

Ali Moazami-Goodarzi

The Work-Family Interface and its Correlates

Integrating Variable and Person Oriented Approaches



Ali Moazami-Goodarzi

The Work-Family Interface
and its Correlates

Integrating Variable and Person Oriented Approaches

Esitetään Jyväskylän yliopiston kasvatustieteiden ja psykologian tiedekunnan suostumuksella
julkisesti tarkastettavaksi yliopiston vanhassa juhlasalissa S212
marraskuun 29. päivänä 2017 kello 12.

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by permission of
the Faculty of Education and Psychology of the University of Jyväskylä,
in building Seminarium, auditorium S212, on November 29, 2017 at 12 o'clock noon.



UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2017

The Work-Family Interface and its Correlates

Integrating Variable and Person Oriented Approaches

Editors

Timo Suutama

Department of Psychology, University of Jyväskylä

Pekka Olsbo, Sini Tuikka

Publishing Unit, University Library of Jyväskylä

Cover picture by Ali Moazami-Goodarzi

Permanent link to this publication: <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7236-3>

URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7236-3

ISBN 978-951-39-7236-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-951-39-7235-6 (nid.)

ISSN 0075-4625

Copyright © 2017, by University of Jyväskylä

Jyväskylä University Printing House, Jyväskylä 2017

ABSTRACT

Ali Moazami-Goodarzi

The Work-Family Interface and its Correlates: Integrating Variable and Person Oriented Approaches

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2017, 70 p.

(Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research

ISSN 0075-4625; 598)

ISBN 978-951-39-7235-6 (print)

ISBN 978-951-39-7236-3 (pdf)

The aim of this research was to examine key correlates of the interaction between work and family in one Nordic country, Finland, using a person-oriented and variable-oriented approach. The correlates that were chosen and examined over the course of three studies were job control and work-family boundary management styles, turnover intention, core self-evaluations, and vigor at work. Study I was part of a 2-year longitudinal study which was conducted in two Finnish universities (n = 700); Study II consisted of two samples, one of university employees (University 1, n = 666; University 2, n = 644), and the other of nurses (n = 301) from one healthcare district in Finland; and Study III used the same sample as in Study I. The findings of this research provide evidence that vigor at work leads to work-family enrichment by creating a positive mood in individuals that is transferable from work to family. The findings also suggest that enriching family life through work experiences can, in turn, lead to greater vigor at work. Although, no reciprocal relations were found between work-family enrichment and core self-evaluations when using variable oriented analyses, a person-oriented analysis showed that individuals who are better at managing their work and family domains make positive self-evaluations. The results also showed the importance that individuals attach to boundary characteristics in managing the work-family interface, suggesting that perceived situational constraints or opportunities (ability) and personal motivation (willingness) can be useful components in predicting a positive or negative work-family interface. Furthermore, the results showed that a combination of high work-family enrichment and low work-family conflict can result in beneficial outcomes, while low enrichment and high conflict would have the opposite effect.

Keywords: work-family enrichment, work-family conflict, vigor at work, core self-evaluations, boundary management styles, job control, turnover intention, person-oriented approach.

Author's address Ali Moazami-Goodarzi
Department of Psychology
P.O. Box 35
40100 University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Ali.moazami-goodarzi@jyu.fi

Supervisors Professor Jari-Erik Nurmi
Department of Psychology
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Professor Saija Mauno
Department of Psychology
University of Jyväskylä, Finland
University of Tampere, Finland

Docent Johanna Rantanen
Department of Teacher Education
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Professor Katariina Salmela-Aro
Department of Psychology
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Reviewers Docent Liisa Mäkelä
Faculty of Business, Management and Organizations
University of Vasa, Finland

Professor Petra Lindfors
Department of Psychology
Stockholm University, Sweden

Opponents Docent Liisa Mäkelä
Faculty of Business, Management and Organizations
University of Vaasa, Finland

TIIVISTELMÄ (FINNISH ABSTRACT)

Moazami-Goodarzi, Ali

Työn ja perheen välinen vuorovaikutus ja siihen yhteydessä olevat tekijät: muuttuja- ja henkilökeskeinen tarkastelu

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2017, 70 p.

(Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research

ISSN 0075-4625; 598)

ISBN 978-951-39-7235-6 (print)

ISBN 978-951-39-7236-3 (pdf)

Tässä väitöskirjatutkimuksessa tarkasteltiin työn ja perheen vuorovaikutukseen liittyviä tekijöitä Suomessa hyödyntämällä muuttuja- ja henkilökeskeistä tutkimusotetta. Työn ja perheen vuorovaikutusta ja siihen liittyviä tekijöitä tutkittiin kolmessa osatutkimuksessa ja tekijöinä analysoitiin vaikutusmahdollisuuksia työssä, työn ja perheen rajapinnan hallintastrategioita, työpaikan vaihtoi-keita, minuuden ydintulkintoja sekä tarmokkuutta työssä. Ensimmäinen osa- tutkimus, joka oli osa 2-vuotista seurantatutkimusta, toteutettiin kahdessa suomalaisessa yliopistossa (n =700). Toisen osatutkimuksen aineisto koostui yliopistotyöntekijöistä (yliopisto 1, n = 666; yliopisto 2, n = 644) ja hoitoalan työntekijöistä (n = 301). Kolmas osatutkimus perustui samaan seuranta- aineistoon kuin ensimmäinen osatutkimus. Tutkimustulokset osoittavat, että tarmokkuus työssä lisäsi työstä ja perheeseen suuntautuvaa rikastuttamista yli ajan, joka puolestaan lisäsi tarmokkuutta työssä yli ajan. Työstä perheeseen suuntautuva rikastuttaminen ja minuuden ydintulkinnat eivät kuitenkaan olleet pitkittäisesti yhteydessä toisiinsa, kun yhteyksiä analysoitiin muuttujakes- keisellä tutkimusotteella yli ajan. Toisaalta henkilökeskeiset analyysit osoittivat, että ne työntekijät, jotka kokivat pystyvänsä hallitsemaan työn ja perheen välis- tä rajapintaa, raportoivat myös positiivisempia minuuden ydintulkintoja. Työn ja perheen välisen rajapinnan hallinnan suhteen havaittiin, että työntekijän ar- vioimat mahdollisuudet ja halukkuus olivat keskeisiä rajapinnan hallinnan ulottuvuuksia myönteisen työn ja perheen vuorovaikutuksen näkökulmasta. Tulokset osoittivat myös, että korkea työstä perheeseen suuntautuva rikastut- taminen ja vähäinen työstä perheeseen suuntautuva ristiriita johtivat positiivi- siin seurauksiin, kun taas vähäinen rikastuttaminen ja korkea ristiriita johtivat kielteisiin seurauksiin.

Avainsanat: työ-perhe rikastuttaminen, työ-perhe ristiriita, tarmokkuus työssä, minuuden ydintulkinnat, työn ja perheen rajapinnan hallintastrategiat, vaikutusmahdollisuudet työssä, työpaikan vaihtoaikeet, henkilökeskeinen analyysi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost I would like to express my deepest gratitude and dedicate this dissertation to my extraordinary supervisor, Prof. Jari-Erik Nurmi, for his invaluable support, guidance, patience, and caring throughout every step of this dissertation. Sadly, he deceased before the completion of the dissertation and regretfully I miss the chance of expressing my sincerest appreciation to him in person. He was not only my supervisor but also my best friend and role model. There aren't enough words to express the strong, positive impact he has had on my life. I will forever miss his wisdom, sense of humor, and unfailing kindness.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Saija Mauno and Dr. Johanna Rantanen who generously provided me data and resources along with their insightful comments, constructive suggestions and guidance that were essential to me in completing this dissertation. My deepest appreciation to Prof. Kaisa Aunola for her great support, guidance, and kindness throughout this journey. Special thanks to Prof. Katariina Salmela-Aro for her fruitful comments during the preparation of this dissertation. I am really honored to work under the guidance of these distinguished people. I would also like to express my great appreciation to the reviewers of this dissertation, Prof. Petra Lindfors and Dr. Liisa Mäkelä for their brilliant comments and suggestions. I also wish to thank all my co-workers, especially Matilda Sorkkila, Xin Tang, and Hely Innanen for their friendship and warm support.

Most importantly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my dear best friend and beautiful wife, Maryam. I dedicate this dissertation to her. The endless love, support, and patience she has given me throughout the past fifteen years makes my life a wonderful experience.

I would also like to thank my dear parents, brothers, sisters, and all my Iranian friends here in Finland for their encouragement and support. I wish to extend my appreciation to Jyväskylä University and Department of Psychology for their financial support in my doctoral studies in Finland. Finally, I would like to thank Isabel and Seela, my lovely little friends, and their Mom, Matilda, for making it possible for me to capture a beautiful moment and turn it into a wonderful cover photo.

Jyväskylä 1.11.2017
Ali Moazami-Goodarzi

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

- I Moazami-Goodarzi, A., Nurmi, J.-E., Mauno, S., & Rantanen, J. (2014). Cross-lagged relations between work-family enrichment, vigor at work, and core self-evaluations: A three-wave study. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 30, 473–482.
- II Moazami-Goodarzi, A., Rantanen, J. Nurmi, J.-E., & Mauno, S. (2015). Work-family boundary management profiles in two Finnish samples: A person-oriented approach. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 6, 12–25.
- III Moazami-Goodarzi, A., Rantanen, J. Nurmi, J.-E., Aunola, K., & Mauno, S. (2017). Latent profiles of work-family balance: Antecedents and outcomes. Submitted manuscript.

Taking into account the instructions given and comments made by the coauthors, the author of the present thesis wrote the original research plan, conducted all parts of the statistical analyses on the available data sets, and wrote the reports of the three publications.

TABLES

TABLE 138

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

TIIVISTELMÄ (FINNISH ABSTRACT)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATION

TABLES

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	11
1.1	Work-family conflict and enrichment.....	13
1.2	The concept of work-family balance	15
1.3	Theoretical background to work-family interface concepts	15
1.3.1	The role theories	16
1.3.2	The conservation of resources theory.....	17
1.3.3	Boundary and Border Theory	17
1.3.4	The work-family enrichment theory	19
1.3.5	The Broaden-and-Build Theory	20
1.4	Work-family interface: antecedents and outcomes.....	21
1.4.1	Vigor at work.....	23
1.4.2	Core self-evaluations	24
1.4.3	Work-family boundary flexibility.....	26
1.4.4	Job control	27
1.5	Controlled background variables.....	28
1.6	Person-oriented approach	29
1.7	Study context: work-family interface in Finland.....	29
1.8	Aims of the research	30
2	METHOD	32
2.1	Participants and procedure	32
2.2	Measures	34
2.3	Analysis strategy in the three studies	36
3	OVERVIEW OF THE ORIGINAL STUDIES	39
3.1	Study I	39
3.2	Study II.....	40
3.3	Study III.....	40
4	DISCUSSION	42
4.1	Summary of the findings	42
4.4	Strengths and limitations.....	47
4.5	Practical implications	49
4.6	Future directions.....	50
4.7	Concluding remarks	51
	YHTEENVETO (SUMMARY)	52
	REFERENCES	55

1 INTRODUCTION

Work and family are terms that have traditionally been used to describe two separate domains in people's lives, and yet they are also highly interdependent. In many ways, they could be seen as being at two opposite ends of a spectrum, and in that respect they are in dynamic relation to each other (Anafarta, 2011; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Not only are work-family dynamics being constantly reshaped by historical changes in demographics and family roles (Vieira, Matias, Lopez, & Matos, 2016), but they are proving crucial to understanding more about individual well-being. While most of the empirical literature has focused on the negative aspects of the work-family interface, i.e., conflict or interference (e.g., Jansen, Kant, Kristensen, & Nijhuis, 2003; Moreno-Jiménez et al., 2009), the emphasis of positive psychology on human strengths, such as optimism, resilience, etc., (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) has drawn attention to the good sides of combining work and family responsibilities (e.g., Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Shein & Chen, 2011). Involvement in multiple roles has been identified as a form of protection or a buffer for individuals facing negative experiences in one or other of these roles (Barnett, & Hyde, 2001). For example, working commitments in more than one domain allows a person to gain resources and satisfaction in a number of life roles (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002; see Allis & O'Driscoll, 2008).

Research on the more positive effects of the work-family interface has been growing in recent years (e.g., Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Lu, 2011). It has been suggested that *work-family enrichment* is a useful way to describe how the work-family interface benefits from affective and instrumental paths (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Also, the antecedents and consequences of family enrichment have gained increasing attention (for a review, see McNall, Nicklin & Masuda, 2010). Work engagement, for instance, that consists of challenging, but positive and meaningful work experiences will generate a broad spectrum of positive thinking and feelings; foster personal growth and development; provide the individual with psychological, social, and cognitive resources (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011); and in turn, enrich the individual's family domain too (see Eldor, Harpaz, & Westman, 2016). Positive core self-

evaluations may also enhance work-family enrichment by increasing individuals' coping skills (Boyar & Mosley, 2007), and by encouraging them to seek more challenges, to acquire new skills, to show positive moods and perspectives, and to achieve more rewards at work (Baral & Bhargava, 2011; Ouwenel, Le Blanc, & Schaufeli, 2012; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009).

As moving between multiple roles is increasingly seen as a significant factor in people's lives, researchers have started to investigate how working adults navigate between such roles in the work and family domains (Rothbard & Dumas, 2006). It has been suggested that individuals differ in *boundary management style*, considering the boundary between the domains of work and family (Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2009). As considerable attention has been paid to organizational-level policies for managing work and family than to the individual-level processes (Kreiner et al., 2009), less is known about how that boundary management styles depend on individuals' characters as much as on the structure of their job (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2005), and how they relate to more specific work and family outcomes, such as work-family enrichment and conflict (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010).

Both the conceptual and empirical distinctions between work-family enrichment and work-family conflict (Schenewark, & Dixon, 2012) must be considered if we are to advance current knowledge on how individuals feel about what constitutes a good work-family balance (Powell & Greenhaus, 2006; see also Demerouti, Corts, & Boz, 2013). Frone (2003), for instance, defines it as experiencing high levels of work-family facilitation (enrichment) and low levels of work-family conflict. By this account, work-family enrichment and conflict are seen as a priori constructs necessary to achieve work-family balance. Accordingly, researchers have described various types of work-family enrichment and work-family conflict in terms of the bidirectionality of these experiences, that is, work can enrich or conflict with family, just as family can enrich or conflict with work (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004; Grzywacz, Butler, & Almeida, 2008). Some have also stressed that a specific combination of work-family conflict and enrichment is in fact more important for individual well-being than simply conflict or enrichment in isolation (Rantanen, Kinnunen, Mauno, & Tillemann, 2011).

There are several caveats in the research literature, however. First, most findings on the work-family interface have been based on cross-sectional studies (e.g., Hakanen, Peeters, & Perhoniemi, 2011; McNall, Scott, & Nicklin, 2015; Siu et al., 2015). This makes it hard to establish the direction in which the enrichment or conflict is taking place between work and family, not to mention the antecedents and outcomes; and there is thus a call for more longitudinal studies. Second, because most previous research has used a variable-oriented, rather than a person-oriented methodology, it is harder to identify various groups of individuals, the focus has been more on the associations between different constructs. Third, although predictors and consequences of the work-family interface have been well-established in numerous studies in North

America and Europe (see Drummond et al., 2017), the context has varied according to the welfare regime in each country. In Finland, a generous welfare state specifically has been designed to help people juggle work and family commitments (Kröger, 2010). Consequently, there is a need for research that is not only longitudinal, but is also conducted across different societal contexts and countries to achieve more generalizable findings.

This research therefore contributed to previous research in three ways: it used a longitudinal design with three waves of data collection that took place in 2008, 2009, and 2010; it employed a person-oriented framework to identify different subgroups of participants as characterized by certain patterns of work-family boundary management and balance (including both enrichment and conflict); and it was conducted in Finland, thus representing the Nordic context.

1.1 Work-family conflict and enrichment

The work-family interface represents the challenge of managing multiple roles, i.e., at work, in the family, and among the community. Incompatibility between these domains has been characterized as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, 77). Work-family conflict occurs when one role interferes with another (for a review, see Kinnunen, Rantanen, Mauno & Peeters, 2013). It may originate in either work interfering with family (work-to-family conflict) or vice versa (family-to-work conflict), and both may lead to increased stress in individuals, though it is more likely to be the former (Kinnunen et al., 2013). According to previous research, conflict in both these directions is associated with job satisfaction, marital satisfaction, life satisfaction, job burnout, and the psychological and physical strains of both (for a review, see Allen, 2013).

On the other hand, combining work and family roles may provide benefits and opportunities for enrichment. Some researchers have thus turned their focus away from the negative aspects of the work-family interface to benefits to look at these aspects (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne & Grzywacz, 2006). Terms for such positive experiences include *work-family enhancement* (Sieber, 1974), *positive spillover* (e.g., Crouter, 1984; Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006), *work-family facilitation* (e.g., Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004), and *work-family enrichment* (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). The distinction between each of these various constructs is not consistently clear, and indeed they are often used interchangeably (Wayne, 2009), but there are some differences that should be noted (Carlson et al., 2006).

According to Sieber (1974), work-family enhancement refers to the acquisition of resources that will be useful in a number of life’s challenges (see also Russo & Buonocore, 2012). Meanwhile, positive spillover refers to the transfer of generative skills, moods, values, and behaviors from work to family or vice versa (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Hanson et al., 2006). For example, the

skills learned at work are transferred and applied at home. The key distinction between work-family enhancement and positive spillover is thus that positive spillover happens when individuals themselves transmit the benefit to another domain (McNall et al., 2010), whereas enhancement is more about the actual acquisition of useful resources.

Work-family facilitation differs slightly again, as it is defined as “the extent to which an individual’s engagement in one life domain (i.e., work/family) provides gains (i.e., developmental, affective, capital, or efficiency) that contribute to enhanced functioning of another life domain (i.e., family/work)” (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007, 64). For example, facilitation occurs when the skills learned from the workplace improve ways in which the family function (Allen, 2013). The key distinction between this and positive spillover is that facilitation occurs only when the individual successfully applies the gains acquired in one domain to the other domain at the system level, i.e., among co-workers or family members (Greenhaus & Singh, 2012).

Finally, the key difference between work-family enrichment and the other positive work-family interfaces mentioned above, is that work-family enrichment requires more than just the transfer of either experiences or resources from one domain to the other. Enrichment will only happen if the transfer also happens in a way that improves individual performance and feelings of well-being (Powell & Greenhaus, 2006). Work-family enrichment, like conflict, is defined as bidirectional, in that each domain can influence the other (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). The key notion here is that both work and family generate certain resources, and that enrichment actually happens when the resources acquired during activities within either of them can promote a better performance in the other. According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), a resource is “an asset that may be drawn on when needed to solve or cope with a challenging situation” (80); and these kinds of resources can be categorized into social-capital resources, material resources, psychological and physical resources, skills and perspectives, and flexibility.

Previous research on work-family enrichment has shown that a supportive work environment (Nicklin & McNall, 2013), certain job characteristics, such as flexibility or resource availability (e.g., Carlson, Ferguson, Kacmar, Grzywacz, & Whitten, 2011), and personality variables, such as core self-evaluations (McNall, Masuda, Shanock, & Nicklin, 2011; Michel, Clark, & Jaramillo, 2011), are often associated with positive behaviors and outcomes in the family environment. The increasing prevalence of work-family enrichment suggests that greater knowledge is needed on precisely how these concepts affect individuals and their families.

1.2 The concept of work-family balance

Although work-family enrichment yields positive outcomes, it does not automatically entail the absence of negative spillover, interference, or work-family conflict (Demerouti et al., 2013). Indeed, because the two can exist simultaneously at work and at home (Boz et al., 2009), both enrichment and conflict need to be taken into account (Powell & Greenhaus, 2006; see also Demerouti et al. 2013), with the consequence that some research has focused on work-family balance instead (e.g., Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Rantanen, Mauno, Kinnunen & Tement, 2013; Valcour, 2007;; Wayne, Butts, Casper, & Allen, 2016).

Work-family balance is thought of as a unique and useful addition to understanding the well-being of individuals (e.g., Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Maertz & Boyar, 2011; Valcour, 2007; Wayne et al. 2016), but there are many interpretations and approaches to the concept (Rantanen et al., 2013). Wayne et al. (2016) splits them into two kinds: *global balance approaches* in which balance refers to an overall appraisal of combining work and family roles without specifically referring to the cross-domain processes (conflict or enrichment) or the direction in which they operate (work-to-family, family-to-work); and *combined spillover approaches* in which balance refers to low levels of work-family conflict and high levels of work-family facilitation (enrichment) (Frone, 2003). In combined spillover approaches, conflict and enrichment are seen as a priori constructs that together comprise work-family balance. Frone (2003) thus suggests a four-fold taxonomy for establishing the level of balance in terms of the constructs (ideally high enrichment and low conflict) and their bidirectionality between the two domains. However, this early conceptualization does not adequately cover the possibility that the balance between work-family enrichment and conflict might be experienced when the constructs are at the same levels of intensity (i.e., both at high levels or both at low levels), or indeed in numerous other possible combinations of levels that might be more suitable to some individuals than others (Grzywacz, Bass, 2003; Rantanen et al., 2013).

1.3 Theoretical background to work-family interface concepts

A broad category of theories, explaining the work-family interaction, have been emphasized on the importance of determining the key resources that enhance work-family enrichment and the key demands that increase work-family conflict. As enhancing work-family enrichment and reducing work-family conflict is related to well-being of employed individuals both at their work and in their family lives, the aim is to illustrate what antecedents and outcomes are likely to increase the experiences of negative and positive work-family interaction for a review, see Kinnunen et al., 2013). According to the role theory (Kahn, Wolfe,

Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964), conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), boundary and Border theory (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Clark 2000), work-family enrichment theory (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), and broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson, 1998), work domain can impact the family domain and the family domain can impact the work domain which can be positive or negative.

1.3.1 The role theories

Most work-family research derives from role theory, according to which everyone has multiple life roles, and each role has a set of expectations associated with it. There are two competing approaches: role scarcity and role enhancement. The role scarcity approach suggests that engaging in one role makes participating in others more difficult due to incompatible role pressures from work and family (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kahn, et al., 1964), which may then cause physical and psychological exhaustion (Marks, 1977; see also Bhowon, 2013). Hence, work-family conflict represents “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, 77). Accordingly, an individual is not able to cope with certain requests and expectations associated with, for instance, a family role, because resources such as time and energy are being used for a work role (Hill, Hawkins, Martinson, & Ferris, 2003; Murphy & Zagorski, 2006). Eventually, this depletion of resources results in conflict and tension, both of which may produce an associated cost, such as psychological distress (Barnett & Gareis, 2006; see also Schenewark, & Dixon, 2012).

