This book aims to promote individuals’ personal and vocational wellbeing through an increased awareness on the invaluable nature of the positive role interaction between work and family contexts. Built upon rich theoretical and empirical evidence in the existing literature, the book presents a research study focusing on the construct of work-family enrichment, one of several constructs representing the positive interdependencies of work and family roles. It illustrates vividly how the psychological process of enrichment takes place, demonstrating movements and correlations between various variables and dynamics in the process. Through a critical eye, findings of the current research contribute to greater understanding of the positive linkages between work and family role participation. The book concludes with a synopsis of the newly expanded, innovative, and comprehensive framework of worklife and family life enrichment, highlighting the implications for theory, research, and practice.

Researchers, scholars, and practitioners in various walks of social sciences can benefit from this book, especially those who work in areas of vocational and career psychology, organizational and industrial psychology, health psychology, counselling psychology, human resource management and development, and other related fields. Nevertheless, readers do not have to be experts in these human services realms only. Lay workers across professions can enjoy the insights and intelligence from this book for their own work-family wellbeing.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This book presents a study that seeks to explore the positive side of occupying both work and family roles; specifically, to elucidate how multiple role participation results in improved performance in each domain. This is the essence of work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), an emerging construct in the work-family literature. This introductory section will begin with a description of the surge of interest in the work-family interface, followed by a discussion of the competing assumptions of the depletion argument and the role accumulation perspective. It will then present a metatheory for understanding life-role interaction and integration; namely, Donald Super’s (1980, 1990) Life-span, Life-space approach to career development. It will describe current trends in the investigation of the positive side of the work-family interface, and a most recent theoretical model of enrichment. It will provide a rationale for conducting qualitative research to validate a conceptual framework that has yet to develop an empirical basis. Finally, it will introduce the current study; an exploration of work-family enrichment among senior managers in the financial services industry.

INTEREST IN THE WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE

The intersection of work and family has been the subject of a great deal of research over the last 25 years (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Greenhaus & Powell, 1996). The disciplines of management and psychology have shown an increased interest in the subject of how men and women balance their work and family responsibilities (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 1992a, 1992b; Kossek, Noe, & Demarr, 1999). Researchers attribute the surge in studies of the work-family interface to changes in the nature and structure of work and family roles, including the rise in dual earner couples, the greater labour force participation of women (especially mothers), the prevalence of women at all levels of higher education, and a blurring of the traditional gender roles in family responsibilities (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, & Crouter, 2000). More specifically, women are devoting less time to household chores and childcare than they did 30 years ago, while men are spending relatively more time on such duties (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Moreover, approximately 60% of married couples in America are dual earners, and over 70% of single parents are employed (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). Additionally, almost 50% of managers in Fortune 500 companies are members of dual-career families (Kossek et al., 1999).

ROLE CONFLICT: SCARCITY AND DEPLETION

The work-family literature has primarily focused on the conflict that arises between the work and family spheres (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006;
Grzywacz & Marks, 2000, Hass, 1999). In their review of the work-family conflict literature, Bellavia and Frone (2005) explain that the most widely cited definition of work-family conflict is that of Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (p. 77). Greenhaus and Beutell’s definition is clearly rooted in role theory; according to role theorists, a role is a set of expectations imposed by role senders, upon a focal individual (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal, 1964). Kahn and Quinn (1970, as cited in Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) further explained that role expectations can also be self-defined, such as when the focal individual creates expectations based on his or her own values regarding work or family role behaviour. Interrole conflict occurs when the expectations associated with one role interfere with one’s ability to adequately fulfil the other. Goode (1960) proclaimed that interrole conflict is an inevitable corollary of occupying multiple roles (Bellavia & Frone, 2005).

The idea that devotion to work and family is a zero-sum game derives from a scarcity hypothesis; the assumption is that we all have a limited amount of energy that must be split between multiple roles, such that energy consumed by one role necessarily diminishes energy available for other roles. This position is also known as the “depletion argument” (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Rothbard, 2001). Accordingly, a person holding multiple roles will inevitably experience conflict that will negatively impact quality of life in the form of strain, which entails a reduced capacity to fulfill competing role expectations. Rothbard (2001) explains that the depletion argument dominates much of the research on the work and family interface, regardless of whether the focus is on conflict or balance.

ROLE ACCUMULATION: SYNERGIES EXIST AND SHOULD BE EXPLORED

The almost unique focus on the conflict arising between work and family roles fails to account for another process, by which engagement in more than one role provides benefits that enhance people’s lives rather than detract from them. This is the essence of the role accumulation literature (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974) or the “enrichment” argument (Marks, 1977; Rothbard, 2001). Researchers such as Marks and Sieber were among the first to question the conflict perspective and suggest the possibility that participation in multiple roles could be advantageous rather than deleterious to role performance in both spheres. Sieber proposes that participating in multiple roles does not necessarily produce role conflict and lead to role strain, as many role theorists, including Goode (1960) and others would have us believe. He argued that the benefits of role accumulation, namely role privileges, status security, resources for role enhancement and role performance, and enrichment of the personality and ego gratification, outweigh the potential for stress associated with multiple roles, leading to “net gratification” (p. 567). Marks discusses the “expansion approach” and notes, “it provides an energy-creation theory of multiple roles rather than a ‘spending’ or ‘drain’ theory” (p. 921). Marks argued that energy depletion is described by many theorists as a biological necessity, but pointed to the exceptions to this presupposed
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rule; he asked, what of the individuals who have abundant energy despite multiple roles and responsibilities? How does the scarcity hypothesis account for these individuals’ experiences? Marks suggested instead that certain social interactions, including activities engaged in with a sympathetic family, can generate energy; that is, resources and benefits accrue to individuals in one realm that may produce additional energy to be used toward that role or for roles in other domains. This is very much akin to Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) current conceptualization of work-family enrichment.

