: A RESEARCH AGENDA REGARDING WORKING WITH FAMILY

In this final section of the chapter, we discuss future research issues related to our proposed models of the work–family interface. We begin this section by proposing macro-level research that we feel merits increased attention, and we conclude this section by proposing micro-level research that we feel needs more examination. Furthermore, we seek to explore these issues from multiple
perspectives, including being a family member who works for a family business, being a nonfamily member working for a family-run business, and working in the same industry/organization with a family member (e.g., spouses working for the same company). Where appropriate, we have presented research questions to help guide researchers in their thinking about these areas.

Qualitative Research

Research that explores the unique dynamics of working with family in significant depth would be valuable in better understanding the nuanced nature of working with family. Research concerning the impact of working with family on employee stress and well-being is in its infancy. While we have presented a model based on the literature concerning work–family linkages and demand/resource perspectives, qualitative research that examines the more dynamic relationship between roles for those who work with family would be particularly valuable in refining our proposed model and linking it to the experiences of those in family work situations.

Larger Scale Studies

While seemingly paradoxical in light of our call for qualitative research, research is also needed that is larger in scope. While unique compared to employees who do not work with their family members, there is very little larger scale research that can help assist in generalizability that extends to other employees who work with family. This is, in large part, because individuals who work with family are difficult to find. While family businesses represent a large segment of our economy and the number of same-career couples appears to be increasing, studies of these individuals are not well suited to typical organizational survey designs, as they require surveys conducted in a large number of small firms rather than one survey in a large firm. Moreover, due to the nature of the topic of study, dependencies exist in the data that make them challenging for statistical analysis. Nonetheless, as models of the impact of working with family on employee stress and well-being are refined, larger studies designed to test and extend those models will be valuable in advancing this literature.

Cross-Cultural Research

With different expectations regarding family interactions, cross-cultural research on working with family might be particularly illuminating. We expect
that the nature of work–family linkages would differ rather dramatically across cultures as respective value of work and family differ. The impact that working with family has in those situations is likely to differ as well, either increasing or decreasing the likelihood of stress. For example, in many cultures, working with family is the norm, not the exception. In these cultures, family and work roles have already become so intertwined so as to make the desire for segmentation moot. As such, the inability to segment work and family roles in these cultures would be less likely to serve as a stressor.

Some initial cross-cultural research has shed some interesting light, for example, on the nature of stress in family business. Zheng (2002) suggests that in Chinese culture, the equal inheritance of a family business among sons often creates a natural conflict in the family. However, he also found that there are social and economic pressures to keep the family business stable and productive. The unique experience of stress through generations would be an interesting question in-and-of itself, but is particularly interesting when we consider the potential cross-cultural differences in how this stress is addressed by family members. Similarly, the equal distribution of family business shares through inheritance also sets up a situation of comparison and competition between family members; this situation can become stressful if the family members offer unequal contributions to the family business despite inheriting an equal share (Yue, 1989; Zheng, 2002). More research on the social comparison processes between family members and their relationship to stress would be of value.

We also believe that these issues should be more integrated with the macro culture research that is typified by the work of Hofstede (1983). As implied by the nascent cross-cultural research that we have highlighted, it appears that cultures with more collective norms will produce decreased roles strain among members of the culture. As countries with this cultural value tend to promote the common good of the group, it is likely that family members working together will more easily subordinate their individual aspirations than would individuals who live in a society, such as the United States, that promotes individualistic norms. While countries can vary on more than just the collective–individual cultural trait, we believe that this cultural trait in particular will most likely moderate the relationships between work–family experience and the myriad outcomes discussed in this chapter.

**Research Question 1.** What micro-level and macro-level cultural variables influence the relationship between working with family and stress?
While we have focused on a subdimension of PE Fit, the demands–resources perspective, organizational behavior, and human resources management (HRM) scholars have identified multiple dimensions of fit that affect employee outcomes. Wheeler, Buckley, Halbesleben, Brouer, and Ferris (2005) summarize five dimensions of fit that have been identified and empirically examined over the last 40 years; moreover, Wheeler et al. (2005) integrate these dimensions of fit into a coherent framework that explains why individuals seek to fit with the organization on more than just one of the subdimensions. Person-Organization Fit (P-O Fit; Chatman, 1989) describes the congruence between the individual’s and organization’s values, goals, and beliefs. Person-Job Fit (P-J Fit, Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990) describes the congruence between an individual’s knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) and KSAs required by the job. This dimension of fit developed from the demands–resources conceptualization of P-E Fit (Kristof, 1996) that we have utilized in this chapter, but P-J Fit is more narrowly defined to describe job-related KSAs fit as opposed to the personal resources-based view of the demands–resources conceptualization of P-E Fit (Edwards, 1991). As previously described in this chapter, the demands–resources conceptualization of P-E Fit is rooted in Holland’s (1985) notion of Person–Vocation Fit (P-V Fit), which typically describes the congruence between the individual’s personal attributes and the attributed demanded by the job itself. Related to the needs–supply conceptualization of P-E Fit, Person–Preferences for Culture (P-P Fit, Van Vianen, 2000) describes the extent to which an organization satisfies the resource needs of the individual. Finally, Person–Team Fit (Ferris, Youngblood, & Yates, 1985) describes the extent to which an individual’s attributes overlap with the attributes of the team to which the individual belongs.

Wheeler et al. (2005) proposed that these multiple dimensions of fit relate to an individual’s core self-concept, which implies that an individual will assess fit on these dimensions to the extent that the dimensions are relevant or salient to the individual. Moreover, individuals are motivated to assess fit for two primary reasons. First, based upon social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), individuals have a strong motive to belong to groups as a means of bolstering self-esteem. Experiencing fit across multiple dimensions leads an individual to more closely identify with the organization, and this close identification becomes a source of esteem for the individual. Second, by assessing fit on multiple dimensions, the individual can compartmentalize misfit in any single dimension without experiencing misfit across the other
dimensions. As a result of this compartmentalization process, misfit in a single dimension will most likely not result in turnover, dissatisfaction, or decreased commitment to the organization. In short, assessing multiple dimensions of fit simultaneously boosts self-esteem and protects self-esteem, and assessing fit, whether a single dimension or multiple dimension, has yet to be examined in the context of work–family integration.

We can, however, draw inferences about fit in the work–family context based upon existing research on fit. Aside from the P-V Fit and P-J Fit perspectives, which are derived from P-E Fit and form the basis of our examination of work–family interactions, we propose that the three other dimensions of fit need closer research examination. For family members working for the family business, it would appear that high levels of P-O Fit would exist, simply for the reason that work values, goals, and beliefs appear to be learned from parents and other family members (see Kristof, 1996 for etiology of P-O Fit). However, we know of no research specifically exploring the congruence between family members P-O Fit. As perceptions of P-O Fit vary as a function of both individual values and goals and the values and goals espoused by an organization through its culture (Kristof, 1996), it would appear that family-owned and operated business should in fact experience a high degree of agreement between members in terms of P-O Fit perceptions. As P-O Fit has been found to predict employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to remain with the organization (Kristof, 1996; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003) family-owned and operated organization should experience high degrees of those important behavioral outcomes. In fact, because of expected high levels of P-O Fit among family-owned and operated organizations and employees, we would expect that any individual who experiences a lack of fit would also report increases in stress and also utilize any of the mechanisms for coping with stress that we have outlined in this chapter.

Similarly, for family members who work together in a nonfamily-owned organization, we would expect similar outcomes. For instance, research on spouses has shown that spouses tend to share similar attitudes and opinions toward a target object (e.g., Smith, Becker, Byrne, & Przybyla, 1993); thus, we would expect that if one member of a couple perceives high P-O Fit with an organization so would the other member of the couple. Moreover, as previously noted, the frequency of romances occurring in organizations has increased (Fisher, 1994), and it could be possible that shared perceptions of the organization are in fact partially responsible for the attraction between couples at work. On the other hand, should one member of the couple feel misfit with the organization, this misfit would cause great stress to both
partners in the relationship. Moreover, should one partner actually exit the organization due to misfit, the potential stress this causes to the partner could also lead to both partners leaving the organization. Again, no research exists on the topic of fit and couples on the job, so the outcomes of fit or misfit are completely unknown.

**Research Question 2.** What are the unique relationships between fit and stress for those who work with family?

What we find most interesting regarding the concept of fit as it relates to working with family, as seen in the previous paragraph, is not so much understanding the influence of fit but understanding how individuals in these situations cope with misfit. The fit literature tends to focus exclusively on fit and the benefits thereof and seems to treat misfit as the precursor to turnover (Wheeler et al., 2005). Hence, we find it understandable that stress has been examined in the fit literature as a mechanism for either increasing satisfaction, commitment, and retention (e.g., remove the demand of stress on individual coping resources by increasing fit) or decreasing satisfaction, commitment, and retention (e.g., the lack of fit causes stress and drains resources). What this literature assumes, however, is that the lack of fit necessarily leads to turnover (Wheeler et al., 2005), although no research exists to test this assumption.

As we have proposed throughout this chapter, working with family can create both stress-inducing and stress-reducing outcomes for individuals. On one hand, working with family members can increase stress. On the other hand, working with family can provide a buffer to stress in the form of social support and work–family enrichment. Moreover, the stress induced by working with family members is most likely compounded when considering the psychological stress associated with turnover intentions. That is, while working with family members can lead to stress, leaving a family-run business could represent a traumatic episode in an individual’s life. Given the difficulty an individual most likely feels when leaving a family-run business, the glaring lack of research associated with misfit represents a key area for future research within the work–family dynamic. Two particular models related to fit and turnover seem applicable to the topic of work–family and fit.

Lee and Mitchell (1994) proposed the unfolding model of voluntary turnover. The model asserts that voluntary turnover is caused by shocks, which they define as either planned or unplanned events (e.g., unplanned job offer, expiration of employment contract, turnover of supervisor or co-worker, etc.) that start a decision-making process which leads to staying or leaving. When a shock occurs, the individual begins a cognitive process akin
to going through a series of scripts. These scripts can appear logical and sequential or random but in essence have the feel of a decision-making tree. Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, and Hill (1999) empirically tested the unfolding model of voluntary turnover and found strong support for tenets of the model; moreover, importantly they found that the assumed directionality of dissatisfaction, stress, and turnover, in that order, is not assured. In fact, a shock can lead to dissatisfaction; however, given no suitable alternatives for employment, an individual might not leave the organization. Moreover, the shock in and of itself can be unrelated to satisfaction yet still lead to turnover. In the case of working with family members or in a family-run business, it seems plausible that shocks, while leading to great anxiety, stress, or dissatisfaction, may not result in turnover because the individual cannot separate the family from the job. Furthermore, for spouses working in the same organization, both spouses can be relatively satisfied with the organization; yet the organization could lose both employees if one receives an unexpected shock, such as an unexpected external job offer.

A second model of understanding the impact of misfit on intentions to leave an organization was outlined by Wheeler et al. (2005). Based on the concept of shocks, they reasoned that shocks, dissatisfaction, or stress lead to the assessment of fit across the dimensions we previously outlined in this section. Should an individual assess fit and find that fit is still high with organization, that individual will likely remain with the organization. Should the individual perceive misfit with the organization across dimensions of fit, that individual has several choices available to cope with this misfit and commensurate stress. The individual can adapt to the situation and alleviate the misfit and stress. Should adaptation appear unfeasible, the individual will consider a series of options, one of which is ultimately voluntary turnover. The individual can engage in: (1) impression management to mask the feelings of misfit; (2) can engage in a process of psychological withdrawal from the job, the organization, and its members; or (3) a process of voicing concerns to management with the hopes of changing the organization or the situation.

As shown in the literature, exiting a family business might be too traumatic for an individual to consider. Given also that family businesses tend to be small and that familiarity with individual personalities might be considerably higher in family business compared to nonfamily businesses, we would not expect an individual experiencing stress or misfit to engage in impression management. However, familiarity and size more likely will lead a family member to becoming more vocal about problems in the organization. This could lead to actual changes in the organization or to changes in the individual’s direct work situation. It also seems plausible that the
same pressure experienced by an individual contemplating voluntary turnover in a family-run business could also apply to a family member feeling pressure when considering involuntary turnover activity (e.g., termination or firing a family member). Leaving a family business for any reason seems more difficult than leaving nonfamily businesses, and we propose that terminating the employment contract of a family member would create a stress for that individual. Thus, in terms of misfit, we believe that in-activity of an individual who feels misfit is a likely outcome in lieu of turnover. Should an individual feel misfit, yet not want to leave or create conflict through voicing dissatisfaction, it seems likely that such an individual might view disengagement as the easiest choice to deal with the stress associated with misfit in a family organization. The likelihood of termination in a family business is reduced, and the individual could effectively cope with stress by in essence no longer caring about the business.

**Research Question 3.** In what manner does working with family influence the relationship between stress and turnover intention?

Along these lines, Zheng's (2002) study highlights another potential stressor worthy of study for those who work in family business: possible clashes between career aspirations of children and inheritance plans of parents. The issue of career aspirations is inextricably tied to cultural norms. While we have already argued that the cultural dimension of individualism most likely moderates the relationships between work–family experiences and the associated outcomes, this particular issue will also be affected by societal norms impacting individual behaviors. In individualistic societies, such as the United States, children are socialized to differentiate themselves from others, especially in terms of achievement and success. Individuals who possess high levels of personal need for achievement often view career success as central to expressing who they are (Chusmir & Azevedo, 1992; Elder, 1968); furthermore, longitudinal studies demonstrate that achievement orientation is passed down from parents to children, most likely through social learning (Elder, 1968). We would expect then that children are reared in highly individualistic cultures to seek career aspirations that differentiate themselves from their parents and siblings. However, cultures with more collective societal norms would experience the opposite. In terms of other societal norms that should influence career aspirations, we would expect cultures that support greater power distance and masculinity to create norms consistent with children following the career aspirations of older parents and siblings. In these societies, we would expect less stress associated
with enter careers or business associated with family members; however, we would expect the opposite in cultures with less power distance and masculinity. That is, we expect these societal norms to moderate the relationship between individual career aspirations related to the family and subsequent role strain, role stress, and career satisfaction. While such arrangements are not particularly common, research that explores the intricate dynamics of coping with this unusual stressor would be an interesting and informative addition to the literature.

**Research Question 4.** How do working with family and cultural variables influence the relationships between career aspirations and role strain?

---

**Job Embeddedness and Work–Family Experiences**

Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez (2001) proposed a construct called *job embeddedness* (JE) that incorporates the ideas of fit and the unfolding model of turnover into a larger network that explains why individuals stay or leave an organization. There are two types of JE, organizational and community, which taken together differentially predict turnover and performance (Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004) beyond the effects of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Mitchell et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2004). Each type of JE consists of three independent components: fit, links, and sacrifice (Mitchell et al., 2001).

*Fit* is conceptualized as the congruence between an employee’s “personal values, career goals, and plans for the future…with the larger corporate culture and the demands for his or her immediate job” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1104), which applies to community fit, where individuals possess unique interests in the community in which they live. *Links* “are characterized as formal or informal connections between a person and institutions or other people” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1104), which are established both within organizations (e.g., coworkers, subordinates, and supervisors) and within the communities in which individuals live (e.g., friends, families, community organizations, etc.). *Sacrifice* describes the “perceived cost of material or psychological benefits that may be forfeited by leaving the job” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1105), which again is applied to the community whereby individuals sacrifice the benefits of belonging to a community should they relocate to another community for work purposes.

In terms of applying the construct of JE to working with or for family members, we propose that JE explains why individuals experience stress when either working for family business or considering leaving a family
business. Quite simply, the organizational and community components of JE are blended together so that the individual cannot separate the organization from the community. In essence, for people working with family the community and organization are one in the same; thus these people have strong fit and links. Moreover, the sacrifice for leaving the organization is increased for people working with family. While JE is a relatively new construct to organizational scholars, we believe it is a construct of great importance to the work–family interface from both the personal and organizational perspectives. In fact, Lee et al. (2004) found that organizational JE predicted employee performance; whereas community JE predicted organizational citizenship behavior and employee intentions to turnover. These findings suggest that individuals leave organizations because of what occurs at home. However, as our chapter suggests, when the individual cannot separate work from home, as occurs with individuals working with family members, it may have an important effect in terms of important organizational outcomes such as performance and turnover.

**Research Question 5.** How does working with family influence the relationships between job embeddedness, performance, and turnover outcomes?

*Human Resources Management Effectiveness and the Family Business*

We believe that organizational research should have practical applications for practitioners; therefore, we believe that any examination of the work–family interface should address key organizational concerns. In the previous sections of this chapter, we have discussed potential research related to fit and embeddedness; and these two areas of research have been linked to the two drivers of organizational performance: productivity and employee retention (Guest, 1997; Huselid, 1995). Strategic human resource management (SHRM) scholars explore the relationships between high-performing HRM systems and organizational performance (Becker, Huselid, Pickus, & Spratt, 1997; Huselid, 1995; Huselid, Jackson, & Schuler, 1997) such that each HRM process individually and the combined effectiveness of all HRM processes add value to the organization through improvements in employee productivity and retention (Arthur, 1994; Barney, 1991; Ichniowski, Shaw, & Prennushi, 1997; Lepak & Snell, 2002; Wright & Snell, 1998; Wright, Gardner, & Moynihan, 2003). That is, any HRM process, such as recruitment (Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 1988), selection (Wright, Dunford, & Snell, 2001), or training and development (Huselid, 1995), must increase employee productivity and retention. Moreover, each of these functions
must directly relate to and support the organization mission (Barney & Wright, 1998).

SHRM scholars have grappled with explaining how HRM effectiveness leads to positive organizational outcomes (Boxall, 1996), but increasingly, SHRM researchers have concluded that HRM systems geared toward “shape[ing] desired employee behaviors and attitudes by forging psychological links between organizational and employee goals” (Arthur, 1994, p. 671). That is, HRM is judged as effective to the extent that organizations can strengthen the psychological bonds with employees. In the work–family interface context, we know very little about the HRM systems in place in family-run businesses. As family businesses tend to be small businesses, they tend to implement less formal HRM practices but tend to develop these into more formalized practices as the organization grows (Kotey & Slade, 2005). In fact, Roberts, Sawbridge, and Bamber (1992) found little or no formalized HRM practices at organizations employing less than 20 people; however, they also noted that the lack of formalization often impeded organizational performance. As we have little understanding of how family business practice HRM, this represents an opportunity for researchers interested in understanding HRM effectiveness, especially for family-run organizations, and the implications of HRM effectiveness for employee and family member stress and well-being.

Without a better understanding of how effectively family-run businesses utilize formal HRM practices, it is difficult to understand the relationship, if one exists, between HRM effectiveness and JE. As both the SHRM and JE literatures do not address issues such as the family–work interaction, we are left to ponder how family-run business can capitalize on these constructs to better operate these organizations and enhance the employment experience of people working for these organizations. We have no reason to assume that family-run business are excluded from the benefits of HRM effectiveness or JE; therefore, linking HRM effectiveness with JE, it seems that organizations can increase employee retention and productivity in so far that the organization can foster JE among employees. That is, we believe that JE mediates the relationship between HRM effectiveness and organizational performance (measured through increasing employee productivity and retention). However, while these relationships appear logical and fairly straightforward, in the context of the work–family environment, these relationships only partially account for the added complexity of working with family.

As previously outlined, JE should be very strong among individuals working with family members, as organizational and community JE become confounded. However, Halbesleben et al., 2005) and Halbesleben and
Zellars (2006) found that working with family can at times contribute great stress to an individual or provide a source of great social support to individuals experiencing stress. That is, working with family can constitute either a demand or a resource for coping with stress that is germane to any working environment or that is specifically associated with working with family members. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) could help to explain the role of social support in the HRM effectiveness–JE–Performance relationship. Social exchange researchers have identified two types of social support, each predicting separate outcomes. Direct supervisor–subordinate relationships have been found to predict employee performance, whereas general social support (e.g., supportive environment, organizational processes, peers, etc.) has been found to predict employee commitment and intentions to remain with the organization (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Coupled with Lee et al.’s (2004) finding that organizational JE predicted performance and community JE predicted turnover intentions, this suggests that the quality of the supervisor–subordinate relations should moderate the relationship between HRM effectiveness and organizational JE, which then mediates the HRM effectiveness–performance relationship. On the other hand, general social support should moderate the HRM effectiveness–community JE relationship, which mediates the HRM effectiveness–turnover relationship.

In the context of working with family, depending on the quality of the direct work relationships, we should expect that more formalized HRM practices should lead to increased organizational JE and subsequent performance on the job. Moreover, depending on the quality of the relationships among other members of the organization and family, who are a known source of social support (Halbesleben et al., 2006; Halbesleben & Zellars, 2006), we should expect that more formalized HRM practices should lead to increased community JE and subsequent employee retention. In short, we argue that the more formally a business operates, in terms of HRM practices, the less is the likelihood of stress-induced turnover and stress-induced poor performance. That is, should a family want to reduce the amount of work-related stress and reduce any potential spillover into non-work aspects of an individual’s life the key is formalized business practices. We recommend that researchers who are interested in viewing formalized business processes as a resource in the work–family interface examine the roles of HRM effectiveness, social support, JE, performance, and turnover.

**Research Question 6.** What role can HRM practices play in shaping the relationships between stress and outcomes when working with family?
A psychological contract refers to “an employee’s beliefs regarding the mutual obligations between the employee and an employer” (Lambert, Edwards, & Cable, 2003, p. 895; Rousseau, 1989). Typically, a psychological contract consists of the employee’s belief that pre-hire expectations about what the organization offers (e.g., culture, compensation, promotion opportunities, etc.) are met post-hire (Robinson & Morrison, 2000; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). If the employee feels that expectations are unmet, the violation of the psychological contract often results in voluntary turnover (Robinson & Morrison, 2000). In a comprehensive review and longitudinal empirical study, Lambert et al. (2003) identified six organizational resources supplied to employees that are often at the root of psychological contract violation: pay, recognition, relationships, job variety, career training, and skill development. They found that when perceived levels of these six factors were not sufficiently met from pre-hire expectations, employees reported psychological contract violation, reduced satisfaction, and increased intentions to leave the organization. In short, if the organization fails to properly set pre-hire expectations regarding a slew of organizational resources, including culture, and the employee feels that post-hire expectations are unmet, the breach of the psychological contract results in negative outcomes for both the employee and organization. In terms the work–family interface, the concept of psychological contracts requires theoretical and empirical examination.

First, how do family members develop work-related psychological contracts? As work–family roles become confounded, it seems plausible that expectations are developed in the more immediate context of the family and then bleed over into the work context. Second, when a psychological contract is breached, what is the source of the breach, work or family? The psychological contract breach may in fact be the underlying source of stress for people in these work–family situations. That is, the basic root of stress that some experience may be caused by some psychological contract violation, whether that violation occurred in the work or family context. Third, research should identify to what the individual feels psychologically contracted. We assume that the contract would be strongest to the family; hence, this might explain the difficulty leaving a family organization. Fourth, for couples working in nonfamily business, to what do these couples feel psychologically contracted? This question raises the possibility that individuals possess dual psychological contracts in the work context, one to the organization and the other to the spouse. Finally, and we address this...
issue in the next section, for nonfamily members working in a family business, how do these employees’ psychological contracts differ from the family members?