In contrast, the role enhancement approach focuses more on the positive effects that energy, skills and resources in one role may have on roles in another domain. This approach actually has its roots in the older theories of *role accumulation* (Sieber, 1974) and *role expansion* (Marks, 1977). These were the first attempts to reach a clear understanding of how knowledge and skills acquired in one domain may positively affect performance in another. Role accumulation theory argues that multiple roles are beneficial by providing access to multiple resources. For instance, by being involved in multiple roles, individuals could achieve various successes and rewards by simply accumulating roles. According to this theory, engaging in a variety of activities gives individuals multiple roles that will in turn benefit individuals’ psychological and physical well-being. Simply put, individuals satisfied with both work and family roles would experience higher well-being than those satisfied in only one domain (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Using this theory as a starting point, Marks’ (1977) expansion approach argues that some roles will produce resources which can in turn be channelled into another role. The difference between role expansion and role accumulation is that role expansion emphasizes the transfer of positive benefits from one role to another and that resources obtained in this way may then be reinvested in the other role (Marks, 1977). Engaging in multiple roles may also provide an

individual with various learning opportunities which then result in beneficial outcomes, albeit more indirectly, for other life roles (Barnett & Gareis, 2006).

1.3.2 The conservation of resources theory

Hobfoll's (1989) *conservation of resources* (COR) theory has been employed by a number of researchers to get a better understanding of how multiple role participation affects work-family conflict and enrichment (Fung, Ahmad, & Omar, 2012, Lu, 2011; McNall et al., 2010; Odle-Dusseau, Britt, & Greene-Shortridge, 2012; ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012; van Steenbergen, Kluwer, & Karney, 2014). According to it, individuals struggle to acquire, maintain, and protect key personal and contextual resources that favor the attainment of the same things they value (Hobfoll, 1989). In COR theory, resources are defined as "those entities that either are centrally valued in their own right (e.g., self-esteem, close attachments, health and inner peace) or act as a means to obtain centrally valued ends (e.g., money, social support, and credit)" (Hobfoll, 2002, 307). Two basic processes describe how resources can be lost or gained. *Resource loss* describes the stress felt in an environment in which resources are threatened, loss occurs, or a situation in which resource investment does not lead to the preferred resource gain. For example, juggling both work and family roles deplete time and energy which in turn might lead to work-family conflict and ultimately experiencing anxiety, job dissatisfaction, and turnover intention (Hobfoll, 1989). Whereas, *resource gain* describes how initial resources can help create more resources, which accumulate over time, ultimately creating a *gain spiral* (Hobfoll, 1989, 2002; ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012; van Steenbergen et al., 2014). For example, getting a promotion at work may activate a resource gain spiral as it may increase an employee's skills, level of income, and the status, which can facilitate the development of further resources that make it easier the accomplishment of family goals (Russo, 2015). COR theory can be applied when employees make decisions about the allocation of their resources so that will protect their resources or avoid losing additional resources (Hobfoll, 2001). Hence, "individuals develop a strategy based on anticipated outcomes of a situation. Then, based on that expectation, individuals determine the investment of resources given their resource pool" (Carlson, Wayne, & Harris, 2009, 198) which subsequently result in resource gains or losses (Hobfoll, 2001).

1.3.3 The boundary and border theory

Boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000) and border theory (Clark, 2000) play a major part in understanding work-family boundary management. Boundary theory views boundaries between work and family roles as socially constructed lines which tend to have both a temporal (e.g., work hours) and a spatial component (e.g., work building); and its focus is on the ways that people actively create, maintain, and modify their boundaries across the lines created (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000; see also Hunter, Clark, & Carlson, 2017). Border theory concerns the boundaries that divide the times, places, and people

associated with work versus family roles, suggesting that work-family balance can be achieved in multiple ways depending on factors such as the strength of the boundaries between the domains (Allen, Cho, & Meier, 2014; Clark, 2000). Borders are the lines of demarcation between work and family domains which can take three forms: physical borders, i.e. where role-domain behavior occurs; temporal borders, i.e. when role-specific work is done; and psychological borders, i.e. when thinking patterns, behavior patterns, and emotions are appropriate for one domain but not for the other (Clark, 2000).

Both theories provide frameworks intended to increase understanding concerning the ways in which individuals create and manage the boundaries between work and family, however, the origins of the two theories differ (Allen et al., 2014). Boundary theory was developed to better understand the meanings individuals assign to work and home (Nippert-Eng 1996), along with the frequency and ease of transitioning between the two domains (Ashforth et al. 2000, Desrochers & Sargent 2004). Whereas, border theory has been developed with regards to dissatisfaction with existing work-family theories, which limits it to the work and family domains (Clark 2000, see also Allen et al., 2014).

Both theories classify characteristics that are related to boundaries. Boundaries are composed of two characteristics: flexibility, i.e. the degree to which the spatial and temporal boundaries shift, depending on the role demands of one domain or the other; and permeability, i.e. the degree to which an individual can be physically located in the role's domain but psychologically and/or behaviorally involved in another role (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000). Flexible boundaries tolerate exiting one role to enter another (e.g., leaving work to pick up a sick child), whereas permeable boundaries are weak or porous, allowing another role to interfere (e.g., when one's job allows personal phone calls) (Hunter et al. 2017).

The styles individuals may employ to manage their work-family boundaries can be arrayed on a continuum, from high integration to high segmentation, with points along the scale reflecting different boundary characteristics that one might enact (Ashforth et al., 2000; Bulger, Hoffman & Matthews, 2007; see also Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, 2012). According to both theories, individuals with high segmentation are characterized by inflexible and impermeable role boundaries. For example, they refuse to reveal personal information to coworkers and dislike discussing work with spouses (Nippert-Eng 1996). In contrast, individuals with high integration are characterized by flexible and permeable role boundaries. For example, they freely share family stories with coworkers and talk about work with spouses (Nippert-Eng 1996). Most individuals, however, reside somewhere between these two extremes.

Work-family boundary management styles assumed to be associated with an employee's own experience of work-family conflict and/or enrichment (Hecht & Allen, 2009; Ilies, Wilson, & Wagner, 2009). Although an ability to make an easy transition from one domain to another provides a means for decreasing the conflict between roles (Ashforth et al., 2000), however, increasing the transition overall between roles can still result in higher conflict

between those roles (Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005; see also Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). For example, it has been found that the existing fit between an individual's desire for segmentation and organizational policies is positively associated with work-to-family enrichment and negatively associated with work-to-family conflict (Chen, Powell, & Greenhaus, 2009). Further, setting a clear boundary around the work domain and reducing the level of integration of work and family domains has been positively related to work-life balance (Li, Miao, Zhao, & Lehto, 2013).

1.3.4 The work-family enrichment theory

With the growth, in the last 20 years, of the positive psychology movement on both theoretical and empirical levels (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), work-family interface researchers have increasingly focused more on the positive side of work-family relations (e.g., Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Lu, 2011). Based on Mark's (1977) theory, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) developed a theoretical framework for work-family enrichment that drew attention to the ways and means to apply resources gained in one domain to ensure positive repercussions in the other domain. This framework takes into account: the directions and dimensions of work-family enrichment, the resources generated in work and family roles, and paths that promote work-family enrichment in each role.

In terms of *directions and dimensions*, work-family enrichment is seen as bidirectional (Frone, 2003; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). That is, the family provides resource gains that enhance performance in the work domain, or vice versa. Carlson et al. (2006) has extended the concept of work-family enrichment by introducing extra dimensions to this bidirectionality between the domains: a) work-to-family *development* enrichment and vice versa, b) work-to-family *affect* enrichment and vice versa, and c) work-to-family *capital* enrichment, though in the other direction of this dimension it is family-to-work *efficiency* enrichment. Work-family development enrichment happens when work or family involvement leads to gaining or refining knowledge, skills, and behaviors that will contribute to improving individuals' performance in the other domain. Enrichment through affect is when work or family involvement leads to positive emotional states which improve individuals' performance in the other domain. Meanwhile, work-to-family capital enrichment arises when events at work increase psychosocial resources such as self-fulfillment or a sense of security, which then result in enhanced performance in the family domain. Finally, family-to-work enrichment through efficiency arises when the family role requires efficient time management skills and focus, which are then transferable into the work domain.

In terms of the *resources generated in work and family roles*, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) identified five kinds that are most likely to promote work-family enrichment. The first of these are the abilities to cope, multitask, and have interpersonal abilities, while maintaining a perspective on handling situations and respecting cultural and individual differences through role experience. The

second kind are psychological and physical resources, which refer to enhanced energy, mental sharpness and resilience on the one hand, and hardiness, self-efficacy, optimism and physical health on the other. The third are social-capital resources, which stem from interpersonal relationships developed at work and family roles (e.g., information and influences). The fourth are related to flexibility that is an individual's ability to determine the speed, timing, and location in meeting role requirements. Finally, the fifth kind are material resources, such as money.

As for the *paths that promote work-family enrichment in each role*, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) were referring to the instrumental and affective pathways through which a resource generated in role A (work or family) may promote high performance and positive affect in role B (family or work). The instrumental path occurs when a resource is transferred directly from role A to B, leading to improved performance and positive affect in role B. For instance, managers who have acquired enhanced communication skills at work are able to apply these skills in the family context and reduce conflict. The affective path occurs when a resource in role A promotes high performance and positive affect in role B indirectly via the positive affect it creates. For example, receiving a promotion at work will boost an individual's self-esteem and mood at work, which will translate into a higher quality of performance at home (Carlson et al., 2006).

1.3.5 The broaden-and-build theory

Whereas role theory gives an insight into the process of enrichment, *broaden-and-build* theory (Fredrickson, 1998) is an attempt to explain how this enrichment then provides satisfaction in both work and family domains (Carlson, Hunter, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2014). It proposes that certain discrete positive emotions, i.e., interest, joy, contentment, love, and pride, all share the ability to broaden an individual's momentary thought-action repertoires and build on enduring personal resources, whether these take the form of intellectual, physical, psychological, or social strengths (Fredrickson, 2001). It has been suggested that positive emotions broaden thought-action repertoires by increasing flexibility, improving creativity, and producing wider visual search patterns (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008). A broadened thought-action repertoire then allows individuals to build on personal resources or find new ones, in terms of health, social support, and increased mindfulness. These in turn result in greater satisfaction (Fredrickson, Cohn, Coffey, Pek, & Finkel, 2008; see also Carlson et al., 2014). By the same token, negative emotions will narrow a person's momentary thought-action repertoire which, although allowing for quick and decisive actions that will focus on a single adaptive response in times of trouble, will limit a person's ability to build on resources in the long-term (Fredrickson, 2001).

Broaden-and-build theory is thus particularly concerned with how engagement and work-family enrichment relate to performance (Carlson et al., 2011; see also Carlson et al., 2014). Positive emotions, such as being optimistic or

hopeful promote creative, innovative, and flexible thought processes, that are more likely to achieve success in the long-term (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001), allowing one to build on personal resources that provide adaptive benefits (Fredrickson et al. 2008; see also Morganson, Litano, & O’Neill, 2014). For example, it has been found that the more individuals experience positive emotions, such as love from their spouse and children, the more the family enriches their work life (Kim, Las Heras, & Bosch, 2016).

1.4 Work-family interface: antecedents and outcomes

Antecedents of work–family enrichment.

Enrichment theories suggest several common antecedents to the experience of enrichment which can be classified into two broad categories: 1) *contextual characteristics*; and 2) *personal characteristics*. Contextual characteristics are aspects of social context or a role's environment. For example, having a supportive supervisor, having job autonomy, and working in an organization that has family-friendly policies are the characteristics of the work context that could enable the acquisition of resources so that could enrich one's family life. Similarly, one's family context could have certain characteristics, such as having supportive family members or being married, which could provide work-enriching resources (for a review, see Lapierre et al., 2017). Personal characteristics, refers to aspects of the self that cause the individual to “experience positive emotional states, seek positive developmental experiences, and earn status and other assets” (Wayne et al., 2007, 67), such as conscientiousness, self-efficacy, and positive affectivity (see also Lapierre et al., 2017).

Although, meta-analytic studies available on the antecedents of work-family enrichment are rare (Michel et al., 2011), but most recently, Lapierre et al. (2017) conducted a meta-analysis study by reviewing the 1990 to 2016 empirical literature reporting relationships between contextual and personal characteristics and enrichment in it’s both directions (work-to-family and family-to-work), and also addressed several antecedents that have often been studied as determinants to work–family conflict. They divided those variables in three categories considering the two directions of work-family enrichment: resource-depleting contextual characteristics; resource-providing contextual characteristics; and personal characteristics associated with each domain.

Resource-depleting contextual characteristics refer to demands at work and at home that drains their resources (e.g., energy, positive emotions, time) and could thus limit the degree to which enrichment occurs. According to Lapierre et al.’s (2017) meta-analysis, work/family overload, number of hours spent working or on family activities are resource-depleting characteristics which could impede work-family enrichment.

Resource-providing contextual characteristics include, for example, availability of flexible work arrangement in organization or supportive coworkers and supervisors (Lapierre et al., 2017). Similarly, individuals can receive sup-

port from their family in ways that could enhance their experiences at work (Carlson et al., 2006), providing individuals new knowledge or skills which then could improve working life (van Steenbergen, Ellemers & Mooijaart, 2007; see also Lapierre et al., 2017).

Personal characteristics refer to individual's psychological investment in their work/family (e.g., work/family involvement); the more psychologically invested people are in their work/family role, the more they could lead to the acquisition of several valuable resources (e.g., better health, greater knowledge and skill, more positive mood; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008), which could then enhance the family role (Rothbard, 2001; see also Lapierre et al., 2017).

Outcomes of work–family enrichment.

There is already quite a lot of research on outcomes work-family conflict in both directions (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011), but research increasingly has turned towards the outcomes of work-family enrichment. These can be broadly grouped into work-related outcomes; non-work-related outcomes; and health or well-being outcomes (for reviews, see Crain & Hammer, 2013; Kinnunen et al., 2013; McNall et al., 2010). In their meta-analytic review, McNall et al. (2010), examined four work-related outcomes that were found to be associated with both direction of enrichment: job performance; job satisfaction; organizational commitment; and turnover intention.

Most of research on consequences of non-work-related enrichment has focused on family and life satisfaction, as both are related to both direction of enrichment (Crain & Hammer, 2013). Further, research on the health and well-being outcomes of enrichment has examined various aspects of psychological and physical health. In line with findings of McNall et al.'s (2010) meta-analysis, work-to-family and family-to-work enrichment are both associated positively with mental and physical health (see also Crain & Hammer, 2013).

Antecedents of work–family conflict.

According to Michel et al.'s (2011) meta-analysis concerning the antecedents of work–family conflict, global job stressors and work overload (i.e., having too many tasks to do) were the best antecedents of work-to-family conflict. Work role conflict (i.e., having too many tasks to do) and work time demands (i.e., devoting a large amount of time to work) were also identified as variables which were related to higher work-to-family conflict. On the other hand, global family stressors, family role conflict, and family role overload were the best antecedents of family-to-work conflict. An additional contribution was the finding that there are cross-domain relationships between work-to-family conflict, global family stressors, and family role conflict, as well as between family-to-work conflict, global job stressors, and work role conflict (see also Smoktunowicz, Lesnierowska, Cieslak, & Benight, 2017). Besides, personality characteristics particularly locus of control and the Big Five personality characteristics (i.e. openness to experiences, neuroticism, agreeableness, extraversion, and con-

scientiousness) received sufficient empirical attention in the meta analytic examination (Michel et al., 2011). Neuroticism seems to be the most crucial factor, moderately related to both higher work-to-family conflict and higher family-to-work conflict (Kinnunen et al., 2013). Further, an internal locus of control (a core self-evaluations subscale), also exhibited a negative relationship with work-family conflict (Michel et al., 2011; see also Mihelic & Tekavcic, 2014). Furthermore, a longitudinal study from eight different occupations approved the same relationship between performance-based self-esteem (a core self-evaluation subscale) and work-family conflict (Innstrand, Langballe, Espnes, Aasland, & Falkum, 2010, see also Mihelic & Tekavcic, 2014).

Outcomes of work–family conflict.

Consequences of work–family conflict are explained by either cross-domain hypothesis, i. e. consequences of conflict impact a different domain than its origin, or within-domain hypothesis, i.e. consequences of conflict are in the same domain as it origin (Smoktunowicz et al., 2017). Meta-analyses' (Amstad et al., 2011; Shockley & Singla, 2011) results indicated that both work-to-family and family-to-work conflict showed stronger relations to within-domain, the originating role, outcomes. Consequently, work-to-family conflict was associated more strongly with work-related than with family-related outcomes, and family-to-work conflict was associated more strongly with family-related than with work-related outcomes (see also Kinnunen et al., 2013). It has been suggested that social exchange theory can explain why the within domain relationships are more logical (Peeters, ten Brummelhuis, & van Steenbergen, 2013). According to Peeters et al. (2013), individuals tend to associate the benefits/challenges with work or family domain and then reciprocate. That is, when there are some benefits/challenges individuals respond with work (dis)engagement or job/family (dis)satisfaction, respectively to the domain where they get benefits/challenges from (see also Smoktunowicz et al., 2017).

1.4.1 Vigor at work

Work engagement is defined as a positive state of mind, in which work feels fulfilling, and is characterized by absorption, dedication and vigor (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008). Absorption indicates that one is fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work to the point of experiencing time as passing quickly. Dedication refers to being emotionally involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge (Siu et al., 2010). And finally, vigor is described as experiencing high levels of energy, effort, persistence and resilience in one's job (Bakker, Schaufeli, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2007).

Vigor at work has also been described as the internal and affective state of an individual's energy pool associated with his or her job (Little, Nelson, Wallace, & Johnson, 2011). In this research, the focus was specifically on vigor, because it was expected that it would reflect the energetic aspects of engagement more effectively than perhaps some other dimensions, such as

dedication (van Wijhe, Peeters, & Schaufeli, 2011). It was thought that vigor, in particular, would be the most sensitive dimension to changes over time, which is an important aspect in longitudinal research if the construct is examined as a correlate. Vigor at work can be considered a resource that an individual can transfer to other life domains (e.g., family), so it has the potential to facilitate performance and improve the quality of life in the other domains (Greenhaus & Powell 2006). A complete absorption with, or dedication towards work, however, might not as easily have such a positive, resource generating role in relation to other life domains. Indeed, it might even deplete resources, such as time and psychological presence that are needed in other life domains.

The broaden-and-build theory also associates vigor at work with positive affect, as this leads to increased work-family enrichment (Culbertson, Mills, & Fullagar, 2012). For instance, positive affect at work may result in higher levels of work engagement (Avey, Wernsing, & Luthans, 2008), and broaden individual resources and action repertoires, which then results in an enriched work-family interaction (Culbertson et al., 2012). In turn, work-family enrichment may also boost vigor at work. For example, individuals who perceive that their work is benefiting their family life are likely to feel more energized or vigorous at work (Hakanen et al., 2011). Overall, the broaden-and-build theory could predict an upward spiral in which vigor at work and the work-family enrichment it engenders also influence one another reciprocally, leading to significant increases in emotionally enriching experiences over time (Hobfoll, 1998).

Thus far, only a few studies have examined how engagement at work correlates, such as vigor, are associated with work-family enrichment (Cinamon & Rich, 2010; Culbertson et al., 2012; Montgomery, Peeters, Schaufeli, & Ouden, 2003; Siu et al., 2010). In the study by Cinamon and Rich (2010), family-to-work enrichment was found to be positively associated with vigor at work; while Montgomery et al. (2003) showed that a positive work-family interface was related to feelings of being engaged at work.

1.4.2 Core self-evaluations

Core self-evaluations (CSE) can be defined as “the fundamental assessments that people make about their wellness, competence and capabilities” which then go on to influence their perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, decisions, and actions (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005, 257). Individuals show unique personal qualities when responding to various challenges in work and family settings (Innstrand, 2009). It has been suggested that CSE are the most fundamental evaluations that individuals make of themselves, reflecting a baseline appraisal that is implicit in all other evaluations and beliefs (Ferris, Johnson, Rosen, & Tan, 2012).

CSE have been described in terms of four conceptually related personality dimensions (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997): *self-esteem*, which is an overall appraisal of one’s self-worth (Rosenberg, 1965); *neuroticism*, as opposed to emotional stability, which is the propensity to feel calm and secure (Eysenck,

1990); *locus of control*, or the extent to which people believe they have power over events in their lives (Rotter, 1966); and *generalized self-efficacy*, which is an estimate of one's ability to perform and cope successfully within an extensive range of situations (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). It has been suggested that these four personality dimensions are indicators of latent higher order of CSE (e.g., Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000; see also Ferris et al., 2012). Not only are these variables interrelated, indeed highly correlated (e.g., Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2002), but they share similar relations with each other. It thus seems entirely appropriate to consider the traits together as a concept (Judge et al., 1997).

CSE are expected to predict work-family enrichment. For example, a recent meta-analysis found that CSE are related to both directions of work-family enrichment (McNall et al., 2011). Boyar and Mosley (2007) have also found that positive CSE increase an individual's coping skills, which then enhance work-family enrichment. Individuals with positive CSE show positive moods and perspectives, seek more challenges, achieve more rewards at work, and acquire new skills. Similarly, Baral and Bhargava (2011) reported that positive CSE were associated with a high family-to-work enrichment. Boyar and Mosley (2007), in turn, showed that CSE were negatively related to work-family conflict (in both directions), but not to work-family facilitation (i.e., enrichment). Furthermore, CSE have been shown to be a reliable predictor of some important workplace outcomes, such as job satisfaction, turnover intention (i.e., whether employees want to change jobs), and job performance (e.g., Bono & Judge, 2003; Harris, Harvey, & Kacmar, 2009; Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge et al. 2002, 2005; Piccolo, Judge, Takahashi, Watanabe, & Locke, 2005). It has been argued that those with positive CSE consider their jobs and workplaces as more attractive, and thus they become more engaged in their jobs (Judge et al., 1997). Most recently, Ferris et al. (2012) found that CSE were positively related to perceived job characteristics, which suggest that individuals with positive CSE also pay more attention to the positive aspects of their environments.

Personality traits (such as CSE) are, by definition, assumed and shown to be fairly stable over time (Caspi, Roberts, & Shiner, 2005; Kokko, Rantanen & Pulkkinen, 2015). However, it also has been suggested that there are certain personality constructs which change over time, such as self-esteem (e.g., Orth, Trzesniewski, & Robins, 2010) and neuroticism (e.g., Rantanen, Tillemann, Metsäpelto, Kokko, & Pulkkinen, 2015; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006). Research has shown that changes in social roles or in the environment put individuals in social situations that may require adaptation and a more mature personality (Denissen, Aken, Penke, & Wood, 2013; Rantanen et al., 2015). For example, Specht, Egloff, and Schmukle (2011) found that age-graded changes in the work context were associated with personality changes.

