The Complexification of Work-Family Conflict Theory: A Critical Analysis

Susan R. Madsen
Scott C. Hammond
Utah Valley State College

Abstract
This paper provides an extensive review and categorization of the work-family conflict literature, followed by a discussion of paradigmatic assumptions found within that literature and critical recommendations. The article describes the five most widely utilized theories in the work-family conflict literature: conflict theory, spillover theory, gender role theories, identity theory, and role theory. It concludes by recommending that future research focus on becoming more complex by moving from simple to complex explanations focusing less on hierarchy definitions and more on interactions, less on accounting for singular causality and more on multiple (sometime indeterminate) causalities, use less determinant and more indeterminate language, and adopt a morphogenic view of change.

INTRODUCTION

Changes in workforce demographics have resulted in increased research on work-family issues (Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001) exploring two important domains in an employee's life (Fu & Shaffer, 2000; Skitmore & Ahmand, 2003) and adding understanding to the issue defined by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) as "a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" (p. 77). Work and family conflict evolves from factors within the work and family realms or domains (Kim & Ling, 2001). While some say the work-family interaction is not directly related to the "responsibilities of either the workplace or the public sector" (Skitmore & Ahmad, 2003, p. 37), most agree (e.g., Batt, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Major, Klein, & Ehrhart, 2002) the work-family conflict construct is an important topic for management scholars and organizational leaders. According to Noor (2002), "research in work-family conflict has increased dramatically over the last two decades because of the changing nature of the balance between work and family responsibilities, most notably, the growing numbers of dual-earner families and single parents" (p. 646). With this increase in research it is imperative that projects be based and designed around appropriate theoretical frameworks. Way (1991) purported that research and development efforts in work-family relationships will be most effective "if they are based upon carefully considered and well formulated theoretical and conceptual frameworks" (p. 1).

Grant-Vallone and Donaldson (2001) stated that research that examines work-family conflict has advanced over the last decade by the development of theoretical models, empirical studies, and organizational sponsored work-family initiatives. However, Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) complained that work-family researchers have not based their predictions on strong conceptual frameworks and that often theories are not even mentioned in the literature.

This article provides a critical analysis of the paradigmatically based theoretical frameworks in the work-family conflict literature. Our intent is to categorize the literature, expose significant limitations of the current research lines, and propose recommendations for future inquiry. In the first section of this paper we categorize 75 of the major work-family conflict publications by theory. In this section we will describe and summarize five major theoretical constructs that have emerged from the work-family

conflict literature. These five constructs help expose the depth and gaps in the literature and form the foundation for our critique. In the second section we examine the emergence of different social scientific paradigms found in the literature. This sets the stage for our critical analysis in the third section where we describe in detail the narrow focus of the current status of the work-family conflict literature and suggest avenues for stronger theoretical exploration. In this section we address specific theoretical weaknesses in the work-family conflict literature around key paradigmatic measures proposed by Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979).

THE EMERGENCE OF THEORY IN THE WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT LITERATURE

Over 200 scholarly articles and dissertations were searched to extract names and/or descriptions of the theoretical frameworks that provided foundations for research projects. Reviewed/scholarly articles were found through searches in the following library indexes: ABI/INFORM, Business Source Premier, Academic Search Elite, and PsychInfo. Even though peer-reviewed/scholarly articles were used as a search limiter, search findings were further reduced by eliminating articles without references and those that did not appear to be based on empirical research (see Appendix). Eventually, we analyzed the theoretical frameworks and paradigmatic assumptions 75 literature pieces that provided fairly clear frameworks, revealing 15 operational theories within the literature (see Table 1). However, the vast majority of theoretical claims within the work-family conflict literature centered on five theories which draw our critical analysis.

TABLE 1 Work-Family Conflict Theoretical Frameworks - Frequencies

Rank	Name of Framework	No. of articles in which framework was used
1	Role Conflict Theory	45
2	Spillover Theory	16
3	Gender Theories	12
4	Role Theory	10
5	Identity Theory	7
6	Work/Job Strain Model	5
7	Segmentation Theory	5
8	Rational Theory	4
9	Personal Control	4
10	Compensation Theory	4
11	Scarcity Theory or Hypothesis	4
12	Job Stress Model	4
13	Conservation of Resources Model	3
14	Multiple Roles Theory	3
15	Expansion Theory	3

The five fairly clear frameworks identified in the 75 of the articles evaluated revealed that the role conflict theory provided the most prominent framework for the majority (n=45) of work-family conflict papers. This appears to be a "catch-all" theory for work-family conflict where researchers/theorists have built on each other's work throughout the past few decades. The spillover theory, general category of gender theories, and role theories provided frameworks for 10 to 16 papers. We considered these theories to be sufficiently developed to be useful subjects for our critical analysis. Each of the theories of our analysis is briefly described below as a foundation for our critical review. Theories

articulated in less than six journal articles were not sufficiently developed for our analysis.

Role conflict theory. The role conflict theory states that experiencing ambiguity or conflict within a role will result in an undesirable state. Because conflicting demands among roles (e.g., time, incompatible behaviors) leads to personal conflict, it becomes more difficult to perform each role successfully (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). Biernat (1997) explained that "role strain or difficulty in meeting role demands is inevitable" and a person "must continually make role decisions and bargains in order to meet role requirements" (p. 9).

Although some authors have used role conflict theory and role theory as seemingly interchangeable frameworks, there are definite differences between them. The role conflict theory outlines a deeper and more specific framework that provides a richer understanding of various work-family conflict forms, directions, and dimensions; these details are not presented in other theoretical frameworks. For example, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) presented and defined three forms of work-family conflict (time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict). In addition, researchers (e.g., Duxbury, Higgins, & Mills, 1992; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991) purported that to understand work-family conflict both directions (work interference with family and family interference with work) must be considered. The combination of these forms and directions comprise Carlson, Kacmar, and William's (2000) six dimensions of work-family conflict: time-based work interference with family, time-based family interference with work, strain-based work interference with family, strain-based family interference with work, behavior-based work interference with family, and behavior-based family interference with work. Researchers have recognized the importance of personal perceptions in determining the presence and impact of role conflict (Way, 1991).

Spillover theory. Spillover theory explains work influences in family life. Positive spillover is affirmed when the satisfaction, energy, happiness, and stimulation an individual has at work crosses over into positive feelings and energy at home or when positive satisfaction, energy, and happiness from home crosses over to a positive experience at work (Hill, Hawkins, & Miller, 1996; Higgins, Duxbury, Lee, & Mills, 1992; Way, 1991). Negative spillover from work to family is demonstrated when the problems, conflicts, or energy at work has strained and preoccupied an individual, making it difficult to participate in family life effectively and positively (Foley & Powell, 1997). Of course, negative spillover from family to work (e.g., divorce, problems with children, or the death of a close friend or family member) can also be destructive. Although there is overlap between this theory and the others outlined in this section, it appears that the spillover theory, although simplistic, provides the most basic and foundational concepts that underpin some of the assumptions (in full or in part) of the role conflict, gender role, role, and identity theories.