**Research Question 7.** In what ways is the notion of the psychological contract altered when one works with family?

**Impact on Nonfamily Members**

As we had noted, role conflicts are a potential concern in family business. An additional form of role conflict can be introduced when a family business is run like a “family.” This can be particularly salient for nonfamily members who work in a family-based business as they are now faced with managing two “families” and the roles inherent with each. For example, nonfamily members may be expected to display higher levels of commitment that they had anticipated. Ram (2001) demonstrated this concern in the context of family-based management consulting firm, conveying the story of a nonfamily member who was disturbed while on vacation to clarify some work issues. In effect, the employee’s supervisor expected the same level of commitment that one might give to their family; researchers have not yet examined the manner in which this type of conflict can lead to stress in nonfamily-member employees. We note that Beehr et al. (1997) found little difference in nonfamily-member employees in a family business and employees in nonfamily businesses when it came to outcomes such as work–family conflict, which challenges the above suggestion.

**Research Question 8.** How do the unique role demands of family business influence those who are not members of the ownership/management family?

**Coping with Stress**

While it appears that stress may be exacerbated by working with a family business, the picture may become even more complicated when considering how working in a family business might influence options for coping with stress. Typically, employees faced with stress at work can cope in a number of ways, one common distinction is that between active and avoidant coping (cf., Koeske, Kirk, & Koeske, 1993; Tobin, Holroyd, Reynolds, & Wigal, 1989). Active coping (or problem-focused) refers to methods that are used to manage a situation so as to regain control; avoidant coping (sometimes considered a type of emotion-focused coping, see Lazarus & Folkman, 1984)
refers to avoidance of the situations that cause stress. The challenge for those working in a family business is that they may limited in their ability to utilize avoidant strategies, as they cannot get away from the other person or persons involved in the stressful situation (because they are family members; Kaye, 1991). As such, the options for coping with stress among those working in a family business may be limited (Beehr et al., 1987) and they may be more likely to engage in active coping.

On the one hand, the push toward more active coping may be seen as a positive, as research has consistently found benefits of engaging in active coping over avoidant coping (Apsinwall & Taylor, 1992; Day & Livingstone, 2001; Ingledew, Hardy, & Cooper, 1997). Nonetheless, it is unclear whether the limited coping choices will actually lead someone to engage in more active coping. Instead, it may lead someone in a family business to find new ways to avoid the stressful situation, such as quitting their job in the family business. Alternatively, they could avoid the stress by consistently giving in to another family member, particularly if that family member holds more power either in the business or the family. The implications of this approach for additional stress in those working in a family business setting are unclear and certainly worthy of additional study, as they would shed light not only on coping strategies generally but also on the role of power structures in the decision to engage in a coping strategy more specifically.

**Research Question 9.** How does working with family influence decisions regarding coping with stress?

**CONCLUSION**

Despite increasing importance in the working world, the role of working with family in the process of employee stress and well-being has been largely ignored in the research literature. In this chapter, we presented a model, based on Edwards & Rothbard’s (2000) writing in work–family linkages, to describe the role of working with family on employee stress and well-being. Our model suggests that working with family leads to high levels of work–family role integration, which changes the manner in which work–family linkages function and provides unique demands and resources that shape the employees’ stress experiences.

Our model has a number of implications for the literature on working with family. First, it provides the first model to understand the unique role
that working with family plays in the stress and well-being of employees. As such, it provides a guide for future research on the topic. Second, from a broader perspective, literature on working with family helps to better understand the nature of work and family roles generally. Individuals who work in these situations provide a distinctive form for understanding the impact of high level of work–family integration.

The model also may hold practical implications for those running family businesses. It suggests that the manner in which work and family roles are balanced can have implications for the stress of employees. For example, understanding the potential demands from increased resource drain may lead managers of family business to encourage some segmentation between work and family roles. We acknowledge that family dynamics add challenges to this (e.g., telling your son or daughter you would rather not spend more time with them than necessary to avoid resource drain may be problematic). It is our hope that the ideas presented here can spark thinking into managing the process of stress among those working with family in order to capitalize on the unique resources it provides and reduce the potential negative demands in order to improve the well-being for employees.
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CLARIFYING THE CONSTRUCT OF FAMILY-SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS (FSSB): A MULTILEVEL PERSPECTIVE
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ABSTRACT

The goal of this chapter is to present new ways of conceptualizing family-supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB), and to present a multilevel model reviewing variables that are linked to this construct. We begin the chapter with an overview of the U.S. labor market’s rising work–family demands, followed by our multilevel conceptual model of the pathways between FSSB and health, safety, work, and family outcomes for employees. A detailed discussion of the critical role of FSSB is then provided, followed by a discussion of the outcome relationships for employees. We then present our work on the conceptual development of FSSB, drawing from the literature and from focus group data. We end the chapter with a discussion of the practical implications related to our
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model and conceptual development of FSSB, as well as a discussion of implications for future research.

U.S. LABOR MARKET’S RISING WORK–FAMILY DEMANDS

Over recent decades, employee workplace and family relationships have become transformed. For example, in 1950, for every 100 working adults there were 57 adults providing back-up domestic services (child care and elder care, household, daily meal preparation, etc.) (Bianchi & Raley, 2005; Toosi, 2002). Today that number is reduced to 28 per 100 adults, which means more family demands have shifted onto workers and more workers lack strong domestic supports. Similarly, the U.S. Census Bureau shows that in 2000, 78% of mothers with children under 18 were employed, up from 45% in 1965 (Bianchi & Raley, 2005), and the percentage of employees who report having elder care responsibilities within the previous year increased from 25% in 1997 (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1998) to 35% in 2002 (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2003) based on the Families and Work Institute’s National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW). These workforce shifts have dramatically altered the nature of the employee population that has dependents. For example, one-fifth of all workers with children under 18 are single parents (approximately 5% male, 16% female), and 40% of households comprise dual-earner parents (Bianchi & Raley, 2005). Similar statistics are reported by other studies. The NSCW reports that in 2002, 78% of working couples were dual earner; 22% single earner, compared with 66% and 34%, respectively, in 1997 (Bond et al., 2003). Finally, a national study by Neal and Hammer (2007) found that between 9% and 13% of American households with one or more persons aged 30–60 comprised dual-earner couples caring for both children and aging parents. The implications of these labor market demographic shifts are that there is a rise in the need for employees to simultaneously manage the demands of both work and family.

Not only has the nature of the workforce changed but job demands have also risen. The NSCW shows that over the past 25 years between 1977 and 2002, the total work hours of all dual-earner couples with children under 18 years old at home increased an average of an additional 10 hours per week – from 81 to 91 hours (Bond et al., 2003). Companies are cutting pensions and increasing healthcare burdens on employees, heightening the need for
employees to work later in life as well as becoming more fearful of being
down-sized and being unable to provide economically for the family. These
work pressures and fears of job loss have further contributed to conflicts
between managing work and family (Jansen, Kant, Kristenson, & Nijhuis,
2003; Sahibzada, 2006). Furthermore, with recent shifts to a service-based
economy, more people are working nonstandard hours around the clock
requiring them to structure family events and responsibilities around these
atypical hours of work. And finally, the NCSW reports that two-thirds (67%)
of employed parents believe they do not have enough time with their children,
and over half of all employees indicate that they do not have enough time for
their spouses (63%) or themselves (55%) (Galinsky, Bond & Hill, 2004).

With these changes in the demographics of the workforce and the actual
nature of work, we have seen a trend for U.S. employers to make a concerted
effort to adopt policies and practices that directly support working families
(e.g., Lobel & Kossek, 1996). Unfortunately, however, U.S. public policy has
not kept pace with the rest of the industrialized world when it comes to
providing support for working families. For example, despite the fact that the
U.S. Women’s Bureau began campaigning for paid maternity leave in the
1940s (Boris & Lewis, 2006), we are the only industrialized country to not
provide such national support today. Furthermore, because the support at
the national level in the U.S. pales in comparison to other industrialized
nations, families rely on family-supportive workplaces to enable them to
manage the dual responsibilities of work and family (e.g., Boris & Lewis,
2006; Hammer, Cullen, & Shafiro, 2006; Kelly, 2006). Still today, over 80%
of U.S. corporations have less than 100 employees (U.S. Bureau of the
Census, 2001), and thus may be less likely to provide formal family-friendly
supports (e.g., dependent care resource and referrals, alternative work ar-
rangements), as size of company is positively related to provision of such
supports (Hammer et al., 2006).

**OVERVIEW OF CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF
FAMILY-SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISOR BEHAVIORS**

We present a multilevel conceptual model that links organizational policies,
practices, and culture with supervisory behaviors and with employee per-
ceptions of support and experiences of work–family conflict and work–
family enrichment (see Fig. 1). Work–family conflict is defined as a type of
interrole conflict where work and family roles are incompatible (Greenhaus
Beutell, 1985), while work–family enrichment refers to the beneficial relationship between work and family roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Work–family conflict and work–family enrichment are further related to individual level, family level, and organizational level safety, health, family, and work outcomes. We employ a systems view by taking the organizational context into consideration when attempting to understand factors that contribute to family-supportive supervisory behaviors. Further expanding on the systems concept, we suggest that the organizational context impacts not only family-supportive supervisory behaviors, but also employee responses to such support from supervisors. Specifically, we expect that managers, who exhibit higher levels of behaviors that are supportive of work and family, will be perceived by employees as being more supportive than managers who do not exhibit such behaviors, and that employee perceptions of, and reactions to, family-supportive supervisors will be influenced by the family-supportive organizational context. Workers who are supervised by these managers will in turn, experience lower levels of work–family conflict and higher levels of work–family enrichment that will ultimately impact individual, family, and organizational well-being.
While there has been a trend toward greater organizational adoption of formal family-supportive policies, reviews suggest that the existence of such policies is a necessary but insufficient condition to alleviate workers’ rising work and family demands and needs for greater flexibility (Allen, 2001; Kossek, 2005). Reviews also suggest there is much to be learned regarding how to make these supports work well and to increase their usability (Eaton, 2003; Kossek & Lambert, 2005). This is because workplace climates and cultures are often slow to adapt to support new ways of working (Kossek, Colquitt, & Noe, 2001; Thompson, Beauvis, & Lyness, 1999). Furthermore, most workplaces offer supports related to work hours, scheduling, and flexibility based on formalized discretion of supervisors. Supervisors generally are given wide latitude over whether to approve employee use of available policies or informal practices related to working time and their decisions are influenced by organizational-level factors such as the work–family culture and climate. Given the key role of supervisors in enacting formal organizational policy implementation and informal practice, the study of supervisor support for work and family is critical to the understanding of how to effectively implement work and family policies in employing organizations (Hopkins, 2005).

We see the supervisor as the linking pin between the availability of formal family-supportive organizational policies and practices, such as (dependent care supports, healthcare, alternative work arrangements, adequate compensation) and informal family-supportive organizational culture and climate defined as: “the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives” (Thompson, Beauvis, & Lyness, 1999, p. 394). It is expected that both sets of these organizational level factors (i.e., formal and informal organizational support for family) influence the way that supervisors interpret and enact policies and practices within the organization, resulting in family-supportive supervisory behaviors (FSSB). Thus, the enacted FSSB are a function of these organizational-level factors. Differing supervisor–organizational level dynamics exist at the intersection of formal policy adoption and supervisor policy interpretation and implementation.

We believe then that employees’ perceptions of supervisor support for family are influenced directly by three factors: (1) the availability of formal
policies and practices related to organizational support for family, (2) informal family-supportive organizational climate and culture, and (3) FSSB. The first two factors have been supported by previous research, and the third factor is newly presented here. Our model advances the field by integrating these three factors, which previously generally have been examined in isolation. While the actual direction of these relationships is still inconclusive due to a lack of longitudinal studies, the relationship between availability of formal policies and practices and employee perceptions of supervisor support, as well as the relationship between informal family-supportive organizational culture and employee perceptions of supervisor support for family has been found (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). We propose that employee perceptions of supervisor support for family are also influenced by FSSB.

This model presents a multilevel analysis of the relationships in that the family-supportive organizational level factors (climate–culture and policies–practices) are expected to impact family-supportive supervisory level factors (i.e., FSSB). In turn, supervisory level FSSB is expected to influence employee level perceptions of supervisor support for family and employee reports of work–family conflict and work–family enrichment. Ultimately, employee experiences of work–family conflict and work–family enrichment are expected to impact individual, family, and organizational level outcomes.

SUPPORT FOR WORK AND FAMILY: ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL AND SUPERVISORY LEVEL FACTORS

Family-supportive organizational policies are designed to provide assistance to employees coping with competing demands of work and family. Examples of family-supportive organizational policies include dependent care, flextime, and telecommuting (e.g., Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood, & Colton, 2005b; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), while family-supportive practices include the conditions of work such as pay and benefits that support working families. Family-supportive organizational policies and practices have been designed to reduce the negative effects of work–family stress and conflict on employee health and well-being.

Despite increased employer interest in work and family, reviews suggest work and family policies have not been highly effective in reducing work–family conflict and improving worker health and well-being (Kossek, 2005).
Even when available, family-supportive policies such as dependent care assistance are underutilized (Kossek, 2005), have low-baseline utilization rates, and use can be associated with higher, rather than lower, work and family conflict, specifically family-to-work conflict (Hammer et al., 2005b). Employees may be worried about negative supervisory repercussions as result of use (Judiesch & Lyness, 1999) or they may simply not be aware that such policies and supports even exist in their organization (Neal & Hammer, 2007). We do know that when managers provide an example and make visible to others that flexible work arrangements are practical options, employees are more likely to use such schedules themselves (Kossek, Barber, & Winters, 1999).

Furthermore, it has been found that these types of organizational policies, which are initiated to help employees meet family responsibilities, have not always had the desired impact of reducing levels of work–family conflict (Hammer et al., 2005b; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). In fact, employees often perceive that employers encourage workers to devote themselves to their work at the expense of other life domains (Lobel & Kossek, 1996). This is a critical point, as the implementation of family-friendly benefits may not have the effect intended if employees do not perceive the environment of the organization hospitable to their efforts to seek balance between their work and nonwork lives (Allen, 2001). A large part of perceiving that an organization values this balance is to have a supervisor who employees feel is supportive of these organizational policies and understanding of the issues related to work-life balance. Thus, employees who perceive the organization and their supervisor as family-supportive should feel more comfortable utilizing available benefits (Allen, 2001).

Moreover, higher levels of perceived organizational support for family has beneficial effects on employee attitudes and behaviors and these effects seem to occur over and above the effects of use of supports (e.g., Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). Specifically, reviews suggest perceptions of whether one's workplace is family-supportive has a stronger correlation with work and family well-being than objective measures of work–family support such as the availability of policies (e.g., Allen, 2001). Similarly, perceptions of a positive work–family culture are significantly and positively related to affective commitment, and utilization of work–family benefits is negatively related to intentions to quit and work–family conflict (Thompson et al., 1999).

We believe that there is a need for greater conceptual clarity related to three types of supports (i.e., formal and informal organizational supports for family and supervisory support for family). While it appears that
formal organizational family supports may be beneficial for employees (e.g., Thomas & Ganster, 1995), there is also a need for an informal supportive work–family culture (e.g., Thompson et al., 1999). However, at times this construct of a supportive work–family culture gets intertwined with the concept of supervisor support. In fact, the measure (Thompson et al., 1999) of work–family culture includes a dimension of perceived managerial support for family. This is a level of analysis issue, as we expect there to be a significant relationship between the informal support for family and supervisor support for family, but we see them as separate constructs; one an organizational level construct the other a supervisor level construct. Specifically, a family-supportive organizational culture will influence a supervisor to behave in supportive ways. In addition, it is up to the supervisor to decide if he or she will take on and embrace the organizational work–family culture. Thus, we see a need for researchers to tease these two constructs apart in the hopes of better understanding the practical implications of being a supportive supervisor versus having a supportive organizational culture. This will enable better practical applications leading to potential training and instruction of supervisors related to ways they can be more supportive of their employees’ work and family management strategies.

Evidence exists suggesting that when the work–family culture is not supportive, use of formal supports does not have as strong of an impact on an employee’s work–family conflict and other health and work outcomes, compared to when the culture is supportive (Allen, 2001; O’Driscolll et al., 2003; Thompson et al., 1999). As clearly stated by O’Driscolll et al. (2003, p. 340) in response to their findings of significant effects for work and family culture over that of availability of formal policies:

Hence, although many organizations may introduce these initiatives as mechanisms for reducing strain among their employees, the policies by themselves may be insufficient to generate significant stress reduction in this area (Thompson et al., 1999). Rather, development of an organizational culture that is perceived to be supportive of work and family balance may be a necessary condition for the alleviation of work and family conflict and related negative effects.

While certainly formal organizational supports for family are important to adopt, supervisory support for family is extremely important when considering workers’ ability to manage work and family. The supportive supervisor is one who empathizes with the employee’s desire to seek balance between work and family responsibilities (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). This support might include accommodating an employee’s flexible schedule, being tolerant of short personal phone calls after school, granting a time trade
so that new elder-care arrangements can be monitored, allowing one to bring a child to work on a snow day, or even offering a kind word when the babysitter quits (Thomas & Ganster, 1995).

Although some studies find the implementation of workplace supports to be associated with positive outcomes, research also demonstrates that an unsupportive organizational culture may undermine the effectiveness of such programs (Thompson, Thomas, & Maier, 1992). Thus, evidence exists suggesting the moderating effects of work–family culture (in which supervisor support is a critical component) on the relationship between use of supports and beneficial employee outcomes. More specifically, when the work–family culture is not supportive, use of formal supports does not have as significant of an impact on employee’s work–family conflict, and other health and work outcomes, as when the culture is supportive (Allen, 2001; O’Driscoll et al., 2003; Thompson et al., 1999). As Kossek (2005) asserts, even if supportive benefits or policies exist, unsupportive supervisors have the ability to offset the intended effects of these benefits and policies. On the other hand, supervisors can provide a social resource for utilization of work–family policies, and even assist in inoculating employees against some of the negative effects, such as effects on advancement in the company, that prevent policy use (Wharton & Blair-Loy, 2002).

Below we review the literature in a manner that is organized by the different pathways presented in Fig. 1. Additionally, because FSSB is a new integrative construct, we provide four initial propositions about its relationships with three constructs in our model.

**Proposition 1.** We expect a positive relationship between the availability of formal family-supportive organizational policies and practices and level of FSSB.

**Proposition 2.** We expect a positive relationship between the degree to which the organizational culture is supportive of family and the level of FSSB.

**Proposition 3.** We expect a positive relationship between the level of FSSB and employee perceptions of supervisor support for family.

**Proposition 4.** We expect that formal and informal family-supportive organizational culture, as well as FSSB, will be positively related to employee perceptions of supervisor support for family.

It is further expected that employee perceptions of supervisor support would lead to decreased work–family conflict (e.g., Carlson & Perrewe,
and increased work–family enrichment. Ultimately, we expect that this increased work–family enrichment and decreased work and family conflict will lead to a host of health-related, safety-related, family-related, and work-related outcomes as described below in more detail.

WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT AND WORK–FAMILY ENRICHMENT

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) proposed three sources of work–family conflict: time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based conflict. Time-based conflict arises when time pressures in one role restrict the amount of time that can be devoted to the other role. According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), antecedents of time-based conflict include number of hours worked per week, inflexibility with one’s work schedule, and the number and age of dependent children at home. Strain-based conflict arises when strain in one role (e.g., family) affects successful performance of role responsibilities in another (e.g., work). Examples of strain-based conflict include role ambiguity, poor supervisory support, family disagreement about gender roles, and absence of familial or spousal support. Behavior-based conflict, the most infrequently studied form of conflict, arises when patterns of behavior in one role are incompatible with behaviors in another. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) suggest that these pressures will be experienced as stressful only to the degree that the individual experiences negative consequences for not meeting role demands.

Meta-analyses show that work–family conflict is significantly correlated with higher work stress, family stress, turnover intentions, substance abuse, and lower satisfaction (i.e., family, marital, job, and life), organizational commitment, and performance (e.g., Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Research also suggests that unpredictability in work routines promotes work–family conflict, given that work variability and working weekends or rotating shifts both relate to higher conflict (Fox & Dwyer, 1999; Shamir, 1983). In addition, conflict is higher among individuals who work a greater number of hours or longer days (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999).

Research in the work–family domain has also emphasized the importance of distinguishing between the two directions of work–family conflict in which work interferes with family (work-to-family conflict) as well as
family interferences with work (family-to-work conflict) (e.g., Greenhaus, Allen, & Spector, in press). Literature suggests that work interference with family may have different antecedents and outcomes than family interference with work, with work-related demands being most often associated with work-to-family conflict and family-related demands being most often associated with family-to-work conflict (e.g., Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). Finally, recent research has also linked family-to-work conflict to self reports of safety compliance and safety participation, demonstrating that higher levels of conflict are related to lower levels of safety (Cullen & Hammer, in press).

While work–family research in the industrial–organizational and organizational behavior literature has typically focused on work–family conflict and the difficulties associated with combining the two roles (e.g., Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005), there is a growing awareness, however, that work and family roles may have beneficial and reciprocal effects on one another and that focusing heavily on work–family conflict has left a gap in our understanding of the work–family interface (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002; Rothbard, 2001; Voydanoff, 2004). These ideas about the benefits of combining multiple roles originated in the earlier work of Sieber (1974) and others (e.g., Marks, 1977; Thoits, 1983). More recently, constructs such as work–family positive spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006), work–family facilitation (Grzywacz, 2000a), and work–family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) have been introduced to describe the theoretical relationships and associated mechanisms that enable work and family to benefit one another. We use the term work–family enrichment to represent those beneficial relationships between work and family, consistent with Greenhaus and Powell (2006).

To date, very little research has examined the outcomes of work–family enrichment. The research that does exist has linked positive spillover to health and role satisfaction (Crouter, 1984; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Pavalko & Smith, 1999; Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2004). For example, research by Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, and Shafer (2005a) has demonstrated significant longitudinal crossover relationships between work and family positive spillover experienced by a spouse and an individual’s experience of depressive symptoms one year later. We would argue that social support from one’s supervisor is likely to improve positive spillover between work and family as it provides an additional resource to workers that enhances the relationship between work and family.
WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT/ENRICHMENT AND HEALTH OUTCOMES

As for the effects on health, we expect that decreased work–family conflict and the potential associated increased work–family enrichment will be associated with decreased depressive symptoms (Frone, 2000; Hammer et al., 2005a), and improved physical health (Allen & Armstrong, 2006; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1997; Greenhaus et al., in press). We would expect that over time, the effects of work–family conflict to be consistent with other types of chronic stressors and result in such negative outcomes as cardiovascular disease, and most notably high blood pressure (e.g., Landsbergis, Schnall, Belkic, Baker, Schwartz, & Pickering, 2002).

It has been shown that work-to-family conflict predicted greater depression, physical health complaints, and hypertension whereas family-to-work conflict predicted greater alcohol consumption (Frone et al., 1997). Frone (2000) found both family-to-work conflict and work-to-family conflict to be positively related to anxiety disorders, mood disorders, and substance abuse disorders. Specifically, Frone (2000) found that individuals experiencing work-to-family conflict were 3.13 times more likely to have a mood disorder, 2.46 more likely to have an anxiety disorder, and 1.99 times more likely to experience a substance disorder than were individuals who were not experiencing this type of conflict. Individuals experiencing family-to-work conflict were 29.66 times more likely to have a mood disorder, 9.49 times more likely to have an anxiety disorder, and 11.36 times more likely to have a substance dependence than individuals not experiencing this type of stress. These results show the critical impact of the work–family interface on employee well-being.