According to Rothbard (2001), the enrichment argument directly challenges the depletion perspective and proposes that rather than draining individuals of their finite amount of energy, participating in multiple roles actually expands the energy and attention available for each role (Marks, 1977). This expansionist view (Barnett & Hyde, 2001) posits that the benefits of engaging in multiple roles can outweigh the strain that individuals may experience. In particular, Barnett and Hyde (2001) refer to empirical findings suggesting that regardless of gender, multiple role participants report “fewer physical and mental health problems and greater subjective well-being” than do people who are involved in fewer roles (p. 784). Particularly relevant to the current study, Barnett and Baruch (1985) found that married women who had children and who held prestigious jobs reported the greatest well-being of all women in their sample. While the literature on the positive side of the work-family interface does not deny the potential for conflict and strain, its focus is on identifying instances in which occupying multiple roles can be an enriching endeavour.

A METATHEORY: DONALD SUPER’S LIFE-SPAN, LIFE-SPACE APPROACH

Interestingly, though largely absent in the work-family interface literature with a few recent exceptions (see Perrone, 2005; Perrone & Civiletto, 2004), Donald Super (1940, 1953, 1957, 1980, 1984a, 1984b, 1990), like Sieber (1974) and Marks (1977), believed that conflict between multiple roles need not necessarily occur. While he acknowledged the potential for conflict (1980), he also wrote of the positive aspects of the intermingling of work and family roles. As early as 1940, Super theorized that roles could also be “extensive”, meaning, “supportive or supplementary” (1990, p. 218). Super, a leading figure in the career development literature, perennially acknowledged the co-existence of multiple roles in people’s lives, and saw work roles as only one aspect of an individual’s “life space”, which, according to his (1980) Life-span, Life-space approach, encompassed nine key roles: child, student, leisurite, citizen, worker, spouse, homemaker, parent, and pensioner. Super (1980) indicated that these roles are not necessarily sex-linked, nor do they necessarily occur in a specific order. Super also theorized that these roles are played out in four main theatres: the home, the community, the school, and the workplace. Super’s belief in the notion of positive work-family relationships is exemplified in his statement of the potential for roles typically designated for one “theatre” (i.e., workplace or home) “to enrich the life of those in [another] theatre” (1980, p. 285). According to Super’s (1984b) findings, women and men who were found to be committed to their career and work roles also tended to be committed to their home and family roles. The same notion of a positive correlation between commitment to work and family roles was later
found by Marks and MacDermid (1996). Super’s idea that more than one role could be salient and enhance rather than detract from an individual’s life represents a key contribution to the career psychology literature, and to our understanding of the work-family interface.

Super (1980, 1990) termed role salience as the level of importance that an individual places on a particular role. Researchers agree that role salience is a key determinant of the potential for work-family enrichment, noting that the more men and women value their work and family roles, and care about these deeply, the more they are likely to deploy resources gained in one domain to the other (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000), and to transfer positive experiences between domains (Kirchmeyer, 1992a). In a recently published theoretical model of work-family enrichment, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) propose that role salience is a key moderator of the enrichment process; specifically, the more one values their role performance in a given domain, the greater the potential for the successful application of resources from another domain to that role (i.e., the higher the likelihood of enrichment to occur). This assumption directly challenges the role scarcity hypothesis and lends credence to Super’s notion that roles can be extensive (i.e., supportive or supplementary). As an increasing number of women and men are highly devoted to both work and family roles, understanding how these roles interact to produce positive outcomes in both domains is a worthwhile endeavour. Empirical evidence demonstrating that when both work and family roles are important to a person’s identity both domains are enriched has profound implications for how individuals feel about occupying multiple roles, and how they organize their life-careers. Moreover, such evidence can impact the organizational climate in favour of policies that support devotion to both spheres; the notion that when work and family are both important to workers work performance can be enhanced is indeed a powerful idea.

In recent reviews of the work-family literature, researchers have called for a greater focus on the positive side of the work-family interface (see Frone, 2003). As Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999) indicated, “few studies have acknowledged the possibility that work and family roles can have positive or enriching effects on one another” (p. 395). The impetus for examining the positive aspects of the work and family interface has been further fuelled by growing interest in positive psychology (Seligman, 2002), organizational behaviour (Luthans, 2002), and family studies (Patterson, 2002). These lines of inquiry have placed greater emphasis on wellness and maximizing one’s potential, as opposed to focusing on stress and illness. The idea is that work-family interaction can be a win-win situation, in which several benefits accrue to people who work and engage in family roles such as spouse, parent, or eldercaregiver (Halpern & Murphy, 2005). Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) view work and family roles as “allies” as opposed to “enemies”.