Gender role theories. Gender role theories seek to explain gender differences in work and family roles. Three of the well-known gender theories that represent three different sets of assumptions are the biological influences, childhood socialization processes, and social structural factors in society. According to Way (1991), "biological influences theory posits that sex differences in attitudes, abilities, and temperaments are innate and that these innate differences cause males and females to be differentially suited for certain work and family roles" (p. 13). According to the childhood socialization theories, formed and voluntarist personality differences lead males and females to choose and even prefer different social roles. Lastly, social structural theories tend to focus on the sources of gender inequality "stemming from systems of either patriarchy or capitalism, or both" (p. 13).

Role theory. Another framework for investigating work-family conflict is the general role theory. It refers to a set of behaviors that have socially agreed-upon functions and an accepted code of norms. Typical roles include spouse, parent, manager, employee, church member, student, friend, and more. Roles can represent relationships or functions, and they are necessary for the attainment of goals and the preservation of group solidarity. A role set is the entire assortment of roles a person occupies or plays at one time. Strain can occur when there are conflicting and/or competing demands made by two or more simultaneous roles held by one person. Role theory purports that multiple roles can lead to stressors (work overload and interrole conflict) and, in turn, to symptoms of strain (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984). Work overload refers to expectations that can lead to an increase in workload and possible feelings of overload within the work or nonwork domains. Interrole conflict refers primarily to the conflict between the roles. As mentioned previously, role theory has a much larger and general scope regarding work-family conflict as compared to the role conflict theory. Although one portion of the role theory focuses on role conflict, it does not provide the detailed description of the related components as found in the role conflict theory. Interesting, some authors occasionally infer that role conflict theory is one construct within the broader role theory framework.

Identity theory. According to Judge, Boudreau, and Bretz (1994), "identity theory maintains that individuals seek to construct desired images of themselves, and anything that blocks construction of these directed images represents a threat to self-identification. Because conflict between work and family roles constitutes an impediment to goals of self-fulfillment, threats resulting from work-family conflict likely lead to job stress" (p. 769). Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1993) say work-family conflict represents a, "threat or impediment to self-identification because it represents the degree to which work

activities are blocked or inhibited by pressures and responsibilities at home and vice versa" (p. 555). People are threatened when obstacles to activities that have potential implications for identity damage their self-image. Identity theory differs from role conflict theory and role theory because its basic premises are much broader than its use in this specific context. There are various psychological functions that are served by developing a sense of identity (i.e., basic need for self-esteem or self-enhancement; basic need for self-efficacy which is related to the sense of personal competence and control; and it allows for the development of self-consistency or coherence) (Smyth, 2002). There are many other constructs that can threaten or impede an individual's ideal or perceived personal identity, role conflict or work-family conflict being just a few. In addition, role theory and role conflict theory focus on internal struggles and incompatibilities but do not center on the potential influence these may have on an individuals overall personal identity. Although there is some overlap, some researchers (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1993; Judge, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1994) claim that understanding identity adds depth and breadth in examining the work-family conflict phenomenon.

These five theories become the subjects of our paradigmatic analysis in the third section. But first, in the next section, we must describe our method of analysis.

PARADIGMS, ASSSUMPTIONS, AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO THEORY IN THE WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT LITERATURE

While the word "paradigm" has become a cliché in some circles, it has important meaning in a discussion of theoretical evolution. Before Thomas Kuhn (1970) introduced the concept of *paradigm* in the 1950's, paradigms were generally unquestioned and unexplored. They fit Lincoln and Guba's (1985) definition of a paradigm as a "distillation of what we think about the world (but cannot be proven)." Thus the components of a paradigm are

called *assumptions* and not *axioms*, for they are not subject to mathematical proofs, only to metaphysical argument (this point will be important later). A paradigm is the mirrored reflection of theory; it is the unstated assumptions that are the basis of any scholars knowledge claim. Paradigms allow us to see the family of theories because we can see the association of simplifying assumptions. Patton (1989) said, "Paradigms tell them what is important, legitimate, and reasonable. Paradigms are also normative, telling the practitioner what to do without the necessity of long existential or epistemological consideration (p. 203)." Patton (1989) acknowledged that the strength of paradigmatic simplicity creates a critical opening where inherent weak assumptions can be questioned and explored.

Burrell and Morgan (1980) proposed a common, linear model that surfaces important paradigmatic assumptions in management theories. Burrell and Morgan contend that the assumptions within paradigms have two critical dimensions. The first dimension says the assumptions within a paradigm fall on a continuum of radical change versus regulation. Paradigms supporting radical change argue revolutions are required in order to bring about change. Marxism would be a classical revolutionary paradigm while regulation oriented paradigm favor incremental regular change. The second critical dimension charts subjective or objective paradigmatic assumptions. An extreme subjective orientation supports a nominalist ontology, while an extreme objective orientation is realist in nature. The realist, according to Burrell and Morgan (1980), argue reality is external to the individual. Nominalists argue humans name the environment, and reality is a product of individual cognition.

While the language of Burrell and Morgan (1980) helps distinguish each of our categories of theory, our critical analysis in section three is based on the Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) model. Even though this model has been around for more than 25 years, we

think this model is useful in providing progressive direction for work-family conflict literature. Schwartz and Ogilvy, suggest that paradigms are in constant flux. They say social scientific paradigms generally move along six dimensions. The first is from paradigmatic assumptions that conceptualize a simplistic world where relationships are based on probability towards a complex and diverse world where it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate and reduce elements and relationships. This new perspective suggests that systems are not the sum of their parts, but rather dynamic properties of all systems that create the unique characteristics of that system. Thus a mature paradigm focuses on relationship processes rather than outcomes.

The second shift is away from hierarchy toward interaction. This shift would suggest that interactions create influence, that mutual constraints emerge in all systems, and that these relationships are always in flux.

The third shift detailed by Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) is a movement from Newtonian causality to a holographic network. This shift is a movement from the linear push-pull world to one where everything is connected interdependently. What is important about this shift is the notion that each part of the whole contains some information about the whole. If one connection is broken, then another connection can take its place and reconstruct a new whole.

The fourth shift, described by Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979), is a movement from a determinate world to an indeterminate world. Schwartz and Ogilvy argue complex systems are not predictable or determinate, even if they are understandable. This notion leads very directly to the fifth shift, which is mutual causality. No longer in this new paradigm should we focus on simplistic cause-effect kinds of notions, but rather recognize there are multiple causes and effects in each, and that it is difficult, if not

impossible, to separate an effect from a cause.