Several other studies have found links between work–family conflict and mental health outcomes. For example, Burke and Greenglass (1999) found that work–family conflict was related to greater psychological distress. A number of studies examined relationships between work–family conflict and depression with most, but not all, of these studies assessing depressive mood or symptoms rather than a clinical depressive disorder (Greenhaus et al., in press). Studies provide evidence that employees who experience high work–family conflict also experience elevated levels of depression and both directions of the work family interface are associated with this depression (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1991; Hammer et al., 2005a; Thomas & Ganster, 1995).

In addition to the psychological health outcomes that are associated with work-family conflict are the physical outcomes individuals experience as a result of role interference. Some research has studied physical health in the context of conditions such as blood pressure, hypertension, cholesterol level,
and cortisol levels. Thomas and Ganster (1995) found that both directional measures of work–family conflict were positively related to diastolic blood pressure level, whereas Frone et al. (1997) found that family-to-work conflict but not work-to-family conflict, was associated with hypertension. Thomas and Ganster (1995) also reported higher levels of cholesterol for individuals experiencing extensive work-to-family conflict. These findings suggest a link between physical health and work–family responsibility.

Stress-related outcomes are also important health outcomes associated with work–family conflict. Both physical and psychological stressors within work and nonwork domains have been examined. For example, increased work–family conflict is related to increased job burnout (Greenglass & Burke, 1988; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996), quality of work life (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991), and increased job and family distress (Frone et al., 1997).

Grzywacz (2000b) found that there are different forms of positive spillover between work and family that are associated with better physical health and psychological well-being among midlife adults. Specifically, it was found that positive spillover between work and family may be particularly important for mental and psychological well-being, whereas negative spillover between work and family may be particularly detrimental to physical health. Work–family positive spillover was shown to be more strongly related to depression than work–family conflict (Hammer et al., 2005a). In addition, it has been shown that there are significant crossover effects of spouses’ positive spillover on decreasing depression (Hammer et al., 2005a).

Research examining the relationship between work–family conflict and general health outcomes has grown out of several general models of job stress. Studies show that job distress is predictive of both affective and physiological symptoms of ill-health (Frone et al., 1992; Greenglass, Burke, & Ondrack, 1990). The inability to cope with distress is seeded in symptoms of psychological withdrawal and shutting down of physiological functions. Affective and physiological symptoms have also been linked to the quality of the marital role, the degree of marital satisfaction, and the extent of marital distress (Frone et al, 1992).

WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT/ENRICHMENT AND SAFETY OUTCOMES

An understudied but exciting new area ripe for future research that we identify in our model is linkages between work–family conflict and work–family enrichment and safety outcomes. Drawing from models of job
insecurity and safety motivation (e.g., Probst & Brubaker, 2001), we expect that if we decrease stress of workers as result of increasing managers’ support for work and family, not only will work–family conflict decrease, but we will also see increases in safety motivation and safety knowledge. The theoretical reasoning for this relationship is that workers who are experiencing high levels of work–family conflict are more stressed, and in turn are not able to concentrate on doing their jobs as effectively because of limited resources (e.g., Hobfoll, 1989). Thus, we would expect that higher levels of work and family conflict are associated with lower levels of safety compliance motivation and safety knowledge. This in turn would be related to higher levels of accidents and injuries on-the-job. By decreasing work–family conflict through managerial behavioral training, we expect that over time workers will report higher levels of safety motivation and knowledge.

Cullen and Hammer (in press) found that family interference with work was related to both safety participation and safety compliance. Specifically, the more family-to-work conflict healthcare workers report, the less likely they are to partake in safety-related activities. Family-to-work conflict reduces employees’ compliance to safety rules and their devotion of discretionary time and energy toward safety activities primarily by reducing their safety. Other studies have also demonstrated the ways in which occupational stressors can impact workplace safety. For example, Probst (2002) demonstrated how threats of job layoffs result in more safety violations at work, and Hemingway and Smith (1999) documented how role ambiguity among nurses is associated with injuries at work. Both of these studies highlight the importance of considering specific work-related stressors, rather than just overall job stress, when examining workplace safety behaviors.

In addition, in some preliminary research using a construction-worker population, Chen, Rosecrance and Hammer (2006) further demonstrated a link between work-to-family conflict and the frequencies of injuries noted by construction workers. We know of no research that has linked work–family enrichment and safety outcomes.

**WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT/ENRICHMENT AND FAMILY OUTCOMES**

It is well known that stress produced within the work role may have dysfunctional consequences for one’s nonwork life (Bedeian, Burke, & Moffett, 1988). In general, research has shown that greater levels of work–family
conflict are associated with lower levels of reported life satisfaction (Allen et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Netemeyer et al., 1996; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992). It has been suggested that as people have come to expect more balance, they may experience more dissatisfaction with their life when that sense of balance is violated (Allen et al., 2000).

The relation between work–family conflict and marital satisfaction has shown somewhat mixed results (Aryee, 1992; Duxbury et al., 1996; Parasuraman et al., 1989), however, most of the support suggests that work–family conflict is related to higher levels of marital discord or lower levels of marital satisfaction (e.g., Neal & Hammer, 2007). Research has also examined the relationship between work–family conflict and family satisfaction, demonstrating a general negative relationship (Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999). Only one known study, that of Brockwood (2002), found that increased work-to-family positive spillover was associated with higher family satisfaction after accounting for family role quality and negative affectivity.

Additionally, research on crossover effects has shown that both work–family conflict and work–family enrichment impact spouses’ well-being (Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Hammer et al., 2005a). We believe that expanding the outcomes of work–family conflict and work–family enrichment to the broader family context provides for a more complete understanding of the work–family interface.

WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT/ENRICHMENT AND WORK OUTCOMES

In addition to the family-related consequences associated with work–family conflict and work–family enrichment are the work outcomes resulting in various consequences for individuals and organizations (see Eby et al., 2005 for a review). Job satisfaction is the individual outcome variable that has attracted the most research attention. Although the results have been mixed, the majority of studies have found that as work–family conflict increases, job satisfaction decreases (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Burke & Greenglass, 1999; Allen et al., 2000).

Organizational commitment is another work-related variable that has been studied in association with work–family conflict, demonstrating a negative relationship (Ayree, 1992; Kossek & Ozeki, 1999; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Lyness and Thompson (1997) examined three different types of commitment and found that work–family conflict was negatively related to
affective commitment, positively related to continuance commitment, and not related to normative commitment.

Work–family conflict is also related to greater turnover intentions (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Collins, 2001; Lyness & Thompson, 1997; Netemeyer et al., 1996) as well as lower career satisfaction (Martins, Eddleston, & Veiga, 2002). In fact, Allen et al. (2000) revealed that intention to turnover was the work-related variable most highly related to work–family conflict, which suggests that a common response to a high degree of work–family conflict may be a desire to flee the situation and thus, employees may choose to seek alternative employment with organizations that offer environments that are more supportive of work–nonwork balance.

There has been some inconsistency in regards to the relationship between work–family conflict and absenteeism. Using a study of healthcare workers, Thomas and Ganster (1995) did not find a relationship between work–family conflict and self-reported absenteeism. On the other hand, Goff, Mount, and Jamison (1990) found that work–family conflict was significantly related to absenteeism after the implementation of onsite childcare. Kossek and Nichol (1992) also found mixed effects of use of on-site child care and absenteeism, surmising that if a child is sick, they cannot go to onsite day care which forces parents to be absent to care for them. Other research has examined at the bidirectional nature of work-family conflict and found that there was a significant relationship between family-to-work conflict and absenteeism but not between work-to-family conflict and absenteeism (Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999). Finally, Hammer, Bauer, and Grandey (2003) found not only a relationship between one’s own work–family conflict and self-reported absenteeism, but also crossover effects between spouses’ work–family conflict and absenteeism. The relationship between work–family conflict and performance outcomes has mixed results, as well (Frone et al., 1997; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Frone et al. (1997) found a significant relationship using a multiple-item self-related measure of in-role job performance. Aryee (1992) used a four-item self-report measure of work quality and found that it was related to job-parent conflict but not to job-spouse or job-homemaker conflict. Netemeyer et al. (1996) used a multiple-item self-rated measure of sales performance and found null results. The magnitude of this relationship may depend on whether the type of work–family conflict being measured is bidirectional or unidirectional, as well as the operationalization of performance (Perrewé et al, 2003).

Given that work–family positive spillover has not been studied extensively, we are only aware of a few studies that specifically link work–family
positive spillover and work outcomes. Specifically, Brockwood (2002) and Crouter (1984) found that increased family-to-work positive spillover was associated with higher job satisfaction. In sum, our model integrates supervisor support for family as a critical resource for managing work–family conflict, and for enhancing work–family enrichment, leading to improved health, safety, family, and work outcomes. We argue that greater clarity is needed in the work–family literature on what it means to provide supervisor support for family. The next section of the paper focuses on developing and refining the concept of FSSB.

**DEVELOPING THE CONSTRUCT OF FAMILY-SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS (FSSB)**

We have argued that the linking pin between the formal and informal supports for family at the organizational level is the supervisor who has the ability to either enact and support, or not enact, the formal policies and practices. We believe that part of this decision regarding the degree to implement these policies and practices will depend on the informal family-supportive organizational culture and climate. However, little research exists on how managers actually go about the enactment of the formal and informal family support in organizations. It is our goal to develop and refine ideas around what it means to be a family-supportive manager who interprets, uses, and defines family-supportive organizational formal and informal supports. We believe that the manager has a large amount of discretion when it comes to being supportive of workers’ work and family needs and that understanding the manager’s role is necessary (Lirio, Lee, Williams, Haugen, & Kossek (2004)).

We believe it is important to discuss and differentiate these three main types of support in our model (i.e., formal organizational, informal organizational, and supervisor), as the way that many studies conceptualize them is unclear and they are not always presented as being conceptually distinct, as we believe they are. If we are going to truly influence the degree to which employers increase supervisor support for family, we need to understand the context of supervisor support and better delineate how it is measured and conceptualized. Toward this end, we discuss the dimensions of this construct and consider ways to improve its measurement. In order to understand the FSSB construct, we integrate the research on types of employer supports for family reviewed above: formal policies and practices, informal cultural support, with what we know about the conceptualization of supervisor support.
We define FSSB as being those enacted behaviors exhibited by supervisors that are supportive of families. In other words, we see FSSB as a form of instrumental support that leads to employee perceptions of emotional support from their supervisors, consistent with the similar distinction made by Perrewe, Treadway, and Hall (2003). While measures of supervisory support typically focus on emotional support, we see instrumental support as being more closely aligned with FSSB. In addition, we believe that FSSB is also related to managers recognizing the dual agenda of working families housed within organizations. Finally, parts of the behaviors that make up FSSB are related to supervisors modeling how to appropriately manage work and family roles. The research that does exist is focused specifically on emotional supervisory support and measures of such perceptions of supervisory support have been significantly related to work–family conflict in numerous studies (e.g., Baltes & Heydens-Gahir, 2000; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 2004; Fu & Shaffer 2000; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998), and to work–family enrichment by Voydanoff (2004).

Our model suggests that supervisor support for family should be seen as a critical resource for managing work and family stress (cf. Hobfoll, 1989). We argue that greater clarity is needed in the work–family field about what it means to provide supervisor support for family both emotionally and behaviorally.

While we argue that the study of supervisor support for families is important, previous research has typically only measured employee self-report of general supervisor support for work and family, and to our knowledge only one measure of actual behavioral supervisor support for family exists (Shinn, Wong, Simko, & Ortiz-Torres, 1989), which only assesses one dimension of this multidimensional construct. In order to advance the field, we need theoretical models such as ours that clarify the construct of FSSB and lead to measures that more specifically operationalize what supervisors need to do to help employees manage work and family.

While most measures of family-supportive supervision (see Table 1), and more general supervisor support (see Table 2), have been based primarily on emotional support dimensions, we believe that it is important to more clearly conceptualize family-supportive supervision by identifying specific behaviors that supervisors enact. More specifically, we conducted a review of the literature to better understand how the constructs of general supervisor support and family-supportive supervision are operationalized.

Based on our review, we identified six commonly used measures of family-supportive supervision (Clark, 2001; Fernandez, 1986; Galinksy, Hughes, & Shinn, 1986; Kossek & Nichol, 1992; Shinn et al., 1989) (see Table 1). In
addition, the managerial support dimension of the measure of work–family culture (Thompson, Beauvis, & Lyness, 1999) has also been used as a measure of supervisor support and is an example of how the operationalization of the two constructs (work–family culture and family-supportive supervision) have been confounded with one another. We note several characteristics of these scales that we think needs to be addressed in future conceptualizations of the construct. First, all measures are unidimensional, failing to capture what we see as the multidimensional nature of supervisor support. Second, most of the measures are more clearly characterized as representative of the emotional support dimension of supervisor support. An exception is the Shinn et al. (1989) measure which asks about the frequency of specific supervisory behaviors. To our knowledge this is the only measure of FSSB in the literature and appears to be the most commonly used of the measures, as it appears to be used in its entirety in the Thomas and Ganster (1995) study and in Allen (2001). In addition, several of the items were used in the study by Frye and Breauagh (2004). It should be noted that all of these measures are taken from the perspective of the employee, are unidimensional, and do not appear to be systematically developed. We attempt to overcome these deficiencies by clarifying the multidimensional nature of the construct and discuss the need to understand the construct from a multilevel perspective.

While many authors appear to develop idiosyncratic measures of general supervisor support specific to their own studies, we highlight the ones that appear to be the most commonly used in Table 2. Until now, research has generally included only employee self-report measures of supervisor support for work and family and has not measured actual supportive behaviors. Self-report questions have addressed supervisory support through items related to the way the supervisor cares for employees (e.g., Kinnunen & Natti, 1994) and perceptions that the supervisor values the employee’s contribution (e.g., Ostroff, Kinicky, & Clark, 2002). Supervisor support has been measured by how accommodating and understanding the supervisor is (e.g., House, 1981); and other measures include the degree of career support employees receive from their immediate supervisor (e.g., Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990).

The four dimensions that we think necessary to be included in the concept of FSSB are: emotional support, instrumental support, role model behaviors, and those related to the dual agenda of how the work is structured and managing upward in the workplace. As stated earlier and as can be seen in Tables 1 and 2, the most common measures of supervisor support in general and family-supportive supervision are ones that contain emotional
### Table 1. Commonly Used Family-Supportive Supervision Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Scale Range</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark (2001)</td>
<td>Scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>1. My supervisor understands my family demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. My supervisor listens when I talk about my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. My supervisor acknowledges that I have obligations as a family member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez (1986)</td>
<td>Choose between: to a great extent; to some extent; to a small extent; not at all</td>
<td>1. To what extent does your supervisor support you and your childcare needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose between: very free; free; not very free; not at all free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How free do you feel to discuss your childcare needs with your immediate supervisors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galinsky, Hughes, &amp; Shinn (1986)</td>
<td>Scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1. My supervisor or manager is fair and doesn’t show favoritism in responding to employees’ personal or family needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. My supervisor or manager accommodates me when I have family or personal business to take care of – e.g., medical appointments, meeting with child’s teacher, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. My supervisor or manager is understanding when I talk about personal or family issues that affect my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I feel comfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my supervisor or manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kossek &amp; Nichol (1992)</td>
<td>Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)</td>
<td>1. My supervisor makes it easy for me to deal with scheduling problems during work hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. My supervisor is supportive of my need to juggle work and family responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. I feel free to discuss scheduling issues with my supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. My supervisor is supportive when I experience stress on the job due to work/family conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. My supervisor is supportive when I experience stress at home due to work/family conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinn, Wong, Simko, &amp; Ortiz-Torres (1989)</td>
<td>Scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (often).</td>
<td>According to Thomas and Ganster (1995) respondents were asked to rate how often in the past two months one’s supervisor engaged in specific supportive behaviors:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Switched schedules (hours, overtime hours, vacation) to accommodate my family responsibilities.
2. Listened to my problems.
3. Was critical of my efforts to combine work and family. (R)
4. Juggled tasks or duties to accommodate my family responsibilities.
5. Shared ideas or advice.
6. Held my family responsibilities against me. (R)
7. Helped me to figure out how to solve a problem.
8. Was understanding or sympathetic.
9. Showed resentment of my needs as a working parent. (R)

Thompson, Beauvis, & Lyness, (1999)

Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)

1. In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of family-related needs.
2. Higher management in this organization encourages supervisors to be sensitive to employees’ family and personal concerns.
3. Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees’ child care responsibilities.
4. In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first.
5. In this organization employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and family lives.
6. Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees’ elder care responsibilities.
7. This organization is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons.
8. In this organization it is generally okay to talk about one’s family at work.
9. In this organization employees can easily balance their work and family lives.
10. This organization encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins.
11. In this organization it is very hard to leave during the workday to take care of personal or family matters. (R)
### Table 2. Commonly Used General Supportive Supervision Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Scale Range</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau (1975) | Scale ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much) | 1. How much does each of these people go out of their way to do things to make your work life easier for you? a) Your immediate supervisor (boss).  
2. How easy is it to talk with each of the following people? a) Your immediate supervisor (boss).  
3. How much can each of these people be relied on when things get tough at work? a) Your immediate supervisor (boss).  
4. How much is each of the following people willing to listen to your personal problems? a) Your immediate supervisor (boss). |
| Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley (1990) | Scale ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) | 1. My supervisor takes the time to learn about my career goals and aspirations.  
2. My supervisor cares about whether or not I achieve my career goals.  
3. My supervisor keeps me informed about different career opportunities for me in the organization.  
4. My supervisor makes sure I get the credit when I accomplish something substantial on the job.  
5. My supervisor gives me helpful feedback about my performance.  
6. My supervisor gives me helpful advice about improving my performance when I need it.  
7. My supervisor supports my attempts to acquire additional training or education to further my career.  
8. My supervisor provides assignments that give me opportunity to develop and strengthen new skills.  
9. My supervisor assigns me special projects that increase my visibility in the organization. |
| House (1981)                     | Scale ranged from 0 (not at all) to 3 (very much) | 1. How much can each of these people be relied on when things get tough at work: a) Your immediate supervisor (boss).  
2. How much is each of the following people willing to listen to your work-related problems: a) Your immediate supervisor (boss).  
3. How much is each of the following people helpful to you in getting your job done: a) Your immediate supervisor (boss). |
Please indicate how true each of the following statements is of your immediate supervisor:
Scale ranged from 0 (not true at all) to 3 (very true)

1. My supervisor is competent in doing (his/her) job.
2. My supervisor is very concerned about the welfare of those under him.
3. My supervisor goes out of his way to praise good work.

Kinnunen & Natti, (1994)

Scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

1. My supervisor supports and encourages me.
2. My supervisor rewards good efforts.
3. My supervisor is inspiring.
4. My supervisor discusses with us a lot.
5. My supervisor tells us openly all that is going on in the workplace.
6. My supervisor trusts the workers.
7. There is a lot of disagreement between me and my supervisor. (R)
8. My supervisor put the emphasis on contentment of the workers.
9. My supervisor is unconcerned about workers’ feelings. (R)
10. My supervisor encourages workers to study and develop in their work.
11. My supervisor knows my tasks well.

Ostroff, Kinicky, & Clark (2002)

Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

1. My supervisor has the technical skills to help me do my job well.
2. My supervisor listens to me.
3. My supervisor treats me with respect.
4. The supervisor and employees work together as a team in my department.
5. My supervisor plays favorites. (R)
6. My supervisor provides me with the coaching and guidance I need to improve performance.
7. My supervisor relates to employees in a warm and sincere manner.
8. My supervisor asks for our opinions and encourages us to make suggestions that will improve performance.

Yoon & Lim (1999)

Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

1. My supervisor can be relied upon when things get tough on my job.
2. My supervisor is willing to listen to my job-related problems.
3. My supervisor really does not care about my well-being. (R)
support items. Emotional support generally is focused on perceptions that an individual is being cared for, that their feelings are being considered, and that they feel comfortable communicating with the source of support when needed.

Instrumental support, on the other hand, is related to more behavioral types of support for work and family in the form of scheduling and flexibility and use of policies and practices, assisting with tasks, and making changes in the time, place, and way that work is done to be accommodating to employees’ work–family responsibilities. While we see this dimension of FSSB as critical, there is very little in the literature that helps in better defining this dimension. See Table 1, measure by Shinn et al. (1989) for example of the types of behaviors that would be considered part of instrumental support. Recent work by Greenhaus and Singh (in press) discusses mentoring behaviors through a “work–family lens.” This novel thinking about behaviors that supervisors could and should enact to assist their employees with work–family conflicts is notable, and provides an example of the types of behaviors that should be considered when clarifying the concept of FSSB. For example, Greenhaus and Singh (in press) offer an example of a “coaching” mentoring function with an example behavior “Discuss with the protégé the work–family implications of different career strategies.”

Another different type of supervisor behavior involves taking actions indicative of what work-life scholars have referred to as the “dual agenda.” This is the ability to consider the implementation and redesign of work to support family demands in a manner that is win–win for both employees and employers (Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002). In many firms, particularly those that are just beginning to experiment with the implementation of work–family policies, their use is often seen in a win–lose manner. They are seen as hurting productivity and benefiting workers more than the company or supervisor. A supervisor with a dual-agenda perspective would think about how work can be redesigned to reduce work–family conflict at the same time as productivity is increased. For example, a supervisor may support cross-training of a job to enable someone to be able to leave work every Friday afternoon to volunteer at their child’s school. This not only benefits the workers who has time off on Fridays for his family, but also the company because now the company has more than one worker that can do a job and back up systems are enhanced. Kossek, Laustch, and Eaton (2006) have found that if supervisors manage teleworkers in a way that supports a dual agenda, then employees experience lower work–family conflict. We also surmised that dual-agenda behaviors may involve an ability to manage workers
in a manner that considers the larger organizational system and involves some managing upward behaviors to bring senior managers on board.

Supervisors also can exhibit role model behaviors, which we see as a fourth type of support. If they themselves do not respond to emails over the weekends or send them out at 4 a.m., then their subordinates are less likely to feel pressured to do so. Similarly, if supervisors leave work sometimes early to support family demands such as a sick child or to take care of their own health needs by exercising this sets up a role model for workers to emulate. To our knowledge, little or no research has been conducted on the effects of supervisors exhibiting role model behaviors supportive of their own families as resulting in lower work–family conflict for employees. As our empirical data from the focus groups reported below will also show, if supervisors are experiencing work-family stress, they are less likely to have the personal resources to be able to be supportive of their subordinates’ work–family conflicts.

FURTHER CLARIFYING THE CONSTRUCT OF FSSB: EXPLORING EMPIRICAL FOCUS GROUP DATA

As part of the process of clarifying the construct of FSSB, we conducted four focus groups with grocery workers as well as four interviews with their district managers (DM). The four focus groups consisted of the following groups of workers: store managers (SM), department heads (DH), part-time associates (PT), and full-time associates (FT) (see Appendix A for focus group and interview questions). The first and second authors of this chapter conducted the focus groups and interviews in different northeastern cities on the same day during Fall 2005. All participants were employees of a major grocery chain consisting of non-union (SM and DM) and union employees (DH, PT, and FT). The group size ranged from 5 to 8 participants per group with a total of 28 participants in 4 focus groups. The age range was 17–73 years of age and there were 21 males and 7 females present. Demographics by group include the following.