**CURRENT INVESTIGATIONS OF THE POSITIVE SIDE OF THE WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE**

The most recent entries into the work-family literature have aimed to identify synergies between work and family roles and answer the call for further investigation into the
benefits of combining multiple roles; however, there are a number of issues that have consistently undermined the value of these studies. First, there have been multiple definitions of the positive side of the work-family interface, which has caused several conceptual, theoretical and operational difficulties (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). The main concepts thus far explored in the literature are positive spillover (Crouter, 1984; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a, 2000b; Kirchmeyer, 1992a, 1993, 1995; Stephens, Franks & Atienza, 1997; Sumer & Knight, 2001; Voydanoff, 2001) enhancement (Ruderman, Okeechobee, & Sumer, 2002; Tiedje et al., 1990), facilitation (Frone, 2003; Tompson & Werner, 1997; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004), and enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Kirchmeyer, 1992b; Rothbard, 2001). A second problem, stemming from the first, is that measurement of the various concepts representing the positive interface has been inconsistent; most research in the area has employed measures that have not been empirically validated (Carlson et al., 2006). Due to construct validity and measurement problems, it is difficult to compare findings from different studies and to aggregate results in a meaningful way (Carlson et al., 2006). As well, the processes behind the observed work-family relationships have been poorly specified (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000); a comprehensive theory that explains the positive interactions between work and family roles has been difficult to develop and test empirically, thus limiting the value of research on the benefits of engaging in both work and family roles (Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Moreover, study after study suggests that the processes underlying the positive interdependencies between work and family domains are distinct from those generating work-family conflict (Carlson et al., 2006; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a, 2000b; Kirchmeyer, 1992b, 1993; Powell & Greenhaus, 2006), indicating that theoretical models developed to study work-family conflict are not suitable for examining the positive side of the interface.

A NEW THEORETICAL MODEL AND A VALID GLOBAL MEASURE OF ENRICHMENT

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have recently addressed the aforementioned problems by proposing a theoretical model of work-family enrichment. Greenhaus and Powell define work-family enrichment as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (p. 72). To further specify the broad concept of “quality of life”, the authors note that their conceptualization encompasses two elements: high performance and positive affect (p. 80). There is an important feature that distinguishes enrichment from other constructs representing the positive side of the work-family interface; for enrichment to occur, benefits or resources gained in one domain (work or family) must not only be transferred, but also, successfully applied in another domain (work or family), such that performance or affect in the receiving domain is improved (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Carlson et al., 2006). Furthermore, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) aim to extend the literature on the positive side of the work-family interface by specifying the conditions under which work and family roles are allies, through two postulated paths to enrichment; namely,
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the instrumental path and the affective path. In addition to specifying two routes to enrichment, the authors propose several moderators to enrichment that can be tested empirically. A key moderator, according to Greenhaus and Powell, is role salience, a concept that has received attention in many other contexts, aside from the work-family enrichment literature. One aforementioned theorist who devoted a great deal of attention to role salience was Super (1980, 1990).

In addition to Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) offering of a theoretical model of work-family enrichment, the study of the construct has recently become even more empirically sound with the publication of the first validated global measure of work-family enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006). Given these two developments, emerging research in the area of the positive interface between work and family will eventually have a sound theoretical and empirical basis on which to rest; one that is as rigorous as the literature that focuses on conflict.

RATIONALE FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH ON WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

The rationale for the use of qualitative methodology in the current study begins most fundamentally with the need to develop a more profound explanation of the inner meaning of work-family enrichment for the men and women experiencing it, “a deeper understanding of the participants’ lived experiences of the phenomenon” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The research on positive cross-role relationships is still in its infancy (Wayne et al., 2004), and work-family enrichment in particular is a construct that has recently been the focus of theory development (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). However, much as a global measure of the construct has been introduced (Carlson et al., 2006), there is a dearth of literature exploring the complexities and processes underlying enrichment. Despite the existence of a promising theoretical model, enrichment itself is a specifically defined construct that remains difficult to test empirically at this early stage. According to Greenhaus and Powell, “new measures are needed to assess the extent to which each resource included in our model and positive affect have beneficial effects on the other role…measures of the proposed moderators…should be developed or modified from the existing literature” (p. 86). The researchers note that only after such measures are developed and validated can their model be tested empirically. It is for this reason that Greenhaus and Powell suggest a viable alternative to further exploring their model – the critical incident technique – a qualitative research method designed to examine specific episodes of enrichment that can elucidate the processes of this phenomenon in a manner that a quantitative inquiry cannot. Chell (1998) suggests that the critical incident technique is an entirely appropriate method for elaborating upon an existing theory, as it can provide a framework of “preconceived categories – a coding frame – for which evidence can be sought in the data” (p. 60).

RATIONALE FOR STUDYING SENIOR MANAGERS

There are several reasons why senior management is an excellent focal group for the study of work-family enrichment. First, research demonstrates that employee usage
of family-friendly policies depends on actual organizational attitudes experienced by employees, as opposed to the degree of availability of the programs (Kossek et al., 1999). As such, demonstrating the benefits of combining work and family roles among senior managers could be highly impactful, potentially filtering down to other levels of the organization, and shifting attitudes within the organizational climate in favour of policy usage. Second, it is reasonable to expect that with the great responsibility inherent in senior management level positions, there are also significant resources to be accrued, including material wealth; status and prestige; opportunities to develop self-efficacy and self-esteem; interpersonal skills, including negotiation and conflict resolution; social support and influence; among many other desirable benefits. It would stand to reason, then, that opportunities for work-family enrichment abound within this category of workers. Finally, examining the research participants of other studies dealing with the positive side of the work-family interface reveals great heterogeneity. Specifically, many studies do not separate participants according to occupational level, thus obscuring the effect of job level on enrichment (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a, 2000b; Hill, 2005). As well, researchers have sampled many younger employees, including recent graduates from business school, begging the question of applicability of findings to more seasoned, higher level managers (Kirchmeyer, 1992b; Ruderman et al., 2002). Finally, from a personal perspective, the researcher is interested in studying enrichment among senior managers, as this is the population she works with in her current counselling practice, within which work-family interface issues are often encountered.