The fifth shift Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) describe is dependent on the other four. When diversity, complexity, indeterminacy, openness, and nonlinear causality merge, then morphogenesis is possible. Morphogenesis is the creation of new forms from elements only partly identifiable. In this notion, the authors touch on underdetermination, suggesting the outcomes of these interactions are only partly identifiable. They also touch on the notion of patterns. Morphogenic patterns are created by information all parts of a system have in common, and which create the boundaries of the field. Morphogenesis suggests continuously changing but identifiable boundaries and indeterminate and unpredictable outcomes. Morphogenesis opens the possibility for self-organization.

Finally, Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) purport that there is a shift from objectivity to a perspectival posture. In this shift, we have moved from the Archimedean point from which the researchers or observers progress objectively, to an understanding that we are all part of the systems we are serving. In this new social science paradigm, we must consider that there would be multiple and sometimes conflicting perspectives of the same phenomena (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Schwartz & Ogilvy, 1979).

While each deal with different issues, the normative nature of the Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) model suggests that paradigms begin in the regulation/objectivist quadrant. Paradigms mature they move from simple to complex explanations, from hierarchy defining to describing interactions, from accounting for single causality to multiple (sometime infinite) causalities, from determinant to indeterminate language, from a static to a morphogenic view of change, and from a fixed to perspectivist knowledge claims. This takes them into the radical change/subjectivity quadrant in the Burrell and Morgan (1980) model.

In the section that follows we will evaluate the five leading work-family conflict theories against the six maturity criteria proposed by Schartz and Ogilviy (1979).

THE COMPLEXIFICATION OF WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT THEORY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The introduction of this paper cited Grant-Vallone and Donaldson (2001) and Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) who expressed concerns about the theoretical rigor of the work-family conflict literature. In our first section we placed the work-family literature in categories, illustrating the association of assumptions within the literature. In this section we use the Burrell and Morgan (1980) and Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) models, described in section two, to chart the paradigmatic progress of the five theories. Our critical analysis provides six recommendations of how the work-family conflict literature can move towards a more complex and realistic set of knowledge claims.

In general, we have found that the work-family conflict literature has a determinist bend with an effects orientation. INegative effects are measured in order to defend the home against work-related incursions or to defend the productivity of the workplace against the inefficiencies created by family relations. The work-family conflict literature has a quantitative bias and a behavioral focus which does not acknowledge the full complexity of humans. Key terms such as gender and identity are often not held to be problematic. While progress has and is being made, we argue that each of the five popular theories could benefit from six recommendations described below:

1. Work-family conflict research should move from simple to complex explanations. By increased complexity we mean conceptual, spatial complexity, and temporal complexity.

Conceptual complexity simple means that the symbols used to describe the explained phenomena need to be accurately reflected in the knowledge claim. Because the work-family conflict literature focuses on two domains (work and family), it is inherently simplistic. Indeed, much of the literature we reviewed assumed work and family were easily distinguished and failed to acknowledge other factors in great depth. For example, when role conflict occurs factors such as mental health, cultural tradition, and economic need are often ignored by the investigators.

Spillover theory, which appears to be more of an *idea* than a theory that can be used as a foundation for scholarly work (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), opens inquiry up to new variables but chooses to ignore the qualitative dimension of those variables. In order to move to more complex explanations of the phenomena of work-family conflict, more in-depth qualitative inquiry must occur. Only gender theory has drawn a comprehensive qualitative analysis. The other four dominant work-family conflict theories are support largely by quantitative analysis. To move towards multidimensional knowledge claims, researchers should see both the qualitative and quantitative dimensions of these problems.

By temporal complexity we mean that we need to look at how variables and values interact over time. Snap shots of measured effects tell us only what is happening in the moment of measurement. Most readers of this article who have been through or who are going through rigorous academic gauntlets to gain an advanced degree will agree that their family life has suffered at the hands of scholarly productivity. But it is also easy to see how an advanced degree earns one a career that offers flexibility and autonomy that, in the long run, is conducive to good family life. The Grant-Vallone and Donoldson study (2001) on the consequences of work-family conflict on employee well-being over time is a step in the right direction as a longevity study. While all research must have a beginning and an end, these scholars know that value of measuring variables through several natural cycles in order to see patterns that are not apparent in more convenient research designs.

By spatial complexity we mean that at any time, in any place, there are numerous, perhaps an infinite number of factors which might impact that which is being observed. It been over a hundred years since French Mathematician Henri Poincare (1890) told us that one key defining characteristic of a complex system is *sensitive dependence on initial condition*. Commonly known as the "butterfly effect" and used in physics and meteorological modeling, it simply suggests that small, seemingly insignificant factors can interact within a complex system to create significant effects.

2. Work-family conflict research needs to move from hierarchy defining to describing interactions. By this we mean that research needs to focus on the interaction between structures and not the structures themselves. To-be-sure, the nature of work and family has changed in the last 100 years. A century ago the traditional nuclear family was the definition of family. Today blended families, single parent families, two parent families, and even same sex families are redefining the traditional structures. The nature of work has changed as well with the movement from agricultural to industrial to informational work hierarchies.

Our point is this: What we are measuring is changing with new meanings in each generation. We need to focus our research interest on the relation between these two changing domains and not on the domains themselves. The Batt and Valcour study (2003) is an excellent example of a move towards a complexification because it focuses on the relationship between work and family, not merely on creating constructs. While building on the work of Carlson et al. (2000) and others, and by using the role conflict and spillover theories as frameworks, they describe both positive and negative

interactions within and between humans. They also look at the interactions of human resource practices and work and family outcomes.

The Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) is another good example of focusing on relationships. Although it bases its assumptions on role conflict, spillover, and role theory, it provides (as a foundation) the Conservation of Resources Model which clearly addresses constructs within and without the overlap of the work and family domains. The authors admit that many of the utilized theories (e.g., role theory, spillover theory, segmentation models) are somewhat segregated and have not been integrated into a comprehensive model that includes the complexity and integration to account for the interactions in, out, between, and among work-family conflict constructs, antecedents, determinants, and outcomes.

3. The work-family conflict research must move from accounting for single causality to multiple (sometime indeterminate) causalities. In maturing paradigms knowledge claims that show clear causality within complex system are inherently problematic. We have already discussed the Pioncare notion of *sensitive dependence on initial condition*, suggesting that all claims based on probability will occasionally produce anomaly. A mature research line needs to acknowledge problematic causality but it has to also provide an ever expanding number of variables, some of which seem insignificant but overtime become significant. This is difficult to do when the tradition is to speak in terms of linear causality that begins with preconditions and ends with effects.