The Part-Time group included 5 attendees with a mean age of 48.5: 2 males (40%) and 3 females (60%). Three of the five participants were married, one single and the other widowed. Two participants had children, and none of the respondents indicated providing care to aging relatives. These participants reported working on average 24.1 hours per week, and none reported having a second job.
The Department Heads’ group included 8 attendees with a mean age of 36.5: 5 males (63%) and 3 females (38%). Five of the eight participants were married, one divorced. Five participants had children and two participants reported caring for aging relatives (25%). These participants reported working on average 41.63 hours per week, and none reported having a second job.

The Store Managers’ group included 7 attendees, with a mean age of 48. All participants were males, and all were married. Five of the participants had children, and two participants were providing care to aging relatives (29%). These participants reported working on average 58.21 hours per week, and one reported having a second job.

The Full-Time Associates’ group included 8 attendees with a mean age of 51; 4 males (50%) and 4 females (50%). Three of the eight participants were married, and one was divorced. Four of the participants had children, and two participants were providing care to aging relatives (25%). These participants reported working on average 44.13 hours per week, and one reported having a second job.

Sampling was accomplished by random selection of names from employee lists provided by the grocery chain. These employees were provided with letters of invitations to participate in focus groups on work and family and were asked to call the researchers directly so as to avoid any feelings of coercion by the employer. In addition, fliers were posted in employee break rooms inviting any workers who were interested to participate. Potential participants were then asked to call the Center for Work–Family Stress, Safety, and Health’s toll-free number to confirm their attendance at the focus group. At that time we verified that they were attending the correct group based on their position in the company. Four district managers were referred to the researchers by the regional director of human resources within two regions of the company. When contacted, all four agreed to participate.

To examine family-supportive and family-unsupportive supervisor behaviors, we conducted analysis of the data using an “open-coding” approach (Strauss & Corwin, 1990) to identify the broadest possible range of focus group responses. This involved coding for supervisors’ supportive and unsupportive behaviors from the perspective of each level of employee represented in the study. We extracted a total of 130 quoted behaviors that represented either family-supportive or family-unsupportive supervisor behaviors. Four independent coders coded for themes, while three coders coded specifically for quotes of behaviors.
A coding sheet was developed from a reflective memo template, which included dimensions of behavior as well as perspectives of overall company support, work-life philosophy, schedule, flexibility, work norms, business climate, human resource strategies effect, and issues of exploitation. For the purposes of this chapter, the focus will remain on the behaviors of supervisors.

Coders reviewed the analyses to determine the degree of convergence or divergence and realized a high degree of inter-rater reliability among coders of all themes (approximately 95% across raters). A reflective summary memo was then created for each group (SM, DH, PT, FT, and division manager) and then further summarized into a final rollup report. Finally, an executive summary was created which included broad highlights of the data.

Of the 130 quoted behaviors, 66 were identified as supportive and 64 as unsupportive. The following information represents the FSSB themes that were derived from the quotes, along with the number of quotes associated with each theme in parentheses.

The themes developed for FSSB include: Commuting Support (7), Being Sensitive to Employees’ Work–Family Needs (22), Scheduling Flexibility (26), and Respect Toward Employees (11).

Each theme has descriptors attached based on the 130 quoted behaviors. The supportive descriptors are as follows. Commuting support was identified by FT, DH, and DM totaling 7 quotes (i.e., FT (3 quotes), DH (1 quote), and DM (3 quotes)) and is described as helping an employee to transfer to a store closer to their home for personal reasons. An FT stated:

I got transferred to a store, it was a little distance from my house, and I told him my mom and dad are here and they are taking turns in and out of the hospital and any possibility of me getting closer to my house ... hospital was just up the road so on my lunch hour I can run to the hospital. And they live ... just down the street. So, I am within ten minutes of either location, their house or their hospital. It really helped me out.

Being sensitive to employees’ work–family needs was identified by all levels of participants totaling 22 quotes (i.e., DM (9), SM (4), DH (1), FT (5), & PT (3)) and is described as understanding employees’ home life situations, showing concern and offering assistance in times of need – illness, accidents, death, etc., open-door policy for communicating needs, communicating in a way that shows a caring attitude toward employees, only calling home for emergency help, respecting employees’ personal time, listening and offering assistance and/or advice, helping alongside employees when the store is
busy, offering assistance during personal crisis, and a sympathetic attitude toward family issues. A DM stated:

We had a couple of store managers pass away and they worked on getting scholarships for their children so they could get college taken care of through donations and fundraisers. I had someone, one of my managers died at 32. The company helped me do a spaghetti dinner ... to raise money so their kids could go to college ...

**Scheduling flexibility** was identified by all levels of participants totaling 26 quotes (DM (16), SM (1), DH (2), FT (3), & PT (4)) and is described as: making changes to an employees’ schedule to accommodate emergency needs, trying to give the same days off each week, scheduling around work–family issues such as family events, giving time off to avoid burnout, scheduling around holidays in advance, trying to change schedules when requested, and discussing schedules in advance and offering flexibility as able. An FT stated:

My mom was in the hospital for a couple of weeks and I said how about knocking off the nights for a while. So, he let me write the schedule and he didn’t change it. Whatever I need, he let me write it for what I needed.

**Respect toward employees** was identified by all levels of participants with the exception of DH totaling 11 quotes (DM (4), SM (3), FT (3), & PT (1)) and is described as: encouragement of an employee through attitude and praise, creating a comfortable environment, coaching, helping, defending, and listening to employee, protecting employee by not taking stress out on them, and offering employees’ assistance on the front line. An FT stated:

Some will chip in and come if you are really busy. They’ll put on an apron and they will come and help you.

**Unsupportive** themes identified include: Culture of Work First (11), Some Managers Are Unapproachable (4), Scheduling Issues (20), Understaffing (13), and Disrespectful Attitudes Toward Some Employees (16).

Each theme has descriptors attached based on the 130 quoted behaviors. The unsupportive descriptors are as follows. **Culture of work first** was identified by FT, SM, and DH totaling 11 quotes (FT (2), SM (7), & DH (2)) and is described as: lack of concern about employees’ personal lives/family and great concern about profitability, necessity to attend meetings outside the scheduled work day, and putting in extra time at work and feeling like they cannot easily take time off without repercussions. An SM stated:

Taking care of your family is almost looked on as a weakness ...

**Some managers are unapproachable** was identified by all participants with the exception of Part-Time Associates totaling 4 quotes (FT (1), DH (1),
DM (1), & SM (1)) and is described as: a lack of communication with employees and unwillingness to deal with issues. An FT stated:

There are some stores where you don’t talk to the manager unless he says something to you. There are some managers you don’t even want to address.

*Scheduling issues* was identified by all levels of participants totaling 20 quotes (DM (3), SM (2), DH (3), FT (6), & PT (6)) and is described as: depending on the manager, scheduling flexibility is variable, new hires are given better schedules than long-time employees, different employees receive different amounts of hours, it is difficult to have an entire weekend off or two days off in a row, schedule requests are not always given much consideration, inconsistent scheduling on a regular basis, more money but also less hours or not giving enough hours, inconsistency between managers on allowing or not allowing flexibility, and difficulty managing work–family due to a lack of flexibility in scheduling. An FT stated:

What we are finding now is a lot of people that are being promoted to full time are coming in with the schedule that they want. In other words, we were hired, we had to have an anytime availability. You had to be willing to work nights, which is only fair. We could never be hired with, “I only work six to two” or “I can only work seven to four” and the people coming in now, get that. That’s kind of unfair.

*Understaffing* was identified by all levels of participants with the exception of District Managers, totaling 13 quotes (SM (6), DH (5), FT (1), & PT (1)) and is described as: try to hire employees that are willing to stay for more than six months which excludes extra-seasonal help (i.e., college students), understaffing at all levels makes flexibility very challenging, and budgeting cuts increases pressure and stress because it causes a decrease in staffing and increased inability to cross-train and have flexibility.

An FT stated:

I have had two bad knees that are going to be replaced. I gave up therapy because of the fact that I couldn’t work 7:30 to 4 and make it five o’clock. I was told point blank that’s not possible. So, I worked around it which is fine. I don’t go to therapy at all.

*Disrespectful attitude toward some employees* was identified by all levels of participants with the exception of District Managers totaling 16 quotes (FT (3), PT (6), SM (2), & DH (5)) and is described as: Taking out frustrations on employees by yelling, hollering, and embarrassing an employee in front of customers, fear-based management, more negative feedback than positive feedback, lack of clear instruction and communication. A PT stated:

… this store manager embarrassed … had a habit of doing that if they saw the employee on the floor like in the aisle or whatever doing something that they weren’t supposed to
be doing, would call you on it right then and there. I guess, and one example is going
from their department to the other end of the store, coming back and delaying looking at
a display, thinking of buying it, you know, when you get off of work. “You’re not
supposed to be shopping while you work.” And did it in front of the customer, so … I
thought that was kind of …” Not treating employee with respect, demeaning … I think
that’s a real no-no, to be honest with you. Um, actually, I have say when I was sent down
in the floral department last fall there was a manager there before (employee name) was.
And this was this person’s management technique, which I said, I could … Um, coming
in this … likes decorating, made a big mess with all these plants. And there’s dirt all over
the place. And after finish doing all that, turned around and looked at me and said,
“Yeah,” “Get a broom.” That’s exactly what that person said to me. I felt like saying,
“No.” But I did.

The themes created from this analysis represent individual coding and group
discussion and evaluation, which were determined to be fairly consistent
across raters in approach and outcome of themes. These focus groups were
helpful by giving specific examples of what employees in a grocery store-
context perceived as being family-supportive and not so supportive. It was
noted in our group discussions that there are no formal work–family policies
in place in this grocery store chain and that assistance was given in extreme
circumstances but not for the general day-to-day work–family needs of em-
ployees. Thus, it appears that there was sole reliance on informal, rather
than any formal, system of support for work and family, and more spe-
cifically, reliance on supervisor support.

It should be noted that a limitation of this study is the inclusion of four one-
hour interviews of district managers which were treated similar to the data
collected from the four one-hour focus groups conducted with the district
managers’ subordinates (SM, FT, PT, and DH). Because the district managers
are not actually in the grocery stores on a daily basis, their perception was
interpreted differently. Additionally, there are more quotes represented by
district managers, which could present a slightly biased perspective toward
supportive behaviors if viewed only from the number of quotes. In addition,
we did analyze the information by individuals; thus, it is possible that one
individual could have contributed several behavioral examples to one theme,
or a theme could have been based on input from numerous participants.

FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE
IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPT OF FSSB

Our model offers a mechanism for research and practice as it depicts clear
pathways between organization-level factors, supervisor-level factors, and
individual and organizational outcomes related to FSSB. More specifically, we suggest that taking a multilevel approach to understanding not only the concept of FSSB, but also the outcomes of such behaviors will provide a more clear understanding of the importance of FSSB for both researchers and managerial practitioners.

These findings based on our literature review and our focus groups specifically point to the need for the development of psychometrically sound measures of behavioral supervisory support for family. While measures of employee self-report of general emotional supervisor support for work and family exist, to our knowledge, only one measure of actual behavioral, or instrumental, supervisory support exists (Shinn et al., 1989), and it appears to be an unidimensional measure. It is clear from the results of our focus groups and from our review of the literature that there is a need for a multidimensional measure of FSSB. In order to advance the field, we argue that it is important to develop a measure that more specifically operationalizes what behaviors supervisors need to be engaging in to help employees manage work and family. The measure should incorporate four positive dimensions: emotional/social support, instrumental support, support for a dual agenda, and supervisory family-supportive role model behaviors that are supportive of work and family.

In addition to the propositions presented in this chapter and the noted areas for needed research, we suggest that another area for future research is to better understand what factors contribute to FSSB, in addition to the formal and informal family-supportive organizational culture. For example, using data from the families and work institute, the 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce, a recent study by Foley, Linnahan, Greenhaus, and Weer (2006) found that supervisors are more likely to provide family-supportive supervision to employees who were similar in either gender or race compared to employees who were dissimilar. As they noted, few studies have examined factors that contribute to family-supportive supervision (Foley et al., 2006). Furthermore, Foley et al. (2006) suggest that with increasing diversity of our workforce, these findings point to an even greater need for diversity training and training managers on how to be responsive and sensitive to employees’ work-life issues.

We suggest that managers should be trained on how to exhibit the four dimensions that we have identified, which make up FSSB: emotional/social, instrumental, dual agenda, and role-supportive behaviors. We also think they should be trained on counterproductive behaviors – that is, behaviors that employees are likely to interpret as being barriers to support and visible indicators of unsupportiveness. This can be achieved through a combination
of training on general sensitivity to work–family employee issues, as well as more technical training specific to the characteristics of the job, that involve structurally changing the place, organization, and scheduling of a job to be adaptable to the work–family needs of workers. Ultimately, we suggest that FSSB should be linked to supervisor feedback and training interventions in order to enhance managerial competencies in managing work and family. Likewise, Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) recently found that supervisors who feel supported by their organizations are, in turn, more likely to provide support to their employees resulting in more positive employee outcomes. This research suggests that more multilevel studies that fully depict factors that impact FSSB and the resultant effects on employees are needed.

We encourage future research to develop training interventions in this area. Hammer and Kossek (2005) have begun designing such an intervention which will be linked directly to the FSSB construct. They will conduct a quasi-experimental design to evaluate the effectiveness of such interventions. This research is part of a national work, family health, and well-being network being led by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), with collaborative funding from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and the National Institute on Aging (NIA). Hammer and Kossek’s (2005) study is one example of where the future research in the field of work and family should evolve. We must move researchers from not only defining constructs in general, such as the notion of supervisor support, but also clarify the actual behaviors that must be exhibited (such as FSSB). Researchers must also begin to link work–family conflict to intervention and formal and informal systems that are implemented across organizational levels – namely from the formal policy level, to the informal supervisory practice level where the employee’s job demands are carried out in the context of their daily work and family lives.
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APPENDIX A: FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Focus Group Questions: Part-Time and Full-Time Associates

1. What are the (company name) attitudes toward managing work and family here, for example, what is valued and not valued by the company?
2. What do you see as the role of Department Heads in managing work and family? Without mentioning names, can you give me examples you have seen or heard about that are particularly helpful or NOT helpful?
3. How about the role of Store Managers in managing work and family? Any examples that are helpful or NOT helpful?
4. Have you witnessed a Department Head or Store Manager being what you would call supportive when it comes to work and family responsibilities? If so, please describe what you observed.
5. What would you most like to see changed about how work and family is managed at (company name)? Why?
6. Are there any other comments regarding work and family at (company name) that you would like to make that would help us better understand how work and family is being managed here?

Focus Group Questions: Department Heads and Store Managers

1. What are the (company name) attitudes toward managing work and family here, for example, what is valued and not valued by the company?
2. What do you see as YOUR role in managing work and family? Without mentioning names, can you give me examples you have seen or heard about how other Department Heads (Store Managers) are assisting employees in managing work and family that are particularly helpful? How about examples you have seen or heard about that were NOT helpful?
3. What are the differences, if any, between Store Managers and Department Heads in assisting employees in managing work and family at (company name)?
4. What do you see as the role of District Managers in managing work and family?
5. What would you most like to see changed about how work and family is managed at (company name)? Why?
6. Are there any other comments regarding work and family at (company name) that you would like to make that would help us better understand how work and family is being managed here?

Interview Questions: District Managers

1. When you hear the term managing “work and family” at (company name), what first comes to your mind?
2. What are the company’s attitudes toward managing work and family here? What is valued by the company? What is not valued?
3. What do you see as the role of District Managers in managing work and family? Without mentioning names, can you give me examples you have seen or heard about that are particularly helpful? How about examples you have seen or heard about that were NOT helpful?
4. What do you see as the role of Store Managers in managing work and family? Without mentioning names, can you give me examples you have seen or heard about that are particularly helpful? How about examples of those supervisor actions you have seen or heard about that were NOT helpful?
5. What do you see as the role of Department Heads in managing work and family? Without mentioning names, can you give me examples you have seen or heard about that are particularly helpful? How about examples you have seen or heard about that were NOT helpful?
6. What would you most like to see changed about how work and family is managed at (company name)? Why?

Are there any other comments regarding work and family at (company name) that you would like to make that would help us better understand how work and family is being managed here?
WOMEN’S KALEIDOSCOPE CAREERS: A NEW FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING WOMEN’S STRESS ACROSS THE LIFESPAN

Sherry E. Sullivan and Lisa Mainiero

ABSTRACT

This chapter explores the linkage between the careers of women over the lifespan and their experience of stress. Traditional models of career stages were developed by studying men’s careers and do not fit the complexities of women’s careers. Several newer models of careers have appeared in the literature but none of these models adequately address the issues women face as they juggle work responsibilities and their family lives. We discuss the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) as a means of understanding the parameters that may affect women’s decision making about their careers and the relationship between these parameters and the experience of stress. Testable propositions based on this model using the Kaleidoscope Careers Self-assessment Inventory (KCSI) are included as ideas for future research. Recommendations for organizational programs and policies are also detailed.

The American Institute on Stress has identified stress as the number one health problem in the USA (NOISH, March 19, 2006). Stress costs U.S.
businesses approximately $300 billion per year (http://www.stress.org, March 19, 2006). Estimates suggest that 40% of turnover costs, 55% of employee assistance program costs, and 60% of workplace accidents costs can be attributed to stress (Tangril, 2003). A recent American Psychological Association study found that 61% of the employees surveyed reported that heavy workloads were having a significant impact on their work stress levels, with one out of four workers confessing to taking day off of work to cope with stress (http://www.apahelpcenter.org, March 19, 2006). Despite the transition to the information age and its promised work-life improvements, individuals continue to seek remedies for job stress; an Amazon.com book title search using the keyword “stress” produced 12,055 results (http://www.amazon.com, March 19, 2006). Major newspapers and magazines still regularly run stories about the negative impact of stress on employees’ work lives (e.g., “Face Time: The New Assembly Line;” Ryan, BusinessWeek, April 22, 2005).

Numerous academic studies have examined the relationship of stress to a variety of factors including: performance (see Sullivan & Bhagat, 1992 for a review), decision making (Ganster, 2005), job demands (Ganster & Schaumbroek, 1991; Van Veghel, De Jonge, & Landsbergis, 2005), job design (Ganster, Fox, & Dwyer, 2001), job complexity, (Schaumbroek, Ganster, & Kemmerer, 1994), job accountability (Hochwarter, Perrewé, Hall, & Ferris, 2005), job resources (Van Veghel et al., 2005), the level of emotional labor in a job (Johnson et al., 2005), work environment (Harenstam, 2005; Raghuram & Wiesenfeld, 2004), supervisor’s behavior (Gilbreath & Benson, 2004), personality traits such as Type A behavior (Schaumbroek et al., 1994), citizenship behaviors (Bolino & Turnley, 2005), political skill (Perrewé, Ferris, Frink, & Anthony, 2000; Perrewé & Nelson, 2004; Perrewé et al., 2004; Perrewé et al., 2005), mentoring (see Young, 2005 for a review), management interventions (Giga, Cooper, & Faragher, 2003), organizational justice (Greenberg, 2004), external career stage (Carlson & Rotondo, 2001), and economic cycle (Tausig, Fenwick, Sauter, Murphy, & Graif, 2005). There has been a tremendous amount of research completed on the impact of work–family conflict on employee well-being and performance, with special attention paid to gender differences in how individuals negotiate the ambiguity and strain often associated with multiple work and nonwork roles (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1995; Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2002; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). Scholars have also studied the increasingly long hours individuals devote to
their jobs (Clarkberg & Moen, 1998; Jacobs & Gerson, 2000), the impact of working nonstandard hours and spouses working different job shifts (see Barnett, 2006 for a review), as well as working women’s “second shift” of doing housework and taking care of children and elderly relatives after a long day at the office (Hochschild, 1989, 1997).

Despite the extensive research that has been completed on stress, what still remains unexplored is the relationship between women, careers, and stress. Although the study of stress has been of great interest to both managers and academics, there is no accepted framework that adequately explains how stress affects women across the lifespan. Moreover, while studies of women’s development have examined key decision-making points or defining moments over the lifespan (Bardwick, 1980; Kram, 1996; Gallos, 1989; Powell & Mainiero, 1992), the link between stress, women, and career development still remains weak. It is often assumed that women experience the same types and levels of stress as do men, even though previous research has found that women have greater responsibilities for childcare, eldercare, and housework (Hochschild, 1997; Crittenden, 2001), are more relational in the decision-making process (Gilligan, 1978; Gallos, 1989), and often leave the workforce because of the impossible demands of balancing work and family roles as well as other factors including sex discrimination and harassment (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005). The stressors that women experience are different from those of men and may affect their career development, their willingness to remain continuously employed over their lifespans, and their family lives.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine these issues and provide a focus on the intersection between women, stress, and career development. We begin this chapter by briefly reviewing the general literature on career stages and discuss the implications of these linear career stage models for the understanding of women’s stress. Next, we introduce the Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) as a new framework for examining women’s careers. Then we delineate how the KCM can provide a more comprehensive framework for studying stress as a woman’s career unfolds and set an agenda for future research. Finally, we offer suggestions on how organizations can address the problem of workplace stress in light of the changing nature of work.

**STRESS AND THE TRADITIONAL (MALE-DEFINED) CAREER**

Historically, models of careers emerged from manufacturing age principles that suggested that men work for organizations that were designed as a
structured pyramid. These models were founded on the premise that men were focused on upward movement within one or two companies over their lifespans (e.g., Super, 1957). In this traditional system, it was important for workers to repeatedly win rounds in the career tournament (see Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005 for a review; Nicholson & De Waal-Andrews, 2005; Rosenbaum, 1979). It was also vital for the traditional workers to have a cadre of helpful allies, including the “special woman,” usually a homemaker, who took care of the children and supported her husband’s career ambitions (Levinson, 1978) as well as a mentor (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Forret & de Janasz, 2005; Kram, 1985; Levinson, 1978), who helped the younger worker navigate organizational politics and gain enhanced career outcomes, especially increases in salary and rapid promotion rates (Feldman, 2002). These helpful allies not only aided in the man’s career advancement but also helped reduce the stress associated with climbing the corporate ladder. The special woman helped reduce the man’s stress by freeing his mind from worries about domestic concerns, including any problems the children may be experiencing, and by taking care of the routine tasks of daily living (e.g., laundry, preparing meals, keeping the home clean). The mentor also helped reduce the man’s stress by protecting him from political opponents and teaching him the politics of organizational life (see Levinson, 1978 for further discussion of the special woman and the mentor).

One of the most well-recognized and well-cited models of the traditional linear career was developed by Donald Super (1957) (Super, Thompson, & Lindeman, 1988; see also Sullivan, 1999 for a review of the traditional stage models). Super (1957) articulated a model by which individuals expressed their self-concepts as summarized by four career stages. In each stage, the individual strived to complete certain tasks in order to develop, mature, and successfully move on to the next stage. Unsuccessful completion of these developmental tasks stalled one’s career progress, creating anxiety and stress. The four stages of Super’s (1957) model are:

1. Exploration, a period of engaging in self-examination, schooling, and the study of different career options;
2. Establishment, a period of becoming employed and finding a niche;
3. Maintenance, a period of holding on to one’s position and updating skills; and
4. Disengagement, a time to phase into retirement.