THE CURRENT STUDY

The current study seeks to extend Super’s (1940; 1990) broad theory that multiple roles can be extensive (i.e., supplementary or supportive), by further specifying how the process of enrichment occurs; it seeks to validate several key elements of Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theoretical model of enrichment. Super (1990) admits that his theory is “segmental” (p. 199), meaning that different elements of his thought can provide testable hypotheses that may eventually lead to an integrative theory of life-career development. As such, Super would undoubtedly support the current study’s attempt to demonstrate how combining multiple roles in individuals’ life-careers can result in enhanced performance within both work and family domains. The current study also answers the call of researchers interested in the positive side of the work-family interface for greater theoretical understanding of the positive linkages between work and family role participation (Carlson et al., 2006; Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Rothbard, 2001), as it describes and explains some of the characteristics of enrichment and its underlying processes that cannot be captured through global measures of the construct.
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THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL FOUNDATION

This chapter will provide a more detailed account of the existing literature on the benefits of engaging in multiple roles. In order to contextualize the current study, it will begin with a description of Super’s Life-span, Life-space approach to career development, presenting a graphic depiction and explanation of how he believed individuals integrate multiple roles in their life-careers. Next, it will present previous research on the positive side of occupying multiple roles, initially by differentiating the constructs described in the literature, including enrichment, positive spillover, enhancement, and facilitation, and then by detailing the findings accrued within each category. It will then describe, in greater detail, Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theoretical model of work-family enrichment. It will also discuss the first published global measure of work-family enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006). Finally, it will state the research questions of the current study.

SUPER’S LIFE-SPAN, LIFE-SPACE APPROACH AND THE LIFE-CAREER RAINBOW

Super’s (1980, 1990) Life-Career Rainbow was his illustration of the Life-Span, Life-Space approach to career development. The purpose of Super’s graphic depiction was to portray multiple role careers, taking into account an individual’s life stages, the different roles that are salient at certain points in time, and their determinants and interactions. Looking at Super’s theoretical model, the outer band of the Rainbow (1990, p. 212) depicts the major life stages, in a typical but by no means rigid order, and the approximate ages of each. The longitudinal image represents the “life-span” of Super’s approach to career development. The stages included are: Growth (childhood); Exploration (adolescence); Establishment (young adulthood); Maintenance (middle adulthood), and Decline (old age). The second dimension portrayed in the Rainbow is role salience; it is latitudinal, representing the “life-space” of Super’s approach, “the constellation of positions occupied and roles played by a person” (p. 218).

Super’s (1990, p. 212) version of the Life-Career Rainbow encompassed six major roles (a more succinct version of his 1980 Rainbow that involved nine major roles): Child, Student, Leisurite, Citizen, Worker, and Homemaker. In the model, role participation is indicated by the shaded areas; as a person moves through the life stages, the differential shading reflects the addition and abandonment of particular roles. Super (1980, 1990) theorized that as new roles are added, participation in and affective commitment to other roles may be reduced; however, he also noted that the various roles may be “extensive” (1990, p. 218), quite aligned with the role accumulation literature (Marks, 1977; Sieber 1974) and the expansionist hypothesis (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Super (1980, 1990) did not ignore the potential for role conflict, however,
and indicated that multiple role participation can overburden individuals. Nevertheless, he also explicitly stated that enrichment could occur when experiences transfer from one of life’s “theatres” to another. Particularly evident in Super’s conceptualization of life-career is that there is no separation between an individual’s career and the rest of one’s life roles; Super’s is thus a holistic perspective that echoes the sentiments and empirical findings of others who insist that work and family are interconnected as opposed to separate spheres (e.g., Kanter, 1977). What Super never wrote about from a theoretical perspective, however, is how the multiple roles interact so as to become extensive. In other words, while Super (1940, 1980, 1990) acknowledged the potential of work and family roles to enrich each other, the processes by which roles become supplementary or supportive were never articulated in an empirically validated manner.

Super’s theory of role salience (1980, 1990) provides another key contribution to our understanding of the work-family interface, and the Life-Career Rainbow provides a tool to conceptualize and estimate role salience. Super termed role salience to refer to the level of importance that an individual places on a particular role. As noted earlier, researchers agree that role salience is a key determinant of the potential for enrichment, as the more individuals value their work and family roles, and care about their role performance in each sphere, the more they are likely to deploy resources gained in one domain to the other (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Although Greenhaus and Super have apparently not collaborated academically, their mutual interest in role salience can be traced quite far back; For instance, in Super’s (1982) article addressing the meaning of work, Greenhaus (1971, 1973) is credited with being the first researcher to operationalize the term salience. Greenhaus created a measure of the relative importance of work, compared to other roles one engages in. As Super reiterates, “career salience thus denotes relative importance, the degree to which a given role stands out from others played” (p. 97). Perrone (2005) explains, “Super’s life-span, life-space theory (1990) emphasizes the importance of implementing one’s self-concept through a combination of life roles. The work role is addressed in the context of other life roles. Individuals experience varying degrees of participation in, valuing of, and commitment to these roles” (p. 317). If role salience were empirically demonstrated to facilitate enrichment, this would be a highly meaningful finding; specifically, it would suggest that more positive outcomes in both work and family domains could be expected when the roles of each domain are considered very important to the person occupying them.