Consider, for example, the Anderson, Coffey, and Byerly study (2002) found in the *Journal of Management*. While this study (as well as many others) does acknowledge the complexity of family and work situations, it is wholly linear in its approach. The authors said, "We propose antecedents and outcomes are associated with two forms of

work-family conflict (i.e. work interfering with family (work-to-family conflict (WFC)) and family interfering with work (family-to-work conflict (FWC))" (p.788). It is interesting that these authors can divide antecedents and outcomes as well as develop two different directions of conflict. The authors go on to suggest that these two kinds of conflict lead to stress and absenteeism and are linked to job dissatisfaction and turnover. It will question if absenteeism, for example, is an antecedent, an outcome, or both. As the work-family relationship is complexified, we will begin to see more and more variables and interactions that can affect what we are trying to measure. For example, the authors have successful shown that family structure effects positively the family-to-work conflict and leads to greater absenteeism. But what they fail to show is if greater absenteeism for those within stable family relations, leads to lower long-term productivity.

Please note that we are not suggesting that researchers should just add additional conditionality to their claims. We are suggesting that we need be more creative in describing the organic nature of relationships with complex structures. This means we will need a language that acknowledges the indeterminacy of what we measure. We are not suggesting an indeterminate free fall, where definitions are in constant dispute. That is a step backwards. But we are suggesting that the literature acknowledge the organic nature of relationships and the evolution of meanings that we use to describe them. Every time we publish something on the meaning of family we do not just get closer to a common definition, we also create more questions and concerns.

4. The work-family research should move from determinant to indeterminate language. We have argued that terms such as work and family need to be held to be problematic. The assumption is that they are separately definable is an artifact of modern western culture. In some cultures and in different times in history, family and work were not so easily

separated. Just as these primary terms are indeterminate, so are some of the secondary terms that follow this literature.

The most cited definition (as previously presented) of work-family conflict is that of Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). This article gave birth to the role conflict theory as we know today, but it appears that it has seen little evolution throughout the 22 years since. We do admit that Gutek et al. (1991) and others did expand the theory to include two directions (work to family and family to work) and Carlson et al. (2000) have expanded the construct to include six dimensions, but these appear to be relatively surface contributions and do not move the theory to include truly "indeterminate language" as we suggest. Even though the family, work, and world have changed dramatically during the past few decades, the depth and breath of the theory appear to remain at a one-dimensional level. Even the expanded theory does not (in full) account for the ever changing definitions of family, work, and their integration.

Carlson & Perrewe (1999) do acknowledge role ambiguity and provide an interesting model of work-family conflict that does include various antecedents and consequences in this process: work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work time demands, job involvement, family involvement, family time demands, family role conflict, family role ambiguity, job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Again, the model has been created primarily through quantitative means and appears to discard (in part) antecedents and consequences that may account for struggles of many individuals in nontraditional family and work situations.

The source of some underdetermination is culture. The Noor study (2002, p. 645) uses the term "well being" but this term is never clearly defined. Surely "well-being" in Malaysia is defined differently than in parts of the U.S. and Europe. In our analysis, few studies fully acknowledged underdetermination by suggesting that there are permeable boundaries between family systems and work systems.

5. The work-family conflict research should move from a static to a morphogenic view of change. We often need to remind ourselves that we are not studying something that is dead. Families and work organizations are living. They are inherently complex and merit qualitative and quantitative description. We are not just focusing on the rate of certain variables, but on the occasion where those variables occur. Often we hear terms that imply that family and work could be more in "balance." This adopts assumptions that once the two are in balance they will be static. For example, Maoz, Stroh, and Reilly (1995) provide a segmentalist theoretical framework that is based on economic, compensation, and socialization theory. They suggest that deficiencies in one area are often compensated for by increased performance in another. Implied in this model is an assumption that performance in work or family can be scored or measured and that one is always looking for balance between the two. An out of balance person would be seen negatively while an ideal person would have balance between work and family. The former would be required to change while the latter would be static.

A morphogenic view means that work and family issues are always before us. They are part of the permanent questions of a larger, self sustaining system that we call society. In other words, the focus of the research is no longer normative, but rather descriptive. It hopes to describe the ongoing interaction of values between two important domains. It then becomes a research paradigm focused on process evaluation rather than effect or outcome prediction.

6. The work-family research should move from a fixed to perspectivist knowledge claim. A mature scholar should be able to speak in his or her own voice and not in the artificial voice of a generic research authority. All research is done from the

foundation of a value system. The value system always bends the light to fit the shape of the researcher's eye. We need to acknowledge as research our values of what a family is and what an appropriate relationship between work and family is. A mature field will make a place for this and will in fact demand that perspective be articulated.

The Marchese, Bassham and Ryan analysis (2002) is a breath of fresh air. They present an alternative view, involving a virtue ethics analysis, in addressing critical business decisions related to work-family conflict. Although they present elements of the traditional view of role conflict theory, it does appear that they expand to report and address both qualitative and quantitative elements. In other words, the authors are making clear their own point of view. They are showing us where they stand and do not assume that we all stand in the same place.

CONCLUSION

We have just presented six recommendations for changes and improvements in approaching new and ongoing exploration, investigation, and conceptualization related to work-family conflict theoretical frameworks. These recommendations may also be helpful in restructuring assumptions and perceptions related to increasing the breath, depth, and applicability of various research foci within the general work-family/work-life arena. Generally, we have recommended more in depth qualitative inquiry, examination of conflict on employee well-being over time and in different spaces, and improvements in language and conceptualization.

If work-family researchers and theorist followed these recommendations, we believe there would be positive implications for the discipline. First, the reconceptualization of the terms "family" and "work" to account for a variety of cultures could result in a broader display of the full richness of the human condition. This is imperative considering the globalization of business in today's society. Second, a broader set of research methods and methodologies would be accepted in scholarly journals and at research conferences. Hence, richer and more complex data related to work-family conflict antecedents, mediators, outcomes, and interventions as well as program analysis, design, and evaluation would not only be more readily available but would provide a more comprehensive look at this most complex human phenomena. In addition, different inquiry approaches may provide new insights into advantages that work-family conflict may actually provide (i.e., development of competencies, self-esteem, self-efficacy) to employees, spouses, and dependents. Any discussion of this perspective has been generally avoided in the work-family conflict literature thus far. Finally, we believe that by following these recommendations there will be a stronger integration of the work-family literature into traditional business literature. If read, more business researchers, consultants, and practitioners could more widely implement ideas, strategies, improvements, and interventions that would assist employees and employers in improving individual and organizational performance.

Our recommendations for paradigmatic direction are surely going to challenge and even offend some who have invested their academic careers in this literature. We acknowledge that these recommendations are somewhat underdeveloped and it is unlikely that they will be soon realized. With academic traditions deeply entrenched in dissertations, programs, and publications, it is unlikely that change will be obvious. Most scholars, particular those focused on the work-family conflict literature, do not make explicit theoretical claims or their paradigmatic reflections. But there are three micro trends that we see in the literature that forecast this macro direction change. This is clearly a move to add a qualitative dimension to this literature that is already reflected in a few pieces. This does not mean that the quantitative is being abandoned. It means that

the qualitative is being used to context the quantitative claims. Second, there is clearly a multicultural dimension that is emerging in the literature as scholars from all over the globe are including in an academic discourse that once was dominated by westerners. This means alternative definitions of family, work, conflict, roles, and such. In some cases, the multicultural perspective seems to be holding

problematic the possible separation of work and family since both are interdependent on the other. Third, there is clearly an emergent multiple ideologies. No longer is it assumed that increased productivity is always desirable. These factors, and a host of others, make work-family conflict research a compelling and exciting challenge for insightful scholars in the coming years.