Given the assumption that individuals generally progress through these stages in a linear and uniform fashion, human resource professionals have
designed career management programs to assist employees in successfully completing the tasks associated with each stage of development. These organizational programs helped individuals cope with the stress typically associated with each stage of development. For instance, in the establishment stage, firms provide organizational orientation and socialization programs to help newcomers reduce the stress of being “the new kid on the block” by increasing their understanding of the firm’s culture and norms (Wanous, 1992; Reichers, 1987). Progressive firms often use Realistic Job Previews (RJPs) to reduce culture shock and the related stress, job dissatisfaction, and turnover that can occur when newcomers, particularly those with limited work experience, have unrealistically high expectations (Wanous, 1992). For employees in the maintenance stage, firms typically offer training that focuses on updating computer and other technological skills, which may help reduce employees’ fear of being obsolete, and may perhaps even offer training on health-related issues, such as how to manage stress or a midlife crisis (see Crocitto, 2006 for a review of midcareer issues). For employees in the disengagement stage, firms typically offer limited assistance in making the potentially stressful transition from work to retirement, with emphasis usually placed on financial concerns rather than possible psychological stressors.

Although these organizational programs can be helpful in reducing stress, they do not necessarily address the particular issues that lead to stress in women’s lives. This should not be surprising, however, as most organizational programs are based on what was traditionally defined as a “male” model of career development, with emphasis placed on reducing typical male stressors. Traditional organizational programs tend to neglect the different (and often additional) needs of women workers. In the next section, we further explore women’s stress within the context of the traditional organization.

WOMEN, STRESS, AND THE TRADITIONAL ORGANIZATION

For women, stress results from two primary organizational sources: (1) feelings of discrimination in a male-dominated work environment and (2) issues associated with balancing work–family conflict. First, there is sufficient literature that suggests working women are more likely to experience stress based on gender differences (see Powell & Graves, 2003). Although there are some workplace stressors, such as long work hours, that both men and women are likely to experience (Barnett, 2006), women are more likely
to face certain stressors, such as sexual harassment and sexual discrimina-
tion, than are men (e.g., Bowes-Sperry & Tata, 1999; Nelson & Burke, 2000). For women, just being employed in a male-dominated work envi-
ronment is a cause for stress, as the norms, values, and expectations of the
male-dominated culture are uniquely different (see Maier, 1999). The glass
ceiling, the glass wall, and the sticky floor still prevent a large percentage
of women from climbing to the top of organizations (e.g., Ohlott, Ruderman,
& McCauley, 1994; Powell, 1999; Ragins, Townsend, & Mattis, 1998; Stroh,
Brett, & Reilly, 1996; Van Vianen & Fischer, 2002). Women represent only
1.6% of Fortune 500 CEOs, fewer than 10% of line managers, 14% of the
U.S. Senate, and 15% of the U.S. House of Representatives (Spence, 2006).
Moreover, despite women’s gains in educational achievements, women still
face workplace discrimination and suffer from pay inequity (Powell &
Graves, 2003). For example, only 47% of women university faculty has
tenure compared to 65% of men; only 18% of the full professors at doctoral
universities are women (AAUP, 2004). While the average salary of male full
professors is $94,235, the average salary of female full professors is $82,874
(Riss, 2005).

The basic rules of the organizational game are different for women and
men (see Powell & Mainiero, 1993). Often, women receive mixed messages
that confound their skills in navigating the expectations of the male-dom-
ine workplace. For instance, women are encouraged to be assertive, yet
to defer to men. Women are told to take risks, but to always be successful.
Moreover, a woman’s range of acceptable political behavior is much nar-
rower than a man’s. When a woman has minor disagreements with em-
ployees, others may perceive her behavior as aggressiveness; women are
usually stereotyped as the meeker sex, whereas similar actions by a man are
often viewed as a positive expression of assertiveness (see Perrewé & Nelson,
2004 for further details).

Second, as the primary caregivers of both children and elderly relatives,
women are more likely than men to have additional nonwork responsibili-
ties that may add considerable stress to an already overloaded schedule.
The typical organization was designed around the traditional male linear
career and the “ideal worker” who has a wife at home taking control of
nonwork demands (Burud & Tumolo, 2004). Despite some well-publicized
exceptions, most organizations do not offer a culture or the resources nec-
essary for working women to balance all of her responsibilities (Baruch &
Sullivan, 2006; Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005; see also reviews of the work/
family literature such as Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Fig. 1 summarizes
some of the previously studied sources of women’s workplace stress.
In sum, much of the past research on careers has been conducted within the context of the traditional organizational structure and assumed that individuals had linear careers (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005). Likewise, past research on stress has tended to focus on individuals in traditional organizational forms with traditional linear careers (Sullivan, 1999). However, the landscape of the western workplace has dramatically changed, calling for a re-evaluation and re-examination of stress across an individual’s lifespan. The next section briefly reviews the changes that have recently occurred in the contemporary workplace.

**STRESS AND THE CHANGING WORKPLACE**

Until recently, career stage models were the primary focus of the literature on careers, as most professional workers were men and the traditional, multi-layered manufacturing organization still dominated the western workplace and supported traditional career structures (see Cytrynbaum & Crites, 1989 for a review). Over the last two decades, the way in which work is done,
as well as the advent of the knowledge economy, has created a new work landscape that has dramatically changed how careers are enacted (Baruch, 2004; Baruch & Hall, 2004; Kaye, 2002). The larger numbers of women in the labor force, the increased number of part-time workers, and the rise in the number of single working parents (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002, 2004a, 2004b) coupled with increased globalization and the rapid rate of technological advances (e.g., Friedman, 2005; Kanter, 2001) have called into question whether the traditional linear models still represent the careers of most western professionals—both men and women (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Cappelli, 2000; Hall, 1996; Osterman, 1996; Peiperl & Baruch, 1997; Weick, 1996).

There have been fundamental changes in the psychological employment contract. The old psychological contract, whereby workers exchanged organizational loyalty for job security was violated as firms laid-off workers, including an unprecedented number of white collar professionals. The old contract was replaced with a new contract that emphasizes workers offering high-level performance in exchange for learning opportunities which should increase their marketability (Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau & Wade-Benzoni, 1995). This new psychological contract has resulted in increased individual mobility; individuals are no longer bounded by a single organization, industry, profession, or even country (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Peiperl & Baruch, 1997; Sullivan & Arthur, 2003, 2006; Weick, 1996). Career success is no longer solely defined by upward advancement (Baruch, 2004; Cappelli, 2000; Cappelli & Associates, 1997) or extrinsic rewards (Gunz & Heslin, 2005; Hall, 1996, 2002, 2004; Heslin, 2005). The new contract has also increased individuals’ career management responsibilities (Baruch, 2004, 2006a, 2006b), causing many to be uncertain about what kind of training and development activities are needed to remain employable (see Baruch & Sullivan, in press, for a review of career management practices; Mallon & Walton, 2005).

Careers are being redefined, as illustrated by Hall’s (2002, p. 12) definition of the modern careers as “the individually perceived sequence of attitudes and behaviors associated with work-related experiences and activities over the span of the person’s life.” A growing number of professionals are taking themselves off the fast-track (Ibarra, 2003), redefining career success (Gunz & Heslin, 2005; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Sturges, 1999), or are opting out of corporations to open small businesses (Buttner & Moore, 1997; Moore, 2002) or to focus on nonwork issues (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2006). Many have proclaimed the traditional career to be dead (Hall, 1996; Pink, 2002) and have called for the development of new models to understand how
contemporary western careers now unfold (e.g., Sullivan, Carden, & Martin, 1998). Table 1 provides a summary of the characteristics of professional careers under the traditional system as well as the contemporary professional career.

Despite these trends, however, much research still is based on linear career models (Arthur et al., 2005). Moreover, concerns have been raised about the validity of these traditional models (Sullivan, 1999), with many scholars questioning whether an uninterrupted career progression depicts reality (Hall & Mirvis, 1996; Reitman & Schneer, 2005; Schneer & Reitman, 1993, 1997, 2002), how cultural norms (see Sullivan & Crocitto, 2006 for a review) and generational differences (Catalyst, 2001; Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005, 2006; Smola & Sutton, 2002) impact how careers unfold, and whether these linear models that were developed to describe the careers of men are truly applicable to the careers of women (Gallos, 1989; Powell & Mainiero, 1992, 1993; Sullivan, 1999).

Dissatisfaction with the traditional, linear, age-based career models have encouraged the development of nontraditional career models including “Boundaryless” (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996), “Protean” (Hall, 1996; Briscoe, Hall, & DeMuth, 2006), “Multidirectional” (Baruch, 2004), and “Customized” (Valcourt, Bailyn, & Quijada, 2005). These newer career paths are nonlinear (Brousseau, Driver, Eneroth, & Larsson, 1996; Driver, 1979, 1982; Driver & Combs, 1983), include taking time out from work in order to balance work and nonwork demands (Powell & Mainiero, 1992, 1993), and recycling to early career concerns in order to change career course (Power & Rothausen, 2003; Sullivan, Martin, Carden, & Mainiero, 2004). Nontraditional careers are often based on project work (DeFillipi & Jones, 1996; Jones, 1996), portable skills (Saxenian, 1996; Sullivan et al., 1998), career interruptions (Schneer & Reitman, 1997), free agency (Peiperl & Baruch, 1997), and part-time job assignments (Feldman, 1990).

Many of these newer models, however, are based on limited empirical examination, and do not recognize the potential for negative outcomes that may be associated with newer, more lateral career paths and other nontraditional career typologies (Sullivan, 1999; Sullivan & Arthur, 2006), especially in relation to stress. For example, the literature on nontraditional career patterns emphasizes the importance of continuous learning and development, assuming that individuals can and will regularly engage in these activities, even without the paternalistic influence of a traditional employer. In an exploratory examination of the learning of individuals both in- and outside of organizational boundaries, however, Mallon and Walton (2005) found less learning was occurring than would be expected. Mallon and
Table 1. Professional Careers Then and Now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Characteristics</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career defined by</td>
<td>The employing organization</td>
<td>The individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Trajectory</td>
<td>Linear, upward</td>
<td>Multidirectional; e.g., up, lateral, down, and in &amp; out of organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Stable environment supporting tall, multi-level organizations</td>
<td>Dynamic, changing, and sometimes chaotic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with employer</td>
<td>Work with one or two firms over lifespan; “cradle to grave” employment typical</td>
<td>Work with multiple firms, crossing the boundaries between functions, departments, industries, occupations, and countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Contract</td>
<td>Exchange of job security for employee’s organizational loyalty</td>
<td>Exchange of learning opportunities for high quality performance &amp; commitment to work at hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for career management</td>
<td>The paternalistic organization, which usually offers “one size fits all” programs based on career stage</td>
<td>The individual, who may seek help from career coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning focused on</td>
<td>Firm specific needs</td>
<td>Maintaining knowledge, skills &amp; abilities to keep marketable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>Formal programs to promote organizational-specific knowledge &amp; organizational commitment; amount of training received usually decreases as employee’s tenure increases</td>
<td>On-the-job learning, action learning; training may be less for those with short-term work assignments such as project and temporary workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluated by</td>
<td>Proxies of performance such as face-time, willingness to travel and relocate</td>
<td>Actual performance outcomes with no constraints on where work can be performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High value placed on</td>
<td>Extrinsic rewards</td>
<td>Intrinsic rewards and flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walton (2005) reported that while individuals agreed in principle that workers were responsible for their own career development and intended to engage in learning activities, they were unsure how to do so. Surprisingly, many of those involved in careers outside of organizational boundaries were passive about their own career development and still relied on past organizational learning experiences. These careerists were too busy earning a living to actually participate in developmental activities, questioned the quality of on-the-job feedback they received, and were anxious about operating in a new career context. Despite breaking the bounds of the traditional employment relationship, employees outside of the traditional employment relationship still desired the guidance and support of an organization in their further development.

Likewise, while the literature on the boundaryless and protean careers focuses on the importance of increased job responsibilities, career autonomy, and learning in order to increase the individual’s continued marketability, it is also assumed that most individuals want enriched jobs. Personality traits, however, may cause such enriched jobs to be more stressful. For instance, Schaubroeck and associates’ (1994) longitudinal study of 251 police and fire department employees suggests that interventions to increase job satisfaction by increasing job complexity may have negative health consequences for those with Type A behavior. They found that the enriched, complex, and perhaps more socially desirable jobs may be well suited to individuals with Type B behavior but may be mismatched to people exhibiting Type A behavior. Individuals with Type A behavior may be better matched to simpler jobs or may need training to overcome their Type A tendencies in order to avoid serious cardiovascular disorders when employed in positions with high job complexity.

Organizational changes, management technologies, and working conditions, thought to bring improvements to individual workers, may in fact make some problems worse. Incidents of sexual harassment and discrimination could actually increase in the new boundaryless environment, as women contract workers may be less likely to report illegal treatment worrying that it will tarnish their business reputation and reduce their marketability. In contrast, women with long-term relationships with a firm may be more likely to report these occurrences, assuming that such actions may directly improve their work situation and help current and future coworkers avoid these problems. Additionally, in the new economy, the use of appropriate political skill may be even more important for women trying to break the glass ceiling and advance to executive levels (Mainiero, 1994a, 1994b). Political skill, which has also been found to moderate the effects of role
overload and strain (Perrewé et al., 2005), may be especially needed by women with overloaded schedules, who are trying to achieve work–family balance. Given the changing nature of employment relationships, stress associated with role overload and strain may be even higher in the contemporary career environment than in traditional organizations.

Changes in the workplace may help some workers while making the conditions even worse than they were before for other workers. Harenstam (2005), while studying seventy-two organizations in Sweden, found that there are definitive winners and losers in the new economy. Changes were found to be most favorable in high-tech and knowledge-based operations, where most of the workers were men, whereas outcomes were less favorable in labor-intensive services, where most workers were immigrants, and least favorable in human services, where most workers were women (see also Tausig et al., 2005). Harenstam (2005) also reported that contract workers faced special pressures as they were held to standardized performance measures, experienced increased work intensity, were assigned less challenging job tasks, and had more inconvenient working hours. Contract workers may also have the additional stress of not knowing whether their contract will be renewed or whether it will take two weeks or two months (or more) to secure a new assignment. To remain employed, contract workers are under pressure to continually research the job market for opportunities for future employment and engage in networking to gain knowledge and job contacts.

Taken as a whole, many individuals in this changing work environment may lack the necessary skills and abilities to continually develop and market their skills in order to remain employable. Individuals may experience stress from a number of sources, including the constant need to quickly become acquainted with a new work environment as they change jobs more frequently, increasing job insecurity that may result from shorter organizational tenure, and the lack of organizational support in terms of training, benefits, and coworker interactions. Prior research has found that women are less likely to have mentors and to have access to the training and development opportunities (e.g., Powell, 1999; Powell & Graves, 2003), which may put them at a greater disadvantage than men in this evolving workplace. The potential negative outcomes associated with nontraditional careers, especially the possibility of increased stress for women, have not been extensively examined in the academic literature on careers and deserve greater research attention.

In the next section, we detail KCM as a new means for understanding women’s careers. Then we will discuss the use of the KCM as a framework for examining women’s stress in the contemporary workplace.
THE KALEIDOSCOPE CAREER MODEL

Using a multi-method approach (e.g., interviews, focus groups, and three extensive surveys) with a sample of over 3,000 individuals, we (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005, 2006) developed a new model of careers, the Kaleidoscope Career Model.¹ We suggest that: “Like a kaleidoscope that produces changing patterns when the tube is rotated and its glass chips fall into new arrangements, women shift the pattern of their careers by rotating different aspects of their lives to arrange roles and relationships in new ways” (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005, p. 111). Each of the three parameters (i.e., authenticity, balance, and challenge) of the KCM shifts over the course of an individual’s lifespan to create different patterns. All three parameters are always present and always interacting but take on different levels of importance based on what is occurring in a woman’s life at that point in time and the fit between the woman’s life and her career. These three parameters are:

1. Authenticity – defined as being true to oneself in the midst of the constant interplay between personal development and work and nonwork issues;
2. Balance – defined as making decisions so that the different aspects of one’s life, both work and nonwork, form a coherent whole; and
3. Challenge – defined as engaging in activities that permit the individual to demonstrate responsibility, control, and autonomy while learning and growing.

We call these three parameters the “ABCs of Kaleidoscope Careers.” Just as a kaleidoscope uses three mirrors to create infinite patterns, our Kaleidoscope Career Model has three “mirrors” or parameters (authenticity, balance, and challenge), which combine in different ways throughout a woman’s life, reflecting the unique patterns of her career. To use an artistic metaphor, the colors of a woman’s kaleidoscope are reflected in these three parameters, shaping her decisions as one aspect of the kaleidoscope, or color, takes on greater intensity as a decision parameter at different points of the lifespan. Over the course of the lifespan, as a woman searches for the best fit that matches the character and context of her life, the colors of the kaleidoscope shift in response, with one color (parameter) moving to the foreground and intensifying in color as that parameter takes priority at that time in her life. The other two colors (parameters) lessen in intensity and recede to the background, but are still present and active as all aspects are necessary to create the current pattern of her life/career. For example, at one point, a woman may delay having children in order to devote more energy...
to her career. At another point, she may subjugate career ambitions for the sake of her family needs. Later in life, she may forge ahead, searching for meaning and spirituality in her life. Somewhere in the middle she may be most concerned about balance and relationships in her life. Her context, and the level of stress she experiences at different “tipping points” over the lifespan, shapes her choices.

The KCM suggests that each of these parameters – authenticity, balance, and challenge – is active as signpost throughout a woman’s career. Certain issues predominate at different points in the lifespan, becoming the parameter that caused a pivot in the woman’s decision making about her career. The remaining aspects, still active, are not irrelevant but take on a secondary role at that point in time.

In our research, most women discussed their needs for finding career challenges early in their lives. Issues of balance and authenticity were of secondary concern, but nonetheless important. For instance, a woman may make a career decision to take a position offering more responsibility at the expense of flexibility, because challenge is the key pivot at that time, while the remaining issues (i.e., balance, authenticity) become secondary.

In mid career, the women we studied were predominately concerned about the issue of balance. It did not matter whether the woman had a husband or children or whether she was single. She was concerned about balancing her family needs as a priority, or, as in the case of single women, soliciting eldercare for aging parents, aiding the concerns and interests of various nephews and nieces, or searching for a companion with whom she could balance her life. At this point in her life, a woman may make adjustments to her career ambitions in order to obtain a more flexible schedule. Or, she may put aside personal needs for authentic work or meaningful experiences in favor of the needs of those around her.

In late career, we found that the women in our research were asking the question, “Is that all there is?” Desire for authenticity, being true to themselves, and making decisions that suited them above others predominated their career and life decisions. At this point, we found most women were still interested in challenges, but these challenges were of their own making or were being addressed on their own terms. They were making decisions in an authentic, meaningful way and the issue of balance, while still active, had receded to the background.

Consider again the working of a kaleidoscope; as one part moves, so do the other parts change. There is a large and growing literature that discusses how women operate relationally – that is, women focus on connections, networks, and others in their decision making (e.g., Gilligan, 1978;
Women, perhaps more so than most men, understand that any decision they make for themselves creates changes in others’ lives. Women evaluate the choices and options available through the lens of the kaleidoscope to determine the best fit among their many relationships, work constraints, and opportunities. The lens of their kaleidoscope also is used to evaluate decisions in terms of the potential cost of the decision outcomes to both her and those around her, including the level of stress associated with the decision. Our research supports the concept of relationalism; we found that women do not make decisions in isolation from those around them. Thus, the KCM reflects the inherent relationalism of women as they make decisions about their careers. Each action taken by a woman in her career is viewed as having profound and long-lasting effects on others around her. Each career action, therefore, is evaluated in light of the impact such decisions may have on her relationships with others, rather than based upon insulated actions as an independent actor on her own.

Although the idea of relationalism in not new (e.g., Gilligan, 1978) and past research has examined the stress aspects of work–family conflict, applying the concept of relationalism to the empirical study of careers is new. We expand this concept by breaking with the typical narrow definition of family as a husband and children. We instead suggest that “family” be more broadly defined as nonwork and relational issues. Nonwork issues not only include what has been typically defined as family (e.g., husband, children, parents, siblings) but also encompass a woman’s own physical and psychological well-being; her friends – especially if she is single or has no children – volunteer activities, hobbies, and spirituality.

Because of women’s connections to others, making career decisions that take into account the decision’s potential impact on others, who may have many different and conflicting needs, may be quite stressful. Career decisions made in this context often have a negative impact on other career outcomes. For example, an examination of the past research on impact of the work–family interface on the career attainment of U.S., East Asian, and Spanish workers found that family responsibilities limit career mobility, and this impact is stronger for women than men (Konrad, Yang, Goldberg, & Sullivan, 2005). Women are more likely than men to take jobs that permit them to combine work and family responsibilities. However, these jobs usually pay less and offer fewer advancement opportunities (see Konrad, Ritchie, Liebe, & Corrigall, 2000 for a meta-analysis review of gender differences in job attribute preferences; Taniguchi, 1999; Waldfogel, 1998). Despite some lessening of gender stereotypes, women still bear most of the domestic burden, spending 37 hours a week on household chores and
childcare compared to the 20 hours a week contributed by men, a gender gap of 17 hours (Winkler, 2002). Research has found a positive relationship between longer work hours and managerial advancement (Konrad & Canning, 1997; Metz & Tharenou, 2001). Because women tend to have greater care-giving and household responsibilities than do men, they spend fewer hours at the workplace, suffering the penalty of reduced pay, fewer opportunities for advancement, and lower retirement income (Crittenden, 2001).2 Many companies continue to use long hours (i.e., face-time) as a proxy for productivity and organizational commitment (Landers, Rebitzer, & Taylor, 1996), even though these longer hours do not automatically translate into increased productivity. The use of long hours is an archaic, albeit still prevalent, measure of performance, especially considering that the transition to the knowledge economy and pervasiveness of technology should have increased worker flexibility in regard to the time and place in which work could be accomplished. However antiquated, long hours are still used as a proxy of performance, placing women at a disadvantage in terms of pay and advancement opportunities.

The KCM provides a new framework for examining women’s careers and decision-making processes. In our research, we found that for women, the concept of “career” can not be summarily divorced from a larger understanding of “context.” In our Kaleidoscope Career Model, “family” and “context” are more broadly defined as the set of connections, representing individuals who are considered important by a woman. Women realize that each of these individuals has his/her own needs, wants, and desires that must be evaluated as she makes decisions. Women’s relationalism forces stressful choices that require an assessment of the needs of their children, spouses, aging parents, friends, and even coworkers and clients – as part of the total gestalt of their careers. The KCM has already been used to examine career management programs (Baruch & Sullivan, in press) and other aspects of career decision making (Sullivan, Mainiero, & Forret, 2006). We suggest that the KCM be further examined as a framework for studying women’s stress. In the next section, we describe how the KCM can be employed to better understand women’s stress in an increasing complex work environment.

EXAMINING WOMEN’S STRESS USING THE KALEIDOSCOPE CAREER MODEL

Because much research has questioned the generalizability of the traditional linear career models to the careers of women (e.g., Gallos, 1989;
Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005, 2006; Powell & Mainiero, 1992, 1993; Sullivan, 1999, 2006), we suggest the use of the KCM as a more appropriate framework for understanding women’s careers and for examining the stress associated with their career. The KCM suggests that women are trying to maintain a delicate equilibrium among the three parameters of the model – authenticity, balance and challenge. When the three parameters are in equilibrium, then little or no stress is being experienced. When that interplay among the three parameters is not in equilibrium, we would expect stress to occur.