1.4.3 Work-family boundary flexibility

According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), a major ingredient in the enrichment process is flexibility, which they define as having the “discretion to determine the timing, pace, and location at which role requirements are met” (80). Flexible work arrangements (e.g., flexible working hours, reduced hours, and working from home) may play a key role in the resource generation process, thereby increasing work-family enrichment. For example, flexibility at work may either directly improve employees’ parenting role by allowing them to take time off to be with the family when needed, or indirectly improve it by producing a positive affect in them (e.g., high energy) which leaves them better equipped to meet family needs (McNall et al., 2010). In turn, flexibility at home (such as an employee’s spouse or partner being able to take care of children) may allow for a better performance at work (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). For instance, McNall et al. (2010) found that flexible work arrangement systems (such as *flextime* and the *compressed workweek*) helped them experience higher work-to-family enrichment, which increased job satisfaction and decreased turnover intention, that is, the likelihood of them wanting to change jobs.

However, individuals differ in just how flexible the boundaries to their life domains are. This *boundary-flexibility* has been defined as the degree to which one has the capacity to contract or expand a domain’s boundary to accommodate the demands of another (Clark, 2000). According to Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010), flexibility in the work domain is positively associated with an increase in transitioning from work to family roles (in response to increased family demands), while flexibility in the family domain is positively associated with an increase in transitioning from family to work roles (in response to increased work demands).

Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010) went on to extend this definition by suggesting that boundary-flexibility has two components: *flexibility-ability*, and *flexibility-willingness*. The first component describes the perceived ability to move from one boundary domain to another; that is, when it is high, it feels easier to leave one domain to attend to another, and vice versa (when it is low). Note that this is rooted in ones’ perception, and might not necessarily correspond with the reality. Meanwhile, flexibility-willingness is a component that was devised in response to the proposition that individuals vary in their preferences for either integrating aspects of work and home or keeping them separate (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999). That is, the higher flexibility-willingness individuals have in responding to family demands, the higher is the chance of them leaving work to attend to family matters, and vice versa (Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, & Bulger, 2010). The more an individual is willing to be flexible, the more blurred those boundaries become, which will facilitate, in turn, both the cognitive and physical transitioning between domains (Desrochers et al., 2005).

1.4.4 Job control

Job control is an important aspect of the work domain, and refers to the extent to which employees are in control of the speed at which they need to complete tasks (Karasek & Theorell, 1990), and the nature and conditions of their work. It consists of two aspects: *decision-making authority*, or the extent to which an employee can make work-related decisions (regarding the method and timing, for instance); and *skill discretion*, or the extent to which they get to apply specific skills in the work setting (Häusser, Mojzisch, Niesel, & Schulz-Hardt, 2010).

According to COR theory, individuals try to protect, retain, and build on their resources. Having low job control, as a work resource, is more likely to be related to negative outcomes like stress, work-family conflict, and lower health and overall well-being, while greater job control is more likely to facilitate positive outcomes. The implication is that having greater autonomy over one's work will make it easier to cope with stressful situations, reduce exposure to work stressors, and facilitates the more active coping strategies (Karasek 1998; see also Cheng, Mauno, & Lee, 2014).

A growing body of research also indicates that high job control has positive impacts on work-related outcome variables (for a review, see Crain & Hammer, 2013; see also Cheng et al., 2014) and is positively associated with work-family enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Mauno & Rantanen, 2013; Siu et al., 2010), while low job control is positively associated with adverse work outcomes, such as high burnout (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; for a review, see Schaufeli, & Taris, 2014)) and work-family conflict (Heponiemi, Elovainio, Pekkarinen, Sinervo, & Kouvonen, 2008).

1.4.5 Turnover intention

Turnover intention, i.e., "a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization" (Tett & Meyer, 1993, 262), is one important outcome of (low) work-family enrichment and (high) work-family conflict. Although they measure 'intentions' these outcomes are also a strong predictor of whether people do actually leave their jobs too (Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000; See also Klehe, Zikic, van Vianen, & De Pater, 2011). This can not only be harmful and costly for organizations (Davidson, Timo, & Wang, 2010), but also reduce their organizational efficiency and all-round performance (Campbell, Im, & Jeong, 2014; see also Chen, Zhang, Sanders, & Xu, 2016). It has been found that an individual's intention to quit comes from wanting to manage the work-family balance more effectively in a new working environment where there are improved conditions for work-family interactions (e.g., more resourceful jobs, more flexible working hours, and family-friendly policies) (Amstad et al., 2011). This makes turnover intention a key component of the work-family interface.

According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), resources gained at work (e.g., flexibility) result in better work performance, leading to greater positive affects felt at work, which then translate into positive affects in the family domain (i.e., work-to-family enrichment). Consequently, individuals experiencing more

positive emotions at work should exhibit a lower level of turnover intention. To gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between work-family enrichment and turnover intention, COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989) can also be applied; that is, when valued resources are drained, individuals will try to avoid further resource reduction. Turnover intention is thus a response to resource-reducing stimuli like low work-to-family enrichment. Another factor is that, according to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), when individuals perceive that they are receiving favorable treatment, such as help in managing work and family roles, they feel obliged to reciprocate in kind, by having more positive feelings about the organization and greater job commitment i.e., a low level of turnover intention (Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006).

Chang, Wang, and Huang (2013) found that turnover intention is also associated with various individual and organizational factors. They conducted a review of 20 studies on turnover intention, and found that low job autonomy (control) was one of its most common predictors. However, there are still no conclusive findings about the precise relationship between the work-family interface and turnover intention (for a review, see McNall et al. 2010). Gordon, Whelan-Berry, and Hamilton (2007), for instance, did not find any association between enrichment and turnover intention, while others studies found greater enrichment to be related to lower levels of turnover intention (Balmforth & Gardner, 2006; Crain and Hammer, 2013) and greater conflict to be associated with higher levels of turnover intention (Amstad et al., 2011). Most recently, Sirgy and Lee (2017) conducted a review on the consequences of work-life balance to find that, as work-life balance improves, turnover intention decreases. It is worth noting that greater work-family balance in their study meant fuller engagement in work and outside work, with minimal conflict between social roles in those two domains.

1.5 Controlled background variables

Typically, the following background variables are controlled for, when examining the impact on participants of work-family conflict or enrichment: their age, gender, working hours per week, type of contract, and job tenure. A recent study conducted by Selvarajan, Singh, and Cloninger (2016), for instance, revealed that there was a positive relationship between *age* and work-family conflict, which might be a result of fulfilling an increasing number roles at work as employees get older, which then contribute to increased work-family conflict. By the same token, however, these multiple roles might also make the job more rewarding, as work-family enrichment was found, in another study (Jain & Nair, 2015), to be lowest among younger employees.

Gender must be controlled for too, as men and women still have quite different social roles (Kulik, Shilo-Levin, & Liberman, 2015). In most studies, men report experiencing more work-to-family enrichment and conflict, while women report experiencing more family-to-work enrichment and conflict

(Rothbard, 2001; Byron, 2005). A positive correlation has been found between *the number of working hours* and level of work-to-family conflict, indicating that the longer the working hours, the more work-to-family conflict will be (Jain & Nair, 2015). The *terms of a contract* might also have an impact on the work-family interface, in so far as temporary employees have reported higher levels of job exhaustion and turnover intention, accompanied by lower levels of work-family enrichment (Mauno et al., 2015). Finally regarding *tenure*, research indicates that the level of enrichment generally increases the longer one stays employed in the same organization (Jain & Nair, 2015; Stoddard & Madsen, 2007).

1.6 Person-oriented approach

Most studies on the work-family interface have analyzed the relationship between concepts at the level of variables (Bergman & Trost, 2006; Heikkilä, Niemivirta, Nieminen, & Lonka, 2011). In such variable-oriented approaches, the statistical models used are based on the assumption that the population is homogeneous (Laursen & Hoff, 2006). More recently, however, there have been an increasing number of person-oriented studies on the work-family interface (e.g., Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012; Rantanen et al., 2013). In this methodological approach, individuals are conceived of as unique wholes that are more effectively described using a dynamic system which patterns or profiles their different characteristics as individuals (Bergman, Magnusson & El-Khoury, 2003; Bergman & Andersson, 2010). The basic idea behind the person-oriented approach is that it is the individuals themselves that are seen as developing (Lapka, Wagner, Schober, Gradinger, & Spiel, 2011), rather than simply a number of variables which can be artificially separated from the whole person. The emphasis is thus on identifying subsystems related to the work-family interface, measuring their components, and studying them in each individual's case as undivided wholes, usually by applying some type of pattern-oriented approach (Bergman, & Trost, 2006). In the person-oriented approach, models are predicated on the assumption that the population is heterogeneous in terms of how the variables operate on each other (Laursen & Hoff, 2006). These kinds of analytic models are well suited for questions that concern individual or group differences in patterns of development and association among variables (Laursen & Hoff, 2006).

1.7 Study context: work-family interface in Finland

Although there are significant differences between those states that have a welfare system, the Nordic countries (Sweden, Finland, Iceland, Denmark, and Norway) are renowned as offering comparatively strong and continuous

support for balancing work with family life and promoting gender equity in both the workplace and family. In Finland, work-life balance has been strongly influenced by comparative flexibility in the workplace, well-established family leave policies, and a publicly funded educational system of daycares and schools. Finnish family leave consists of maternity leave (105 weekdays), paternity leave (63 weekdays), and parental leave (entitled to either parent for 158 weekdays). Parents are also entitled to take unpaid child-care leave from work for a total of three years from the time their child is born, in which period they may receive an allowance from the state for taking care of the child at home.

Concerning flexibility in the workplace, Finland has the highest percentage of any European country's workforce engaged in everyday multi-locational work (above 45%) as compared to the European average of around 25% (Eurofound, 2012). Meanwhile, the overall employment rate in 2016 for those aged between 15 and 64 was 68.7%, or 69.8% of all men and 67.6% of all women (Official Statistics of Finland, 2016). Finland also has the highest percentage of mothers in full-time work in Europe, which makes dual-earner couples very common. For those who have at least one child aged less than 15 living at home, or a dependent child (aged 15–24), maternal employment rates are 77.2% and paternal employment rates are 88.8% (EU Labour Force Survey, 2012). Meanwhile, the overall number of working hours (paid and unpaid) are about the same for women as they are for men (Pääkkönen & Hanifi, 2012). In 2016, the average number of working hours per year was 1,639 (Official Statistics of Finland, 2016). Part-time work is not typical in Finland (only 13.9% of mothers work part-time), which demonstrates that another aspect that must be factored into work-family reconciliation studies is the proportion of time spent at work (Tammelin, Malinen, Rönkä, & Verhoef, 2017).

1.8 Aims of the research

This research was comprised of three studies which aimed to increase understanding of the work-family interface by examining the key correlates of work-family interaction in Finland using both variable-oriented and person-oriented approaches. The key correlates chosen were job control and work-family boundary management styles, turnover intention, core self-evaluations, and vigor at work.

Study I examined the cross-lagged relations between CSE, vigor at work, and work-family enrichment among Finnish university employees at yearly time points over three years (2008–2010). Although there is a fair amount of existing research on the effects of a positive work-family balance, little is known about the reciprocal relations between work-family enrichment, CSE, and vigor at work. In particular, there is a need to gain a better understanding of how different personal resources and forms of work engagement change in tandem with work-family enrichment (Zimmerman & Hammer, 2010). This is because

earlier studies have, by and large, been cross-sectional, which means no conclusions can be drawn about the direction of effects between variables. Study I, therefore, filled this need by examining in particular how CSE, vigor at work, and work-family enrichment relate to each other reciprocally over a period of three years.

Study II aimed to identify different profiles for work-family boundary management among Finnish employees. It then examined how these relate to conflict and enrichment between work and family. As considerable attention has been paid to organizational-level policies for managing work and family than to the individual-level processes (Kreiner et al., 2009), less is known about how that boundary management styles depend on individuals' characters as much as on the structure of their job (Kossek et al., 2005), and how they relate to more specific work and family outcomes, such as work-family enrichment and conflict (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). Consequently, Study II used a person-oriented methodology to distinguish different groups of employees according to their boundary management profiles.

Finally, Study III focused on identifying different groups of employees according to the different kinds of work-family balance they achieved over time. By using a person-oriented framework, the longitudinal latent profiles of work-family balance were examined in a sample of Finnish university staff at three yearly time points over a period of two years. Using Rantanen's (2008) typology, different work-family balance profiles, their antecedents (job control and CSE), and their outcomes (turnover intentions) were tested. Unlike previous literature on the subject, this study was the first of its kind to aim at understanding the overall experience of work-family balance by testing these associations using longitudinal data.

2 METHOD

Table 1 (p. 38) presents a summary of the data sets, aims, variables, and statistical methods used in the three studies. The samples and measures are described briefly below, but the original studies attached give a more detailed description.

2.1 Participants and procedure

The data used in the three studies was from a research project entitled *Are Temporary Workers a Disadvantaged Group?* It was collected at yearly intervals every fall, so the time points were at the beginning (T1), middle (T2), and end (T3) of a two-year period (2008–2010). The data came from two Finnish universities in Central Finland (see Kinnunen, Mäkikangas, Mauno, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2014; Mauno et al., 2015; Mauno, Mäkikangas, & Kinnunen, 2016). In the first year (at T1), an electronic questionnaire was sent to the email addresses of 4,408 employees of two Finnish universities (2,293 from University 1, and 2,115 from University 2) who were employed for at least 20 hours or more per week (the university was their principal source of income). Academic staff and administrative/technical personnel alike, were asked to fill out an online questionnaire about their overall well-being, work conditions, and health (in general and at work). The response rate at T1 was 48% ($n_1 = 1197$; $n_2 = 940$); higher than the average response rate in organizational studies (36%), according to Baruch and Holtom (2008). All T1 respondents were then asked to participate again to fill out the same questionnaire in the fall of the following year (2009) at T2. Response rate at T2, relative to T1, was 61% (see De Cuyper, Mäkikangas, Kinnunen, Mauno, & Witte, 2012). In the fall of 2010 (T3), the electronic questionnaires were again sent out, but only to those participants who responded at T2. In total, 926 participants responded, yielding a response rate of 70% relative to T2 respondents, and 43% relative to T1 respondents (see Kinnunen et al., 2014).

At T1, about half of the respondents were academic staff (53%). These respondents included full professors, lecturers, senior academic assistants, and senior researchers from the following faculties: Economics and Administration, Social Sciences, Humanities, Medicine, Information Technology, Education, Science, and Mathematics. The other 47% consisted of administrative and technical personnel including management and office staff, library staff, IT staff, and maintenance staff. Of the sample, 66% were women, 34% were men, the average age was 45.1 years (SD = 10.0, range 22–65), and the majority had either a Master's (38%) or Licentiate/Doctoral (36%) degree at T1. Of the participants at T1, 53% had a permanent employment contract (56% at T2 and 60% at T3), 96% worked full-time, and 52% were from University 1 and 48% from University 2. Of the respondents, 81% had a partner and 67% had children living at home at T1 (see Kinnunen et al., 2014).

2.1.1 Study I

The two-year longitudinal study (TempWell) conducted in two multidisciplinary Finnish universities in the fall of 2008 (T1), 2009 (T2), and 2010 (T3) was used in Study I, as described earlier. The data analysis for this study was restricted to only those individuals who had responded to all three of the annual online questionnaires (n = 700). Of these participants, 461 (66%) were women and 239 (34%) men, and their combined mean age was 48.6 years (SD = 10.0). Seventy-five percent had at least one child, and 77% had a Master's degree or higher.

2.1.2 Study II

University sample. The first sample was part of the same study on university employees (University 1, n = 666; University 2, n = 644) as used in Study I. But in Study II, only the data gathered from two multidisciplinary Finnish universities in the fall 2009 was used. Because the focus here was on how people managed the boundaries between work and family, the sample was restricted to the sub-sample of university employees who had family demands i.e., a partner and/or child under 18 (n = 1139). Of these participants, 68% were women, 32% men, and their mean age was 42.8 years (SD = 10.5). Sixty-eight percent of the participants had at least one child under the age of 18 living with them. The average length of job tenure was 20.0 years (SD = 10.9), and the average length of a working week for the sample was 40.5 hours (SD = 8.5).

Nurse sample. The second sample (n = 301) was gathered via an online questionnaire in the spring of 2009 from nurses in one health care district in Finland. Both the invitation to participate and a link to the questionnaire were posted on the health care district's intranet. In this sample, the data analysis was again restricted to individuals who were, at the time of the study, living with a partner and/or children (N = 271). Of these participants, 90% were female and 10% men, and their mean age was 46.8 years (SD = 10.2). Seventy-

two percent of the participants had at least one child under the age of 18 living with them. The average length of job tenure was 20.3 years (SD = 10.2), and the average working week was 38.4 hours (SD = 4.10).

2.1.3 Study III

In this study, the same sample was used as in Study I, i.e., the two-year longitudinal study (TempWell) conducted in two multidisciplinary Finnish universities in the fall of 2008 (T1), 2009 (T2), and 2010 (T3). But in Study III, data analysis was restricted to those who had child and/or a partner at T1 (N = 1,870). At the second measurement point, questionnaires were sent out again, but only to those who had participated at T1 and were still working at the same university (n = 2,020). A total of 1,075 participants met the aforementioned restrictions for data analysis out of the 1,314 employees who returned the completed questionnaire (response rate 65.0%). In the last measurement (T3), the electronic questionnaires were, in turn, sent out only to those participants who had responded at T2. In total, 789 participants were eligible for data analysis out of the 926 participants that responded (response rate 70%). Of these participants, 33% were men and 67% female and their mean age was 44.5 years (SD = 10.3, range 22–64). Of the participants at T1, 72% had children, 92% had a partner, and the majority had either a Master's degree (42%) or higher (33%).

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Work-family enrichment

Work-family enrichment was measured by four items derived from the scale developed and validated by Carlson et al. (2006). The focus was on two factors (of two items each) that specifically relate to a family life enriched by work: *affect* (two items, e.g., "My involvement in my work makes me feel happy and this helps me to be a better family member."); and *development* (two items, e.g., "My involvement in my work helps me to acquire new skills and this helps me to be a better family member."). All four items were scored on a seven-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). The Cronbach's alphas for when these four items were combined were .85, .88, and .90 at times 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The focus was on on affect and development of work-to-family enrichment because they reflect the two key processes in the theoretical model for enrichment proposed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006). The focus was just given to just the one direction, because the larger follow-up study specifically focused on investigating working life and so family-to-work enrichment data was only gathered in one of the data waves (T1).

2.2.2 Work-family conflict

Work-to-family conflict was also measured using four items (e.g., “The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.”), which were derived from Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams’s (2000) scale. All items were scored on a seven-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for the item scores were .83, .80, and .83 at T1, T2, and T3, respectively.

2.2.3 Vigor at work

Vigor at work was measured using a vigor subscale of three items (e.g., “At my work, I feel like I am bursting with energy.”) derived from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006) and previously validated in Finland (Seppälä et al., 2009). All three items were scored on a seven-point scale (1 = never; 7 = always). The Cronbach’s alphas for the item scores at T1, T2, and T3 were .87, .89, and .90, respectively.

2.2.4 Core self-evaluations

Core self-evaluations were measured with 12 items, using a seven-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) that had been devised by Judge et al. (2003). Sample items included: “When I try, I generally succeed.”, and “I am filled with doubts about my competence.” (reverse scored). Reverse scored items were then corrected before averaging the items to create a composite scale. The Cronbach’s alphas for the combined item scores were .88 at all three measurement points. This scale has also recently been validated in Finland (Mäkikangas, Kinnunen, Mauno, & Selenko, 2016)

2.2.5 Job control

Control over one’s work was measured using four items (including “Can you influence decisions that are important for your work?” and “Can you set your own work pace?”), which were derived from the scales used in the General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work ((QPSNordic; Dallner et al., 2000). The items were scored on a five-point scale (1 = very seldom or never; 5 = very often or always). The Cronbach’s alphas for the item scores were .72 (T1), .72 (T2), and .74 (T3).

2.2.6 Work-family boundary flexibility

Participants’ perceived flexibility of their work-family boundary was evaluated using the domain flexibility scale, as established by Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010). This consisted of four subscales: work flexibility ability (WFA); work flexibility willingness (WFW); family flexibility ability (FFA); and family

flexibility willingness (FFW). These subscales were each scored on a seven-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). Sample items for each subscale included: "While at work, I can stop what I am doing to meet responsibilities related to family and my personal life." (WFA); "I am willing to take time off work to deal with my family and personal life responsibilities." (WFW); "My family and personal life responsibilities would not prevent me from going into work early if the need arose." (FFA); and "I am willing to cancel plans with my friends and family to deal with work-related responsibilities." (FFW). The Cronbach's alphas for the scores were .80 (WFA), .66 (WFW), .80 (FFA), and .84 (FFW).

2.2.7 Turnover intention

This scale was developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) and measured by three items (such as, "It is likely that I seek other jobs in the near future."). Each item was rated on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree; 7 = totally agree). The Cronbach's alpha for the scores were .87 (T1), .87 (T2), and .85 (T3).

2.2.8 Background information

Participants were restricted to those who had a partner and/or children under 18. They were also asked questions about their age (in years), gender (1 = female, 2 = male), hours worked per week, how long they had been in their job (job tenure), type of contract (1 = full-time, 2 = part-time), and the ages of their children. These were then used as control variables in further analyses.

2.3 Analysis strategy in the three studies

In Study I, the main aim was to examine the reciprocal relations between CSE, vigor at work, and work-family enrichment across the three measurement points. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to do this; and since, gender, age, and parenthood have corroborated to be relevant factors in earlier work-family interface studies (e.g., McNall et al., 2010), they were included as covariates in the main analysis using SEM.

In Study II, the construct validity of the domain flexibility scale was first established by examining its factor structure using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Second, It was investigated whether the four-factor structure was invariant across both samples. Third, a cluster analysis was conducted to identify the various different profiles of participants who were homogenous in terms of their boundary management scores. Finally, analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were conducted to test for profile differences between prime examples of work-to-family conflict and enrichment. The difference between such pairs of opposites were also tested with a Bonferroni correction. Control

variables used in these analyses were age, gender, having a child under the age of 18, length of tenure in a job, and hours worked per week.

In Study III, latent profile analysis (LPA) was carried out to identify the different latent profiles over time concerning work-to-family conflict and enrichment. In order to decide the optimal number of such profiles, solutions with a different number of them were compared using the five statistical criteria of log likelihood (Log L), Bayesian information criterion (BIC), sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion (SSABIC), entropy, and the Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (VLMRT). Next, a multinomial logistic regression was conducted to examine to what extent job control and core-self evaluations at the beginning of the study were associated with profile membership (after controlling for age, gender, hours worked per week, and type of contract). Finally, a structural equation model (SEM) was conducted to investigate whether turnover intention at T3 could be predicted by profile membership (after controlling for age, gender, hours worked per week, contract-type, and turnover intention at T1 and T2). All the analyses were performed using the Mplus statistical package (Version 7.3; Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012), and the parameters of the models were estimated using maximum likelihood estimation and robust standard errors.