REFERENCES

Adams, G. A., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 411-420.

Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management, 28*(6), 787-810.

Aryee, S. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among married professional women: Evidence from Singapore. *Human Relations, 45*(8), 813-837.

Aryee, S., & Luk, V. (1996). Work and nonwork influences on the career satisfaction of dual-learner couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*, 38-52.

Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., & Lo, S. (1999). Role stressors, interrole conflict, and well-being:The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 259-278.

Barling, J., & MacEwen, K. E. (1992). Linking work experiences to facets of marital functioning. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 573-583.

Batt, R., & Valcour, P. M. (2003). Human resources practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover. *Industrial Relations, 42*(2), 189-219.

Beutell, N. J., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1982). Interrole conflict among married women: The influence of husband and wife characteristics on conflict and coping behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 21*, 99-110.

Biernat, B. A. (1997). *Employed parents' preference for reduced job hours in relation to job and family characteristics.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Blau, G. (1995). Influence of group lateness on individual lateness: A cross-level examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1483-1496.

Boles, J. S., & Babin, B. J. (1996). On the front lines: Stress, conflict, and the customer service provider*. Journal of Business Research, 37*(1), 41-50.

Boles, J. S., Howard, W. G., & Donofrio, H. H. (2001). An investigation into the inter-relationships of work-family conflict, family-work conflict and work satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13*(3), 376-390.

Boles, J. S., Johnston, M. W., & Hair Jr., S. F. (1997). Role stress, work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion: Inter-relationships and effects on some work-related consequences. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 17(1), 17-28.

Burley, K. (1989). *Work-family conflict and marital adjustment in dual career couples: A comparison of three time models.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, CA.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1980). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis.* London: Heinemann.

Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2002). Work-family conflict in the organization: Do life role values make a difference? *Journal of Management,* 26(5), 1031-1054.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56* 249-276.

Carlson, D. S. & Perrewe, P. L. (1999). Personality and role variables as predictors of three forms of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55,* 236-253.

Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management, 25(*4), 513-528.

Cinamon, R. G., & Rich, Y. (2002). Profiles of attribution of importance to life roles and their implications for the work-family conflict. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*(2), 212-220.

Cohen, A. (1995). An examination of the relationships between work commitment and nonwork domains. *Human Relations,* 48(3), 239-263.

Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1984). Stress and strain from family roles and work-role expectations. *Applied Psychology, 69*(2), 252-260.

Cutler, M. M. & Jackson, A. L. (2002). A "glass ceiling" or work/family conflict? *Journal of Business & Economic Studies, 8*(2), 73-89.

Duxbury, L. E., Higgins, C. A., & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict: A comparison by gender, family type, and perceived control. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*(3), 449-466.

Duxbury, L. E., Higgins, C. A., Lee, C., & Mills, S. (1992). An examination of organizational and individual outcomes*. Optimum*, *23*(2), 46-59.

Duxbury, L. E., Higgins, C. A., & Mills, S. (1992). After-hours telecommuting and work-family conflict: A comparative analysis. *Information Systems Research, 3*(2), 173-190.

Eagle, B. W., Miles, E. W., & Icenogle, M. L. (1997). Interrole conflicts and permeability of work and family domains: Are there gender differences? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 168-184.

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 178-199.

Foley, S., & Powell, G. N. (1997). Reconceptualizing work-family conflict for business/marriage partners: a theoretical model. *Journal of Small Business Management, 35*(4), 36-47.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(1), 65-75.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1993). Relationship of work-family conflict, gender, and alcohol expectancies to alcohol use/abuse. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14, 545-558.*

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1997). Relation of work-family conflict to health outcomes: A four-year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*(4), 325-335.

Frone, M. R., Yardley, J., & Martel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative

model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 145-167.

Frone, M. R., & Yardley, J. K. (1996). Workplace family-supportive programmes: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69*(4), 351-366.

Fu, C. K., & Shaffer, M. A. (2001). The tug of work and family: Direct and indirect domain-specific determinants of work-family conflict. *Personnel Review, 30*(5), 502-522.

Gerson, K. (1987). How women choose between employment and family: A developmental perspective. In N. Gerstel and H. E. Gross (Eds.), *Families and work* (pp. 270-288). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Good, L. K., Page Jr., T. J., & Young, C. E. (1996). Assessing hierarchical differences in job-related attitudes and turnover among retail managers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 24*(2), 148-156.

Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The conservation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 350-370.

Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Consequences of work-family conflict on employee well-being over time. *Work & Stress, 15*(3), 214-226.

Greenberger, D. B., & Strasser, S. (1986). Development and application of a model of personal control in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(1), 164-177.

Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experiences, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31*, 200-215.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review,* *10*(1), 76-88.

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

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., Granrose, C. S., Rabinowitz, S., & Beutell, N. J. (1989). Sources of work-family conflict among two career couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 34*, 133-153.

Gutek, B., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role-explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(4), 560-568.

Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. D. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual-earner couples:within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50,* 185-203.

Higgins, C. A., & Duxbury, L. E. (1992). Work-family conflict: A comparison of dual-career and traditional-career men. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 389-411.

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

Higgins, C. A., Duxbury, L. E., & Lee, C. (1994). Impact of life-cycle stage and gender on the ability to balance work and family responsibilities. *Family Relations, 43*, 144-150.

Higgins, C. A., Duxbury, L. E., Lee, C., & Mills, S. (1992). An examination of work-time and work-location flexibility. *Optimum, 23*(2), 29-37.

Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., & Miller, B. C. (1996). Work and family in the virtual office: Perceived influences of mobile telework. *Family Relations, 45*, 293-301.

Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. (1994). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 767-782.

Kim, S. (1998). Organizational culture and New York State employees' work-family conflict: Gender differences in balancing work and family responsibilities. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 18*(2), 57-72.

Kim J. L. S., & Ling, C. S. (2001). Work-family conflict of women entrepreneurs in Singapore. *Women in Management Review, 16*(5), 204-221.

Kinnunen, U., & Mauno, S. (1998). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among employed women and men in Finland. *Human Relations, 51*, 157-177.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1995). Managing the work-nonwork boundary: An assessment of organizational responses. *Human Relations, 48*(5), 515-535.

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

Kossek, E. E., Colquitt, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2001). Caregiving decisions, well-being, and performance: The effects of place and provider as a function of dependent type and work-family climates. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(1), 29-44.

Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(2), 139-149.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lincoln, Y., & Goba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Madsen, S. R. (2003). The effects of home-based teleworking on work-family conflict. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 14*(1), 35-46.

Major, V. S., Klein, K. J., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2002). Work time, work interference with family, and psychological distress. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 427-436.

Marchese, M. C., Bassham, G., & Ryan, J. (2002). Work-family conflict: A virtue ethics analysis. J*ournal of Business Ethics, 40*, 145-154.

Martins, L. L., Eddleston, K. A., & Veiga, J. F. (2002). Moderators of the relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(2), 399-409.

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work- family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 400-410.

Noor, N. M. (2002). Work-family conflict, locus of control, and women's well-being: Tests of alternative pathways. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(5), 645-662.

Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Granrose, S. (1992). Role stressors, social support, and well-being among two-career couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 339-356.

Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., Rabinowitz, S., Bedeian, Ar. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1989). Work and family variables as midiators of the relationship between wives' employment and husbands' well-being. *Academy of Management Journal,* 32(1), 185-201.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.).* Newbury Park:

Sage.

Pleck, J. H. (1977). The work-family role system. *Social Problems,* 24, 417-427.

Poincare, H. (1890). Sur le probleme des trois corps el les equations de la dynamique. *Acta mathematica, 13*, 1-270.

Roxburgh, S. (1999). Exploring the work and family relationship: Gender differences in the influence of parenthood and social support on job satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues, 20*(6), 771-788.

Schwartz, P. & Ogilvy, J. (1979). *The emergent paradigm: Changing patterns of thought and belief.* Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. (2001). Struggling for balance amid turulence on international assignments: work-family conflict, support and commitment. *Journal of Management, 27*(1), 99-121.

Shaffer, M. A., & Joplin, J. R. W. (2001). Work-family conflict on international assignments: Time- and strain-based determinants and performance effort consequences. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* IM: I1-I6.

Skitmore, M. & Ahmad, S. (2003). Work-family conflict: A survey of Singaporean workers. *Singapore Management Review, 25*(1), 35-53.

Smyth, L. F. (2002). Identity-based conflict: A systemic approach. *Negotiation Journal, 18*(2), 147-161.

Tenbrunsel, A. E., Brett, J. M., Maoz, E., Stroh, L. K., & Reilly, A. H. (1995). Dynamic and static work-family relationships. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 63(3), 233-246.

Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control

perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 6-15.

Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 392-415.

Tompson, H. B., & Werner, J. M. (1997). The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors: Testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management, 23*(4), 583-602.

Walls, G. D., Capella, L. M., & Greene, W. E. (2001). Toward a source stressors model of conflict between work and family. *Review of Business, 22*(1/2), 86-91.

Way, W. L. (1991). Frameworks for examining work-family relationships within the context of home economics education. In G. Felstehausen & J. B. Schultz (Eds.), *Work and Family Educational Implications* (pp. 1-23). Peoria, IL: Macmillian/McGraw-Hill.

Wiersma, U. J. (1994). A taxonomy of behavioral strategies for coping with work-home role conflict. *Human Relations, 47*(2), 211-221.

Wiley, D. L. (1987). The relationship between work/nonwork role conflict and job-related outcomes: Some unanticipated findings. *Journal of Management, 13*(3), 467-472.

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

Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. (2000). Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(1), 113-123.

Researcher/ Author	Name of Theory, Model, or Framework	Source Cited	Topic
Adams, King, & King (1996)	WFC and social support model	Adams et al., 1992	Relationship of WFC* and social support to job and life satisfaction
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly (2002)	Integrative model of work-family conflict	Various	Original model of WFC antecedents and job-related outcomes
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Carlson & Perewe, 1999; Frone et al., 1992; Netemeyer et al., 1996	Directions and definition of WFC
Aryee (1992)	Scarcity hypothesis	Marks, 1977	Multiple roles drain scarce energy
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
	Multiple roles	Hall, 1972	Gender differences in multiple roles
Aryee & Luk (1996)	Model of interdependent domains	Near, 1980	Interdependence of work and nonwork
	Identity theory	Lobel & St.Claire, 1992	Career performance outcomes
Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo (1999)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
	Role stressors, interrole conflict, and well-being model	Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999	Relationship of work & parent overload, WFC, & coping behaviors to satisfaction
	Similar model	Cohen & Wills, 1985	Support, stress, and well-being
	Stress theories	Various	Interaction of stress, strain, and coping

APPENDIX: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Work-Family Conflict Literature

Barling & MacEwen (1992)	Four-stage marital functioning model	Barling & Macewen, 1992	Role ambiguity and conflict, job insecurity, and job satisfaction's role
Batt & Valcour (2003)	Role conflict theory	Carlson et al., 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Gutek et al., 1991	Directions of WFC
	Spillover theory	Cook & Rousseau, 1984; Frone et al., 1992; and others	Positive and negative spillover between work and family
Beutell & Greenhaus (1982)	Interrole conflict coping	Hall, 1972	Three strategies for coping
Biernat (1997)	Multiple roles	Goode, 1960	Role demands and strain
	Role theory	Merton, 1957	Role demands/ overload
	Role conflict model	Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
	Spillover theory	Staines, 1980	Permeability between domains
	Job satisfaction model	Lawler, 1973; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984	Satisfaction with one's employment
	Job stress model	Dewe & Guest, 1990	Stress in one's occupation
	Family stress model	Hill, 1949	Family stressors and reactors
Blau (1995)	The absence culture	Johns & Nicholson, 1985	Tolerable or justifiable absence
Boles, Howard, & Donofrio (2001)	WFC - job satisfaction model	Boles & Babin, 1996	Relationship between WFC & satisfaction
	Systems theory	Boles & Babin, 1996	Interaction between elements in a system
Boles, Howard, & Donofrio (2001)	Role conflict theory	Netemeyer et al., 1996	Directions of WFC (WIF*, FIW*)
		Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985	Description and three forms of WFC

Boles, Johnston, & Hair Jr. (1997)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Netemeyer et al., 1996	Role conflict, stress, and ambiguity; directions and forms
	Role stress, WFC, & emotional exhaustion	Boles et al., 1997	Relationships and consequences
Burley (1989)	Spillover theory	Kanter, 1997	Effects of work and family on each other
	Compensation theory	Champoux, 1978	Make up for deficiencies in one domain
	Role conflict theory	Kahn et al., 1964	Conflict between roles
Carlson (1999)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
	Personality types	Ganseter, 1987	Type A, Type B
Carlson & Kacmar (2002)	Model of work-family conflict	Various sources	Original model of work-family conflict processes
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Description of work-family conflict
Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams (2000)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
		Gutek et al., 1991	Directions of WFC (WIF, FIW)
Carlson & Perrewe (1999)	Stress model	Gore, 1987	Role of social support in stress levels
	Role strain theory	Bedeian, Burke, & Moffet, 1988	Role conflict, ambiguity, and time demands on WFC
Cinamon & Rich (2002)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Definition and description of WFC
	Attribution theory		Importance to roles
	Life-span/space theory	Super; Tajfel & Turner, 1985	Multidimensional and concurrent examination of social roles
	Social identity theory	Stryker, 1987	Simultaneous view of diverse life roles