To understand how equilibrium among the three parameters can lead to lower stress while disequilibrium among the three parameters can lead to higher levels of stress, consider the cases of two women, Marge and Nikki. Marge is a twenty-eight-year-old lawyer who is putting in long hours in an effort to make partner at her firm. Her primary focus is on challenge, and this need is met through the variety of cases and clients she deals with on a daily basis. Her company encourages pro bono work; Marge often works on cases involving women from the local battered women’s shelter, a cause close to her heart. After much discussion, Marge and her husband, Frank, have decided to wait a few more years to have children. Because Frank often travels in connection with his work, the couple has established a regular “date night” and has breakfast and dinner together whenever Frank is in town. Although Marge’s life is not without its daily hassles and is certainly not stress-free, because Marge’s primary need for challenge and her secondary needs for balance and authenticity are being addressed, she has relatively low levels of stress.

In contrast, thirty-year-old Nikki has a high level of stress; there is disequilibrium among the three parameters of authenticity, balance, and challenge. Like Marge, Nikki puts in long hours; she is a physician in private practice. Because of rising insurance costs, Nikki must meet with a certain number of patients each day in order to make break-even costs. She often feels rushed when speaking with patients. She would prefer to provide each patient with more individualized care, but just cannot allocate the time. She encounters mostly routine cases and does a lot of paperwork. Some days Nikki worries that she has not become the type of physician she dreamed she would be while attending medical school. On the way home from the office each night, Nikki spends at least an hour with her seventy-five-year-old mother who is a patient in a local nursing home. Afterwards, Nikki either runs whatever errands need to be completed, works out at the local gym, or watches some TV. She tries to have dinner with friends at least once a week, but it has been four weeks since they last got together. Although Nikki’s
schedule is full, her primary need for challenge is not being met nor are her secondary needs for authenticity and balance.

As illustrated by these examples, both Nikki and Marge lead full and complicated lives. Both work long hours. However, Nikki’s stress level is much greater than Marge’s because of the greater disequilibrium among the three parameters of Nikki’s Kaleidoscope Career. Disequilibrium occurs when one or more parameters are out of sync. This may account for why some women opt out of corporate jobs in order to start their own businesses; women who are not challenged by their current job may seek to achieve equilibrium among the three parameters by creating a work environment that supports their need for challenge. Or, this may be why some women decide to opt out of corporations in mid career to take care of their families; the balance parameter of their kaleidoscope career may be off-kilter and equilibrium must be restored. Likewise, this may also explain why some women choose to opt out later in their lives to pursue long-forgotten dreams; their need for authenticity may not be met and thus they are making a career transition in order to find more meaning in their lives and reestablish equilibrium among the three parameters (see Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005, 2006). Based upon the principles of the KCM, we propose the following relationship between stress and the ABCs of the KCM:

**Proposition 1.** Women are more likely to experience stress when the three parameters of the KCM (authenticity, balance, and challenge) are in disequilibrium than when the three parameters are in equilibrium.

Moreover, we suggest that the amount or degree of stress experienced by a woman will be in proportion to the amount of disequilibrium that is present among the three parameters. For example, for a working woman who is rearing small children while at the same time caring for elderly parents, the demands of caregiving may interfere with career demands. She may find it difficult to work the expected long hours or accept challenging assignments that require extensive travel, creating disequilibrium among the parameters, and subsequent stress. If it is possible for her to do so financially, the woman may regain the equilibrium among the three parameters by choosing to allow her career to take a backseat by either switching to a reduced-load work schedule (and the associated lower pay and benefits), or by leaving the workforce altogether (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005, 2006). If she is unable to make adjustments and regain the delicate balance among the three parameters, the greater this disequilibrium, the greater is the stress she
will experience. Thus, following from the principles of the KCM, we suggest the following proposition:

**Proposition 2.** The greater the disequilibrium among the three parameters of authenticity, balance, and challenge, the greater is the experience of stress.

The KCM details how the three parameters of authenticity, balance, and challenge shift over the course of a woman’s lifetime and that one of these parameters usually predominates at a specific point in time. If disequilibrium among the three parameters does occur, the parameter that is of primary importance at that point of time is likely to be a greater source of experienced stress than the other two parameters. For instance, in early career, challenge tends to be the parameter of primary importance for most women. If the parameters of authenticity, balance, and challenge are in disequilibrium for women in early career, then it is more likely that challenge, the predominant parameter at this stage, will be a greater source of stress than the parameters of either authenticity or balance. Similarly, in midcareer when balance predominates, it is likely to be a greater source of stress than is either authenticity or challenge. In late career when authenticity predominates, it is likely to be a greater source of stress than is either balance or challenge. Thus, we suggest the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.** If there is disequilibrium among the three parameters of a woman’s Kaleidoscope Career, the parameter of primary importance at that point in time is most likely to be the source of greater stress than either of the other two parameters.

We hope this discussion of the possible relationships between stress and the parameters of the KCM encourages future research on women’s stress, especially within the context of the changing work landscape. Beyond testing these proposed relationships, other directions for future research include examining the impact of the contemporary work environment on the stress of men. We think it is also relevant to examine men’s stressors, especially because recent research suggests that younger men, those of the X and Y generations, may have much different attitudes toward work and careers than did previous generations of men, and we may expect variance in their sources of stress (see Mainiero & Sullivan, 2006 for a more detailed discussion of generational differences and careers).

The potential moderating effect of other variables on the relationship between the three parameters of the KCM and stress is another direction for future research. Some of these moderators may include: the culture of
employing organization; personality traits (e.g., Type A behavior, locus of control); the attitudes toward work and marital roles of the woman’s significant other; number and age of children; level of eldercare responsibilities; the degree of household responsibilities and hours spent on household tasks; and the amount of support for managing work/nonwork demands (e.g., both from the supervisor and formal organizational programs such as flexible scheduling as well as the support provided by extended family and friends).

Another interesting avenue for future research is to examine the relationship between stress and differences in Kaleidoscope Career patterns. While our research has found that most women’s Kaleidoscope Careers follow the Challenge-Balance-Authenticity or Beta pattern, some women do exhibit the Challenge-Authenticity-Balance or Alpha pattern more similar to that of the men (see Mainiero & Sullivan, 2006 for more details). Future research should examine the relationship between the two different female career patterns and stress as well as any potential moderators of these relationships. We think the use of the KCM framework to examine stress over the course of women’s (and men’s) careers may provide additional insights into the process of stress, encourage additional longitudinal research, and help to build a stronger theoretical base so that career stress is examined in a systematic, meaningful manner.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS FOR REDUCING WOMEN’S CAREER STRESS

What implications does the Kaleidoscope Career Model have for organizations and stress management practices? One of the first steps that managers and counselors can take in assisting women to cope with and reduce their stress is to determine what parameter may be the focal point of the experienced stress. The Kaleidoscope Career Self-Assessment Instrument (KCSI), which helps individuals determine their Kaleidoscope Career pattern (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005, 2006), can be administered to employees to determine the focal parameter and thus the most appropriate stress-reduction strategies (see http://www.theoptoutrevolt.com). Once the results of the KCSI have been assessed, it may become apparent that there are already established organizational programs that could be of value to the employee (e.g., sabbaticals, eldercare assistance, telecommuting) and that the employee should be encouraged to use. If no such programs exist, appropriate arrangements could be devised or negotiated between the worker and her
supervisor (e.g., use of flexible schedule, increased job challenge and re-
sponsibilities, additional training) in order to manage stress and enhance
career outcomes.

The value of career coaching and other types of counseling should not be
underestimated. Women should be encouraged to seek assistance in man-
aging work stress. For instance, women may find it useful to work with a
counselor in order to establish boundaries between their work and nonwork
lives. Although email and other technologies can increase flexibility, they
can also increase working hours. Employees are always available via email
or cell phone and work can be completed via laptops even while on vacation
or attending their children’s sporting events (see Quick, Henley, & Quick,
2004 for a discussion of the self-management of stress). Moreover, women
may benefit from engaging in sessions with a career coach. Such coaching
can help women to better understand the politics and culture of the male-
dominated environment in which they may work and can be used to develop
skills, including political skills, which will enhance promotability.

In addition to individual counseling, on a more macro level, human re-
source managers need to examine the current practices of their organiza-
tions to determine if their culture and procedures promote a positive
environment that helps to reduce employee stress. Organizational culture is
a vital link in the prevention of stress. Firms that encourage workers to live
full life and discourage them from being work centric provide a foundation
for women to maintain the equilibrium among the three parameters of au-
thenticity, balance, and challenge as their careers unfold over the lifespan.
This positive organizational culture must be supported by programs and
policies that encourage this gestalt, whether in the form of more flexibility in
work schedules, the use of actual performance rather than face-time as a
proxy for performance and organizational commitment, or establishing
benefits that help employees manage different aspects of their lives
(e.g., childcare, eldercare, cafeteria style benefits, sabbaticals, increased
vacation days).

Organizations must not only provide programs that support the three
parameters of the KCM, but top executives must sincerely encourage the use
of these programs so that women do not fear that taking advantage of them
will damage their careers or take them off the fast track. Firms may need to
think outside of the box and create innovative programs in order to meet the
changing needs of their employees and battle workplace stress in an in-
creasingly turbulent work environment. For instance, women seeking to
express their authenticity may benefit from organization programs that
permit them to devote quality time to their family, friends, and community.
Ice cream giant Ben and Jerry’s provides many examples of how employees have been given the opportunity to engage in socially responsible community projects that increase company goodwill while allowing employees to contribute meaningfully to their communities (see http://www.ben-andjerrys.com for a full description of these programs.) The knowledge gained through these community and other new experiences (e.g., volunteer fundraising, Peace Corps) are carried back to the workplace and enhance the workers’ overall attitudes and effectiveness. In contrast, women who are frustrated in their attempts to express their authenticity may experience increased stress as well as other negative work outcomes (e.g., reduced organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, commitment).

Likewise, women frustrated in their attempts to achieve balance will experience increased stress. Organizational policies need to be created that allow for on and off ramps for those seeking to devote time to child rearing or caring for family members, while still remaining connected to the organization. Women may reduce their work hours to a part-time schedule while being kept in the loop as far as organizational training and development efforts, so that they are well prepared to return to a full-time schedule when the time is right. Some companies, such as IBM, have “boomerang” programs whereby former employees are re-admitted to the firm after taking a career interruption or even after working for another firm (Working Mother, 2003). The firm’s culture must support these efforts by the use of job banks that give first priority to the hiring of alumni and other human resource programs that support those on nontraditional careers paths (e.g., the offering of quality part-time jobs; prorated benefits and training for part-time workers; computer equipment for telecommuting; Boyle, 2005; Branch, 1999; Mainiero & Sullivan, 2006; Riss, 2005; Wheat, 2002).

Because the interplay among the three parameters of authenticity, balance, and challenge may influence stress levels, human resource managers must devise strategies for providing women with job challenges in their organizations. Firms must continually review promotion and reward systems so that qualified women are not prevented from breaking through the glass ceiling and obtaining stimulating, upper-level management positions. Benchmarking must be done to measure the number of women in key profit-and-loss positions as well as the number of women in “the pipeline” gaining the necessary work experiences, network connections, and visibility needed to assume top organizational positions. Activities which support women’s advancement and challenge should be considered, including the monitoring of pay levels to insure equity as well as innovative programs that permit
women to work one on one with key leaders to examine current organizational problems and opportunities. Senior-level managers should be evaluated on their contributions to the advancement of women at all levels in the firm.

One good example of a company that uses benchmarking practices is DuPont. DuPont conducts annual “glass ceiling audits” of its 60,000 employees to ensure that women and men are paid the same for the same or comparable positions (Solomon & Devlin, 2006). Likewise, in June of 2005, the Board of Directors of General Mill instituted a new policy whereby performance in diversity, culture, and development is given a 10% weight in the annual review of each business unit. Marriott International established the goal of spending $1 billion with women and minority-owner suppliers in the next five years and doubling the number of its hotels owned or franchised by women and minorities (Warner, 2006). Firms like DuPont, General Mills, and Marriott International, which are most successful at providing women with challenging jobs, equitable pay, and equal opportunities, tend to live by the motto: “What gets measured gets done” (Cleaver & Spence, 2004; Larson, 2005; Spence, 2005). By setting specific numerical goals, by holding senior managers responsible for the achievement of these goals, and by instituting the appropriate training and development programs that support these policies (e.g., formal mentoring, leadership training, compressed workweeks), firms are more likely to fulfill women’s needs for challenge. Table 2 provides a summary of possible strategies organizations can employ to reduce the stress of women employees.

In conclusion, as women’s careers unfold, they are seeking to maintain the equilibrium among three key parameters – authenticity, balance, and challenge. Much of a woman’s stress arises from her internal perception that these parameters are off-balance, as well as her external assessment that these parameters need more attention in her life. Human resource managers should develop and encourage the use of programs that help women achieve and maintain this equilibrium so that stress is reduced and performance is enhanced.

Top-level executives also must realize that all three parameters must be in equilibrium in order to reduce stress. Therefore, it is in their interests to create and maintain an organizational culture that supports all three parameters of the Kaleidoscope Career. But that is not enough. Given the increasingly complex and turbulent work environment, firms must also have the systems, policies, procedures, rewards, and benefits that, in turn, reinforce a culture of flexibility. Coupled with the use of the KCSI, organizations can develop systematic programs and policies that can promote the
If key organizational executives truly believe that people are the source of the firm’s competitive advantage (Luthans & Youssef, 2004), then they must develop a systematic approach to improving workplace factors that are creating unnecessary stress for women. Otherwise, women will continue to opt out of organizations that fail to provide them with the authenticity, balance, and challenge they seek, taking with them their unique tacit knowledge of the firm. As early as 2012, the U.S. will experience labor shortages, especially among skilled workers and in the growing health care and computer fields (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004a; Grossman, 2005). Human resource managers and key executives must focus on strategies that will attract and attain qualified workers, especially in light of the predicted labor shortages. Human resource managers will need to work with organizational executives to find ways to maintain employee effectiveness by reducing stress and its related harmful effects, and enhance the careers effectiveness of its women workers while reducing stress levels and associated negative outcomes.

### Table 2. Organizational Strategies for Reducing Women’s Stress Based on the Kaleidoscope Career Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaleidoscope Career Parameter</th>
<th>Examples of Organizational Policies &amp; Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>Employee initiates or becomes involved in community projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sabbaticals with socially responsible outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging in meaningful volunteer activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Alternative/flexible work schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution of policies so workers don’t lose advancement opportunities if participate in flexible work programs or take family leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecommuting and increased use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of actual performance outcomes not time-based measures or face-time as proxy measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits prorated for reduced hours employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Move women into visible positions dealing with profit &amp; loss and increased responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmarking top &amp; pipeline positions held by women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting annual audits to insure pay equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting numerical goals regarding the amount of money devoted to support the advancement and training of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding senior managers accountable for promotion, training &amp; development as well as the mentoring of women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and productivity of their qualified employees, especially the growing number of women workers.

**NOTES**

1. Our model is based on a five-year examination of the careers of men and women. Our project was composed of four different studies. Study 1 was an online survey of women members of a national organization of female professionals, which had over 100,000 members in 2001. One hundred and nine women answered the 20-question survey via email for a response rate of almost 10%. Participants were asked to describe their careers and detail the reasons behind their career transitions. Study 2 was an online survey of 1,647 individuals (837 men and 810 women), and was conducted in partnership with an Internet market research firm, Greenfield Online, Inc., (GOI) in 2002. GOI periodically surveys subjects of all ages, races, backgrounds, corporate industries, and titles on various subjects for purposes of market research. GOI holds lists of thousands of respondents who have agreed to participate for a fee. Respondents are guaranteed confidentiality and are required to participate in two surveys per month to maintain their status with the firm. They are not required to purchase products for market research purposes, but they are told their logins will be entered into a drawing for a chance to win a $100.00 cash prize. Our career survey was self-contained and was not merged with any other surveys that GOI was conducting at that time. Survey results were checked, coded, and compiled by GOI from the period of March 15, 2002 through May 30, 2002. GOI’s response rates normally range from 20 to 30%; the response rate for this survey was considered “Good,” as over 33% of individuals available chose this survey for participation. This study focused on the strategies men and women used in their careers, their transitions over time, and the factors that motivated them. Study 3 was composed of a series of online conversations conducted with 5 women and 22 men enrolled in an Executive MBA program in March 2003. Participants ranged in age from 25 to 55, had achieved income levels from approximately $60,000 to 200,000, and worked in various locations all across the U.S. This study employed an online interactive format for discussion on the topic and was undertaken to learn more about men, as considerable data had been collected regarding women in Study 1. Participation was voluntary and respondents were assured of confidentiality. Study 4 was an online survey of 1525 individuals (675 men and 850 women), and captured some of the reasons why women and men leave the
workforce, and the reasons behind their career transitions. This study was conducted in 2004 in partnership with GOI, the Internet market research firm, as described in Study 2. Survey results were checked, coded, and compiled by GOI from the period of July 2004 through August 2004. Respondents reflected the overall population of the GOI website and had similar sample characteristics as reported in Study 2. Study 5 encompassed 52 additional interviews that were conducted from April 2004 to May 2005. The interviews were completed by one of us and took the form of a telephone interview, a face-to-face discussion, or an online conversation about the individual’s career.

2. As gender roles continue to evolve and men increase the hours they devote to childcare and other family and household responsibilities, they are also likely to experience reduced pay and advancement opportunities and they may come to prefer jobs with more flexibility (see Konrad et al., 2005 for a further discussion of changing gender roles).
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WORK HOURS AND WORK ADDICTION: THE PRICE OF ALL WORK AND NO PLAY

Ronald J. Burke and Teal McAteer

ABSTRACT

This chapter addresses a number of issues related to work hours and work addiction. The dependent variables associated with working long hours include health-related illnesses, injuries, sleep patterns, fatigue, heart rate and hormone level changes, as well as several work/non-work life balance issues. Motives for working long hours such as joy in the work, avoiding job insecurity or negative sanctions from a superior, employer demands, are addressed in detail, and a multitude of moderators shown to have affected the work hours and well-being relationship, are reviewed. These include reasons for working long hours, work schedule autonomy, monetary gain, choice in working for long hours. The chapter suggests a need for more research to better understand workaholism and work addiction.

Preparation of this chapter was supported in part by the Schulich School of Business, York University and the DeGroote School of Business, McMaster University. Several colleagues participated in the design and conduct of our projects: Zena Burgess, Astrid Richardsen, Stig Matthiesen, Lisa Fiksenbaum and Graeme MacDermid. Louise Coutu prepared the manuscript.
as well as provides a number of implications and organizational and societal suggestions for addressing work-hour concerns.

Time spent on the job is all at once a source of income, personal identity, and relative status within society, the workplace and household, and a constraint on individuals’ ability to pursue self-directed activities and social reproduction. Work time is determined within a complex web of evolving culture and social relations, as well as traditionally conceived market, technological and macroeconomic forces and institutions such as collective bargaining and government policy (Figart & Golden, 1998, p. 411).

Managerial roles in organizations of all sizes are demanding and time consuming (Brett & Stroh, 2003; Kotter, 1999). There is some evidence that managers in industrialized countries are working more hours now than previously (Greenhouse, 2001; Schor, 1991, 2003). We have met managers who told us they work 80 to 100 hours per week. Working long hours may in fact be a prerequisite for achieving senior leadership positions (Jacobs & Gerson, 1998; Wallace, 1997).

Porter (2004) explored the questions of how and why people work, considering work, the work ethic, and work excess. Some people feel compelled towards excess work even when externally imposed demands are absent. There were several reasons why people worked hard and each reason may have both desirable and undesirable consequences to the individual, the organization, or both. Golden (1998) proposes that the actual hours worked are a function of three factors: hours desired by the worker, hours demanded by the employer, and the institutional environment in which working hour decisions are made (legal constraints, workplace norms, the larger economic environment). There are positive reasons for working long hours (more pay, self-actualization, a sense of commitment to colleagues and clients, work enjoyment) and also negative reasons (avoid sanctions, deal with employment insecurity). Working longer hours may increase one’s competitiveness in the short-term but not be sustainable – and perhaps become counterproductive – in the longer term. Long hours may influence physical and mental health and well-being by increasing stress. Can one make a distinction between a healthy work ethic and working to excess? How much work is too much? One can work to have material possessions, to not be left behind (Reich, 2000), to confirm self-worth, and to provide for children.

The work ethic is based on viewing hard work as virtuous. But this does not address the question of when hard work becomes a problem. What determines too much work? It seems that the norm for amount of work has
risen for some in the past decade. The reasons likely include economic recession, organizational downsizings and restructurings, and levels of insecurity of those with jobs, making it easier for them to choose to work harder. Relatively flat income may also cause some people to work longer. Schor (1998, 2004) has suggested that under the dual pressures of employers and consumerism, individuals are in a “squirrel cage,” trapped by the cycle of work-and-spend (Schor, 1991, p. 176), echoed in the writings of DeGraaf, Wann, and Naylor (2000) and George (1997). We make the assumption that workers are working more because they need to, want to, or are required to. We infer work hour preferences of workers from their behavior.

Although the terms workaholic and work addict encompass all the problems that addiction brings (Oates, 1971), most people believe that work is healthy, desirable, and protective of many illnesses. In support of this view, research has shown that holding multiple roles instead of a single role (e.g., homemaker) generally leads to favorable well-being outcomes among women (Barnett & Marshall, 1992).

Work is a vital and potentially enjoyable event, which provides us with monetary and non-monetary benefits. Work can give us a sense of achievement and success. This chapter will explore reasons or motives for working long hours. Various work and well-being outcomes associated with working long hours, and possible modifiers affecting the relationship between work hours and well-being are also discussed.

The importance of focusing on work hours is multi-faceted. First, a large number of employees are unhappy about the number of hours they work (Dembe, 2005; Jacobs & Gerson, 1998). Second, the amount of time demanded by work is an obvious and important way in which work affects other parts of one’s life (Galinsky, 1999; Shields, 1999). Third, work hours are a widely studied structural output of employment (Adam, 1993). Fourth, the study of work hours and well-being outcomes has produced both inconsistent and complex results (Barnett, 1998).

Clarkberg and Moen (2001) found a considerable gap between couples preferences for their combined work hours and hours worked. Few couples achieve their goal of working fewer hours. They attribute this to beliefs about the nature and structure of work and the pressure to put in long hours to be seen as committed, productive, and having potential for career advancement. Workers generally prefer to work fewer hours. Yet some employers demand more hours (MacDermid, 2006). Workers believe that long work hours will elicit rewards, recognition, and advancement, so they work long hours though they may not want to. The institutional environment also operates as if workers had no family responsibilities.
New technology and job flexibility have facilitated working from home or outside the office, which has contributed to an increase in hours worked in North America (Golden & Figart, 2000a). For example, working seven days a week rose 70 percent for men from 1973 to 1991. These alternative work arrangements can be seen as beneficial; for example, a working mother who chooses to spend more time with her children can do so by working from home or working night shifts. In a study of 61 French hospitals, 85 percent of nurses employed had requested the night shift to allow more time to be spent with their young children during the day (Barton, 1994). This accommodates dual-income families, presenting an arrangement to allow them to share the child rearing and family responsibilities.

With more women now working, workers are increasingly married to other workers, making the family work week longer. In addition, smaller families also allow couples to work more. It could also be that working more hours makes it more difficult to take care of a larger family. It could also be suggested that having a wife who works full time (for men) may drive men to spend more time at work to bolster the masculine identity as provider.