TABLE 1 Summary of the variables and methods used in Studies I-III

	Study I	Study II	Study III
Sample	(N = 700, 66% female) TempWell ^a , 2008, 2009, 2010	(University staff, n = 1139, 68% female) (Nurses, n = 270, 90% female) TempWell ^a , 2009	(n = 789, 66% female) TempWell ^a , 2008, 2009, 2010
Data set & measurement points	TempWell ^a , 2008, 2009, 2010	TempWell ^a , 2009	TempWell ^a , 2008, 2009, 2010
Aims	1) to investigate the cross-lagged relations between core self-evaluations, vigor at work, and work-family enrichment.	1) to identify different work-family boundary management profiles 2) to test the association of the profiles with work-to-family conflict and work-to-family enrichment 3) to validate the construct validity of the domain flexibility scale	1) to identify latent profiles of employees who differ in the two components of work-family balance, i.e., work-to-family conflict and work-to-family enrichment 2) to examine core self-evaluations and job control as the predictors of work-family balance profiles 3) to examine the mediating role of work-family balance profiles
Dependent variables	Work-family enrichment Vigor at work Core self-evaluations	Work-family enrichment Work-family conflict	Work-family enrichment Work-family conflict Turnover intention
Independent variables	Work-family enrichment Vigor at work Core self-evaluations	Domain flexibility: - Work boundary-flexibility-ability - Work boundary-flexibility-willingness, - Family boundary-flexibility-ability - Family boundary-flexibility-willingness	Work-family enrichment Work-family conflict Core self-evaluations Job control
Statistical methods	Structural equation modeling (SEM)	Two-step clustering analysis, ANCOVA	LPA, SEM, Multinomial regression analysis

^a Are temporary workers a disadvantaged group? (Tempwell).

3 OVERVIEW OF THE ORIGINAL STUDIES

3.1 Study I

The aim of Study I was to investigate the cross-lagged relations between core self-evaluations (CSE), vigor at work, and work-family enrichment over two years. The three following hypotheses were presented: (1) work-family enrichment and vigor at work have positive and bidirectional effects on each other over time; (2a) core self-evaluations have a positive effect on subsequent work-family enrichment, plus (2b) work-family enrichment can contribute reciprocally to these CSE; and (3a) because CSE are stable personality traits, they will have a positive effect on vigor at work over time, while (3b) vigor at work contributes, in turn, to CSE.

The results of structural equation modeling showed that vigor at T1 positively predicted work-family enrichment at T2, and that work-family enrichment at T2 positively predicted vigor at T3. In addition, CSE at T2 positively predicted vigor at T3. No cross-lagged associations were found, however, between CSE and work-family enrichment. This study thus showed that there is a positive bidirectional link between vigor at work and work-family enrichment.

The findings suggest that organizations will benefit from developing tools which facilitate resource generation between the workplace and family. Various job-related resources, such as support, control at work, and positively challenging tasks boost both work-family enrichment, as well as vigor at work. Increasing resources such as these would therefore strengthen the mutually positive dynamics between them.

3.2 Study II

The aim of Study II was to identify different work-family boundary management profiles among employees, and examine how these relate to conflict between work and family or their mutual enrichment. In line with earlier findings (Bulger et al., 2007; Matthews et al., 2010) and previous theories regarding boundary management styles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000), three hypotheses were posed. The first was that at least two profiles will emerge from our data sets: *segmentors* who separate work and family domains, and *integrators* who merge work and family. The second was that (a) segmentors would report less work-to-family conflict, and (b) greater work-to-family enrichment than the integrators. The third hypothesis was that (3) the four-factor theoretical structure that Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010) reported would be replicated in our samples.

To identify work-family boundary management profiles, a person-oriented approach via cluster analysis was used. The criteria variables in the cluster analysis were: work flexibility ability, work flexibility willingness, family flexibility ability, and family flexibility willingness (Matthews and Barnes-Farrell, 2010).

A cluster analysis identified three profiles in both samples: segmentors, integrators, and those favoring family over work in the university sample; and segmentors, integrators and those favoring work over family in the nurse sample. In both samples, integrators experienced a higher level of work-to-family enrichment and a lower level of work-to-family conflict than segmentors. As boundary management styles may be occupation-specific, organizations should think how they can be more sensitive to employees' boundary management preferences in different kinds of work situations. Overall, these findings are important for developing organizational policies that increase the ability for employees to integrate work and family roles if they so wish (Ilies et al., 2009).

3.3 Study III

In Study III, the longitudinal profiles of work-family balance, as well as their antecedents and outcome, were investigated. The following hypotheses were posed: (1) there are four different profiles for work-family balance ("active balance", "passive balance", "beneficial balance", and "harmful balance"); (2) a beneficial work-family balance would be associated with high levels of job control and core self-evaluation, because this would imply a greater access to resources; (3) a harmful work-family balance profile would relate to higher subsequent levels of turnover intentions; and (4) job control and CSE have an indirect effect on turnover intention via these work-family balance profiles.

The results of the latent profile analysis did identify the same four distinct profiles for work-family balance as was hypothesized. Multinomial logistic regressions also showed that the higher the levels of job control and CSE, the more likely the participants would be part of a beneficial profile than any of the other profiles. Meanwhile, the ANOVA results revealed that levels of turnover intention were significantly higher in the harmful balance profile compared to the others. The Study broadened the literature in so far as it studied work-family balance profiles longitudinally and because it tested the associations between profiles, their antecedents, and their outcomes.

The results of the Study showed how certain kinds of work-family balance were associated, not only with well-being indicators, but also with negative work attitudes. The implication was thus that it is not simply a question of well-being as to whether people have an unhealthy work-family balance or not; it also depends on variables that have crucial impact on organizational effectiveness, like turnover. In order to have a healthy workforce, organizations should thus implement strategies that promote a family-friendly work environment in order to benefit both employees and organizations. However, such policies should also have tangible effects on individuals so that they do also perceive them as such, since official family-friendly policies might not automatically guarantee that there is actually a family-friendly climate (Amstad et al., 2011).

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Summary of the findings

The aim of this research was to examine the key correlates of the interaction between work and family, using both variable-oriented and person-oriented approaches. The correlates under scrutiny included CSE, job control, work-family boundary management styles, vigor at work and turnover intention. The main objective was to investigate relations across the work-family interface and different personal and contextual variables, both cross-sectionally and longitudinally. Another objective of this research was also to identify different groups of employees who evidenced different profiles of work-family boundary management styles and work-family balance. It was hypothesized that over time, core self-evaluation and vigor at work have positive and bidirectional effects on work-family enrichment and each other. Also, it was assumed that at least two distinct profiles can be identified based on an individual's style of managing boundaries around work and family domains: segmentors, who separate work and family domains; and integrators, who merge them. It was also predicted that the segmentors would report less work-to-family conflict and greater work-to-family enrichment than the integrators. Finally, it was hypothesized that four different groups of employees would emerge, with either a beneficial, active, passive, or harmful work-family balance. These would differ in their levels of work-to-family conflict (both time-based and strain-based) and work-to-family enrichment (both developmental and affective). It was assumed that the group with a beneficial work-family balance would have higher levels of CSE and autonomy and lower levels of turnover intention than the others.

4.1.1 Personal factors and work-family interface

One of the objectives of this research was to examine the relationships between person-related variables and the work-family interface. When a variable-oriented approach was applied (Study I), no positive path was found from CSE

to work-to-family enrichment. Although somewhat unexpected, this result is nevertheless in line with the results of a cross-sectional study performed by Boyar and Mosley (2007). They interpreted these findings to mean that, since work-family facilitation (a construct similar to enrichment) is related to people's perception of the skills and abilities that enrich role fulfillment, core self-evaluations (Judge et al., 1997) may not be sufficient to predict proximal variables such as work-family facilitation (enrichment). They also suggested that this facilitation may be more attributable to environmental aspects rather than to the self-evaluations themselves. As it was, Study I did not find any evidence that work-family enrichment had an impact on CSE, which is in line with previous research showing that core self-evaluations are very stable over time (Judge et al., 2000).

However, when applying the person-oriented approach (Study III), different balance profiles were identified, as mentioned briefly above, in which participants differed in their CSE. The four profiles were in line with Rantanen's typology: active, high enrichment with high conflict; passive, low enrichment with low conflict; beneficial, high enrichment with low conflict; and harmful, low enrichment with high conflict (Rantanen et al., 2008, 2011). The results revealed that members of the beneficial balance profile exhibited the most positive CSE, whereas those in the harmful balance profile showed the least positive CSE. In line with COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001), this suggests that individuals who have high levels self-esteem and self-efficacy are more likely to overcome the negative aspects of working in situations where they receive little support (McNall et al., 2011). They are also more likely to experience a high level of enrichment and a low level of conflict between the two domains of work and family, whereas those who have more negative CSE are less likely to maintain a good balance between work and family.

Notwithstanding the differences between Studies I and III (the former looked only at work-family enrichment, while the latter looked at both enrichment and conflict), the results of person-oriented analyses indicate that the sample is not always homogeneous, so the variables under scrutiny will not affect all individuals in the same way (Gibson, 2003; see also Lapka et al., 2011). In other words, the aggregate values of the variable-oriented approach, brushing aside inter-individual differences, may not accurately unveil the true relation between CSE and different work-family balance profiles.

It is also worth noting that the mean level of CSE among participants was relatively high. This is in line with previous research indicating that higher level jobs (in this case university) are gained by individuals with more positive CSE (Gardner, & Pierce, 2010; Judge et al., 1997). In addition, the mean level of work-family enrichment was also high and relatively stable in our samples. This was consistent with the findings of Öun (2012), which showed that the probability of experiencing a positive work-family interface (after controlling for family and work demand variables) is highest in the Nordic countries, which are often considered as leaders regarding gender equality and family-friendly policies, which aim to help reconcile work and family life. One

explanation for our finding is the fact that Finland provides financial benefits for those wishing to care for small children at home, and policies aimed at encouraging fathers to participate in childcare, and thus help people achieve a better work family balance (Crompton & Lyonette, 2006). However, the high work-family enrichment finding in our samples might be simply to do with the fact that we studied university employees who are typically more likely to have resourceful jobs which might well already, in themselves, enable high work-family enrichment.

The findings of Study II also showed that individuals used different boundary management styles which, in turn, affected the levels of work-to-family conflict and enrichment. In the two different Finnish samples, university staff and nurses, three profiles were identified based on how able and willing employees were to be flexible with their work and family boundaries. Two of the profiles were closely similar in both samples, i.e., segmentors and integrators. Segmentors were characterized by a low level of both willingness and ability to be flexible about work boundaries, but an average level of both willingness and ability when it came to family boundaries. Meanwhile, integrators were characterized by high levels of willingness and ability in both family and work boundary flexibility. The third profile differed between the nurses and university employees, however. Among university employees, the profile was for those who favored family over work, while among nurses it was for those who favored work over family. This was because university employees scored low on both ability and willingness to be flexible over family boundaries, but high on both ability and willingness when it came to forsaking work boundaries. Inversely, nurses scored low on flexibility ability and willingness when it came to work, but high on both ability and willingness to be flexible regarding family boundaries.

One possible explanation for the different results between the university and nurse samples surely comes down to the nature of their jobs (Kossek, Baltes, & Matthews, 2011). For example, university staff generally have more flexible work arrangements and, as they rely on information technology to get a lot of their work done, they can also work from wherever they need to be. This gives them more freedom in respect to work schedules, but also encourages the blurring of work and family boundaries. Meanwhile, as most nurses are required to work in shifts which strictly delineate times of work, and in physical proximity to their patients, family demands must clearly wait.

Overall, the findings of the research provide support for a segmentation-integration continuum (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000), which suggests that people can be placed somewhere on a continuum between integration of work and family roles at one end, and segmentation at the other. This continuum describes how they manage or demarcate boundaries between these. Those who set flexible borders are nearer the integration end, while those who cannot or who find it hard to do so, are nearer the segmentation end of the continuum. The profiles favoring family over work and favoring work over family are located somewhere between the two ends. Also, the findings of the research

emphasize the importance of studying the directionality of boundary management between work and family simultaneously; otherwise the difference between university staff and nurses would not have spotted.

Some of the findings concerning the profiles (i.e., integrators in both samples and favoring work over family) were fairly consistent with the profiles found by Bulger et al. (2007). They found four different profiles based on the level of perceived ability and willingness to set boundaries around the domains of work and personal life, and the permeability of these boundaries. These were: (1) individuals who are able and willing to be flexible with work and family boundaries which they see as permeable; (2) individuals who are able to be flexible but unwilling to do so, who do not see work and family boundaries as permeable; (3) individuals who report an average ability and willingness regarding boundary strength measures; and (4) individuals who are able and willing to be flexible with the work domain boundary, but not the family domain boundary. Moreover, profiles that favored work over family and family over work were in someways consistent with the *above and beyond* and *enhance family* profiles found by Ammons (2013) who interviewed 23 employees about their work-family boundaries. The first profile included individuals who allowed work in family domains but kept family contained, while the second profile included those who allowed family into the work domain but kept work contained (Ammons, 2013).

The findings of Study II showed that, after controlling for background variables, the experience of both work-family conflict and work-family enrichment were related to how individuals managed boundaries around the domains. In university and nurse samples, segmentors experienced the highest level of work-to-family conflict and lowest level of work-to-family enrichment, whereas integrators reported the highest level of work-to-family enrichment and the lowest level of work-to-family conflict. These results are consistent with the findings of Bulger et al. (2007) who found that setting more flexible and permeable boundaries around work and family domains were associated to a higher level of work-family enrichment. It is noteworthy too that the profiles of those segmentors and those favoring family over work who worked fewer hours than integrators were more likely to experience work-to-family conflict.

However, Study II's findings that integrators reported a higher level of work-to-family enrichment and less work-to-family conflict than segmentors are inconsistent with some other studies (Chen et al., 2009; Li et al., 2013). One explanation for this difference is that, since work can be a source of fulfillment (Csikszentmihalyi & LeFevre, 1989), employees might increase rather than decrease the positive aspects of work by integrating work and family domains (Ilies et al., 2009). In this way, the findings of the present research differ from those of Chen et al. (2009), Desrochers et al. (2005), Li et al. (2013), and Ilies et al. (2009) who conversely concluded from their findings that an increase in switching between roles has a negative impact on people's work-life balance, and that minimizing this is thus more beneficial. One possible explanation for the inconsistency between these two findings is that most of the other studies

have been done in the USA, where cultural norms concerning the primacy of work differ, and an individualistic approach to work-family issues predominates (Bulger et al., 2007; Kossek et al., 2012). In Nordic countries, such as Finland, however, the dual-earner family model receives much greater support from the state: there is good and affordable daycare provision for children, care for the elderly, paid parental leave, and certain care entitlements (Korpi, 2000). These all help families to manage the work and family interface more easily (Abrahamsen, Holte & Laine, 2012). In this respect, integrators may thus be more likely to experience enrichment than conflict in Nordic countries.

4.1.2 Contextual factors and work-family interface

One objective of this research was to examine the relationship between contextual variables and the work-family interface. In Study I, the aim was to determine the extent to which vigor at work can lead to work-family enrichment and vice versa. In Study III, the research turned to look at the extent to which job control can predict the types of work-family balance that employees had. It was assumed that employees with more control and autonomy over their job would have more beneficial types of work-family balance. Another aim in the same study was to investigate whether work-family balance profiles can predict turnover intention, and whether such profiles affect the relationship between job control, CSE and turnover intention.

Applying a variable-oriented approach, the results of this research showed, in Study I, that work-to-family enrichment and vigor at work had positive effects on each other, when measured every fall at three time points over the course of a two-year period. There were not only cross-lagged associations between vigor at work and work-to-family enrichment over both years, but also a cross-lagged association between work-to-family enrichment at T2 and vigor at work at T3. In other words, when employees experienced vigor at work, work-to-family enrichment increased, and this had a knock-on effect to create more vigor at work later on. These results are similar to the findings by Hakanen et al. (2011). The present findings also confirm both the COR and broaden-and-build theories, both of which emphasize the reciprocal, positive relationships between different resources, and the kinds of positive experience, which affect psychological well-being (Fredrickson, 2001; Hobfoll, 1989, 2001). The results here are also in line with work-family interface theories. For example, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have suggested that positive work-related experiences, such as engagement at work, act as a proximal factor in creating a high level of work-family enrichment. Although role resources alone may not lead to work-family enrichment, they may promote positive experiences which can then be transferred from one role to another. Since vigor at work may reflect positive role experiences at work, there is good reason to believe that it may also contribute positively to work-family enrichment (Siu et al., 2010).

The present research also demonstrated that the more control and authority university staff have over their job, the easier it would appear for

them to balance the demands of their work and family (Study III), which is also in accordance with previous findings (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004; Grzywacz et al., 2008; Mauno, Rantanen, & Kinnunen, 2011; Rantanen et al., 2011). Another aspect of the COR model that can be used to explain these results, is the idea that individuals tend to seek out and maintain what they see as useful resources. When such a resource is available, employees are more able to balance work with family responsibilities successfully, that is with less work-family conflict and greater work-family enrichment. The person-oriented analyses revealed that a subsample of employees who experienced lower work-family conflict and higher work-family enrichment (i.e., those with a beneficial profile) felt that they had significantly greater control over their work. Conversely, employees with significantly less job control were typically members of the harmful profile, characterized by a high level of work-family conflict and little work-family enrichment.

Study III showed that work-family balance was related to turnover intention. Specifically, members of the harmful balance profile, who reported a high level of conflict and little enrichment, had the highest level of turnover intention, whereas the members of the beneficial balance profile, who reported the opposite, had the lowest level of intention to quit. These longitudinal findings are consistent with the earlier cross-sectional results of Rantanen et al. (2011), showing that those university professionals who were members of the beneficial balance profile had a lower level of turnover intention than members of the passive, active and harmful balance profiles. The findings are thus in line with COR theory (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2000), in so far as when valued resources are drained, individuals will try to avoid further resource reduction. They also were in line with social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), in so far as when individuals perceive they are receiving favorable treatment, they feel obliged to reciprocate in kind with positive feelings about the organization and greater job commitment. In other words, they have a low level of turnover intention (Wayne et al., 2006). It can be concluded from this that turnover intention is thus a response to resource-reducing stimuli which prevent any significant work-to-family enrichment.

4.2 Strengths and limitations

The present research has several strengths. First, the data came from a longitudinal design which meant that it could reveal more about the mechanisms through which the work-family interface relates to personal and contextual constructs as these change with time. Second, whereas previous work-family research has mostly only analyzed the way concepts interrelate at the level of variables, a person-oriented framework was also used in the present research to identify different subgroups of participants, characterized by their kind of work-family balance and boundary management styles. A person-oriented approach such as this is based on the idea that it is individuals that

develop, not the variables (Lapka et al., 2011), and that individuals should be described in terms of a unique profile of characteristics and challenges that interweave to form a dynamic system (Bergman et al., 2003; Bergman & Andersson, 2010). Third, CSE was examined here as a form of personal resource (Judge & Hurst, 2008), and this has less often been studied in the work-family interface context. It has been suggested that CSE accurately reflect fundamental aspects of how individuals see themselves (Ferris et al., 2012) and in the context of the present study, it was expected that they would predict work-family enrichment (McNall et al., 2011). Fourth, although the predictors and consequences of the work-family interface have been well established by numerous studies in North America and Europe (see Drummond et al., 2017), there is a dearth of research in the Nordic context which differs in so far as many statutory work-family arrangements are available, such as flexible working hours, long parental leave, and public day care. Understandably this has repercussions on participants' experiences of the work-family interface.

Some of the limitations of the present research must also be noted though. Firstly, all the data collected was via self-report instruments which are sensitive to common method variance bias. Consequently, any future studies on this subject should not only include some behavioral measures, but also the observations of other individuals, e.g., spouses (Ilies, Huth, Ryan, & Dimotakis, 2015). Secondly, the sample covered only nurses (Study II) and university employees (all three studies), which makes it hard to generalize these findings to other occupational groups, such as blue-collar workers for instance. Given the flexibility and relative control over working hours that university employees (especially academics) have, the results of the present research best represent workplaces that are similarly characterized by relatively high flexibility and control over one's work. Moreover, nurses in Finland, compared to most other OECD countries have better work-family policies which help them to meet the demands of both domains (Thévenon, 2011). Thirdly, the samples could have been more balanced in terms of gender (66% female and 34% male), so in future studies, gender balance should be taken into account to improve the generalizability of results. Finally, the present research was carried out in Finland, and results will surely be different in countries with a less supportive work-family policy, legislation, and culture (O'Brien, Brandth, & Kvande, 2007), so the findings need to be replicated in those other societal and cultural contexts too to be applicable elsewhere.

Finally, secondary data was used in the present research, with the disadvantage that it was not specifically collected to either address the topic or test the hypotheses proposed (Cheng & Phillips, 2014). Consequently, only some of the relevant variables were included in the present research, e.g., social support at work and/or in the family, which has been shown previously to have played a crucial role in the work-family interface (Goh, Ilies, & Wilson, 2015; Siu et al., 2015). Another point is that the outcomes (vigor at work, turnover intention) were not related to overall health or family, but only to work. Also, both conflict and enrichment were studied in only one direction,

work-to-family, when it would be preferable to study both directions of interaction.

4.3 Practical implications

Most of the previous literature dealing with the work-family interface suggests that, in order to obtain positive outcomes, organizations need to minimize work-family conflict (for a review, see Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). However, this research confirms more recent research by demonstrating that it is perhaps more important to look for ways to facilitate enrichment and its positive outcomes rather than just minimize conflict (McNall et al., 2009). Resource-rich job components likely to result in more positive work-family interface outcomes (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005), and will impact positively on work engagement and turnover intention (Shockley & Singla, 2011). Designing more challenging, meaningful, and enriching tasks would make employees more resourceful and available to engage in multiple roles, as these tasks may generate favorable physical and psychological gains for employees (Russo, 2015). For example, increasing skill variety and challenging employees with meaningful and difficult tasks represents an effective way to make them more tenacious and resilient as these tasks require them to go beyond their limit and try hard to succeed (Russo, 2015). Further, family-supportive cultures, such as supportive supervision and sensitivity to employees' family needs can result in more positive work-family interface outcomes (Mauno, 2010), as they may promote positive affect that employees bring from work into home domain. Furthermore, high involvement work practices that boost employees' empowerment might also promote a sense of fulfillment and meaning among employees at work, which can then result in work-to-family enrichment (Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen, 2013).