In terms of career theory, Super (1940) was ahead of his time in suggesting that work and family roles could interact in a positive way; however, he did not provide details as to how this occurs. The current study seeks to deepen our understanding of how individuals’ lives are enriched by occupying work and family roles; Super’s idea that multiple roles can be extensive within the life-space has found a compelling potential explanation in the current theoretical model of work-family enrichment postulated by Greenhaus and Powell (2006). The current study seeks to elucidate the processes of work-family enrichment, with the ultimate goal of understanding the factors that facilitate enrichment among workers with families.
PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON THE BENEFITS OF COMBINING WORK AND FAMILY ROLES

The emerging trend. Differentiating the concepts of the positive side of the interface
The most fundamental problem with existing research on the positive aspects of simultaneous devotion to work and family roles is the inconsistent definition of the positive linkages observed. For instance, the terms positive spillover, enhancement, enrichment and facilitation have often been used interchangeably to describe how work and family benefit each other, although an examination of the studies conducted quickly reveals that these terms refer to quite disparate phenomena (Carlson et al., 2006). The current study seeks to examine work-family enrichment in greater depth, the only one of the above-mentioned constructs that, to date, has generated a published, peer-reviewed theoretical model (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) and an empirically validated global measure (Carlson et al., 2006). Work-family enrichment has been most recently defined by Greenhaus and Powell as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (p. 72). The authors operationalize “quality of life”, as encompassing two elements: “high performance” in a given role within the receiving domain (either work or family) and “positive affect” experienced within a role in the receiving domain (p. 80). The authors propose that there are two potential pathways through which enrichment can occur: the instrumental path and the affective path. The instrumental path to enrichment occurs when resources obtained in one role directly improve performance in another role. The affective path to enrichment occurs when resources obtained in one role indirectly improve functioning in the other role through the resources’ influence on positive affect (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Greenhaus and Powell further specify that enrichment is bidirectional; specifically, work-to-family enrichment occurs when work experiences improve performance or affect in the family domain and family-to-work enrichment occurs when family experiences improve performance or affect in the work domain.

Another frequently cited phenomenon in the work-family interface literature is positive spillover (Crouter, 1984; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Grzywacz & Marks 2000a, 2000b; Grzywacz et al., 2002; Kirchmeyer 1992a, 1993, 1995; Stephens, Franks, & Atienza, 1997; Sumer & Knight, 2001; Voydanoff, 2001). According to Edwards and Rothbard (2000), “spillover refers to the effects of work and family on one another that generate similarities between the two domains” (p. 180). Crouter (1984) was one of the first researchers to examine the occurrence of positive spillover, specifically focusing on positive spillover from family to work. For instance, Crouter stated that positive spillover from family to work occurs when supportive family relationships and helpful skills and perspectives that originate in one’s home environment are used at work. Common constructs studied in the spillover literature are mood, values, skills, and behaviours (Carlson et al., 2006; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Edwards and Rothbard note that the work-family literature mentions two types of spillover: One type sees spillover as “similarity between a construct in the work domain and a distinct but related construct in the family domain” (p. 180); for example, the positive correlation between job and family satisfaction, or work and family values. The second type sees spillover as “experiences transferred intact
between domains” (p. 180), such as when work fatigue manifests within the home environment. From this perspective, spillover need not imply that experiences in the work domain actually shape or otherwise influence a construct in the family domain, or vice versa. As they remark, spillover does not refer to work fatigue inhibiting one’s ability to carry out family responsibilities. Edwards and Rothbard underscore that spillover does not imply a linking mechanism unless a construct in the receiving domain is altered in some way. This distinction fits nicely with Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) conceptualization of spillover as contrasted with enrichment; the latter implies that elements of one domain should have measurable impacts on individual role performance in the other domain. Carlson and her colleagues (2006) highlight this point, noting that the concept of enrichment incorporates the basic notion of positive spillover, but is distinct in that it requires more than the transfer of experiences from one domain to another; enrichment requires that these resources are “successfully applied in ways that result in improved performance or affect for the individual” (p. 133).

The concept of enhancement (Sieber, 1974; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Barnett, 1998; Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Ruderman et al., 2002; Tiedje et al., 1990; Voydanoff, 2002) is another representation of the positive interface between work and family that requires definition and distinction from enrichment for the purposes of the current study. Sieber (1974) first defined enhancement as “the acquisition of resources and experiences that are beneficial for individuals in facing life challenges” (as cited in Carlson et al., 2006, p. 133). The enhancement literature focuses on how multiple roles enhance self-esteem, confidence, and other such constructs, which can positively influence a myriad of outcomes in people’s work and family lives; however, unlike enrichment, enhancement does not specify how resources derived from one domain impact individual role performance in another domain. The term enhancement thus speaks more generally about the benefits associated with occupying multiple roles, and suggests that those benefits have the potential to meaningfully affect activities across the work and family spheres (Carlson et al., 2006).