APPENDIX: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Work-Family Conflict Literature

Cohen (1995)	Role theory	Near et al., 1980	Managing competing expectations
	Spillover or expansion theory		Carry over into other domains
	Compensatory or scarcity model		Seeking involvement outside of work
	Segregation model		No relationship between work and family
Cooke & Rousseau (1984)	Role theory	Blood & Wolfe, 1960	Multiple roles can lead to stress
	Social support theory	LaRocco, House, & Frend, 1980	Multiple roles can serve to reduce stress
Cutler & Jackson (2002)	A model to analyze gender differences	Ragins, 1989	Gender differences in WFC
Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee (1994)	Rational theory of WFC	Greenhaus et al., 1987	WFC linked to hours spent in domain
	Job strain model	Karasek, 1979	Relationship between control and stress
Duxbury, Higgins, & Mills (1992)	Spillover theory	Voydanoff, 1989	Influence of domains on each other
	Gender theory	Pleck, 1984	Sequential/ simultaneous responsibility
	Model of work strain	Karasek, 1979	Conditions conducive to role conflict
Eagles, Miles, & Icenogle (1997)	Gender theory	Pleck, 1977	Women have greater interference
	Segmentation theory	Zedeck, 1992	Separation of work and family
	Work-family conflict	Frone et al., 1992	Asymmetrically permeable domains
Edwards & Rothbard (2000)	Spillover theory	Zedeck, 1992	Effects of work and family on each other
	Compensation theory	Burke & Greenglass, 1987	Offsetting dissatisfaction

	Segmentation theory	Lambert, 1990	Separation of work and family
	Resource drain theory	Staines, 1980	Transfer of finite personal resources
	Congruence theory	Morf, 1989; Zedeck, 1992	Similarities between work and family
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
Roley & Powell (1997)	Sensitization theory	Pleck, 1979	Men and women's self-esteem/identity
	Spillover theory	Evans & Bartolome, 1984	How work influences family life
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
	Work-family conflict model	Kopelman et al., 1983	Work-family conflict
	Model of WFC for business/marriage	Foley & Powell, 1997	Work-family conflict as owners/managers
Frone & colleaguesl (1992; 1993; 1996; 1997; 1997)	Job stress model	Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1986	Lack of fit at the work-family interface presents potent stress
	Identity development and maintenance	Frone et al., 1992	Factors related to identity and health
	Self-identity theory	Schlenker, 1987	WFC represents threat
	Model of work and family interface	Frone et al., 1992b	WFC variables and bi-directionality
	Integrative model of the work-family interface	Frone et al, 1997	Relationship between WFC predictors
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985	The effects of role overload on conflict
	Sex role socialization	Lewis, 1992	Roles of men and women
Fu & Shaffer (2001)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC

APPENDIX: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Work-Family Conflict Literature

	Dimensions of WFC	Carlson et al., (1998)	Six dimensions of WFC
	Work-family conflict models	Fu & Shaffer, 2001	Models of determinants of FIW & WIF
Good, Page Jr., & Young (1996)	Model of organizational turnover	Good, Page, Young, 1996	Extraorganizational antecedent and comparison
	Turnover model	Wunder et al.., 1982	Role stressors, job satisfaction, intent to leave, org. commitment
Grandey & Cropanzano (1999)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1986	Ambiguity and conflict result in undesirable state
	Spillover theory	Zedeck & Mosier, 1990	Influences between work and family
	Segmentation model	Zedeck & Mosier, 1990	Separation between work and family
	Conservation of resources model	Hobfoll, 1989	More positive resources will offset effects of the loss of resources
Grant-Vallone & Donaldson (2001)	Role theory	Chapman et. al., 1994; Marks, 1977	Scarcity hypothesis – time and energy
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985; Kopelman et al., 1983	Directions and three forms of WFC
	Role conflict theory	Kahn et al., 1964	WFC presence, directions
Greenberger & Strasser (1986)	Personal causation theory	Charms, 1968	People need to feel mastery
	Expectancy theory	Vroom, 1964	Causes of performing some actions
	Reactance theory	Brehm, 1966	Loss of control promotes mastery
	Model of personal control	Staw, 1977	Decision-making sequence
	Dynamic model of personal control	Greenberger et al., 1986	Model offered by this study

Greenhaus & Beutell (1985); Greenhaus et al. (1987, 1989)	Attribution theory	Jones & Nisbet, 1971	Differential attributions of behavior cause
	Model of work-family conflict; role conflict	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kahn et al., 1964	Original model; three form of WFC
	Role conflict theory	Hall, 1972	Types and relationships of conflict
	Gender role theory	Bartolome & Evans, 1980	Sequential and simultaneous
	Spillover theory	Brief, Schuler, and Van Sell, 1981	Negative emotional spillover
	Job stress model		Work-related stress affects overall quality of life
Gutek, Searle, & Klepa (1991)	Rational view theory	Keith & Schafer, 1984	Conflict is related linearly to time spent in paid and family work
	Gender role framework	Pleck et al, 1978	Gender affects perceived WFC
	Role conflict theory	Gutek et al., 1981	Directions of WFC (WIF, FIW)
	Socio-cultural expectations theory		Time and person's perspective of WFC
Hamper, Allen, & Grigsby (1997)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Conflict between roles
	Gender roles	Pleck, 1980	Differences between genders in working
	Typology of single/dual-career couples	Yogev & Brett, 1985	Work and family involvement of spouse
	Dual-career couple interactions	Gupta & Jenkins, 1985	How interactions lead to stress
Higgins et al (1992; 1992; 1992; 1994)	WFC model	Kopelman et al., 1983	WFC relationships

APPENDIX: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Work-Family Conflict Literature

	Spillover theory	Staines, 1980	Relationship between WC and FC
	Overload theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Predict work conflict relates to WFC
	Job strain model	Karasek, 1979	High stress when there is little control
	Role accumulation theory	Nieva, 1985	Family role is demanding but satisfying
	Multiple roles	Piotrkowksi & Repetti, 1984	Dual-career woman's ability to handle
	Life cycle stages	Aldous, 1987	Variations in work and family demands
	Rational view model	Staines, Pleck, et al., 1978	Amount of conflict linked to hours work
	Gender role expectation framework	Hockschild, 1989	Expectations affects perceptions of WFC
	Role theory	Kelly & Voydanoff, 1985	Predicts expectations in roles
Judge, Boudreau, & Bretz (1994)	Role theory	Katz & Kahn, 1978	Role conflict with incompatible demands
	Self-identity theory	Schlenker, 1987	Individuals seek to construct self-image
	Model of executive attitudes	Judge et al., 1994	Satisfaction, stress, WFC, FWC
	Person-environment fit theory	French, 1963	Job stress signifies a poor fit
Kim (1998)	Gender theory	No source cited	Differences between genders in WFC
Kim & Ling (2001)	Framework on WFC	Kim & Ling, 2001	Work and family characteristics, conflict types & consequences
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC

Kinnunen & Mauno (1998)	Socio-cultural expectations theory	Gutek et al., 1991	Time and person's perspective of WFC
	Model of WFC antecedents and outcomes	Kinnumen et al., 1998	Original model of WFC antecedents and outcomes
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
	Identity theory	Frone et al., 1996	Genders socialized differently
Kirchmeyer (1995)	Organizational responses framework	Hall & Richter, 1988	Boundary flexibility and permeability
	Managing work-nonwork framework	Kanter, 1977	Managing the boundary between them
Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly (1983)	Model of work, family, and interrole conflict	Kopelman et al., 1983	Original model - includes job, family, and life satisfaction
Kossek, Colquilt & Noe (2001)	Work-family climates	Kossek et al., 2001	Effects of place and provider as function of dependent type and WF climates
Kossek & Ozeki (1998)	Spillover theory	Leiter & Durup, 1996	Carry over of attitudes and behaviors
	Compensation theory	Greenglass & Gurke, 1988	Interrelationships through counterbalance
	Segmentation theory	Lambert, 1990	Compartmentalization of roles
Madsen (2003)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985; Carlson et al., 2000; Gutek et al., 1991	Three forms of WFC Six dimensions of WFC Two directions of WFC
	Work-strain model	Karasek, 1979	Perceived control and WFC
	Systems theory	Swanson, 1997	Interaction between elements in a system
Major, Klien & Ehrhart (2002)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Carlson et al., 2000; Others	Forms of WFC; definition and description of WFC

APPENDIX: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Work-Family Conflict Literature

	Rational model	Duxbury & Higgins, 1994; Gutek et al., 1991	Conflict increases in proportion to time spent in domain
	Spillover theory	Zedeck & Mosier, 1990	Three family characteristics associated with time
Marchese, Bassham, & Ryan (2002)	Directions of WFC	Gutek et al., 1991; MacEwen & Barlin, 1994; Williams & Alliger, 1994	Directions of WFC (WIF, FIW)
	Seven habits cycle	Covey, 1989	Adaptation of the 7 Habits for WFC
Martins, Eddleston, & Veiga (2002)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Forms of WFC in relationship to career satisfaction
Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian (1996)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kahn et al., 1964	Forms of WFC; distinctions between WIF and FIW
Noor (2002)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Directions of WFC
	Measure of control	Frese, 1989	Influence of control on stress/well-being
	Control's effect on well-being as mediated by WFC	Noor, 2002	Influence of control through WFC
Parasuraman and colleagues (1989; 1992)	Employment and well-being model	Parasuraman et al., 1989	Original Model - wife's employment, time commitments, WFC, satisfaction, QL
	Gender theory	Pleck, 1979, 1985	Time commitment and perceptions
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Role demands in both demands
	Stress models	Greenhaus et al., 1986; Kessler et al., 1985	Resource capabilities
	Work-non work stress model	Greenhaus et al., 1986; Parasuraman et al., 1992	Various role stressors and impacts; original model of work/non-work stress

Pleck (1977)	Work-family role system	Pleck, 1997	Original to article
	Gender role theory	Not specific	Male and female roles
	Resource theory of marital power	Safilios-Rathschild, 1970	Women's employment and power
	Functionalist theory	Scanzoni, 1970	Family, work, society linkage
Roxburgh (1999)	Expansion hypothesis	Barnett & Baruch, 1987	Multiple roles enhance well-being
Shaffer et al. (2001)	Human capital theory	Becker, 1985, 1991	Demands and resources
	Conservation of resources model	Hobfoll, 1989	Demands and resources
Shaffer & Joplin (2001)	Human capital theory	Becker, 1985, 1991	Demands and resources
	Conservation of resources model	Hobfoll, 1989	Demands and resources
	Role conflict theory	Gutek et al, 1991	Directions of WFC (WIF, FIW)
Skitmore & Ahmad (2003)	Role conflict theory	Kahn et al., 1964; Greenhaus et al., 1985	Role pressures from both domains Three forms of WFC
	Work-family wins and losses	Goggins, 1995	Work-family wins and losses
Tenbrunsel, Brett, Maoz, Stroh, & Reilly (1995)	Segmentalist theoretical framework	Staines, 1980	Work and family are separate domains
	Economic theory	Becker, 1981	Efficiency governs distribution of involvement in domains
	Socialization theory	Coser, 1975	Socialization of members of society
	Compensation theory	Champoux, 1978	Deficiencies in one domain create need for comp. in another
Thomas & Ganster (1995)	Role theory	Bedeian et al, 1988	Tensions are interrole conflict

APPENDIX: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Work-Family Conflict Literature

	Model of family-supportive variables	Thomas et al., 1995	Original model -family supportive variables and strain outcomes
Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness (1999)	Dimensions of work-family culture	Thompson et al., 1999	Benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and WFC
	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1995	Three forms of WFC
Thomson & Werner (1997)	Role scarcity theory	Cooke & Rousseau, 1984	Conflict between roles is typical
	Role expansion theory	Marks, 1977	Multiple role incumbency is linked with improved well-being
	Role accumulation framework	Oakley et al., 1986	Not just number of roles, but perceptions and interactions
Walls, Capella, & Greene (2001)	Role conflict theory	Kahn et al., 1964	Various role conflicts
		Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of WFC
Wiersma (1994)	WFC coping behavior model	Hall, 1972	Coping behaviors (Type I, II, III)
	Model of role conflict	Ropoport & Rapoport, 1976	Type of dilemmas in role conflict
Wiley (1987)	Exchange theory of commitment	Becker, 1960	Perceived elements of role exchanged with organization
	Role conflict theory	Kahn et al., 1964	Conflict within/ between roles
Williams & Alliger (1994)	Levels of analysis model	Williams & Alliger, 1994	Assisting the quality of experience
	Circumplex model of emotions	Russell, 1980	Immediate mood states
	Control theory view of affect	Carver & Scheier, 1990	Affect is a function of perceived progress toward goals

	Spillover theory	Repetii, 1987	Negative and positive spillover
Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou (2000)	Role conflict theory	Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985	Three forms of conflict
	Work-family conflict directions	Gutek et al., 1991	Types or directions of conflict

*WFC = work-family conflict; WIF = work interference with family; FIW = family interference with work