The findings of the present research also showed that more positive CSE were associated with higher levels of work-family enrichment. Similarly, employees who reported having a higher ability to integrate work and family and were willing to do so, reported lower work-to-family conflict and higher work-to-family enrichment. These findings indicate the possibility of work-flexible policies tailored to individuals' needs, might be helpful to balance multiple roles more easily. For these policies to be effective, employers need to consider individual differences present in their workforce, and design these practices in a way that can fit individual needs as much as possible (Peng, Ilies, & Dimotakis, 2011). The results here show that CSE is highly stable, which suggests that organizations wishing to enhance organizational performance can be more successful if their employees have genuinely positive CSE. Employees with positive CSE consider themselves as being more in control, better appreciated, and more capable of succeeding (Grant, & Wrzesniewski, 2010). For example, such employees may display greater effort and persistence toward achieving their goals, engage in more frequent goal-setting, and capitalize more

effectively on their resources and opportunities (Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge et al., 2002). However, despite the stability of core self-evaluation across certain time points, there can also be significant momentary fluctuations up and down (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2011). For those employees who have lower CSE, employers may need to provide extra guidance and support, such as positive feedback, opportunities to succeed at simpler tasks, and observing them perform roles successfully. Such activity may temporarily enhance their employee's self-evaluations (Bandura, 1997; see also Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2011). Furthermore, to establish the importance of work-family enrichment to organizations, it is essential to link work-to-family enrichment with work-related outcomes. This type of information would be applicable for organizations interested in knowing which specific types of policies result in greatest work-family enrichment (Kinnunen et al., 2013; McNall et al., 2009). Finally, the results of this research, as well as previous findings, suggest that employees enjoy the benefits of autonomy and control over work schedules (e.g., Grzywacz & Butler, 2005). Organizations could provide their employees with more authority at work and greater latitude in the decision-making process, not to mention flexible working arrangements (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2006). This may then lead to greater work-to-family enrichment, higher vigor at work, and lower turnover of employees (McNall et al., 2009).

The findings of the present research showed that CSE were not related to work-family enrichment when a variable-oriented approach was applied. However, when the heterogeneity of the sample was properly taken in to account by applying a person-oriented approach to both conflict and enrichment (in the direction of work-to-family), the association between CSE and the work-family interface was found to be significant. These results demonstrate how changing the methodological approach, from variable-oriented to person-oriented (i.e., analyses for particular individuals or homogeneous subgroups), can lead to new and important conclusions concerning the effect of CSE on the work-family interface.

4.4 Future directions

The present research raises some interesting questions for future research. First, there is an evident need to define work and family roles in more diverse ways than has previously been done. For example, so far family has been conceptualized in a traditional way: participants must be partnered and/or have child (see also Allen & Eby, 2016). Research on work-family balance could thus be expanded if a more inclusive definition of the word *family* was used to cover also multigenerational, same-sex, and single-parent families.

Second, future research into work-family enrichment could go further by specifically examining the role of work-family integration as a means by which individuals can expand the positive features of work so that they benefit family life. In other words, by making a psychological effort to increase the

permeability of the boundary between work and family domains, these integrators are allowing positive work experiences to resonate and have a good effect on their roles as spouse or parent (Ilies et al., 2009). However, it is also possible that also negative issues transfer from work to non-work and vice versa. For example, when individuals have to work outside working hours due to blur boundaries, they might then have less time and energy for their family, which can create a double burden for them. Third, future work-family research should focus more on the enrichment construct and assess the positive spill over that occurs between the two roles (See Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012). Fourth, more research is needed to investigate a variety of important personality antecedents that play a role in perceptions of enrichment (Friede & Ryan, 2005; Michel & Clark, 2009). Examining personality variables, as well as paths that result in work-family enrichment, may help to further improve the application of theory-based interventions to aid individuals prepare for the inevitable challenges posed by multitasking and multiple roles. Finally, it should be stressed again that this research was limited to Finland, and so further research is needed in other cultural contexts, if we want to generalize any further from this. It would be particularly good, for example, to test whether these findings hold true in societies where family-friendly policies are less available for employees than in the Nordic countries (see Mauno & Rantanen, 2013).

4.5 Concluding remarks

This research examined the work-family interface in terms of its key antecedents (personal resources, job resources, and work-family boundary management styles) and its consequences (work engagement and turnover intention). The results suggest that personal and contextual resources are important in helping individuals to manage and balance work with family. The findings of the research provide evidence that vigor at work leads to work-family enrichment by creating a positive mood in an individual that transfers from work to family. They also showed that the enrichment of family life via positive work experiences can lead to greater vigor at work. Although reciprocal relations between work-family enrichment and core self-evaluations were not found when using a variable-oriented framework, these did emerge when using a person-oriented approach, individuals who are better at managing work and family had positive evaluations about themselves. The results here also shed light on the importance of boundary characteristics in studying how individuals manage the work-family interface, suggesting that perceived situational constraints/opportunities (ability) and personal motivation (willingness) components can be useful in predicting a positive or negative work-family interface. It is also reassuring to know that the findings show a high level of work-family enrichment combined with a low level of work-family conflict result in greater beneficial outcomes and less harmful outcomes.

YHTEENVETO (SUMMARY)

Työn ja perheen välinen vuorovaikutus ja siihen yhteydessä olevat tekijät: muuttuja- ja henkilökeskeinen tarkastelu

Tämän tutkimuksen päätavoite oli lisätä ymmärrystä työn ja perheen välisestä vuorovaikutuksesta Suomessa. Tutkimuksessa hyödynnettiin pääasiassa Greenhousen ja Powellin (2006) teoriaa positiivisesta työn ja perheen välisestä vuorovaikutuksesta sekä Hobfollin (1989, 2001) voimavarojen säilyttämisen teoriaa. Työn ja perheen välisen vuorovaikutuksen käsite viittaa siihen, missä määrin kokemukset yhdellä elämän alueella siirtyvät ja vaikuttavat toiseen elämän alueeseen (työstä perheeseen, perheestä työhön). Tutkimuksessa tarkasteltiin erityisesti, millaiset tekijät ennakoivat laadultaan hyväksi koettua työn ja perheen välistä vuorovaikutusta ja mitkä ovat puolestaan hyväksi koetun vuorovaikutuksen seurauksia. Ennakoivina tekijöinä tutkimuksessa tarkasteltiin persoonallisuuden voimavaroja (minuuden ydintulkinnat), työn voimavaroja (vaikutusmahdollisuudet työssä) sekä työn ja perheen välisen rajan hallintaa. Lisäksi tarkasteltiin henkilökeskeisen tutkimusotteen avulla, millaisia erilaisia työn ja perheen yhteen sovittamisen tyynejä eli profiileja tutkimuksen osanottajilla oli työn ja perhe-elämän välisen tasapainon kokemusten sekä työn ja perheen välisen rajan hallinnan suhteen.

Tutkimus koostui kolmesta erillisestä osatutkimuksesta. Ensimmäinen näistä oli pitkittäistutkimus, joka toteutettiin kahdessa suomalaisessa yliopistossa sähköisenä seurantakyselynä vuosina 2008, 2009 ja 2010. Kyselyyn osallistuivat kaikki kyseisten yliopistojen ammattiryhmät ja vastaajat, jotka olivat otaneet osaa tutkimukseen jokaisena ajankohtana (n = 700). Tämä osatutkimus hyödynsi aineistoa koskien vastaajien kokemuksia työn ja perheen välisestä rikastuttamisesta, minuuden ydintulkintoista ja työssä koetusta tarmokkuudesta. Toinen osatutkimus sisälsi kaksi erillistä otosta yliopistojen henkilökunnasta (n = 666 yliopistossa 1, n = 644 yliopistossa 2) ja hoitoalan työntekijöistä (n = 301). Tässä vuonna 2009 kerätyssä sähköisessä kyselyssä vastaajat raportoivat kokemuksiaan työn ja perheen välisen rajapinnan hallinnasta, työn ja perheen välisestä rikastuttamisesta sekä työn ja perheen välisestä ristiriidasta. Kolmannessa osatutkimuksessa hyödynnettiin samaa pitkittäisaineistoa kuin ensimmäisessä osatutkimuksessa (n = 789). Tutkimuksessa analysoitiin vastaajien kokemuksia työn ja perheen välisestä rikastuttamisesta, työn ja perheen välisestä ristiriidasta, vaikutusmahdollisuuksista työssä, minuuden ydintulkintoista sekä työpaikanvaihtoaikeista.

Ensimmäisen osatutkimuksen tulokset (menetelmänä rakenneyhtälömallintaminen) osoittivat, että työssä koettu tarmokkuus ajankohdassa 1 (2008) ennusti positiivisesti työn koettua rikastuttavuutta perheen kannalta ajankohdassa 2 (2009). Lisäksi työn koettu rikastavuus perheen kannalta ajankohdassa 2 ennusti korkeampaa työssä koettua tarmokkuutta ajankohdassa 3 (2010). Lisäksi tulokset osoittivat, että myönteiset minuuden ydintulkinnat ajankohdassa 2 ennustivat lisääntyttä tarmokkuutta työssä ajankohdassa 3. Sen sijaan mi-

nuuden ydintulkintojen ja työstä perheeseen suuntautuvan rikastuttamisen ei havaittu vaikuttavan yli ajan toisiaan lisäävästi tai heikentävästi. Tulokset osoittivat siis kokonaisuudessaan, että työssä koettu tarmokkuus ja työstä perheeseen suuntautuva rikastavuus vaikuttavat toisiinsa positiivisesti, vastavuoroisesti ja pitkäkestoisesti: kun toinen lisääntyy niin toinenkin lisääntyy. Organisaatiot saattaisivat hyötyä työntekijöidensä työssä koetun tarmokkuuden lisäämisen näkökulmasta interventioista, jotka mahdollistaisivat työn ja perheen välistä myönteistä vuorovaikutusta, kuten rikastavuutta, edistävien voimavarojen lisäämisen.

Toisessa osatutkimuksessa tutkittiin työn ja perheen välisen rajan hallinnan erilaisia tyyplejä ja löydettiin klusterianalyysiiä käyttäen sekä yliopistojen että hoitoalan aineistossa kolme profiilia, joista kaksi, eli työn ja perheen "erillään pitäjät" ja työn ja perheen "yhteen nivojat", oli näille aineistoille yhteisiä. Sen sijaan kolmannet profiilit olivat täysin vastakkaisia toisilleen näiden kahden aineiston osanottajien välillä. Yliopistotyöntekijöillä kolmas profiili oli "perhe ennen työtä", kun taas hoitoalan työntekijöillä se oli "työ ennen perhettä". Yliopistotyöntekijät siis asettivat perheen etusijalle suhteessa työhön, kun taas hoitoalan työntekijät tekivät päinvastoin. Molemmissa aineistoissa "yhteen nivojat" kokivat enemmän työn ja perheen välistä rikastuttamista ja vähemmän työn ja perheen välistä ristiriitaa verrattuna "erillään pitäjiin". Siten työntekijät, jotka pyrkivät yhdistämään työn ja perhe-elämän (so. integroijat), kokivat työn ja perheen välisen vuorovaikutuksen laadultaan myönteisempänä kuin työntekijät, jotka pyrkivät pitämään työn ja perheen erillään (so. segmentoijat). Tämän osatutkimuksen tulokset viittaavat toisaalta siihen, että erityisesti silloin, kun työntekijä itse on halukas integroimaan eli nivomaan joustavasti yhteen työtä ja perhe-elämää, organisaatioissa olisi hyvä kehittää käytäntöjä, jotka sallivat heidän näin tehdä. Toisaalta tulokset viittaavat myös siihen, että koska työn ja perheen rajan hallinnan tyyli ja keinot eroavat yksilöiden välillä ja ovat myös osin erilaisia eri ammatti- ja organisaatioaloilla, organisaatioiden tulisi olla sensitiivisiä niille moninaisille työn ja perheen välisen rajan hallintakeinojen preferensseille, joita heidän henkilöstöllään on.

Kolmannessa osatutkimuksessa, jossa menetelmänä käytettiin latenttia profiilianalyysiiä, havaittiin, että tutkittavat jakautuivat työn ja perheen rikastavuuden ja ristiriidan kokemuksen suhteen neljään erilaiseen työn ja perheen välisen tasapainon tyyliin eli profiiliin, jotka olivat hyvin pysyviä tutkimuksen kolmen vuoden aikavälillä: "aktiivinen tasapaino", "passiivinen tasapaino", "suotuisa tasapaino" ja "haitallinen tasapaino". Jatkoanalyysit multinomiaalista regressioanalyysiiä käyttäen osoittivat, että korkeat vaikutusmahdollisuudet työssä ja myönteiset minuuden ydintulkinnat olivat yhteydessä suurempaan todennäköisyyteen kuulua "hyödyllisen tasapainon" profiiliin. Lisäksi keskiarvovertailut osoittivat, että työpaikanvaihtoaikeet olivat korkeimmat profiilissa, jossa koettiin "haitallista tasapainoa". Näin tutkimus osoitti, että työn ja perheen välinen tasapaino, tai sen puuttuminen, ei yksinomaan heikennä työntekijän hyvinvointia, vaan voi ennakoita myös organisaatiotason seurauksia, kuten työpaikanvaihtoaikeita. Organisaatioiden kannattaisikin panostaa per-

hemyönteisyyteen eli järjestelyihin ja ilmapiiriin, jotka helpottavat työntekijöiden työn ja perheen yhteensovittamista, koska sillä voi olla vaikutusta paitsi työntekijään myös organisaatioon. Perhemyönteinen ilmapiiri voi myös kannustaa henkilöstöä käyttämään työn ja perheen yhteensovittamista tukevia järjestelmiä, kuten työaikajoustoja sekä perhevapaita, suotuisan työn ja perheen välisen tasapainon saavuttamiseksi.

Pitkittäistutkimukset työn ja perheen välisen vuorovaikutuksen tutkimuksen saralla ovat vielä suhteellisen harvinaisia. Tästä syystä tämä tutkimus lisää ymmärrystä työn ja perheen vuorovaikutuksesta (mm. työn ja perheen välisestä rikastuttamisesta) ja valottaa niitä mekanismeja, joiden kautta esimerkiksi persoonallisuuden ja työn voimavarat kietoutuvat työn ja perheen vuorovaikutukseen. Koska alueen aikaisempi tutkimus on ollut muuttujakeskeistä, toi henkilökeskeinen analyysitapa uudenlaisen näkökulman työn ja perheen välisen vuorovaikutuksen tutkimukseen suhteessa työn ja perheen väliseen tasapainoon ja työn ja perheen välisen rajapinnan hallintaan. Henkilökeskeinen analyysitapa olettaa, että ajassa kehittyvät tai muuttuvat ihmiset, eivät muuttujat eli mitattavat käsitteet. Tästä syystä tutkimuksessa olisi jatkossakin hyvä tarkastella ja tutkia lisää erilaisia yksilöllisiä profiileja, jotka voivat olla dynaamisessa vuorovaikutuksessa. Minuuden ydintulkintoja on myös melko harvoin tarkasteltu persoonallisuuden voimavarana työn ja perheen välisen vuorovaikutuksen tutkimuksessa, ja siksi olikin tärkeää analysoida myös tätä käsitettä. Tutkimus toteutettiin Suomessa, jossa monet pohjoismaiset perhemyönteiset järjestelyt (mm. perhevapaat, päivähoido, työajan joustot) ovat lakisääteisiä oikeuksia työssäkäyville vanhemmille, mikä saattaa myös osin selittää tutkimuksessa tehtyjä havaintoja. Tästä syystä jatkotutkimuksissa olisi hyvä tarkastella myös maita, joissa on erilainen kulttuuri ja järjestelmät työn ja perheen yhteen sovittamisessa. Myös pitkittäistutkimuksia tulisi toteuttaa lisää. Nämä yhdessä voisivat lisätä tässä tutkimuksessa tehtyjen havaintojen yleistävyyttä.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamsen, B., Holte, K. A., & Laine, M. (2012). Work-family Interference: Nurses in Norway and Finland. *Professions and Professionalism*, 2, 60-74.
- Allen, T. D. (2013). The work-family role interface: A synthesis of the research from industrial and organizational psychology. In N.W. Schmitt, and S. Highhouse (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology*. Vol. 12: *Industrial and organizational psychology*. (pp. 698-718). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Allen, T. D., Cho, E., & Meier, L. L. (2014). Work-family boundary dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 99-121.
- Allen, T. D. & Eby, L. T. (2016). Advancing work-family research and practice. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds), *Oxford handbook of work and family*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278-308.
- Allis, P. & O'Driscoll, M. (2008). Positive effects of nonwork-to-work facilitation on well-being in work, family and personal domains. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 273-291.
- Ammons, S. K. (2013). Work-family boundary strategies: Stability and alignment between preferred and enacted boundaries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82, 49-58.
- Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16, 151-169.
- Anafarta, N. (2011). The relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A structural equation modeling (SEM) approach. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6, 168-177.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 472-491.
- Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? Impact of psychological capital and emotions on relevant attitudes and behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44, 48-70.
- Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 20, 4-28.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13, 209-223.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2007). An organizational and social psychological perspective on burnout and work engagement. In K. Van Den Bos, J. B. De Wit, M. Hewstone, H. A. Schut, &

- M. S. Stroebe (Eds.), *The scope of social psychology: Theory and applications* (pp. 227–250). New York: Psychology Press.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress, 22*, 187–200.
- Balmforth, K. & Gardner, D. (2006). Conflict and facilitation between work and family: Realizing the outcomes for organizations. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 35*, 69–76.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, Macmillan.
- Baral, R. & Bhargava, S. (2011). Predictors of work-family enrichment: Moderating effect of core self-evaluations. *Journal of Indian Business Research, 3*, 220–243.
- Barnett, R. C. & Gareis, K. C. (2006). Role theory perspectives on work and family. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek & S. Sweet (Eds.), *The work and family handbook: Multidisciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 209–221). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Barnett, R. C. & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist, 56*, 781–796.
- Baruch, Y. & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations, 61*, 1139–1160.
- Bergman, L. R. & Andersson, H. (2010). The person and the variable in developmental research. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 218*, 155–165.
- Bergman L. R., Magnusson D., El-Khoury B. M. (2003). *Studying individual development in an interindividual context: A person-oriented approach. Vol. 4: Paths through life* (Magnusson D., Series Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bergman, L. R. & Trost, K. (2006). The person-oriented versus the variable-oriented approach: Are they complementary, opposites, or exploring different worlds? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 52*, 601–632.
- Bhowon, U. (2013). Role salience, work-family conflict and satisfaction of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 5*, 78–90.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Bono, J. E. & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 554–571.
- Boyar, S. L. & Mosley Jr, D. C. (2007). The relationship between core self-evaluations and work and family satisfaction: The mediating role of work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 71*, 265–281.
- Bulger, C. A., Matthews, R. A., & Hoffman, M. E. (2007). Work and personal life boundary management: Boundary strength, work/personal life balance, and the segmentation-integration continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 365–375.
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*, 169–198.

- Campbell, J. W., Im, T., & Jeong, J. (2014). Internal efficiency and turnover intention: Evidence from local government in South Korea. *Public Personnel Management, 43*, 259-282.
- Carlson, D. S., Ferguson, M., Kacmar, K. M., Grzywacz, J. G., & Whitten, D. (2011). Pay it forward: The positive crossover effects of supervisor work-family enrichment. *Journal of Management, 37*, 770-789.
- Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J.G., & Zivnuska, S. (2009). Is work-family balance more than conflict and enrichment? *Human Relations, 62*, 1459-1486.
- Carlson, D. S., Hunter, E. M., Ferguson, M., & Whitten, D. (2014). Work-family enrichment and satisfaction mediating processes and relative impact of originating and receiving domains. *Journal of Management, 40*, 845-865.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 131-164.
- 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.
- Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 453-484.
- Chang, W. J. A., Wang, Y. S., & Huang, T. C. (2013). Work design-related antecedents of turnover intention: A multilevel approach. *Human Resource Management, 52*, 1-26.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 62-83.
- Chen, W., Zhang, Y., Sanders, K., & Xu, S. (2016). Family-friendly work practices and their outcomes in china: The mediating role of work-to-family enrichment and the moderating role of gender. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2016.1195424.
- Chen, Z., Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2009). Work-to-family conflict, positive spillover, and boundary management: A person-environment fit approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*, 82-93.
- Cheng, H. G. & Phillips, M. R. (2014). Secondary analysis of existing data: Opportunities and implementation. *Shanghai Archives of Psychiatry, 26*, 371-375.
- Cheng, T., Mauno, S., & Lee, C. (2014). Do job control, support, and optimism help job insecure employees? A three-wave study of buffering effects on job satisfaction, vigor and work-family enrichment. *Social Indicators Research, 118*, 1269-1291.
- Cinamon, R. G. & Rich, Y. (2010). Work family relations: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Career Assessment, 18*, 59-70.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations, 53*, 747-770.

- Crain, T. L. & Hammer, L. B. (2013). Work-family enrichment: A systematic review of antecedents, outcomes, and mechanisms. In A. B. Grzywacz (Ed.), *Advances in positive organizational psychology* (pp. 303–328). Bingley: Emerald.
- Crompton, R. & Lyonette, C. (2006). Work-life 'balance' in Europe. *Acta Sociologica*, 49, 379–393.
- Crouter, A. C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations*, 37, 425–441.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & LeFevre, J. (1989). Optimal experience in work and leisure. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 56(5), 815–822.
- Culbertson, S. S., Mills, M. J., & Fullagar, C. J. (2012). Work engagement and work-family facilitation: Making homes happier through positive affective spillover. *Human Relations*, 65, 1155–1177.
- Dallner, M., Elo, A.-L., Gamberale, F., Hottinen, V., Knardahl, S., Lindström, K., et al. (2000). *Validation of the General Nordic Questionnaire (QPSNordic) for psychological and social factors at work*. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers, 2000:12.
- Davidson, M. C., Timo, N., & Wang, Y. (2010). How much does labour turnover cost? A case study of Australian four-and five-star hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22, 451–466.
- De Cuyper, N., Mäkikangas, A., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Witte, H. D. (2012). Cross-lagged associations between perceived external employability, job insecurity, and exhaustion: Testing gain and loss spirals according to the conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 770–788.
- Demerouti, E., Corts, I. M., & Boz, M. (2013). Issues in the development of research on inter-role enrichment. In S. Poelmans, J. Greenhaus and M. Las Heras Maestro (Eds.), *Expanding the boundaries of work-family research: a vision for the future* (pp. 227–253). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Demerouti, E. & Geurts, S. (2004). Towards a typology of work-home interaction. *Community, Work & Family*, 7, 285–309.
- Denissen, J. J., Aken, M. A., Penke, L., & Wood, D. (2013). Self-regulation underlies temperament and personality: An integrative developmental framework. *Child Development Perspectives*, 7, 255–260.
- Desrochers, S., Hilton, J. M., & Larwood, L. (2005). Preliminary validation of the work-family integration-blurring scale. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 442–466.
- Desrochers, S., & Sargent, L. D. (2004). Boundary/border theory and work-family integration. *Organization Management Journal*, 1, 40–48.
- Drummond, S., O'Driscoll, M. P., Brough, P., Kalliath, T., Siu, O. L., Timms, C., ... & Lo, D. (2017). The relationship of social support with well-being outcomes via work-family conflict: Moderating effects of gender, dependants and nationality. *Human Relations*, 70, 544–565.
- Edwards, J. R. & Rothbard, N. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 85–129.