Yet another term describing the positive interdependencies between work and family is facilitation (Frone, 2003; Hill, 2005; Wayne et al., 2004), defined by Frone (2003) as “the extent to which participation at work (or home) is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed at home (or work)” (p. 145). Clearly, Frone’s definition reflects the synergies between work and family life, and the potential for enhanced performance is implied. However, the concept of facilitation is not clearly differentiated from other terms reflecting the positive interface between work and family, to the extent that Frone refers to Grzywacz and Marks’ (2000a) study, which measures positive spillover, as an example of a study of “facilitation” (p. 152). Wayne, Musisca, and Fleeson (2004) have defined facilitation as “occurring when, by virtue of participation in one role (e.g., work), one’s performance or functioning in the other role (e.g., family) is enhanced” (p. 110). This definition, in isolation, sounds a great deal like Greenhaus & Powell’s (2006) current conceptualization of enrichment. Grzywacz and Butler (2005) have since called for further specification of the concept of facilitation. Like enrichment, positive spillover, and enhancement, Grzywacz and Butler note that
facilitation is also based in expansionist role theory (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). However, Carlson, Kaemar, Wayne and Grzywacz (2006), underscore Wayne and her colleagues’ (2004) key distinction between the concepts of facilitation and enrichment; the difference lies in the level of analysis. For enrichment, the emphasis is on positive outcomes in terms of individual role performance, whereas for facilitation, the emphasis is on positive outcomes relevant to the functioning of the entire system. For example, an enrichment question might be: how do resources gained through one’s role as a professional contribute to parenting skill? Whereas, a facilitation question might be, how do resources gained through one’s role as a professional contribute to family interaction? Based on the definition of enrichment provided at the beginning of this section, it is clear that facilitation is the closest, conceptually, to the construct under investigation in the proposed study; like enrichment, facilitation requires more than the mere transfer of resources, but the application of those resources resulting in improved outcomes.

The following sections will review the research that has been conducted on each of the above four constructs in turn, describing the findings regarding the benefits of combining work and family roles. In keeping with the positive focus of the proposed study, only the findings relevant to the positive side of the work-family interface will be included, even when the studies mentioned also consider work-family conflict. Each of these studies used self-report measures of the construct in question, with varying levels of validity.

Enrichment. Kirchmeyer (1992b) provided ample evidence of the expansion hypothesis in her study of resource enrichment occurring among individuals occupying work and nonwork roles. Referring to the “condition of resource expansion”, Kirchmeyer noted that “domain participation can even enrich the supply of resources which are available for use in other domains. Hence, the time and involvement which employed individuals spend in nonwork domains need not depress commitment to the employing organization, and could actually enhance it ” (p. 778). Kirchmeyer was particularly interested in the effect of resource enrichment on work attitudes; the researcher hypothesized that there would be a positive association between the resource enrichment experienced from nonwork domain participation and both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The three nonwork domains included in the study were parenting, community involvement and recreation. Kirchmeyer sampled 122 alumni of an undergraduate business program consisting of “early career professionals”, occupying low to middle-level management positions (p. 780). Resource enrichment was measured using 15 items developed by Kirchmeyer to reflect Sieber’s (1974) four categories of benefits associated with occupying multiple roles (privileges gained, status security, status enhancement, and personality development). Results supported Kirchmeyer’s hypotheses regarding organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Specifically, significant correlations were found between organizational commitment and resource enrichment from involvement in community and recreational domains. The same relationships were observed for job satisfaction. However, the correlations were not significant for parenting. Kirchmeyer suggested that further research should be undertaken to help explain the relationship between
"aspects of parenting and important work attitudes" (p. 791). In sum, Kirchmeyer was able to conclude that the business school alumni were experiencing resource expansion in terms of the supply available for work.

Cohen and Kirchmeyer (1995) studied the relationship between nonwork participation and organizational commitment. Most relevant to the proposed study, the researchers endeavoured to discover the personal resource enrichment occurring due to their informants’ activities outside of work. The research participants were 227 female nurses, and resource enrichment was assessed using eight items from Kirchmeyer’s (1992b) measure. While the construct studied here was supposedly enrichment, as Carlson and her colleagues (2006) note, the measure does not capture the full complexity of enrichment as most recently defined by Greenhaus and Powell (2006), because it does not ascertain enhanced performance in the work domain. Cohen and Kirchmeyer hypothesized that both high affective and high normative commitment to one’s organization would be associated with high resource enrichment from participation in nonwork roles, and that there would be no association between resource enrichment and continuance commitment. The researchers’ hypotheses were supported, suggesting that the more involvement in nonwork was considered by participants to enrich their resources for work, the greater their affective and normative commitment to their organizations. This finding has implications for increasing organizational loyalty, according to Cohen and Kirchmeyer (1995).