Because of technological advances and flexible work arrangements, it might be assumed that working time is getting progressively shorter. However, this is one trend that varies from country to country and even within countries by gender, occupation, race, and time period (Figart & Golden, 1998). Beginning in the nineteenth century with the Industrial Revolution, workers fought to get policies enacted to restrict hours of work, especially for women and children (Figart & Golden, 1998). In the mid-twentieth century, the United States began to implement employment legislation that reduced the number of hours worked (Hinrichs, Rochem, & Sirianni, 1991). A new employment arrangement emerged post World War II, which provided stable and life-long employment in addition to a family wage. This was an era of stability for North American households; however this stable period and the ensuing employment arrangement have disintegrated. Economic, technological, and cultural factors have influenced working time, making it extremely variable (Figart & Golden, 1998).

People have expected an association of long working hours and adverse well-being consequences for over 100 years. These concerns were first raised during the Industrial Revolution in 1830 and in later years, and efforts were made to legislate limits in working hours to 10 hours per day at that time (Golden, 2006).

Recently there has been a rise in working hours in North America. The mean hours worked has increased slightly but there are more people working more hours and more people working fewer hours. Jacobs and Gerson
(1998) found that professionals and highly educated individuals have had an increase in their hours worked. In contrast, it was also found that less educated workers have seen a decline. It is believed that professionals and highly educated persons tend to have more responsibility and are under more stress with larger workloads.

Within the United States, large portions of people employed are working very long hours, in both paid overtime and salaried positions (Figart & Golden, 1998). Overtime, which has been used as an indicator of an expanding economy and tight labor markets, has been increasing since the 1970 (Glosser & Golden, 1997). In addition, it was found that those working excessive hours, described as 49 hours a week or more, has also been on the rise recently, especially for higher-educated white men (Hedges, 1993). Conversely, work hours, both weekly and annually, in Western Europe have decreased (Figart & Golden, 1998). Specifically in the Netherlands, Belgium, and West Germany, from 1960 to 1985, there was an annual reduction of 20 percent of work hours (Figart & Golden, 1998). This variation could be due to a number of factors including work legislation and standards on overtime hours. There has been a slight decrease in work hours across Canada as well, which is said to be due to increased vacation time and the expansion of part-time jobs (International Labor Organization (ILO), 1995).

Employer demands and the institutionalized nature of work and employment has tended to constrain work hours in established patterns. But these patterns are changing; several contrasting factors influenced working hours in the 2000s. First, the labor union movement for shorter hours in the EEU has led to a reduction in working hours in some European countries (Rifkin, 2004). Second, the need for organizations to provide 24/7 services has led to the creation of more flexible and non-standard work schedules (Kreitzman, 1999). Third, more employees have also undertaken flexible work schedules to meet their family responsibilities (Hochschild, 1997).

Brett and Stroh (2003) examined the question of why some managers work 61 or more hours per week. They considered four explanations: the work–leisure trade-off, social contagion, work as an emotional respite from home, and work as its own rewards. Data were collected from a sample of 595 male and 391 female MBA alumni of the same university. The males were all married with children at home and a smaller percentage of the females were married and had children. More men than women worked 61 or more hours per week (29 percent versus 11 percent). Men worked 56.4 hours per week and women worked 51.5 hours per week. For males, rewards of work was the only of the four hypotheses to be supported, with hours worked significantly connected with job involvement and intrinsic
satisfaction. For females, the work–leisure trade-off and social contagion hypotheses were supported. However, hours worked did not correlate with job involvement, income, or job satisfaction for females.

**WORK HOURS AND THEIR EFFECTS**

A variety of outcome measures have been examined in connection with working long hours (van der Hulst, 2003). Most studies of long work hours have been conducted in Japan where “karoshi,” sudden death due to long hours and insufficient sleep was first observed. The Japanese coined this term, to refer to deaths of individuals from overwork or working long hours. (Kanai, 2006). Several hypotheses have been advanced to explain the relationship between long work hours and adverse health outcomes. Working long hours affects the cardiovascular system through chronic exposure to increases in blood pressure and heart rate (Buell & Breslow, 1960; Iwasaki, Sasaki, Oka, & Hisanaga, 1998; Uehata, 1991). Working long hours produces sleep deprivation and lack of recovery leading to chronic fatigue, poor health-related behaviors, and ill health (Ala-Mursjula, Vahtera, Kivimaki, Kevin, & Pentti, 2002; Defoe, Power, Holzman, Carpentieri, & Schulikin, 2001; Liu, Tanaka, & The Fukuoka Heart Study Group, 2002). Working long hours makes it more difficult to recover from job demands and the stress of long work hours. Finally, working long hours has been associated with more errors and accidents (Gander, Merry, Millar, & Weller, 2000; Loomis, 2005; Nachreiner, Akkermann, & Haenecke, 2000; Schuster & Rhodes, 1985).

More specifically, the literature suggests that long hours are associated with adverse health effects and increased safety risk (Harrington, 1994, 2001; Cooper, 1996; Kirkcaldy, Trimpop, & Cooper, 1997; Spurgeon, Harrington, & Cooper, 1997). Long work hours have been found to be associated with poor psychological health (Kirkcaldy, Levine, & Shephard, 2000; Sparks, Cooper, Fried, & Shirom, 1997; Borg & Kristensen, 1999), excessive fatigue (Rosa, 1995) and burnout (Barnett, Gareis, & Brennen, 1999). Several studies have also reported that long working hours are associated with more work–family conflict, (Crouter, Bumpus, Maguire, & McHale, 1999; Crouter, Bumpus, Head, & McHale, 2001; Galambos, Sears, Almeida, & Kolaric, 1995; Galinsky et al., 2005; Staines & Pleck, 1984), or fatigue, worrying, and irritability (Grzywicz & Marks, 2000; Kluwer, Heesink, & van den Vliert, 1996; Geurts, Rutte, & Peeters, 1999).
Dembe, Erickson, Delbos, and Banks (2005) examined the impact of overtime and extended working hours on the risk of occupational injuries and illnesses in a representative sample of working adults in the United States. They estimated the relative risk of long working hours per day, extended hours per week, long commute times, and overtime schedules on reporting a work-related injury or illness after controlling for age, gender, occupation, industry, and region. Data were collected from 10,793 workers between 1987 and 2000. After adjusting for these control factors, working in jobs with overtime schedules was associated with a 61 percent higher injury hazard rate compared to jobs without overtime. Working at least 12 hours per day was associated with a 32 percent increased hazard rate and working at least 60 hours per week was associated with a 23 percent increased hazard rate. A strong dose response effect (high number of hours worked) was observed with the injury rate increasing in correspondence with the number of hours per day (or per week) in the worker’s customary schedule. Job schedules with long working hours were not more risky because they are concentrated in inherently hazardous industries or occupations, but because people working long hours have more total time at risk for a work injury.

van der Hulst, van Veldenhoven, and Beckers (2006) considered overtime, work characteristics (job demands, job control), and need for recovery in a large sample ($N = 1,473$) of Dutch municipal administration employees working full time. The Effort–Recovery Model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998) proposes that negative consequences of long working hours for health and well-being depend on the opportunities for recovery during the work day (internal recovery) and after work (external recovery). Working overtime reduces the time available for recovery. In addition, external recovery may be poor due to the spillover of work demands to one’s home life. Finally, overtime is more likely to occur in demanding jobs limiting opportunities for internal recovery. They examined four types of jobs: low strain-low demands, high control; passive-low demands, low control; active-high demands, high control; and high strain-high demands, low control. Overtime was common for a majority of employees and in jobs having high demands. While there was no relationship between working overtime and need for recovery in the total sample, there was a significant and positive relationship between overtime hours and need for recovery in high-strain jobs (high job demands, low control); there was also a relationship between overtime and need for recovery in active jobs (high demands, high control). Working conditions (high-demand jobs) influenced the relationship between overtime and need for recovery.
Caruso, Hitchcock, Dick, Russo, and Schmitt (2004) reviewed the accumulating research evidence on the influence of overtime and extended workshifts on worker health and safety as well as worker errors, considering 52 studies in total. Overtime has increased in the United States from 1970 to 2000 (Rones, Ilg, & Gardner, 1997; Hetrick, 2000). Overtime is defined as working more than 40 hours per week; extended work shifts are defined as shifts longer than 8 hours. They found, in a majority of studies of general health, that overtime was associated with poorer perceived general health, increased injury rate, more illness, and increased mortality. A pattern of reduced performance on psychophysiological tests and injuries while working long hours, particularly very long shifts, and when 12-hour shifts combined with over 40 hours of work a week was also noted. When 12-hour shifts were combined with more than 40 hours of work per week, more adverse effects were evident. Haenecke, Tiedemann, Nachreiner, and Grzech Sukalo (1998), in a study of 1.2 million German workers, found that the risk of workplace accidents increased during the latter portion (after the eighth hour) of a long work shift.

van der Hulst (2003) found that long work hours was associated with adverse health, particularly cardiovascular disease, disability retirement, self-reported health and fatigue. She concluded that working more that 11 hours a day was associated with a three-fold risk of coronary heart disease and a four-fold risk of diabetes. In addition, working 60 or more hours a week was associated with a three-fold risk of disability retirement.

van der Hulst’s (2003) review showed that long work hours was associated with poorer physiological recovery and fewer hours of sleep. van der Hulst (2003) suggested two possible pathways between long hours and health: insufficient recovery – a psychological recovery mechanism – and poor life-style behaviors – a behavioral life-style mechanism. Long work hours are believed to be associated with life-style choices such as smoking, coffee and alcohol consumption, lack of exercise, and a poor (unhealthy) diet. These unhealthy behaviors produce physiological changes (e.g., high blood pressure, high levels of cholesterol, obesity, diabetes) and higher risk of coronary heart disease and poorer health in general. One perspective on why long work hours may be associated with reduced psychological well-being is the Effort–Recovery Model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998). Working long hours is associated with short-term psychological costs, which are irreversible. Individuals experience recovery when the work hours stop. Excessive work hours and insufficient recovery causes these negative effects to persist for a longer period of time or even become irreversible. Long work hours reduce the time of recovery as well as prolonging persistent and psychological demands.
Rissler (1977) studied the effects of high workload and overtime on heart rate and hormone levels during the rest and work hours. High workload was associated with higher levels of adrenaline and heart rate during evenings at home (i.e., rest periods) as well as feelings of fatigue and irritation. His results also indicated an accumulation effect of overtime on adrenaline levels. That is, it takes several weeks to return to normal (i.e., resting) levels following several weeks of overtime.

van der Hulst and Guerts (2001), in a study of 525 full-time employees of the Dutch Postal Service, found that working overtime was associated with negative work–home interference. Employees working overtime and reporting low rewards indicated greater burnout, negative work–home interference, and slower recovery. Employees working overtime and experiencing a high pressure to work overtime, coupled with low rewards, had poorer recovery, more cynicism and negative work–home interference.

Major, Klein, and Ehrhart (2002) in a study of 513 employees from one firm, found that hours worked per week were significantly related to work interference with family. Antecedents of hours worked included career identity, service, work overload, organizational expectations, self-reported financial needs, and non-job responsibilities (negatively). Parental demands were unrelated to hours worked; organizational rewards for time spent at work was respectively correlated (but weakly) with hours worked. Hours worked fully or partially related to the effects of many work and family characteristics on work interfering with family.

Bakker, Demerouti, and Burke (2007), in a study among 168 dual-earner couples, examined the relationship between workaholism and family functioning. More specifically, on the basis of the literature, it was hypothesized that workaholism would be positively related to work–family conflict. Work–family conflict, in turn, was predicted to have a negative relationship with social support given to the partner, as well as the partner’s relationship satisfaction and happiness. The results of multiple group structural equation modeling analyses using the matched responses of both partners supported these hypotheses. Moreover, it was found that work–family conflict mediated the relationship between workaholism and social support; the strength of the relationships in the model being the same for men and women.

Rosa (1995) reported that overtime and fatigue were found to be associated with increases in back injuries, hospital outbreaks of bacterial infection, a three-fold increase in accidents after 26 hours of work and increased risk of safety violations in nuclear power plants, showing that long work hours does not just negatively affect the worker, it puts a strain on overall workplace safety. Shimomitsu and Levi (1992) found that two-thirds of
Japanese workers complain of fatigue, with “koroshi” or death from overwork, an important social concern. Moruyama, Kohno, and Morimoto (1995) found long work hours associated with poor lifestyle habits such as heavy smoking, poor diet, and lack of exercise. Sparks et al. (1997) undertook a meta-analysis of 21 samples and found small but significant correlations between hours of work and health symptoms, physiological and psychological health symptoms. Qualitative analyses of 12 other studies supported the findings of a positive relationship between hours of work and health.

**Motives for Working Long Hours**

Porter (2004) distinguishes two motivations for long hours of work, both of which could have different moderating effects. A person can work long hours because of the joy in their work. This is a constructive, highly committed achievement oriented style. A person can also put in the long hours in a compulsive, perfectionist fashion, driven to achieve perfectionistic standards. Such individuals react to criticism with hostility and resentment, experience frustration from failing to meet superhuman standards, and express anger and competition with colleagues in the workplace. Tucker and Rutherford (2005) argued that some individuals may work longer hours because they enjoy their job and derive pleasure from succeeding at it, enjoy the associated benefits, or want to enrich their job or quality of life. This is contrasted with someone who works longer hours to avoid job insecurity or negative sanctions from a superior. Although there might be pressure on an employee to overwork, it is ultimately their choice. The first would not experience the adverse impacts of stress and burnout as the latter would.

Eastman (1998) notes the skepticism about the benefits of working long hours. The “rat race” notion captures the sense of striving for organizational advancement and material success though working long hours, leads many to disappointment and frustration, and limits the levels and likelihood of taking part in other more worthwhile activities. Women increasingly report that working long hours did not provide the hoped-for returns. Landers, Rebitzer, and Taylor (1996) show that typical work hours are high because firms set hours above those of hard working associates to screen out associates that prefer working fewer hours. Eastman found that his respondents indicated that their work hours were a function of the hours worked by their colleagues. In addition, desired work hours were less than expected hours of work. Individuals work long hours to get an advantage
over the competition, but if competitors also increase their work hours no benefit results from this investment.

Maume and Bellas (2000) considered alternative explanations for hours worked. These included employer demands (Schor, 1991), family stress, more rewards available at work than at home (Hochschild, 1997), and individual and organizational characteristics (education, organizational level, working in large firms). Based on data from 762 respondents in Ohio, they found some support for Schor’s position in that respondents worked more hours if they had a demanding supervisor, had more education and worked in larger firms, and were in managerial and professional jobs; but no support was found for Hochschild’s thesis.

Wallace (1997), in a study of Canadian lawyers, distinguished between number of hours worked and work spillover – perceptions that one’s work is intruding on their non-work life. Predictors of both included work salience (work commitment, professional commitment), motivators (promotional opportunity, social value of the work), pressures (profit driven, competitive, work overload), personal demographics (gender, marital status, pre-school children, in a dual-career couple), and some controls (position partner, professional tenure, level of pay, specialization, firm size). Work motivation was associated with hours worked but not work spillover; promotional opportunity, social value of the work, or profit driven were associated with work spillover but not hours worked; work overload was associated with both hours worked and work spillover. Thus factors predicting work hours did not necessarily predict work spillover; work overload being the only common determinant. Work hours also had a modest relationship with work spillover ($r = 0.29$). These results suggest a need to distinguish between hours worked and work spillover.

Lawyers worked long hours if they were highly committed to their work (internal) or had heavy work demands (external). Work spillover was associated with hours worked, motivators (promotional opportunity, social value of the work), and pressures (profit driven, work overload) all of which were work related.

Wallace concluded that the law firms in her study used primarily coercive strategies to influence lawyer’s effort and productivity (also see Wallace, 1995). Other studies have suggested that firms should use non-coercive strategies (professional commitment, promotional opportunities, competitiveness among colleagues) to develop satisfaction and loyalty.

Wallace offered some advice to both individuals and employing organizations. If professionals want to work fewer hours and have more time for non-work activities, they should work in smaller firms. Also, individuals
should know that the initial career stage was the most demanding. Firms wanting long hours from their employees should try to attract highly motivated people and pay them well, and place large demands on them. But it should be noted that work overload might lead to work spillover. The negative effects associated with work spillover can be reduced by ensuring professionals that they have a future in the firm (e.g., promotions), and their work provides value to society. Work hours may also relate to the quality of the work performance (e.g., mistakes), and fatigue or burnout, which also could reduce job performance.

Moderators of the Work Hours–Well-Being Relationship

The relationship between number of hours worked and well-being is likely to be complex. That is, it is unlikely that there will be consistent findings of the relationship between hours worked and health in the research literature.

The literature has attempted to study possible moderators in the relationship between work hours and the variety of outcomes identified. Tucker and Rutherford (2005) examined the relationship of work hours and self-reported health as moderated by the reasons for working long hours (or overtime), by work schedule autonomy, and by the degree of social support experienced at home and at work. They collected data from 372 train drivers in the south of England. Respondents lacking both schedule autonomy or control and social support, demonstrated positive relationships between hours worked and physical health symptoms. Negative relationships were found among drivers reporting low schedule autonomy or control and high social support. No such interactions were found with fatigue and psychological health however.

For some samples, such as blue-collar workers, money may be a more important moderator of the hours worked and health relationship. Brett and Stroh (2003), in their sample of MBA graduates in managerial and professional jobs, found that extrinsic (financial) and intrinsic job rewards were associated with working longer hours. How many hours a person works involves weighing the costs (more fatigue, impact on family and social life) against the benefits (income, recognition). People with good social support maybe better able to deal with the costs of long work hours; rewards will be more attractive to these individuals.

Choosing to work long hours as opposed to being pressured to work long hours are important moderating considerations. One may choose to work long hours for more pay, getting the job done, proving one is committed,
and positioning oneself for advancement. One can also work long hours or overtime to avoid sanctions and increase one’s job security. Barnett, Gareis and Brennan (1999) found that discrepancies between actual and desired hours are associated with negative health outcomes. In their study of 141 married physicians, the relationship between number of hours worked and burnout depended on the extent to which work schedules met the needs of the employees, his or her partner, and their children. Physicians working more or fewer hours than they and their partners preferred and whose work hours were distributed differently than they and their partners preferred, scored higher on burnout measures.

Choosing to work long hours as opposed to being pressured to work long hours is also likely to moderate this relationship (Barton, 1994). One may choose to work long hours for more pay, getting the job done, proving one is committed, and positioning oneself for advancement. One can also work long hours or overtime to avoid sanctions and increase one’s job security. The strongest relationship of work hours and adverse health outcomes would be among individuals reporting few positive reasons for working long hours and low social support (Golden, 2003).

For some samples, money may be a more important moderator of the hours worked and health relationship (among blue collar workers). Brett and Stroh (2003), in a sample of MBA graduates in managerial and professional jobs, found that extrinsic (financial) and intrinsic job rewards were associated with working longer hours.

How many hours a person works involves weighing the costs (more fatigue, impact on family and social life) against the benefits (income, recognition). People with good social support may be better able to deal with the costs of long work hours. The rewards will be more attractive to these individuals. In addition, these individuals may also want to work more hours. They may even experience benefits from working longer hours (more money, leading to a greater financial security and improved health; or career advancement leading to more enjoyable work).

Addressing Work Hour Concerns

Is working long hours really necessary? Those who work long hours are found in particular industries. These data suggest that working long hours may be consistent with face time (Brown & Benson, 2005). Can organizations reduce the need for face time among employees without affecting their identities and further career opportunities? Can one still get the same
personal and psychological rewards but work fewer hours? One solution is to separate face time from performance appraisals and opportunities for more challenging work. A second is to provide models of managers that do outstanding work but work fewer hours (Munck, 2001). It is also useful to identify unproductive but time-consuming work practices. Individuals can be encouraged and supported to make small changes in hours – but enough to be noticed – and then have these rewarded. Workers’ ability to exert control over work schedules has been shown to have an influence on the effects of work hours on health (Barton, 1994; Smith, Hammond, Macdonald, & Folkard, 1998).

van der Hulst and Guerts (2001) suggest that compensation may also reduce adverse effects of work hours. In addition, length of vacation and commuting time may affect the relationship of overtime and health and safety. Strategies for preventing work injuries should consider changes in scheduling practices, job redesign, and health promotion programs for people working in jobs involving overtime and extended hours (Golden & Figart, 2000b). More days of vacation allow for more rest and may lessen the impact of overtime; longer commute times may add additional job stressors to the effects of working hours (DeGraaf, 2003).

Cartwright (2000) offers these suggestions for breaking out of the long working-hours culture.

1. Schedule meetings only during core hours – no breakfast meetings or meetings after 5:00 p.m.
2. Take regular breaks. Take a short walk. Do not work through lunch.
3. Take your full vacation time. Plan your work around your holidays not your holidays around your work.
4. Do not take work home on a regular basis.
5. Say no to unrealistic deadlines. It is better to under-promise but over-deliver than to over-promise but under-deliver.
6. Do not work late because others are doing so.
7. Monitor the hours you and your staff work. Use this information to make the case for more resources.

There are a number of other initiatives that could be undertaken by societies, organizations, and their employees to minimize the potential adverse effects of long work hours. These include the following.

1. Encourage governments to regulate the length of work schedules as is already the case in many countries in Europe (Green, 2001; Hayden, 2003).
2. Make changes to the work organization and job design
3. Increase worker control of their work hours
4. Utilize ergonomic job design
5. Increase worker training
6. Develop capable supervision
7. Establish a workplace culture that promotes health and safety
8. Employ more people working fewer hours
10. Redesign work to avoid the need for overtime
11. Offer health promotion counseling about the risks of long work schedules
12. Provide medical examinations for at-risk workers

WORKAHOLISM AND WORK ADDICTION

Workaholism and long working hours have positive connotations such as dedication, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior as well as negative connotations such as ill health and damaged family relationships. Number of hours worked per week, while obviously an element of workaholism, does not capture one’s degree of work involvement, a psychological state or attitude. Hours worked per week, however, is a behavioral manifestation of workaholism. Workaholism has traditionally had negative connotations (Killinger, 1991). Are workaholics’ sad and tragic figures doomed to unsatisfactory relationships and ill health (Douglas & Morris, 2006; Peiperl & Jones, 2001; Friedman & Lobel, 2003)? Although the popular press has paid considerable attention to workaholism (Garfield, 1987; Kiechel, 1989a, 1989b; Klaft & Kleiner, 1988), very little research has been undertaken to further our understanding of it (McMillan, O’Driscoll, & Burke, 2003). It should come as no surprise, then, that opinions, observations, and conclusions about workaholism are both varied and conflicting (McMillan, Brady, O’Driscoll, & Marsh, 2001). Some writers view workaholism positively from an organizational perspective. Machlowitz (1980) conducted a qualitative interview study of 100 workaholics and found them to be very satisfied and productive. Others view workaholism negatively (Fassel, 1990; Killinger, 1991; Oates, 1971). These writers equate workaholism with other addictions and depict workaholics as unhappy, obsessive, tragic figures who are not performing their jobs well and are creating difficulties for their coworkers (Porter, 1996). The former would advocate the encouragement of workaholism; the latter would discourage it.
**Definitions of Workaholism**

Oates generally acknowledged as the first person to use the word workaholic, defined it as “a person whose need for work has become so excessive that it creates noticeable disturbance or interference with his bodily health, personal happiness, and interpersonal relationships, and with his smooth social functioning” (Oates, 1971).