- Edwards, J. R. & Rothbard, N. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 178–199.
- Eldor, L., Harpaz, I., & Westman, M. (2016). The work non-work spillover: the enrichment role of work engagement. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*. doi: 10.1177/1548051816647362.
- EU Labour Force Survey (2012). Population in employment working during unsocial hours. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database>
- Eurofound (2012). Fifth European Working Conditions Survey. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Eysenck H. J. (1990). Biological dimensions of personality. In Pervin L. A. (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 244–276). New York: Guilford.
- Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Tan, J. A. (2012). Core self-evaluations a review and evaluation of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 38, 81–128.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 300–319.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56, 218–226.
- Fredrickson, B. L. & Cohn, M. A. (2008). Positive emotions. In M. Lewis, J. Haviland, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions*, 3rd ed. (pp. 777–796). New York: Guilford.
- Fredrickson, B. L., Cohn, M. A., Coffey, K. A., Pek, J., & Finkel, S. M. (2008). Open hearts build lives: Positive emotions, induced through loving-kindness meditation, build consequential personal resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1045–1062.
- Friede, A. & Ryan, A. M. (2005). *The Importance of the individual: How self-evaluations influence the work-family interface*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Friedman, S. D. & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). *Work and family: Allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143–162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fung, N. S., Ahmad, A., & Omar, Z. (2012). Work-family enrichment: It's mediating role in the relationships between dispositional factors and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2, 73–88.
- Gardner, D. G. & Pierce, J. L. (2010). The core self-evaluation scale: Further construct validation evidence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70, 291–304.

- Gibson, C. M. (2003). Privileging the participant: The importance of subgroup analysis in social welfare evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24*, 443-469.
- Goh, Z., Ilies, R., & Wilson, K. S. (2015). Supportive supervisors improve employees' daily lives: The role supervisors play in the impact of daily workload on life satisfaction via work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 89*, 65-73.
- Gordon, J. R., Whelan-Berry, K. S., & Hamilton, E. A. (2007). The relationship among work-family conflict and enhancement, organizational work-family culture, and work outcomes for older working women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 350-364.
- Grant, A. M. & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). I won't let you down... or will I? Core self-evaluations, other-orientation, anticipated guilt and gratitude, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 108-121.
- Greenhaus, J. H. & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In Quick, J. C., Tetrick, L. E. (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 165-183). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Greenhaus, J. H. & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources and conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 72-92.
- Greenhaus, J. H. & Singh, R. (2012). Positive nonwork relational exchanges. In Eby, L. T. & Allen, T. D. (Eds.), *Personal relationships: The effects on employee attitudes, behavior, and well-being* (pp. 301-324). New York: Routledge.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*, 463-488.
- Grzywacz, J. G. & Bass, B. L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 248-261.
- Grzywacz, J. G. & Butler, A. B. (2005). The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: Testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 97-109.
- Grzywacz, J. G., Butler, A. B., & Almeida, D. M., (2008). Work, family and health: Work-family balance as a protective factor against stresses of daily life. In A. Marcus-Newhall, D. F. Halpern, & S. J. Tan (Eds.), *Changing realities of work and family* (pp. 194-216). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grzywacz, J. G. & Carlson, D. S. (2007). Conceptualizing work-family balance: Implications for practice and research. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9*, 455-471.
- Grzywacz, J. G. & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and

- negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 111–126.
- Hakanen, J. J., Peeters, M. C., & Perhoniemi, R. (2011). Enrichment processes and gain spirals at work and at home: A 3-year cross-lagged panel study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84, 8–30.
- Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., & Colton, C. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work–family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 249–265.
- Harris, K. J., Harvey, P., & Kacmar, K. M. (2009). Do social stressors impact everyone equally? An examination of the moderating impact of core self-evaluations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24, 153–164.
- Häusser, J. A., Mojzisch, A., Niesel, M., & Schulz-Hardt, S. (2010). Ten years on: A review of recent research on the Job demand–control (–support) model and psychological well-being. *Work & Stress*, 24, 1–35.
- Hecht, T. D. & Allen, N. J. (2009). A longitudinal examination of the work–nonwork boundary strength construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 839–862.
- Heikkilä, A., Niemivirta, M., Nieminen, J., & Lonka, K. (2011). Interrelations among university students' approaches to learning, regulation of learning, and cognitive and attributional strategies: A person oriented approach. *Higher Education*, 61, 513–529.
- Heponiemi, T., Elovainio, M., Pekkarinen, L., Sinervo, T., & Kouvonen, A. (2008). The effects of job demands and low job control on work–family conflict: The role of fairness in decision making and management. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36, 387–398.
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Märtinson, V., & Ferris, M. (2003). Studying working fathers: Comparing fathers and mothers' work–family conflict, fit, and adaptive strategies in a global high-tech company. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 1, 239–261.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1998). *Stress, culture, and community: The psychology and philosophy of stress*. New York: Plenum.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50, 337–421.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 307–324.
- Hobfoll, S. E. & Shirom, A. (2000). Conservation of resources theory: Applications to stress and management in the workplace. In R. T. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of organization behavior*, 2nd ed. (pp. 57–81). New York: Dekker.
- Hunter, E. M., Clark, M. A., & Carlson, D. S. (2017). Violating work–family boundaries: Reactions to interruptions at work and home. *Journal of Management*. doi: 0149206317702221.

- Ilies, R., Huth, M., Ryan, A. M., & Dimotakis, N. (2015). Explaining the links between workload, distress, and work-family conflict among school employees: Physical, cognitive, and emotional fatigue. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*, 1136-1149.
- Ilies, R., Wilson, K. S., & Wagner, D. T. (2009). The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: The facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*, 87-102.
- Innstrand, S. T. (2009). *Work/home conflict and facilitation: COR[e] relations: A longitudinal study on work-home interaction in different occupational groups in Norway*. Dissertation, Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Innstrand, S. T., Langballe, E. M., Espnes, G. A., Aasland, O. G. W., & Falkum, E. (2010). Work-home conflict and facilitation across four different family structures in Norway. *Community, Work & Family, 13*, 231-249.
- Jain, S. & Nair, S. K. (2015). Role of demographic variables in work-family enrichment: A study of sales employees in India. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 4*, 8-18.
- Jansen, N. W., Kant, I., Kristensen, T. S., & Nijhuis, F. J. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict: A prospective cohort study. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 45*, 479-491.
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 80-92.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: The role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 257-268.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 237-249.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 693-710.
- Judge, T. A. & Hurst, C. (2008). How the rich (and happy) get richer (and happier): Relationship of core self-evaluations to trajectories in attaining work success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 849-863.
- Judge, T. A. & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2011). Implications of core self-evaluations for a changing organizational context. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*, 331-341.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 19*, 151-188.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.

- Karasek, R. A. (1998). The new work organization, conducive production, and work quality policy. In M. Marmot (Ed.), *Labour market changes and job insecurity: A challenge for social welfare and health promotion* (pp. 78–105). Copenhagen: WHO/Europe.
- Karasek, R. A. & Theorell, T. (1990). *Health work: Stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kim, S., Las Heras, M., & Bosch, M. J. (2016). A matter of love: Exploring what enables work-family enrichment. *International Business Research*, 9, 24–36.
- Kinnunen, U., Mäkikangas, A., Mauno, S., De Cuyper N., & De Witte, H. (2014). Development of perceived job insecurity across two years. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19, 243–258.
- Kinnunen, U., Rantanen, J., Mauno, S., & Peeters, M. (2013). Work-family interaction. In M. Peeters, J. D. Jonge, & T. Taris (Eds.), *An introduction to contemporary work psychology* (pp. 267–289). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Klehe, U. C., Zikic, J., Van Vianen, A. E., & De Pater, I. E. (2011). Career adaptability, turnover and loyalty during organizational downsizing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79, 217–229.
- Kokko, K., Rantanen, J., & Pulkkinen, L. (2015). Associations between mental well-being and personality from a life span perspective. In M. Blatný (Ed.), *Personality and well-being across the life-span* (pp. 134–159). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Korpi, W. (2000). Faces of inequality: Gender, class, and patterns of inequalities in different types of welfare states. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 7, 127–191.
- Kossek, E. E., Baltes, B. B., & Matthews, R. A. (2011). How work-family research can finally have an impact in organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4, 352–369.
- Kossek, E. E. & Lautsch, B. A. (2012). Work-family boundary management styles in organizations: A cross-level model. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2, 152–171.
- Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2005). Flexibility enactment theory: Implications of flexibility type, control, and boundary management for work-family effectiveness. In E. E. Kossek & S. J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp. 243–261). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work-nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81, 112–128.
- Kröger, T. (2010). Lone mothers and the puzzles of daily life: Do care regimes really matter? *International Journal of Social Welfare* 19, 390–401
- Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. (2009). Balancing borders and bridges: Negotiating the work-home interface via boundary work tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 704–730.

- Kulik, L., Shilo-Levin, S., & Liberman, G. (2015). Multiple roles, role satisfaction, and sense of meaning in life: An extended examination of role enrichment theory. *Journal of Career Assessment, 23*, 137--151.
- Lapierre, L. M., Li, Y., Kwan, H. K., Greenhaus, J. H., DiRenzo, M. S., & Shao, P. (2017). A meta-analysis of the antecedents of work-family enrichment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. doi: 10.1002/job.2234.
- Lapka, D., Wagner, P., Schober, B., Gradinger, P., & Spiel, C. (2011). Benefits of the person-oriented perspective for program evaluation: Analyzing the differential treatment effects of the Vienna e-lecturing program. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation, 7*, 66-83.
- Laursen, B. P. & Hoff, E. (2006). Person-centered and variable-centered approaches to longitudinal data. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 52*, 377-389.
- Li, Y., Miao, L., Zhao, X., & Lehto, X. (2013). When family rooms become guest lounges: Work-family balance of B&B innkeepers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34*, 138-149.
- Little, L. M., Nelson, D. L., Wallace, J. C., & Johnson, P. D. (2011). Integrating attachment style, vigor at work, and extra-role performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*, 464-484.
- Lu, L. (2011). A Chinese longitudinal study on work/family enrichment. *Career Development International, 16*, 385-400.
- Maertz, C. P. & Boyar, S. L. (2011). Work-family conflict, enrichment, and balance under "levels" and "episodes" approaches. *Journal of Management, 37*, 68-98.
- Mäkikangas, A., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Selenko, E. (2016). Factor structure and longitudinal factorial validity of the core self-Evaluation scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. doi:10.1027/1015-5759/a000357.
- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 921-936.
- Matthews, R. A. & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Development and initial evaluation of an enhanced measure of boundary flexibility for the work and family domains. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*, 330-346.
- Matthews, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Bulger, C. A. (2010). Advancing measurement of work and family domain boundary characteristics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*, 447-460.
- Mauno, S. (2010). Effects of work-family culture on employee well-being: Exploring moderator effects in a longitudinal sample. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*, 675-695.
- Mauno, S., De Cuyper, N., Kinnunen, U., Ruokolainen, M., Rantanen, J., & Mäkikangas, A. (2015). The prospective effects of work-family conflict and enrichment on job exhaustion and turnover intentions: Comparing long-term temporary vs. permanent workers across three waves. *Work & Stress, 29*, 75-94.

- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. (2006). Exploring work-and organization-based resources as moderators between work-family conflict, well-being, and job attitudes. *Work & Stress, 20*, 210-233.
- Mauno, S., Mäkikangas, A., & Kinnunen, U. (2016). A longitudinal person-centred approach to the job demands-control model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 25*, 914-927.
- Mauno, S. & Rantanen, M. (2013). Contextual and dispositional coping resources as predictors of work-family conflict and enrichment: Which of these resources or their combinations are the most beneficial? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 34*, 87-104.
- Mauno, S., Rantanen, J., & Kinnunen, U. (2011). Work-family balance and its correlates among Finnish academic professionals: Profiling the experiences of work-family conflict and enrichment. In IBOP (Ed.), *The future of knowledge-intensive service work: Theory and practice of managing human and organizational resources* (pp. 319-341). Marburg: Metropolis.
- McNall, L. A., Masuda, A. D., & Nicklin, J. M. (2009). Flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: The mediating role of work-to-family enrichment. *The Journal of Psychology, 144*, 61-81.
- McNall, L. A., Masuda, A. D., Shanock, L. R., & Nicklin, J. M. (2011). Interaction of core self-evaluations and perceived organizational support on work-to-family enrichment. *The Journal of Psychology, 145*, 133-149.
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*, 381-396.
- McNall, L. A., Scott, L. D., & Nicklin, J. M. (2015). Do positive affectivity and boundary preferences matter for work-family enrichment? A study of human service workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*, 93-104.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.
- Michel, J. S. & Clark, M. A. (2009). Has it been affect all along? A test of work-to-family and family-to-work models of conflict, enrichment, and satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 163-168.
- Michel, J. S., Clark, M. A., & Jaramillo, D. (2011). The role of the five factor model of personality in the perceptions of negative and positive forms of work-nonwork spillover: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*, 191-203.
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work - family conflict: A meta - analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*, 689-725.
- Mihelič, K. K. & Tekavčič, M. (2014). Work-family conflict: A review of antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Management & Information System, 18*, 15-25.

- Montgomery, A., Peeters, M., Schaufeli, W., & Ouden, M. D. (2003). Work-home interference among newspaper managers: Its relationship with burnout and engagement. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 16*, 195–211.
- Moreno-Jiménez, B., Mayo, M., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Geurts, S., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Garrosa, E. (2009). Effects of work-family conflict on employees' well-being: The moderating role of recovery strategies. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*, 427–440.
- Morganson, V. J., Litano, M. L., & O'Neill, S. K. (2014). Promoting work-family balance through positive psychology: A practical review of the literature. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 17*, 221–244.
- Murphy, S.E. & Zagorski, D.A. (2006). Enhancing work-family and work-life interaction: The role of management. In D.F. Halpern, & S.E. Murphy, (Eds.), *From work-family balance to work-family interaction* (pp. 27–47) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B.O. (1998–2012). *Mplus user's guide* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Nicklin, J. M. & McNall, L. A. (2013). Work-family enrichment, support, and satisfaction: A test of mediation. *The European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22*, 66–77.
- Nippert-Eng, C. (1996). *Home and work: Negotiating boundaries in everyday life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- O'Brien, M., Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (2007). Fathers, work and family life: Global perspectives and new insights. *Community, Work and Family, 10*, 375–386.
- Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Britt, T. W., & Greene-Shortridge, T. M. (2012). Organizational work-family resources as predictors of job performance and attitudes: The process of work-family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*, 28–40.
- Official Statistics of Finland (2016). Labour force survey. Employment and unemployment in 2016. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Retrieved from http://www.stat.fi/til/tyti/2016/13/tyti_2016_13_2017-04-12_kat_002_en.html
- Orth, U., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Robins, R. W. (2010). Self-esteem development from young adulthood to old age: A cohort-sequential longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 645–658....
- Öun, I. (2012). Work-family conflict in the Nordic countries: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 43*, 165–184.
- Ouweneel, E., Le Blanc, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Don't leave your heart at home: Gain cycles of positive emotions, resources, and engagement at work. *Career Development International, 17*, 537–556.
- Pääkkönen, H. & Hanifi R. (2012) Time use changes in Finland through the 2000s. Helsinki: Statistics Finland.
- Peeters, M. C. W., ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & van Steenbergen, E. F. (2013). Consequences of combining work and family roles: A closer look at cross-domain versus within-domain relations. In J. G. Grzywacz, & E.

- Demerouti (Eds.), *New frontiers in work and family research* (pp. 93-109). Hove: Psychology Press.
- Peng, A. C., Ilies, R., & Dimotakis, N. (2011). Work-family balance, role integration and employee well-being. In S. Kaiser, M. J. Ringlsetter, D. R. Eikhof & M. Pina e Cunha (Eds.), *Creating balance? International perspectives on the work-life integration of professionals* (pp. 121-140). Berlin: Springer.
- Piccolo, R. F., Judge, T. A., Takahashi, K., Watanabe, N., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations in Japan: Relative effects on job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and happiness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 965-984.
- Powell, G. N. & Greenhaus, J. H. (2006). Is the opposite of positive negative? Untangling the complex relationship between work-family enrichment and conflict. *Career Development International*, 11, 650-659.
- Rantanen, J. (2008). *Work-family interface and psychological well-being: A personality and longitudinal perspective*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research, 346.
- Rantanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Tement, S. (2013). Patterns of conflict and enrichment in work-family balance: A three-dimensional typology. *Work & Stress*, 27, 141-163.
- Rantanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Tillemann, K. (2011). Introducing theoretical approaches to work-life balance and testing a new typology among professionals. In S. Kaiser, M. J. Ringlsetter, D. R. Eikhof, & M. Pina e Cunha, (Eds.), *Creating balance? International perspectives on the work-life integration of professionals* (pp. 27-46). Berlin: Springer.
- Rantanen, J., Tillemann, K., Metsäpelto, R. L., Kokko, K., & Pulkkinen, L. (2015). Longitudinal study on reciprocity between personality traits and parenting stress. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 39, 65-76.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825-836.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rothbard, N. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655-684.
- Rothbard, N. & Dumas, T. L. (2006). Research perspectives: Managing the work-home interface. In F. Jones, R. Burke, & M. Westman (Eds.), *Work-life balance: A psychological perspective* (pp. 71-89). New York: Psychology Press.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1-28.
- Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, J., Panzer, K., & King, S. N. (2002). Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 369-386.
- Russo, M. (2015). Work-home enrichment and health: An analysis of the mediating role of persistence in goal striving and vulnerability to stress. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26, 2486-2502.

- Russo, M. & Buonocore, F. (2012). The relationship between work-family enrichment and nurse turnover. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 27*, 216–236.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire a cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*, 701–716.
- Schaufeli, W. B. & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In G. Bauer & O. Hammig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health* (pp. 43–68). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Schenewark, J. D. & Dixon, M. A. (2012). A dual model of work-family conflict and enrichment in collegiate coaches. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 5*, 15–39.
- Seligman, M. E. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Special issue on happiness, excellence, and optimal human functioning. *American Psychologist, 55*, 5–183.
- Selvarajan, T. R., Singh, B., & Cloninger, A. (2016). Role of personality and affect on the social support and work family conflict relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 94*, 39–56.
- Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2009). The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 10*, 459–481.
- Siebert, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review, 39*, 567–578.
- Sirgy, M. J. & Lee, D. J. (2017). Work-life balance: An integrative review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*. doi: 10.1007/s11482-017-9509-8.
- Siu, O. L., Bakker, A. B., Brough, P., Lu, C. Q., Wang, H., Kalliath, T., ... & Timms, C. (2015). A three-wave study of antecedents of work-family enrichment: The roles of social resources and affect. *Stress and Health, 31*, 306–314.
- Siu, O., Lu, J., Brough, P., Lu, C., Bakker, A. B., Kalliath, T., ... Lo, D. (2010). Role resources and work-family enrichment: The role of work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*, 470–480.
- Shein, J. & Chen, C. P. (2011). *Work-family enrichment: A research of positive transfer*. Toronto: Sense.
- Shockley, K. M. & Singla, N. (2011). Reconsidering work-family interactions and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 37*, 861–886.
- Smoktunowicz, E., Lesnierowska, M., Cieslak, R., & Benight, C. C. (2017). Effects of contextual and personal resources on work-family interface. In A. S. Antoniou & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Coping, personality and the workplace: responding to psychological crisis and critical events* (pp. 361–374). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Specht, J., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2011). Stability and change of personality across the life course: The impact of age and major life events

- on mean-level and rank-order stability of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 862–882.
- Stoddard, M. & Madsen, S. R. (2007). Toward an understanding of the link between work-family enrichment and individual health. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9, 2–15.
- Tammelin, M., Malinen, K., Rönkä, A., & Verhoef, M. (2017). Work schedules and work-family conflict among dual earners in Finland, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Family Issues*, 38, 3–24.
- ten Brummelhuis, L. L. & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work-home interface: The work-home resources model. *American Psychologist*, 67, 545–556.
- Tett, R. P. & Meyer, J. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259–293.
- Thévenon, O. (2011). Family policies in OECD countries: A comparative analysis. *Population and Development Review*, 37, 57–87.
- Valcour, M. (2007). Work-based resources as moderators of the relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work-family balance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1512–1523.
- van Steenbergen, E. F., Kluwer, E. S., & Karney, B. R. (2014). Work-family enrichment, work-family conflict, and marital satisfaction: A dyadic analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19, 182–194.
- van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2007). How work and family can facilitate each other: Distinct types of work-family facilitation and outcomes for women and men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 279–300.
- van Wijhe, C. I., Peeters, M. C., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). To stop or not to stop, that's the question: About persistence and mood of workaholics and work engaged employees. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 18, 361–372.
- Vieira, J. M., Matias, M., Lopez, F. G., & Matos, M. (2016). Relationships between work-family dynamics and parenting experiences: A dyadic analysis of dual-earner couples. *Work & Stress*, 30, 243–261.
- Wayne, J. H. (2009). Reducing conceptual confusion: Clarifying the positive side of work and family. In D. R. Creane & J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 105–140). Lanham: University Press of America.
- Wayne, J. H., Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Allen, T. D. (2016). In search of balance: A conceptual and empirical integration of multiple meanings of work-family balance. *Personnel Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/peps.12132.
- Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Family-supportive organization perceptions and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work-family conflict and enrichment and partner attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 606–622.
- Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary

- antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 63-76.
- Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 108-130.
- Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work-family support in work-family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 445-461.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 235-244.
- Zimmerman, K. L. & Hammer, L. B. (2010). Work-family positive spillover. In J. Houdmont & S. Leka (Eds.), *Contemporary occupational health psychology: Global perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 272-295). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

ORIGINAL PAPERS

I

CROSS-LAGGED RELATIONS BETWEEN WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT, VIGOR AT WORK, AND CORE SELF-EVALUATIONS: A THREE-WAVE STUDY

by

Ali Moazami-Goodarzi, Jari-Erik Nurmi,
Saija Mauno, & Johanna Rantanen, 2014

Journal of Business and Psychology, 30, 473–482.

Reproduced with kind permission by Springer.

II

WORK-FAMILY BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT PROFILES IN TWO FINNISH SAMPLES: A PERSON-ORIENTED APPROACH

by

Ali Moazami-Goodarzi, Johanna Rantanen,
Jari-Erik Nurmi, & Saija Mauno, 2015

International Journal of Business Administration, 6, 12-25.

Reproduced with kind permission by the authors.

Work–Family Boundary Management Profiles in Two Finnish Samples: A Person-oriented Approach

Ali Moazami-Goodarzi¹, Johanna Rantanen², Jari-Erik Nurmi¹ & Saija Mauno^{1,3}

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

² Department of Teacher Education, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

³ School of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland

Correspondence: Ali Moazami-Goodarzi, Department of Psychology, University of Jyväskylä, Ylistonmaentie 33, 40500 Jyväskylä, Finland. E-mail: ali.moazami-goodarzi@jyu.fi

Received: September 4, 2015

Accepted: September 29, 2015

Online Published: October 22, 2015

doi:10.5430/ijba.v6n6p12

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v6n6p12>

Abstract

Background: The present study aims to identify different work-family boundary management profiles among Finnish employees, and examine how these relate to conflict between work and family or their mutual enrichment.