Positive spillover. The broad goal of Grzywacz and Marks’ (2000b) study was to "develop a more expanded conceptualization of the work-family interface and to identify significant correlates of both positive and negative spillover between work and family" (pp. 111–112). Using Ecological Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, as cited in Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b) as an overarching metatheory, as well as previous findings in the work-family area, Grzywacz and Marks hypothesized that the interface consists of four interrelated dimensions: negative work-to-family spillover, negative family-to-work spillover, positive family-to-work spillover, and positive work-to-family spillover. The researchers also sought to test the following hypotheses relating to positive spillover: family factors would be associated with more positive work-to-family spillover for women than men, while work factors would be associated with more positive work-to-family spillover for men than women; a lower level of positive spillover in both directions would be associated with fewer ecological resources, namely, less decision latitude, support from co-workers and superiors, and less spousal/familial affective support; and, a higher level of positive spillover between work and family would be associated with fewer ecological barriers, namely, less pressure at work, less spousal arguments, and a lower level of family criticism/ burden.

The researchers were also interested in discovering the effects, if any, of individual characteristics such as age, race/ethnicity, educational status, household income, parental status, marital status, employment status, neuroticism, and extraversion, on differences in spillover. In this study, positive spillover was measured using a total of eight items, four each for work-to-family and family-to-work spillover.

Regarding the postulated gender differences, Grzywacz and Marks (2000b) discovered that the women in their study reported more positive work-to-family...
spillover than did the men. In terms of work factors and positive work-to-family spillover, workplace resources were most strongly associated with positive spillover for both genders. When considering family factors and work-to-family spillover, more positive spillover was noted among men having an eldest child under the age of five years, than among men with no children. Another finding was that being in the lowest tertile of other family criticism/burden was associated with less positive spillover from work-to-family among women, contrary to prediction. Considering family factors and positive spillover from family to work, the researchers noted that less affectual support from spouse and other family members was associated with less positive spillover from family to work among both genders. Being unmarried was also strongly associated with less positive family-to-work spillover. As predicted, “a low level of family criticism/burden was associated with more positive spillover from family to work among women but not men” (p. 122). As well, Grzywacz and Marks discovered that fathers tend to experience more positive spillover from family to work in contrast to men without children, while this trend did not hold among women. Considering work factors and positive spillover from family to work, consistent with their hypothesis, Grzywacz and Marks found that less decision latitude at work correlated with less positive spillover from family to work. Similarly, a low level of support at work was associated with less positive spillover. Working alone was associated with less positive spillover from family to work among both women and men, whereas being in the lowest tertile of support at work was associated with less positive spillover from family to work among women only. Finally, working less than full time hours was associated with less positive spillover from family to work among women only.

Controlling for work and family factors, the researchers indeed found that certain individual characteristics were associated with positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b). For instance, younger men reported less positive spillover from family to work than did older men. In contrast, younger women reported more positive spillover from work to family than did their older counterparts. Education status and household income were clearly related to positive spillover from work to family; however, there were significant gender differences among these relationships. Lower positive spillover from work to family occurred among women with lower levels of education and earnings, but this association was not noted for the men in the study. Finally, the findings regarding personality characteristics revealed that women scoring higher in neuroticism experience less positive spillover between work and family, whereas both genders scoring higher in extraversion seem to experience more bi-directional positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b).

Grzywacz and Marks’ (2000b) study contributes to the literature on the positive side of the work-family interface in a number of ways. First, it highlights the importance of considering the reciprocal relationships between both positive and negative elements of work and family spheres. It also provides further evidence that positive spillover from work to family and family to work are distinct constructs, different from each other and from both directions of negative spillover. The authors also note that “limiting the work-family interface to work-family conflict is too simplistic. Work can have an independent positive spillover influence on family
life and family life can have an independent positive influence on work life” (p. 124). Part of the impetus of future research, they note, is to develop better workplace programs, policies and practices, and understanding the correlates of positive spillover can only enhance our capacity to do so.

In another study, Grzywacz and Marks (2000a) examined the association between work-family spillover and problem drinking, among a large, national sample of middle-aged adults. In this study, the researchers measured positive spillover in both directions, using three items for each direction. The items were non-parallel, meaning that there were different items for each direction (work-to-family and family-to-work). Once again using ecological theory as a metatheory, Grzywacz and Marks indicated that certain elements of the work-family interface would be likely to impact alcoholism, as well as other individual behaviours. The novelty of their study is that instead of merely focusing on the conflict between work and family systems that is associated with problem drinking, they hypothesized that more positive work-family spillover would be related to lower probability of alcoholism. As expected, Grzywacz and Marks found that a higher level of positive spillover from family to work was associated with lower odds of participants admitting to engaging in problematic alcohol consumption. However, the other direction of positive spillover revealed an unexpected finding: a higher level of work to family positive spillover results in higher odds of problem drinking. This association became even more robust when the researchers controlled for the psychological well-being of the participants. Grzywacz and Marks offered two possible explanations for this finding: The first is related to the social consumption of alcohol in certain work settings, such as parties and lunches. The second explanation involves the possibility of an individual characteristic (such as alcohol-related expectancies) moderating the association between positive spillover from work to family and problematic alcohol consumption. However, the second explanation could not be investigated, as the researchers had not collected such data.