Killinger (1991) defines a workaholic as “a person who gradually becomes emotionally crippled and addicted to control and power in a compulsive drive to gain approval and success.” Robinson (1998) defines workaholism “as a progressive, potentially fatal disorder, characterized by self imposed demands, compulsive overworking, inability to regulate work to the exclusion of most other life activities.” Porter (1996) defines workaholism as “an excessive involvement with work evidenced by neglect in other areas of life and based on internal motives of behavior maintenance rather than requirements of the job or organization.” Most writers use the terms excessive work, workaholism, and work addiction interchangeably.

Spence and Robbins (1992) define the workaholic as a person who “is highly work involved, feels compelled or driven to work because of inner pressures, and is low in enjoyment at work.” Most writers view workaholism as a stable individual characteristic (Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997; Spence & Robbins, 1992). Most definitions of workaholism portray it in negative terms.

**Measures of Workaholism**

Two measures of workaholism have received some research attention. Robinson and his colleagues developed the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART). The WART contains 25 items drawn from symptoms (characteristics) reported by writers on workaholism (Robinson, 1998). Respondents rate items on a four-point Likert scale (1 = Never true, 4 = Always true) according to how well each item describes their work habits (e.g., “It’s important that I see the concrete results of what I do”). Scores can range from 25 to 100. Robinson (1998) states that scores of 25 to 56 indicate that you are not work addicted; scores from 57 to 66, mildly work addicted; and scores from 67 to 100, highly work addicted. Scores above 65 fall greater than one standard deviation above the mean. The items on the WART, based on a review of available literature, were grouped into five categories: over-doing, self-worth, control perfectionism, intimacy, and pre-occupation future reference.
Spence and Robbins (1992) report the development of their workaholism measure, providing both reliability and concurrent validity information. Based on their definition of workaholism, developed from a review of the literature, they propose three workaholism components: work involvement, feeling driven to the work, and work enjoyment. They developed multi-item measures of these components, each having internal consistency reliabilities greater than 0.67.

Types of Workaholics

Some researchers have proposed the existence of different types of workaholic behavior patterns, each having potentially different antecedents and associations with job performance, work, and life outcomes (Naughton, 1987; Scott et al., 1997; Spence & Robbins, 1992). The existence of different types of workaholics might reconcile conflicting views as to whether workaholics are productive and satisfied or tragic and unfulfilled. Naughton (1987) presents a typology of workaholism based on the dimensions of career commitment and obsession–compulsion. Job-involved workaholics (high work commitment, low obsession–compulsion) are hypothesized to perform well in demanding jobs and be highly job satisfied with low interest in non-work activities. Compulsive workaholics (high work commitment, high obsession–compulsion) are hypothesized to be potentially poor performers (staff problems resulting from impatience and ritualized work habits). Non-workaholics (low work commitment and obsession–compulsion) spend more time in other than work commitments. Compulsive non-workaholics (low work commitment, high obsession–compulsion) compulsively spend time in non-work activities.

Scott et al. (1997) suggests three types of workaholic behavior patterns: compulsive-dependent, perfectionist, and achievement-oriented. They hypothesize that compulsive-dependent workaholism will be positively related to job performance and job and life satisfaction. Perfectionist workaholism will be positively related to levels of stress, physical and psychological problems, hostile interpersonal relationships, low job satisfaction and performance, and voluntary turnover and absenteeism. Finally, achievement-oriented workaholism will be positively related to physical and psychological health, job and life satisfaction, job performance, low voluntary turnover, and prosocial behaviors.

Spence and Robbins (1992) propose three workaholic patterns based on their workaholic triad notion: Work Addicts, Work Enthusiasts, and
Enthusiastic Addicts. The workaholic triad consists of three concepts: work involvement, feeling driven to work, and work enjoyment. Data were collected in this study from 368 social workers holding academic appointments. Profile analysis resulted in the same six profiles for women and men – three workaholic types and three non-workaholic types. These profiles were: Work Addicts score high on work involvement, high on feeling driven to work, and low on work enjoyment. Work Enthusiasts score high on work involvement, low on feeling driven to work, and high on work enjoyment. Enthusiastic Addicts score high on all three workaholism components. Unengaged Workers score low on all three workaholism components. Relaxed Workers score low on feeling driven to work and work involvement and high on work enjoyment. Disenchanted Workers score high on feeling driven to work and low on work involvement and work enjoyment. Other works, involving different samples and conducted in different countries, have produced the same profiles (e.g., Kanai Wakabayashi, & Fling, 1996; Russo & Waters, 2006; Buelens & Poelmans, 2004).

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The following sections of the chapter will review research findings that compare the personal demographics, job behaviors, work outcomes, extra-work outcomes and psychological health of the three types of workaholics proposed by Spence and Robbins (1992).

Personal Demographic and Work Situational Characteristics

A critical question involves potential differences between the three workaholism types on both personal demographic and work situation characteristics including hours worked per week. If the workaholism types were found to differ on these (e.g., organizational level, marital status, hours worked per week), these differences would account for any differences found on work and health outcomes.

A number of studies (Spence & Robbins, 1992; Burke, 1999a; Burke, Burgess, & Oberklaid, 2002; Bonebright, Clay, & Ankenmann, 2000) have reported essentially no differences between the three workaholism types on a variety of personal and work situation characteristics. The workaholism types work the same number of hours and extra-hours per week; the workaholism types working significantly more hours per week and more extra-hours per week than the non-workaholism types.
JOB BEHAVIORS

There has been considerable speculation regarding the work behaviors likely to be exhibited by workaholics (see Mudrack, 2006). This list includes hours worked per week, extra-hours worked per week, job involvement, job stress, non-delegation of job responsibilities to others, high (or low) levels of job performances, and high levels of interpersonal conflict and of lack of trust. There is empirical research that examines some of these hypothesized relationships.

Burke (1999a) considered these relationships in a large sample of Canadian MBA graduates. Comparisons of the three types of workaholism on a number of behavioral manifestations provided considerable support for the hypothesized relationships. First, there were no differences between Work Addicts, Enthusiastic Addicts, and Work Enthusiasts on hours worked per week or extra-hours worked per week; workaholism types working significantly more hours and extra-hours per week than did the three non-workaholism types. Second, Enthusiastic Addicts devoted more time to their jobs in a psychological sense than did both Work Enthusiasts and Work Addicts. Thirdly, Work Addicts reported greater job stress than did Enthusiastic Addicts, both reporting greater job stress than did Work Enthusiasts. Fourthly, both Enthusiastic Addicts and Work Enthusiasts reported greater job involvement than did Work Addicts. Fifthly, Work Addicts had greater inability and unwillingness to delegate than both Work Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts. Sixthly, Enthusiastic Addicts were more perfectionistic than were Work Enthusiasts.

Spence and Robbins (1992) found that Work Addicts reported higher levels of job stress, perfectionism, and unwillingness to delegate job duties to others than did Work Enthusiasts. Kanai et al. (1996), using the Spence and Robbins measures, reported that Work Addicts and Enthusiastic Addicts scored higher than Work Enthusiasts on measures of job stress, perfectionism, non-delegation, and time committed to job. In summary, Work Addicts reported higher levels of work stress, more perfectionism, and greater unwillingness or difficulty in delegating than one or both of the other workaholism types.

Antecedents of Workaholism

Four potential antecedents of workaholism have received some conceptual and research attention. Three of these, family of origin, Type A behavior, and personal beliefs and fears, are the result of socialization practices within...
families and society at large. The fourth, organizational support for work–
personal life imbalance, represents organizational values and priorities.

Family of Origin

Robinson (1998) has written about work addiction as a symptom of a dis-
eased family system. Work addiction, similarly to other addictive behaviors, is
inter-generational and passed on to future generations through family proc-
esses and dynamics. In this view, work addiction is seen as a learned addictive
response to a dysfunctional family of origin system. Pietropinto (1986) sug-
gests that children of workaholics learn that parental love is contingent on
their (the children’s) high performance. Family of origin measures have not
yet been used in studies employing the Spence and Robbins typology.

Personal Beliefs and Fears

Burke (1999b) examined the relationship of personal beliefs and fears and
workaholism. Beliefs and fears are a reflection of values, thoughts, and
interpersonal styles. Three measures of beliefs and fears developed by Lee,
Jamieson, and Earley (1996) were used: “Striving against others,” “No
moral principles,” and “Prove yourself.” Burke compared the three types of
workaholism on these measures of beliefs and fears. Was there a relation-
ship between cognitions managers and professionals hold about their
broader environment and types of workaholism? Analyses provided evi-
dence of such a relationship. First, all three beliefs and fears were signifi-
cantly and positively correlated with measures of feeling driven to work and
negatively with work enjoyment. Secondly, comparisons of workaholism
types showed significant type effects on all three measures of beliefs and
fears as well as on their composite.

More specifically, Work Addicts scored significantly higher than Work
Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts on measures of striving against others
and no moral principles, as well as on the composite measure. In addition,
Work Addicts scored higher on the need to prove self than did Work En-
thusiasts. Workaholism thus emerges as work behaviors in response to
feelings of low self-worth and insecurity. This is best reflected in managers’
feelings of being driven to work. Paradoxically these beliefs and fears were
also found to be associated with lower levels of work enjoyment.

Type A Behavior

Zhdanova, Allison, Pui, and Clark (2006) using meta-analysis, provided
support for Type A behavior as an antecedent of workaholism. Type A
behavior has been shown to be associated with levels of job stress, psychological distress, and coronary heart disease. Pred, Helmreich, and Spence (1987) factor analyzed the Jenkins Activity Survey, a self-report measure of Type A behavior, producing two independent factors: Achievement Striving (AS) which they found to be predictive of positive work attitudes and performances, and Impatience–Irritation (II) found to be predictive of psychological distress.

Burke, Richardson, and Mortinussen (2004), in a study of 171 Norwegian owners and senior managers of construction companies, found that Work Addicts scored higher than Work Enthusiasts on Impatience–Irritation and Enthusiastic Addicts scored higher than Work Enthusiasts on Achievement Striving, both being dimensions of Type A behavior. Impatience Irritation has been shown to be predictive of psychological distress.

Organizational Values

Burke (1999c) compared perceptions of organization culture values supporting work–personal life imbalance across the three types of workaholism. Organizational values encouraging work–family imbalance were measured by scales developed by Kofodimos (1993). Organizational values encouraging balance was measured by nine items (e.g., “Setting limits on hours spent at work”). Organizational values supporting imbalance was measured by eight items (e.g., “Traveling to and from work destinations on weekends”). A total imbalance score was obtained by combining both scales, reversing the balance scores. Work Addicts reported higher imbalance values than both Work Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts. Thus Work Addicts see their workplaces as less supportive of work–personal life balance than the two other workaholism types.

Work Outcomes

The relationship between workaholism and indicators of job and career satisfaction and success is difficult to specify. It is likely that different types of workaholics will report varying work and career satisfactions (Scott et al., 1997).

Burke (1999d) compared levels of work and career satisfaction and success among the workaholism profiles observed by Spence and Robbins (1992). Four work outcomes, all significantly intercorrelated, were used. Intent to Quit was measured by two items (e.g., “Are you currently looking for a different job in a different organization?”). This scale had been used
previously by Burke (1991). Work Satisfaction was measured by a seven-item scale developed by Kofodimos (1993). An item was “I feel challenged by my work.” Career Satisfaction was measured by a five-item scale developed by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990). One item was “I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.” Future Career Prospects was measured by a three-item scale developed by Greenhaus et al. (1990). An item was “I expect to advance in my career to senior levels of management.”

Work Addicts scored lower than Work Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts on Job Satisfaction, Career Satisfaction and Future Career Prospects, and higher than Work Enthusiasts on Intent to Quit. It should be noted that all three workaholic profiles (Work Addicts, Enthusiastic Addicts, Work Enthusiasts) worked the same number of hours per week and had the same job and organizational tenure.

*Workaholism Types and Flow at Work*

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) uses the term optimal experience to refer to times when individuals feel in control of their actions and masters of their own destinies. Optimal experiences commonly result from hard work and meeting challenges head-on. Csikszentmihalyi believes that since so much time is invested and spent in working, the experience of flow at work is likely to have significant effects on one’s quality of life (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Flow also plays a major role in how people respond to stress. Csikszentmihalyi reports data showing that women and men experience more flow at work than in leisure (Csikszentmihalyi, 2003). He also reports that managers and supervisors were more often in flow at work (64 percent) than were clerical workers (51 percent) and blue-collar workers (49 percent). Apathy was reported at work more often by blue collar workers than managers (23 versus 11 percent), and in leisure more often by managers than by blue-collar workers (61 versus 46 percent). Certain activities are more conducive to flow as they make optimal experience easier to achieve (e.g., learning skills, goals and new solutions (Csikszentmihalyi, 2003)).

Would the workaholism types differ in the experience of flow? In a study of 211 Norwegian journalists, Burke and Matthiesen (2004) found that journalists scoring higher on work enjoyment and lower on feeling driven to work because of internal needs indicated higher levels of flow or optimal experience at work. In this same study, Burke and Matthiesen found that Work Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts indicated higher levels of flow than did Work Addicts.
Psychological Well-Being

There is considerable consensus in the workaholism literature on the association of workaholism and poorer psychological and physical well-being. In fact, some definitions of workaholism incorporate aspects of diminished health as central elements. It is not surprising that this relationship has received research attention.

Burke (1999e) compared the three types of workaholism identified by Spence and Robbins (1992) on three indicators of psychological and physical well-being in a sample of 530 employed women and men MBA graduates. Psychosomatic symptoms were measured by 19 items developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974). Respondents indicated how often they experienced each physical condition (e.g., “headaches”) in the past year. Lifestyle behaviors were measured by five items developed by Kofodimos (1993). One item was “I participate in a regular exercise program.” Emotional well-being was measured by six items developed by Kofodimos (1993). An item was “I actively seek to understand and improve my emotional well-being.”

Once again, the comparisons of the workaholism types on the three measures of psychological and physical well-being provided considerable support for the hypothesized relationships. Work Addicts had more psychosomatic symptoms than both Work Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts and poorer physical and emotional well-being than had Work Enthusiasts.

In a study of 171 Norwegian construction company owners and senior managers, Burke et al. (2004) found that Work Addicts reported higher levels of emotional exhaustion than both Work Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts; the three workaholism types were similar on levels of cynicism and personal efficacy.

Extra-Work Satisfactions and Family Functioning

A number of writers have hypothesized that workaholism is likely to impact negatively on family functioning (Killinger, 1991, Porter, 1996; Robinson, 1998). Empirical examinations of this hypothesis are unfortunately few. Robinson and Post (1997) report data from a sample of 107 self-identified workaholics (members of Workaholics Anonymous chapters in North America) who completed the WART and a family assessment instrument. Three levels of WART scores indicating various levels of workaholism were compared. High scores differed from low and medium scores on six of the seven family assessment scales indicating lower (poorer) family functioning in all cases.
Robinson (1998) also reviews the literature on children of workaholics. Robinson and Kelley (1998) asked 211 young adults (college students) to think back to their childhoods and rate the workaholism of their parents on the WART. Participants also completed measures of depression, anxiety, self-concept, and locus of control. College students who perceived their parents as workaholics scored higher on depression and external locus of control. Children of workaholic fathers scored higher on anxiety than did children of non-workaholic fathers. Interestingly mothers’ workaholism had no effect on these outcomes. Robinson attributes the distress of children of workaholic fathers to the presence of a diseased family system, consistent with the evidence that work addiction contributes to family dysfunction (Pietropinto, 1986).

Burke (1999f) considered the relationship of the three workaholism types identified by Spence and Robbins (1992) and extra-work satisfactions. Three aspects of life or extra-work satisfaction were included using measures developed by Kofodimos (1993). These were: Family Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, and Relationship Satisfaction and Community Satisfaction. The comparisons of the workaholism types on the three measures of life or extra-work satisfactions provided moderate support for the hypothesized relationships. Work Addicts reported less satisfaction on all three extra-work satisfaction measures than did Work Enthusiasts and less satisfaction on one (Family) than did Enthusiastic Addicts.

Evaluating Workaholism Components

Russo and Waters (2006) examined the Spence and Robbins workaholism types and work–family conflict in a sample of 169 employees working in the legal industry in Australia. They report that Work Addicts and Work Enthusiasts indicated similar levels of work–family conflict, but these levels were higher than those indicated by the non-workaholism types.

The workaholism measures used in two or more research studies (i.e., Robinson, 1998; Spence & Robbins, 1992) all contain components or factors. Does each of these factors have similar and independent relationships with particular outcomes? Or might they have opposite relationships with some outcomes and no relationship with others?

Burke (1999g) considered the question of whether the workaholism triad components had different consequences. An examination of the relationships among specific workaholism components and the various types of job behaviors and outcome variables revealed an interesting, and complex, pattern of findings. First, work enjoyment and feeling driven to work were
significantly related to all seven job behavior validation measures, while work involvement was significantly related to three of the seven. Respondents scoring higher on the workaholism components also scored higher on job behaviors reflecting workaholism, with one exception – difficulty in delegating. In this instance, respondents scoring higher on work involvement and feeling driven to work and lower on work enjoyment reported greater difficulty in delegating. Secondly, joy in work was the only workaholism component related to work outcomes. Respondents reporting greater work enjoyment also reported more job satisfaction, more optimistic future career prospects and more career satisfaction to date. Thirdly, both work enjoyment and feeling driven to work were related to indicators of psychological well-being but in opposite directions. Respondents reporting greater work enjoyment and lesser feelings of being driven to work reported greater community satisfaction.

Although work enjoyment and feeling driven to work had consistent and similar effects on job behaviors reflecting workaholic, these two workaholism components had different effects on work outcomes and psychological well-being. One, work enjoyment, was associated with positive outcomes; the other, feeling driven to work, was associated with negative outcomes. Finally, none of the workaholism components showed consistent relationships with measures of extra-work satisfactions.

**Implications**

Senior managers and executive work long hours, putting in more hours than managers and professionals working at lower organizational levels in many cases (Maume & Bellas, 2001; Fisher, 1992; Worthy, 1987). There is also compelling evidence that working extreme hours can harm psychological and physical health, productivity, and family and social relationships (Cartwright, 2000; Sparks et al., 1997; Worrall & Cooper, 1999).

This section compared the job behaviors, work and non-work outcomes, psychological well-being, and personal values among three types of workaholics, all of whom work equally long hours. A generally consistent pattern of findings emerged. Work Addicts reported job behaviors likely to be associated with reduced contribution (job delegating) in comparison with Work Enthusiasts and Enthusiastic Addicts. Work Addicts also indicated lower levels of psychological health than the two other types, and less non-work satisfactions.

Why would three types of managers working the same hours per week at the same organizational levels, having the same family structures, the same
job and organizational tenure, and earning the same incomes indicate such
different work and life experiences? The findings shed some light on this.
First, Work Addicts had values and beliefs indicative of greater needs to
prove themselves, greater insecurity (lower self-esteem), and a less support-
ive and trusting environment, in general. Second, Work Addicts described
their organizational values as less supportive of work–personal life balance.
Third, they scored higher on feeling driven to work because of needs, prob-
ably related to their beliefs and values. ForuthFourth, they worked in ways
that created higher levels of work stress for themselves to be perfectionistic,
non-delegating. Thus, it was not a question of how hard they worked but
why (their motivations) and how (their behaviors) they worked hard that
mattered (also see Srivastava, Locke, & Bartol, 2001).

Porter (2001) distinguishes two motivations for long hours at work. A
person can work long hours because of joy in the work. This is a construc-
tive, highly committed achievement-oriented style of workaholism. This ex-
penditure of time results in achievement. A person can also put in long
hours in a compulsive, perfectionistic fashion, driven to achieve perfection-
istic standards. Such individuals react to criticism with hostility and resent-
ment, experience frustration from failing to meet superhuman standards,
and express anger and competition with colleagues in the workplace.

Work Addicts are addicted to the process of work; outcomes are important
only as they supply external rewards for temporarily enhancing self-esteem.
Work Addicts strive for increasing accomplishments to achieve self-worth.
Work Addicts are given to rigid thinking and perfectionism. They have diffi-
culty delegating which limits the development of others around them – Work
Addicts are likely not effective team contributors. They are striving to be in
control – in control of their work activities and other people around them. As
a consequence they increased the chances of ill health, poor relationships, and
diminished leadership contribution – theirs and others around them.

Addressing Workaholism

There is a large speculative literature suggesting ways to reduce levels of
workaholism. One part of this work focuses on individual and family ther-
apy (Killinger, 1991, Robinson, 1998); a second part emphasizes organiza-
tional and managerial interventions.

Individual Counseling

Workaholics Anonymous chapters have sprung up in some North American
cities. These groups, patterned after Alcoholics Anonymous self-help
groups, endorse the 12-step approach common to the treatment of a variety of addictions. Killinger (1991) and Robinson (1998) include chapters outlining actions an individual might pursue to reduce levels of workaholism; Seybold and Salomone (1994) offer suggestions on counseling approaches. Chen (2006) shows how the use of Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy (REBT) can be effective in lessening work–life balance concerns and ameliorating the effects of workaholism. Fry, Matherly, and Vitacci (2006) suggest that spiritual leadership theory may also offer a vehicle for reducing workaholism.

**Family Therapy**

Robinson and his colleagues, consistent with their clinical and consulting perspective, focus on treatment, both individual and family. This is not surprising given the central role they give to both family of origin and current family functioning in the development, maintenance, and intergenerational transmission of workaholism.

The treatment recommendations Robinson (1998) offers are similar to those offered to alcoholic families. Thus, denial is common among workaholics and their family members. Family members are reluctant to complain. Workaholics define their behavior and symptoms in a favorable light (Killinger, 1991; Porter, 1996). Parental expectations of children, often unrealistic, must be addressed. Family structures need to be identified. How do family members collude with the workaholic parent? Family members need help in expressing their negative feelings to the workaholic. Families need to learn to set boundaries around the amount they work together and talk about work. Family members can set goals to improve family dynamics (e.g., communication, roles, expression of feelings).

**Workplace Interventions**

How can employers help workaholics and workaholics help themselves? Schaef and Fassel (1988) offer the following ideas. Employers should pay attention to the performance and work habits of employees and be alert to warning signs of workaholism. They should ensure that employees take vacation time away from work. Finally, job insecurity, work overload, limited career opportunities, and lack of control can make employees feel compelled to work longer. If these factors exist, employers should try to minimize their impact on the atmosphere within the organization.

Haas (1991) also highlights the role that managers can play in assisting their workaholic employees to change. Workaholic employees should be referred to an employee assistance program or a recovery program to start treatment
processes. Managers should help prioritize projects for employees as long-term and short-term assignments. Workaholics must be encouraged and helped to delegate their work. At the end of each day, the manager should meet with the employee to discuss what has been accomplished during that day and to plan (down to short intervals) for the following day. The employee should be given specific times to take breaks and to leave work. It may also be possible to reduce the negative effects of workaholism, particularly well-being and health consequences, through stress-management training.

The development of workplace values that promote new, more balanced priorities and healthier lifestyles will support those workaholism types that want to change their behaviors (Austin Knight, 1995; Messenger, 2006). More people today want a life beyond work. Employees can work more effectively if they can integrate their work, families, and personal lives in more satisfying ways. This becomes a win-win situation for all involved (Friedman, Christensen, & DeGroot, 1998).

There is an old saying that “hard work never killed anybody.” Our research bears this out. Hard work that provides feelings of accomplishment and joy undertaken for noble, not selfish motives, is likely to enrich a manager’s life. The message here is that it is not how hard one works but why and how one works hard that matters.
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