Method: Participants from two samples, one consisting of university staff ($n_1 = 1,139$) and another of nurses ($n_2 = 271$), were asked to respond to an online survey concerning work-family boundary management, work-to-family enrichment, and work-to-family conflict scales.

Results: A cluster analysis identified three profiles in both samples: *segmentors*, *integrators* and *favoring family over work* in the university sample, and *segmentors*, *integrators* and *favoring work over family* in the nurse sample. In both samples *integrators* experienced a higher level of work-to-family enrichment and a lower level of work-to-family conflict in comparison to *segmentors*.

Conclusion: Individuals with a tendency to integrate work and family domains experience higher work to family enrichment and lower work to family conflict compared to those who separate work and family domains.

Keywords: work-family boundary management, domain flexibility, work-family enrichment, work-family conflict

1. Introduction

As moving between multiple roles is increasingly seen as a significant factor in people's lives, researchers have started to investigate how working adults navigate between such roles in the work and family domains (Rothbard & Dumas, 2006). It has been suggested that individuals differ in the ways they manage boundaries between their work and family domains, and these are described as "boundary management styles" (Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2009). Such styles have been defined as "the general approach an individual uses to demarcate boundaries and regulate attending to work and family roles" (Kossek, & Lautsch, 2012, p. 155). Previous research has established that differences between individuals and the structure of their jobs will indeed affect their boundary management styles (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2005). But less is known about how boundary management styles are associated with specific work and family outcomes, such as work–family conflict and enrichment (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). Consequently, our study had two aims. First, we aim to identify boundary management profiles via a person-oriented analysis. Second, we aim to test how these profiles are associated with conflict and enrichment in the work-to-family context.

1.1 Work-Family Boundary Management

Different kinds of boundaries, such as physical, temporal or behavioral boundaries, serve to structure and determine the roles that a person has in different life domains (Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, & Bulger, 2010). It has been suggested that these boundaries are not fixed, but are flexible according to the demands of each domain (Rosenzweig et al., 2011). Boundary-flexibility has thus been defined as the degree to which an individual has the capacity to contract or expand the domain boundary in response to demands from another domain (Clark, 2000). According to Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2006), the flexibility of the family domain is positively associated with an increase in transitions from family to work roles (in response to increased work demands), while the flexibility of the work

domain is positively associated with an increase in transitions from work to family roles (in response to increased family demands).

Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010) went on to extend this definition by suggesting that boundary-flexibility has two components. The *flexibility-ability* component describes the perceived ability to move from one boundary domain to another; so this means it is easier to leave that domain to meet the demands of another when this component is high, and less likely when it is low (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). It's noteworthy that ability to alter boundaries is rooted in individuals' perception and might not necessarily have correspondence with reality. The other component is *flexibility-willingness*, describing an individual's motivation to move between various domains. High flexibility-willingness in individuals responding to family demands would thus mean there is a greater chance of them leaving the work domain to attend to family matters (Matthews et al, 2010). The flexibility-willingness component was developed in response to the proposition that individuals vary in their preferences for either integrating aspects of work and home or keeping them separate (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999). The more an individual is willing and able to be flexible with regard to domain boundaries, the more blurred those boundaries will become, and this will, in turn, facilitate both physical and cognitive transitioning between domains (Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005).

1.2 A Person-Oriented Approach to Work-Family Boundary Management

A person-oriented approach identifies subgroups within a population according to a particular profile or pattern of variables characteristic of that set and shows how these patterns relate to adjustment (von Eye and Bergman, 2003; see Davidson, Gest, & Welsh, 2010). It therefore provides a way of focusing on patterns of behavior that vary systematically between individuals. For this study, the patterns of behavior in question are work-family boundary management profiles.

Some previous studies on work-family boundary management have also used a person-centered approach. For example, Hartman (1997) has suggested that individuals simply vary in the degree to which they segment or integrate their work and family roles. High role segmentation occurs when the domains of home and work are considered as being separate, and physical space and time are designated a single purpose for segmented roles (Nippert-Eng, 1996a). In contrast, high role integration occurs when "no distinction exists between what belongs to 'home' or 'work' and when and where they are engaged" (Nippert-Eng, 1996a, p. 567). Work and family domains are not necessarily integrated or segmented to the same degree, however (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006). The borders can be either stronger or weaker depending on the strength of the situation, the context, and the culture of the focal domain (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Clark, 2000).

Researchers have recently started to unpack this segmentation-integration continuum and give many different labels to these different configurations (Ammons, 2013; Bulger, Matthews & Hoffman, 2007; Kossek & Lautsch, 2008; Kossek et al., 2012; for a review see Allen, Cho, & Meier, 2014). For example, Bulger and colleagues (2007) have found four distinct profiles to describe the boundaries that individuals place around their work and family which vary in flexibility and permeability. These consist of: (1) individuals who show high ability and willingness to be flexible with work and family domain boundaries and let them be permeable; (2) those who show high ability to be flexible with both boundaries, but are unwilling for them to be permeable; (3) those who show the average level of most of the boundary strength measures; and (4) individuals who report both high ability and willingness to be flexible with the work domain boundary, but not the family domain boundary. Likewise, Kossek and Lautsch (2012) suggested that there are three work-family boundary management styles that originate from individual boundary-crossing preferences (e.g., flexibility): (a) separators who distinguished work and family roles; (b) integrators who combined work and family roles; and, (c) alternating individuals who had clear periods of distinct integration and distinct separation. In a qualitative study, Ammons (2013) also found four different configurations based on preferred and actual boundaries that employees have: 1) individuals who kept work and family domains separate; 2) those who integrated work into family (eagerly or reluctantly), but with little to no integration of family into the work domain; 3) those who integrated family into work, but kept work from intruding into their personal lives; and 4) those who experienced work and family as one synergistic whole in terms of thoughts, behavior, and use of time and space.

The present study aims to identify boundary management profiles via a person-oriented analysis based on an individual's willingness (stated preference) and ability (enacted preference) to manage boundaries around work and family domains. Since the majority of the research has so far been conducted only in the United States, our study aims to extend our knowledge about boundary management in different contexts (Finland), in so far as there may be different personal, occupational and cultural priorities around work and family roles.

1.3 Work-Family Boundary Management and Work-Family Conflict and Enrichment

It can be assumed that work-family boundary management styles are associated with an employee's own experience of work-family conflict and/or enrichment (Hecht & Allen, 2009; Ilies, Wilson, & Wagner, 2009). Work-family conflict is defined as "a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Meanwhile, work-family enrichment is defined as "the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role" (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 73). Although an ability to make an easy transition from one domain to another provides a means for decreasing the conflict between roles (Ashforth et al., 2000), current empirical research has shown that increasing the transition overall between roles can nevertheless result in higher conflict between those roles (Desrochers et al., 2005; see Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010).

Chen, Powell, and Greenhaus (2009) found that the existing fit between an individual's desire for segmentation and organizational policies was actually negatively associated with work-to-family conflict and positively associated with work-to-family enrichment or "positive spillover". Similarly, Li, Miao, Zhao, and Lehto (2013) showed that setting a clear border around the work domain and reducing the level of integration of work and family domains was positively related to work-life balance. In addition, Desrochers and colleagues (2005) showed that a higher integration of work and family was positively associated not only with the number of hours worked both at home and work, but also with distractions while working at home, and with work-family conflict. Similarly, Kossek, Lautsch and Eaton (2006) found that work-family boundary management styles which scored higher on integration were positively related to family-work conflict. Meanwhile, Ilies, et al. (2009) found that the extent to which employees integrate their work and family roles is positively associated with the strength of daily job satisfaction spillover into negative and positive affects at home. Taken together, these four studies therefore suggest that segmentation rather than integration is beneficial for a healthy work-family balance, in other words where there is high work-family enrichment and low work-family conflict (Frone, 2003).

It is particularly interesting that all four of these studies have used a variable-oriented approach. In this approach, associations between specific variables are examined, rather than use the individuals themselves, and these are considered random and interchangeable indicators of behavior (von Eye, Bogat, & Rhodes, 2006). In contrast, this study uses a person-centered approach to establish different work-family boundary management profiles, with regard to the position of individuals on an integration-segmentation continuum.

1.4 The Present Study

The first aim of the present study was to investigate whether there exist homogeneous groups of employees, each with a distinct profile to their style of work-family boundary management. To identify such groups, a person-oriented approach via cluster analysis was used. The criteria variables in the cluster analysis were: 1) *work boundary-flexibility-ability*, 2) *work boundary-flexibility-willingness*, 3) *family boundary-flexibility-ability*, and 4) *family boundary-flexibility-willingness* (Matthews and Barnes-Farrell, 2006). We assumed that this range of boundary management styles provides sufficient information on where individuals would be placed on the segmentation-integration continuum. In line with earlier findings (Bulger et al., 2007; Matthews et al., 2010), and previous theories regarding boundary management styles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000), we hypothesize that at least two profiles will emerge from our data sets (H1). These profiles will be *segmentors*, who separate work and family domains; and *integrators*, who merge the work and family domains.

Our second research aim was to then examine the extent to which the two boundary management profiles we had identified differed in terms of work-to-family conflict and enrichment. On the basis of previous studies (Chen et al., 2009; Li et al., 2013), our hypothesis (H2) was that the *segmentors* would report less work-to-family conflict (H2a) and greater work-to-family enrichment (H2b) than the *integrators*.

As Matthews and Barnes-Farrell's "domain flexibility measure" (2010) has not yet been validated among Finnish employees, we also tested this instrument's construct validity, to make sure that it would be a reliable and valid measure in this particular context. Our hypothesis (H3) was that the four-factor theoretical structure that Matthews and Barnes-Farrell reported in 2010 would be replicated in our samples - namely *flexibility-ability* and *flexibility-willingness* as regards *work boundaries* and *family boundaries*.

2. Method

2.1 Participants and Procedure

University sample. The first sample is part of a larger study on university employees ($N_{University1} = 666$; $N_{University2} = 644$). Data was gathered through an online survey in 2009 that targeted academic staff, and administrative and

technical personnel employed in two universities in Central Finland. The participants consisted of professors, lecturers, senior teaching assistants, researchers, and PhD students. All employees at both the universities who were appointed to work for at least 50% of a normal full-time work schedule were invited to complete an online questionnaire about their health and well-being—both at work and in general. In total, we received 2137 (out of 4508) responses after two reminders, yielding a response rate of 48% (see Mauno, De Cuyper, Tolvanen, Kinnunen, & Mäkikangas, 2014).

Because the present study focused on managing boundaries between work and family, the sample was restricted to the sub-sample of university employees who had some family demands; having partner or children under 18 ($n = 1139$). Of these participants, 775 (68%) were women, 364 (32%) men, and their mean age was 42.8 years ($SD = 10.5$). Sixty-eight percent of the participants had at least one child under the age of 18 living with them. The average length of job tenure was 20.06 years ($SD = 10.9$), and the average length of a working week for the sample was 40.52 hours ($SD = 8.56$).

Nurses. The second sample ($n = 301$) was gathered via an online questionnaire in spring 2009 from nurses in one health care district in Finland. As we did not have their email addresses, both the invitation to participate and a link to the questionnaire was posted on the health care district's intranet.

In this sample, the data analysis was again restricted to individuals who were, at the time of the study, living with a partner and/or children ($n = 271$). Of these participants, 243 (90%) were female and 28 (10%) men, and their mean age was 46.8 years ($SD = 10.2$). Seventy-two percent of the participants had at least one child under the age of 18 living with them. The average length of job tenure was 20.34 years ($SD = 10.2$), and the average working week was 38.48 hours ($SD = 4.10$).

2.2 Measures

Domain flexibility. Participants' perception of work-family boundary-flexibility was evaluated using the domain flexibility scale, as established by Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010). The scale consisted of four subscales: 1) *work flexibility-ability* (WFA), 2) *work flexibility-willingness* (WFW), 3) *family flexibility-ability* (FFA), and 4) *family flexibility-willingness* (FFW). These subscales then each had four items—rated from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree* (for reliabilities see table 1). Below are listed examples of each of these items.

- 1) “While at work, I can stop what I am doing to meet responsibilities related to family and my personal life responsibilities” (WFA).
- 2) “I am willing to take time off from work to deal with my family and personal life responsibilities” (WFW).
- 3) “My family and personal life responsibilities would not prevent me from going into work early if the need arose” (FFA).
- 4) “I am willing to cancel plans with my friends and family to deal with work related responsibilities” (FFW).

Work-family enrichment. Work-to-family enrichment was measured by four items derived from the “enrichment scale” developed and validated by Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, and Grzywacz (2006, e.g., “*My involvement in my work makes me feel happy and this helps me to be a better family member*”). The response scale ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree* (for reliabilities see Table 1).

Work-family conflict. We also used four items to measure work-to-family conflict derived from the scale developed by Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000) (e.g., “*The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities*”). The response scale for this also ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree* (for reliabilities see table 1).

Background information. Participants were also asked questions about their age, gender, weekly working hours, how long they had been in their job, and the ages of their children. These were then used as control factors in certain analyses.

2.3 Analytic Strategy

Firstly, the construct validity of the domain flexibility scale was established by examining its factor structure using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We relied on several fit indices to ascertain the model fit, including the Tucker Lewis index (TLI), the comparative fit index (CFI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). “Good fit”, in terms of CFI and TLI values means greater than .90, while RMSEA values should be no more than .06, and SRMR less than .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). We also investigated whether the four-factor structure was invariant across both samples. Due to the sample of university

staff being so large, we randomly chose only 20% of the nurse participants (n = 301) to test for measurement invariance.

Next, we conducted a cluster analysis to identify the various different profiles of participants who were homogenous in terms of boundary management scores. The two-stage cluster analysis, in SPSS 21.0 first identifies the total number of profiles (clusters) and then classifies them using a nonhierarchical procedure. In the pre-clustering stage, cases are divided into small sub-clusters. These sub-clusters are then further arranged into the desired or pre-defined number of clusters (see Facca & Allen, 2011). By default, to determine the optimal number of clusters, SPSS uses an algorithm which is based, in part, on Bayesian (BIC) information criteria loss.

Finally, analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were conducted to test for profile differences between prime examples of work-to-family conflict and enrichment, and the difference between pairs of such opposites were also tested using Bonferroni correction. Control variables used in these analyses were age, gender, having a child under the age of 18, length of tenure in a job, and hours of work per week.

3. Results

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and bivariate correlation of the variables.

Table 1. Means (M), Standard Deviations (SD), reliabilities and Bivariate Correlations of Study Variables

Variables	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	M	SD	α
1. Work Flexibility-ability	5.37	1.17	(.84)	-	.54**	.27**	.21**	.24**	-.27**	-.15*	-.04	-.12*	.07	.01	3.98	1.38	(.80)
2. Work Flexibility- willingness	5.34	1.10	(.79)	.73**	-	.07	.07	.22**	-.11	.16	.15*	-.05	.12*	-.07	4.65	1.12	(.66)
3. Family Flexibility-ability	4.58	1.28	(.71)	.13**	-.01	-	.65**	.17**	-.15*	-.01	-.00	.05	.01	.17**	3.93	1.37	(.80)
4. Family Flexibility-willingness	3.64	1.32	(.81)	.01	-.07	.61**	-	.30**	-.10	.35**	-.04	-.07	.00	.09	2.75	1.24	(.84)
5. Work-Family Enrichment	4.30	1.23	(.84)	.14**	.05	.16**	.17**	-	-.38**	.27**	-.05	-.11	.04	.00	4.43	1.12	(.84)
6. Work-Family Conflict	3.55	1.29	(.79)	-.28**	-.16**	-.07*	.09	-.32**	-	.11	-.00	.09	.04	-.00	4.43	1.12	(.77)
7. Age	43.86	10.56		-.20**	-.21**	.13**	.08**	-.07**	.10	-	-.19**	-.42**	.02	.07	46.79	10.16	
8. Gender ^a	1.31	0.46		.06*	.07*	-.02	.04	-.10**	.05	.07*	-	.22**	.05	.03	1.10	0.30	
9. Child under 18 ^b	1.31	0.46		-.07*	.14**	.31**	.15**	-.04	-.05	.67**	-.02	-	.00	.07	1.25	0.43	
10. Tenure	20.06	10.94		-.20**	-.19**	.15**	.10**	.09**	-.02	.93**	.08**	.65**	-	-.08	20.34	10.16	
11. Weekly work hours	40.68	9.22		-.04	-.04	.13**	.12**	-.02	.26**	.06*	.13**	.03	.05	-	38.52	4.25	

Note. Measures of university and nurse samples are above and below the diagonal, respectively. Internal consistency estimates, that is, reliabilities are reported in parentheses.

^a 1 = Female, 2 = Male; ^b 0 = Yes I have a child under 18, 1 = No I don't have; * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

3.1 University Sample

Older staff tended to set a clear border around their work domain and blur the border around their family domain. Women showed a lower level of WFA and WFW ($t = 2.51, p < .01$; $t = 2.69, p = .007$, respectively). They also worked more hours ($t = 4.74, p < .001$), had a lower length of tenure in their jobs ($t = 2.92, p < .001$), and experienced a higher level of work-to-family enrichment. Results also revealed that while length of tenure was negatively related to WFA and WFW and positively related to FFA and FFW, it was also positively related to a higher level of work-to-family enrichment. Likewise, having a child under the age of 18 was positively related to WFW, FFA and FFW, but negatively associated with WFA. Moreover, those who worked more hours were more

likely to be flexible with the borders surrounding their family domains and to experience work-to-family conflict. Meanwhile, the ability to set a more permeable border around both work and family domains was positively associated with work-to-family enrichment and negatively associated with work-to-family conflict.

3.2 Nurse Sample

There was a negative correlation between age and ability to set a flexible border around work, but older nurses were more motivated to blur borders around the family domain. Women in this sample were more motivated to be flexible with the borders surrounding work ($t = 2.43, p = .02$), and nurses who worked more hours saw themselves as more able to be flexible with the borders around their family domain. In addition, nurses who had been in their job longer were more willing to place a flexible border around their work domain, and experienced a high level of work-to-family enrichment ($t = 3.62, p < .001$), while having a child under 18 was negatively associated with one's ability to set a flexible border around work. Overall, flexibility-ability and flexibility-willingness in both domains proved to be positively correlated with work-to-family enrichment, whereas a perceived inability to place a more flexible border around work and family domains proved to be associated with greater work-to-family conflict.

3.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

University sample. CFA results revealed that the correlated four-factor model used, i.e., work-flexibility-ability (WFA), work-flexibility-willingness (WFW), family-flexibility-ability (FFA) and family-flexibility-willingness (FFW), showed a satisfactory fit in the university sample ($\chi^2/df = 3.22$; CFI = .90; TLI = .88; RMSEA = .08; SRMR = .06). Modification indices suggested, however, that estimating the associations of measurement errors between WFW item 3 and WFW item 4, and between WFA item 3 and WFW item 3 would substantially improve the fit of the model ($\chi^2/df = 2.65$; CFI = .93; TLI = .91; RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .05). After these estimations had been made, the model was significantly better than original model ($\Delta\chi^2(2) = 61, p < .001$). With the new model, the correlations between the four factors showed that the within-life domain correlations (i.e., between ability and willingness) were now higher than the cross-life domain correlations (i.e., between life and work). In other words, r between WFA and WFW = .73 and r between FFA and FFW = .61, whereas r between FFA and WFA = .13, and r between FFW and WFW = -.07.

Nurse sample. We ran a similarly correlated four-factor model for the nurse sample, but the fit of the model was not acceptable ($\chi^2/df = 3.98$; CFI = .88; TLI = .85; RMSEA = .08; SRMR = .07). So on the basis of modification indices, we estimated the measurement errors between WFW item 3 and WFW item 4, between WFA item 3 and WFW item 3, and between FFA item 1 and FFW item 3. After these estimations the model showed a better fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.47$; CFI = .92; TLI = .90; RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .06) than the original model ($\Delta\chi^2(3) = 303, p < .001$). As in the university sample, the within-life domain correlations here were higher than the cross-life domain correlations; In other words, r between WFA and WFW = .54, and r between FFA and FFW = .65, whereas r between FFA and WFA = .27, and r between FFW and WFW = .07.

We also explored the measurement invariance of the correlated four-factor structure across the two samples by comparing the freely estimated model to the constrained model with a Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square difference test (Satorra & Bentler, 2001). Factor loadings were allowed to vary across the samples in the freely estimated model, whereas factor loadings were made equal across the samples in the constrained model. Results indicated invariant factor loadings among the measurement models ($\Delta\chi^2(12) = 19.01, p < .08$).

3.4 Identification of the Boundary Management Profiles and Differences between Them in Background Variables

University sample. In order to identify homogenous groups of participants differing in their boundary management profiles from other groups, SPSS's two-step clustering analysis was conducted, with the four work-family boundary-flexibility variables used as criteria variables. These variables were standardized prior to the cluster analysis, and the number of clusters was determined on the basis of three criteria: BIC value (the Bayesian information criterion), a theoretical interpretation of the clusters, and the number of cases in each cluster. The two-step clustering method suggested that a three cluster solution would best describe the data, even though a four cluster solution had the lowest BIC (902.65), when compared to one (1455.87), two (1203.80), or three (978.71) cluster solutions. The three cluster solution was eventually chosen, because the change in the BIC (-225.8) and ratio of distance measures (2.16) in it were both greater. The means and standard deviations for the three cluster solution are thus reported in table 2, and its demographic description in Table 3.

Table 2. Cluster Membership Means, Standard Deviation, and Analysis of Variance Results

	University sample							Nurse sample								
	C1 _{Segmentor}		C2 _{Favoring family over work}		C3 _{Integrators}			C1 _{Segmentor}		C2 _{Favoring work over family}		C3 _{Integrators}				
	n = 480	n = 394	n = 260					n = 85	n = 115	n = 71						
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F ^a	ηp ²	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F ^a	ηp ²
Work–flexibility ability	-.74	.82	.56 ^a	.54	.61 ^a	.50	544.52**	.49	-.51	.81	-.35 ^a	.75	1.18 ^a	.48	133.90**	.50
Work–flexibility willingness	-.78	.76	.65 ^a	.51	.55 ^a	.58	650.43**	.53	-.33	.94	-.37 ^a	.82	1.00 ^a	.58	74.05**	.35
Family–flexibility ability	-.11	.86	-.61	.09	.89	.53	269.49**	.32	-1.04	.54	.44	.64	.53	.96	133.63**	.50
Family–flexibility willingness	.02	.82	-.76	0.65	1.02	.66	466.45**	.45	.91	.42	.40	.77	.44	1.11	81.56**	.38

Note: All means reported are z-scores. Across rows, means that share subscripts do not differ significantly from one another, otherwise they are significantly different. Results for mean are estimated by Scheffe’s t-test.

C1= Segmentors; C2= Favoring family over work; C3= Integrators; ^a df are 3, 328 for Academic sample and 2, 268 for Nurse Sample; ** p < .01.

The three profiles identified were: *segmentors* (n = 480, 42%), *favoring family over work* (n = 394, 35%) and *integrators* (n = 260, 23%). *Segmentors* were characterized by low levels of WFA and FFW, but average levels of FFA and FFW. Compared with the other two clusters, however, they had held their jobs for longer (F (2, 1116) = 30.98, p < .001).

The *favoring family over work* profile comprised of individuals who scored low on FFA and FFW, but high on WFA and FFW. These individuals seemed to separate family from work yet still be able to integrate work with family. This was also the youngest profile (F (2, 1116) = 30.98, p < .001), and the majority of its members had a child who was under 18 years old (F (2, 813) = 17.83, p < .001). In addition, they worked fewer hours per week (F (2, 1126) = 4.00, p = .018), and had held their job for a shorter time (F (2, 1116) = 30.98, p < .001) than individuals in the two other clusters.

Integrators exhibited high levels of FFW, FFA, FFW and WFA which places them on the high integration end of the segmentation-integration continuum. The members of this profile also worked more hours per week (F (2, 1126) = 4.00, p = .018) than other profiles.

Nurse sample. The two-step clustering method suggested that a three cluster solution described the nurse data best. Although, as in the university sample, the four cluster solution had a lower BIC (902.65) than the three (627.31), the three cluster solution was eventually chosen, because the change in the BIC (-55.64) and ratio of distance measures (1.89) in it were both greater. As with the university sample too, the means and standard deviations for this three cluster solution are reported in table 2, and the demographic description in table 3.

The three profiles in this sample were *segmentors* (n = 85, 32%), *favoring work over family* (n = 115, 42%), and *integrators* (n = 71, 26%). *Segmentors* scored low in both work-flexibility measures as well as FFA, but high on FFW. They were also younger and worked fewer hours per week [F (2, 265) = 4.37, p = .014] than the other two clusters (see table 3).

The *integrators* achieved high scores in both family-flexibility domains, and medium scores in both work-flexibility domains. This places them near to the integration end of the segmentation-integration continuum. In comparison with the two other clusters, more of them had a permanent job [F (2, 266) = 9.86, p < .001] and a child under 18 [F (2, 200) = 6.47, p = .002].

Meanwhile, the *favoring work over family* profile was characterized by low scores in both work-flexibility domains and average scores in both family-flexibility domains. The nurses in this profile tended to have a flexible border around their family but not work, and they were generally older than *integrators* [F (2, 263) = 10.36, p < .001], had

been in their job the shortest amount of time [$F(2, 266) = 9.85, p < .001$], and worked the most hours per week [$F(2, 265) = 4.37, p = .014$].

Table 3. Demographics of the work–family boundary management profiles. Means (SDs) or percentage

	University sample			Nurse sample		
	C1 n = 480	C2 n = 394	C3 n = 260	C1 n = 85	C2 n = 115	C3 n = 71
Age	46.37 (9.90)	40.75 (9.74)	43.79 (11.69)	42.80 (8.55)	48.83 (10.92)	48.40 (9.41)
Gender						
female	73%	65%	65%	88%	90%	90%
male	27%	35%	35%	12%	10%	10%
Having child under 18						
Yes	63%	81%	59%	76%	72%	79%
No	37%	19%	41%	24%	28%	21%
Weekly work hours	40.64 (8.22)	39.67 (7.88)	41.58 (9.93)	38.76 (4.65)	39.10 (3.38)	37.42 (4.34)
Tenure	22.47 (10.65)	16.75 (9.85)	20.43 (11.78)	20.55 (10.45)	18.81 (10.79)	22.54 (8.34)

Note: C1= Segmentors; C2= Favoring family over work; C3= Integrators.

3.5 Summary of the Differences between the Identified Boundary Management Profiles

The *integrators* in the university sample scored higher in all four criteria variables than those in the nurse sample (WFA, $t(330) = 6.22, p < .001$; WFW, $t(330) = 2.36, p < .019$; FFA, $t(330) = 9.93, p < .001$; FFW, $t(330) = 12.93, p < .001$). Similarly, the *segmentors* in the university sample scored significantly higher than the nurse *segmentors* in both family-flexibility domains (FFA, $t(563) = 15.94, p < .001$; FFW, $t(563) = 17.10, p < .001$) and in work-flexibility ability (WFA, $t(563) = 9.95, p < .001$), but there was no significant difference between them in the willingness domain (WFW, $t(563) = 1.50, p < .001$). Unlike the other two profiles, however, the third profile was completely different in both samples. In the university sample, individuals from this profile were more flexible about work boundaries (WFA, $t(507) = 32.41, p < .001$; WFW, $t(507) = 25.90, p < .001$) but clearer about family boundaries, whereas in the nurse sample it was the inverse: they tended to set a flexible border around their family domains (FFA, $t(507) = -5.73, p < .001$; FFW, $t(507) = -6.26, p < .001$), but a vivid border around their work domains.

3.6 Differences between the Boundary Management Profiles in Work-to-Family Enrichment and Work-to-Family Conflict

University staff. The results showed that the main effects of work-family boundary management profiles were significant for both work-to-family enrichment [$F(2,752) = 12.54, p < .000$] and work-to-family conflict [$F(2,752) = 12.14, p < .000$], after controlling for age, gender, having children under 18, length of tenure and weekly working hours as covariates (see table 4). Post hoc comparisons using Bonferroni correction showed that those in the *integrators* profile experienced a significantly higher level of work-to-family enrichment ($M = 4.68, SD = 1.23$) than either those in the *favoring family over work* ($M = 4.15, SD = 1.25$), or *segmentors* profiles ($M = 4.22, SD = 1.17$). In turn, those in the *segmentors* experienced a significantly higher level of work-to-family conflict ($M = 3.80, SD = 1.29$) than either those in the *favoring family over work* ($M = 3.25, SD = 1.21$) or *integrators* profiles ($M = 3.45, SD = 1.31$).

Nurses. The results of the ANCOVA showed that the work-family boundary management profiles varied significantly as regards work-to-family enrichment [$F(2,255) = 7.19, p < .001$] and work-to-family conflict [$F(2,255) = 3.22, p < .04$], after controlling for age, gender, having children under 18, length of tenure, and weekly working hours as covariates (see table 4). Post hoc multiple comparisons using Bonferroni correction showed that those in the *segmentors* profile reported a significantly lower level of work-to-family enrichment ($M = 4.10, SD = 1.11$) than those in the *integrators* ($M = 4.95, SD = 1.00$). Meanwhile, those in the *segmentors* experienced a significantly

higher level of work-to-family conflict ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.27$) than those in the *favoring work over family* ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.13$) and *integrators* profiles ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.21$).

Table 4. ANCOVA results for work–family enrichment and work-family conflict in university and nurse samples

	Work–family enrichment				Work–family conflict			
	F	p	df	ηp^2	F	p	df	ηp^2
Work–family boundary management styles	12.36	.000	2	.032	11.21	.000	2	.029
	7.19	.001	2	.075	3.22	.04	2	.035
Age	1.06	.30	1	.001	0.25	.61	1	.000
	1.89	.17	1	.011	2.18	.14	1	.012
Gender	18.17	.000	1	.024	1.76	.18	1	.002
	0.04	.83	1	.000	0.03	.96	1	.000
Work per week	0.74	.38	1	.001	63.52	.000	1	.078
	0.30	.58	1	.002	0.30	.58	1	.002
Tenure	0.19	.65	1	.000	0.08	.77	1	.000
	1.59	.20	1	.009	1.83	.17	1	.010
Having child under 18	0.11	.73	1	.000	0.96	.32	1	.001
	0.03	.86	1	.000	0.24	.61	1	.002

Note: ηp^2 = Partial eta squared values are suggestive of significant effect size. Measures of nurses sample are in the second line.

4. Discussion

The present study aimed to identify groups of employees who would show different work-family boundary management style profiles. The two different Finnish samples chosen were university staff and nurses. Cluster analysis identified three profiles, two of which were closely similar in both the samples—*segmentors* and *integrators*. *Segmentors* were characterized by a low level of work-flexibility willingness and ability, but an average level of family-flexibility willingness and ability. Meanwhile, *integrators* were characterized by high levels of willingness and ability in both family-flexibility and work-flexibility. These results were consistent with H1 of our hypotheses, and were in line with previous studies (Ashforth et al., 2000; Bulger et al., 2007; Clark, 2000; Matthews et al. 2010). However, the third profile differed in each sample. Among university employees, it was described as *favoring family over work*, while among nurses it was called *favoring work over family*. This was because the university employees scored low on family-flexibility ability and willingness but high on ability and willingness to blur their work domain boundary for family needs; while, inversely, nurses scored low on work-flexibility ability and willingness, but high on ability and willingness to blur their family domain boundary.

Although two similar kinds of profiles were found in both samples (*segmentors* and *integrators*), they showed somewhat different characteristics in each sample. In both samples, *segmentors* reported lower scores in both work-flexibility domains (willingness and ability), but with regard to family-flexibility they differed. Whereas in the university sample *segmentors* showed neither the willingness nor ability to be flexible about the boundaries they set around their family domain, the nurse *segmentors* showed a willingness to be so, even if they felt they were not really able to. In both samples, *integrators* showed high levels of flexibility in all four domains, which implies that they were both willing and able to integrate work and family domains in a roughly equal and symmetrical fashion, that is, in both directions from work to family and vice versa. The difference between the two samples was that while *integrators* among university staff were more flexible around their work borders, among the nurses they were more flexible regarding family.

The third profile in the university sample was described as *favoring family over work*. This was because members of this profile scored low on both the family-flexibility domains but high on both willingness and ability to be flexible with work boundaries. In other words, although they tended to be flexible with work if family demands required it,

family life tended to remain separate so that work demands would not impinge on it. In fact, in this respect, members of this profile were very similar to *integrators* regarding their work-flexibility domains.

The third profile in the nurse sample was described as *favoring work over family*. This was because members of this profile scored low on both work-flexibility domains, but high on both ability and willingness to be flexible with their family domain boundaries. In other words, although they tended to be flexible with family if work required it, their work domain remained separate so that family demands would not impinge on it. In this respect, they were acting like *segmentors* in both work domains, and like *integrators* in the family domains.

One possible explanation for the different results between the university and nurse samples with regard to work and family lives comes down to the nature of their jobs (Kossek, Baltes, & Matthews, 2011). For example, university staff has more flexible work arrangements and, as they rely on information technology to get a lot of their work done, they can do this remotely. This simultaneously gives them more freedom with work schedules, but also encourages the blurring of work and family boundaries. Meanwhile, as most nurses are required to work in physical proximity to their patients, and in shifts which strictly delineate worktimes, family demands must wait.

In addition, individuals may have their own predilections that shape their boundary management styles and preferences (Kreiner et al., 2009). Regardless of the nature of their work, *segmentors* like to keep their personal lives separate from work, while *integrators* attempt to merge them.

Overall, our findings provide support for a segmentation-integration continuum (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000), which suggests that people can be placed somewhere on a continuum from integration at one end, to segmentation of work and family roles at the other, based on how they manage or demarcate boundaries between these. Those who set flexible borders are at the integration end, while those who cannot or who find it hard to do so, are at the segmentation end of continuum. The profiles *favoring family over work* and *favoring work over family* are located somewhere between the two ends. Some of our findings concerning the profiles (i.e., *integrators* in both samples and *favoring work over family*) were fairly consistent with the profiles found by Bulger and colleagues (2007). They found four different profiles based on the level of perceived ability and willingness in setting boundaries around the domains of work and personal life, and on the level of permeability of those boundaries: (1) individuals who are able and willing to be flexible with permeable work and family domain boundaries; (2) individuals who are able but unwilling to be flexible with work and family domain boundaries, nor allow their permeability; (3) individuals who report average ability and willingness with regard to boundary strength measures; and (4) individuals who are able and willing to be flexible with the work domain boundary, but not the family domain boundary. In the present study, however, we did not use the construct of permeability in our data, which makes our results harder to compare to this. Moreover, *favoring work over family* and *favoring family over work* profiles were in somehow consistent respectively with the "above and beyond" and "enhance family" profiles found by Ammons (2013) who interviewed 23 employees about their work-family boundaries. The first profile includes individuals who allow work in life domains but keep family contained, while the second profile includes individuals who allow family into the work domain but keep work contained (Ammons 2013).

Our second research question was to what extent the profiles identified on the basis of being able and willing to be flexible with work and family boundaries would differ in terms of the level of work-to-family conflict and enrichment. Our findings showed that, after controlling for age, gender, having children under 18, length of tenure, and weekly working hours, the experience of either a negative or positive work-family interface was related to how individuals managed boundaries around their work and family domains. In both samples, *segmentors* experienced the highest level of work-to-family conflict and lowest level of work-to-family enrichment, whereas *integrators* reported the highest level of work-to-family enrichment and the lowest level of work-to-family conflict. Our results are consistent with findings of Bulger et al. (2007), who found that setting more flexible and permeable boundaries around work and family domains was related to higher work-family enrichment. It is noteworthy that the *segmentors* and *favoring family over work* profiles, who worked fewer hours than *integrators*, were more likely to experience work-to-family conflict.

Our finding that *integrators* reported a higher level of work-to-family enrichment and less work-to-family conflict than *segmentors* is, however, inconsistent with our second hypothesis (H2) and some previous studies (Chen et al., 2009; Li et al., 2013). One explanation for this particular result could be that, since work can be a source of fulfillment (Csikszentmihalyi & LeFevre, 1989), employees might increase rather than decrease the positive aspects of work by integrating work and family domains (Ilies, et al., 2009). In this way, our present findings differ from those of Chen (2009), Desrochers et al. (2005), Li et al. (2013), and Ilies, et al. (2009) who conversely concluded from their findings that an increase in switching between roles actually has a negative impact on people's work-life

balance, and that minimizing this is thus more beneficial. One possible explanation for the inconsistency of these results is that most of the other studies have been done in the US, where cultural norms concerning the primacy of the work role differ, and an individualistic approach to work-family issues predominates (Bulger et al., 2007; Kossek, et al., 2012). In Nordic countries such as Finland, however, the dual-earner family model receives much greater support by the state; there is good and affordable daycare provision for children, care for the elderly, paid parental leave, and care entitlements (Korpi, 2000). These all help families to manage the work and family interface more easily (see Abrahamsen, Holte & Laine, 2012). In this respect, *integrators* may thus be in a better position to experience more enrichment than conflict in Nordic countries.

One methodological aim of the present study was to assess the factor structure of the work-family-flexibility scale using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in two samples of Finnish professionals, and in this respect we succeeded. The four-factor structure we hypothesized, with two flexibility factors of willingness and ability each for work and family, provides additional evidence of reliability and construct validity for the scale originally developed in the US by Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010). It shows that this scale can also be used in a Nordic context.

5. Implication and Limitations

Our findings suggest that the more able and willing people are to integrate the domains of work and family, the more enrichment and less conflict they experience between work and family domains. Hence, these findings are important for developing organizational policies that increase the ability for work-family role integration when employees are willing to do so (Ilies, et al., 2009). As boundary management styles seem also to be occupation-specific to some extent, organizations should think how they can be more sensitive to employees' boundary management preferences in different kinds of work situations. Work-family balance is achieved when employees' preferences for integration or segmentation (or combinations thereof) are taken into account. It is also worth noting that other factors highlighted by our study, such as the age of children, may affect these preferences too. This points to the need for longitudinal research in future to explore the a desire for segmentation or integration, and also enactment of boundary management strategies when the work and family environment is changing over time (e.g. getting a job promotion, having a divorce) There are four major limitations to the present study. First, because our research design is cross-sectional, the relationships between variables do not necessarily imply causation. Second, the present study used self-report questionnaires to examine boundary-flexibility, conflict, and enrichment between work and family domains; and these may be prone to a response bias towards what participants think are socially desirable outcomes (Polit & Beck, 2012). Third, the sample consisted solely of university employees and nurses, restricting the generalizability from these findings to other occupational groups, such as blue-collar employees. Given the flexibility and relative control over working hours that university employees (especially academics) have, the results of the present study best represent work places that are also characterized by relatively high flexibility and control over one's work. Moreover, nurses in Finland, compared to many other countries outside Scandinavia, have better work-family policies which help them to meet the demands of both domains (Thévenon, 2011). Fourth, the present study was carried out in Finland and nowhere else, and results may well be different in countries with a different work-family policy, legislation and culture. For instance, Nordic countries are well-known for their statutory work-family policies, which evidently will have an impact on employees' experiences of the work-family interface (O'Brien, Brandth, & Kvande, 2007). For our findings to be applicable elsewhere, they therefore need to be tested in other contexts too.

6. Conclusion

The present study identified three distinct profiles in both university and nurse samples. *Segmentors* were characterized by a low level of work-flexibility ability and work-flexibility willingness, but an average level of family-flexibility ability and willingness. *Integrators*, meanwhile, scored high in all four factors, which means they showed a high tendency to integrate the work and family domains. *Integrators* in both the university and nurse samples reported more work-to-family enrichment and less work-to-family conflict, while *segmentors* reported more conflict and less work-to-family enrichment.

Acknowledgement

This study was funded by a grant from the Academy of Finland (138369) for Johanna Rantanen, and a grant from the department of psychology, University of Jyväskylä for the first author.

References

Abrahamsen, B., Holte, K. A., & Laine, M. (2012). Work-Family Interference: Nurses in Norway and Finland. *Professions and professionalism*, 2, 60-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojn.2013.31013>

- Allen, T. D., Cho, E., & Meier, L. L. (2014). Work-family boundary dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 99-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091330>
- Ammons, S. K. (2013). Work-family boundary strategies: Stability and alignment between preferred and enacted boundaries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82, 49-58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.11.002>
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 472-491. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2000.3363315>
- Bulger, C. A., Matthews, R. A., & Hoffman, M. E. (2007). Work and personal life boundary management: Boundary strength, work/personal life balance, and the segmentation-integration continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 365-375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.365>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, M. K., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249-276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, M. K., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 131-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002>
- Chen, Z., Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2009). Work-to-family conflict, positive spillover, and boundary management: A person-environment fit approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 82-93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.10.009>
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53, 747-770. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & LeFevre, J. (1989). Optimal experience in work and leisure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 815-822. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.5.815>
- Davidson, A. J., Gest, S. D., & Welsh, J. A. (2010). Relatedness with teachers and peers during early adolescence: An integrated variable-oriented and person-oriented approach. *Journal of School Psychology*, 48, 483-510. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2010.08.002>
- Desrochers, S., Hilton, J. M., & Larwood, L. (2005). Preliminary validation of the work-family integration-blurring scale. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 442-466. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X04272438>
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 85-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1998.2813>
- Facca, T. M., & Allen, S. J. (2011). Using cluster analysis to segment students based on self-reported emotionally intelligent leadership behaviors. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 10, 72-86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12806/V10/I2/RF4>
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143-162) American Psychological Association.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1985.4277352>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 72-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.19379625>
- Hartman, E. (1997). The concept of boundaries in counseling and psychotherapy. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 25, 147-162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03069889708253798>
- Hecht, T. D., & Allen, N. J. (2009). A longitudinal examination of the work-nonwork boundary strength construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 839-862. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.579>
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>

- Ilies, R., Wilson, K. S., & Wagner, D. T. (2009). The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: The facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 87-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2009.36461938>
- Korpi, W. (2000). Faces of Inequality: Gender, Class, and Patterns of Inequalities in Different Types of Welfare States. *Social Politics*, 7, 127-191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sp/7.2.127>.
- Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. (2008). *CEO of me: Creating a life that works in the flexible job age* (Second printing). Philadelphia: Pearson/Wharton School Publishing.
- Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2012). Work-family boundary management styles in organizations A cross-level model. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2, 152-171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2041386611436264>
- Kossek, E. E., Baltes, B. B., & Matthews, R. A. (2011). How work-family research can finally have an impact in organizations. *Industrial and organizational psychology*, 4, 352-369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01353.x>
- Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2005). Flexibility enactment theory: Implications of flexibility type, control, and boundary management for work-family effectiveness. In E. E. Kossek, & S. J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp. 243-261) Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 347-367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002>
- Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work-nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112-128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003>
- Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. (2009). Balancing borders and bridges: Negotiating the work-home interface via boundary work tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 704-730. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2009.43669916>
- Li, Y., Miao, L., Zhao, X., & Lehto, X. (2013). When family rooms become guest lounges: Work-family balance of B&B innkeepers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 138-149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.03.002>
- Matthews, R. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2006). Advancing measurement of work-family boundary management practices. Poster presented at the 21st Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.008>
- Matthews, R. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Development and initial evaluation of an enhanced measure of boundary flexibility for the work and family domains. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15, 330-346. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019302>
- Matthews, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Bulger, C. A. (2010). Advancing measurement of work and family domain boundary characteristics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 447-460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05>
- Mauno, S., De Cuyper, N., Tolvanen, A., Kinnunen, U., & Mäkikangas, A. (2014). Occupational well-being as a mediator between job insecurity and turnover intention: Findings at the individual and work department levels. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23, 381-393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.752896>
- Nippert-Eng, C. (1996a). Calendars and keys: The classification of "home" and "work". *Sociological Forum*, 11, 563-582. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02408393>
- O'Brien, M., Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (2007). Fathers, work and family life: Global perspectives and new insights. *Community, Work and Family*, 10, 375-386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668800701574971>
- Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & Boswell, W. R. (2006). Blurring boundaries: Correlates of integration and segmentation between work and nonwork. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 432-445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.006>
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2012). *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice* (9th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, Williams, & Wilkins.

- Rosenzweig, J. M., Malsch, A. M., Brennan, E. M., Huffstutter, K. J., Stewart, L. M., & Lieberman, L. A. (2011). Managing communication at the work-life boundary: Parents of children and youth with mental health disorders and human resource professionals. *Best Practices in Mental Health*, 7(1), 67-93.
- Rothbard, N. P., & Dumas, T. L. (2006). Research perspectives: managing the work-home interface. *Work-life balance: A psychological perspective*. In F. Jones, R. J. Burke & M. Westman (Eds.), *Work-life balance: A psychological perspective* (pp. 71-89). Psychology Press.
- Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2001). A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika*, 66, 507-514. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02296192>
- Thévenon, O. (2011). Family policies in OECD countries: A comparative analysis. *Population and Development Review*, 37, 57-87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2011.00390.x>
- von Eye, A., & Bergman, L. R. (2003). Research strategies in developmental psychopathology: Dimensional identity and the person-oriented approach. *Development and Psychopathology*, 15, 553-580. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579403000294>
- von Eye, A., Bogat, G. A., & Rhodes, J. E. (2006). Variable-oriented and person-oriented perspectives of analysis: The example of alcohol consumption in adolescence. *Journal of adolescence*, 29, 981-1004. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2006.06.007>

III

TRAJECTORIES OF WORK-FAMILY BALANCE PROFILES: ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES

by

Ali Moazami-Goodarzi, Johanna Rantanen,
Jari-Erik Nurmi, Kaisa Aunola, & Saija Mauno, 2017

Submitted manuscript.