Grzywacz, Almeida, and McDonald (2002) examine work-family spillover from the perspective of family life course theory, aiming to highlight “the importance of the temporal and social structural context” (p. 29). The researchers investigate whether or not there are differences in spillover by age, type of worker (service versus all other occupations), gender, marital and parental status, race (specifically, Blacks), education, and earnings. Grzywacz, Almeida, and McDonald hypothesize that positive work-family spillover would be greater among older workers relative to their younger counterparts. They further hypothesize that women, Blacks, lower-educated, and lowest income level individuals would experience the lowest level of positive work-family spillover. In this study, the same six items are used to measure positive work-family spillover (three for each direction) as in the Grzywacz and Marks (2000a) study described earlier. The researchers also use self-report “diary” data of “daily stressful experiences” (p. 30), collected via telephone interviews. Results support the researchers’ hypothesis that older workers would experience greater positive spillover from work to family. There is mixed support for hypotheses based on the social structural context variables listed above. Women reported higher levels of positive work to family spillover than did men, and Blacks reported more
positive family to work spillover than non-Blacks. Results show that participants
classified in the third quartile of earnings experience less positive work to family
spillover than those in the top quartile, but not the bottom quartile. In terms of marital
and parental status, having a child aged between six and 18 years was associated
with less positive family to work spillover compared to having no children. Being
married was associated with more positive family to work spillover than being
separated, divorced, widowed, or never married. With respect to occupation, respond-
ents employed in service types of jobs indicated greater work to family spillover
than did individuals employed in technical sales or administrative jobs, operators,
and fabricators, but less positive work to family spillover than people employed in
farming, fishing, or forestry occupations. The researchers note that their findings
suggest the need for policies and programs to be flexible in order to address the
diverse requirements of workers of different ages.

The work of Katherine Kirchmeyer (1992a, 1993, 1995) also figures prominently
in the work-family spillover literature. In one study, Kirchmeyer (1992a) “examined
the nature and predictors of the spillover from nonwork domains to work”. Although
this study only examined one direction of positive spillover (nonwork to work), its
findings were still instructive. Kirchmeyer referred to the expansionist hypothesis
of Marks (1977) and Sieber (1974), described earlier, in her hypothesis that employed
people would perceive more positive than negative nonwork-to-work spillover.
Kirchmeyer further hypothesized that people’s endorsement of statements representing
positive spillover would vary according to the type of nonwork in question, including
parenting, community work, and recreational/ hobby domains. Particularly relevant
to the earlier discussion of Super’s notion of role salience, Kirchmeyer also hypo-
thesized that positive spillover would be greater among individuals who viewed their
participation in a particular nonwork domain as “an integral part of their identities”
(p. 235). As well, the researcher hypothesized that higher satisfaction in the given
nonwork domain would correlate with greater endorsement of positive spillover.
Consistent with the expansionist hypothesis of role accumulation, Kirchmeyer’s final
hypothesis was that the greater the number of hours spent in the nonwork domain,
the greater the amount of positive spillover to work that could be expected.

In this study, Kirchmeyer (1992a) created a 15-item measure of positive spillover
derived from Sieber’s (1974) four postulated outcomes of occupying multiple
roles (role privileges, status security, status enhancement, and enrichment of the
personality) as well as the spillover experiences of workers noted in previous studies
(Crouter, 1984; Piotrkowski, 1979, as cited in Kirchmeyer, 1992a). Participants were
also asked for personal examples to illustrate their endorsement of the statements
assessing positive spillover and to provide further details on “other ways that the
nonwork domain affects work” (p. 237); according to Kirchmeyer, these questions
were aimed at uncovering yet unknown aspects of spillover.

Results indicated that as predicted, a large proportion of the participants deemed
their nonwork roles as “supporting, facilitating and enhancing” work roles. Consistent
with Kirchmeyer’s (1992a) second hypothesis, the degree of positive spillover from
nonwork to work differed depending on the particular nonwork domain; for example,
in terms of Sieber’s resources, status enhancement was more often endorsed in
the community domain as opposed to the parenting and recreational domains. Kirchmeyer’s third hypothesis regarding role involvement and positive spillover was also supported. However, her final two hypotheses regarding satisfaction and time spent in role performance were not entirely supported. Specifically, parental satisfaction did not predict positive nonwork to work spillover, and, contrary to prediction, time spent parenting was significantly negatively correlated with positive spillover from nonwork to work. Overall, the findings lend support to the notion that participation in nonwork domains results in positive outcomes for individuals’ work lives.

In a later study, Kirchmeyer (1993) sought to elucidate the strategies that enable male and female managers to cope with the demands of multiple roles in work, family, community and recreational domains, and how effective strategy use impacts spillover from nonwork to work. Kirchmeyer also investigated potential gender differences in nonwork-work relationships; specifically, the researcher examined these managers’ nonwork involvements, coping strategies, and spillover experiences. Kirchmeyer hypothesized the following with respect to positive spillover from nonwork to work: a) positive spillover would be positively correlated with ego involvement in, and time commitment to, nonwork; b) positive spillover would be positively correlated with higher satisfaction with nonwork; c) positive spillover would be positively correlated with more active coping (as opposed to number of strategies used); d) due to their greater nonwork demands, women would experience more positive (and negative) spillover than would men; e) coping strategies would be more predictive of spillover than would gender.

Kirchmeyer (1993) used the same 15-item measure of positive spillover described above in her 1992a study. Results indicated that as predicted, domain involvement was positively correlated with positive spillover for all three nonwork domains (parenting, recreation and community). The hypotheses with respect to time commitment and satisfaction were also supported. Furthermore, as predicted, active coping was positively correlated with people’s experience of positive spillover. Kirchmeyer’s correlational analysis revealed no gender effects on these managers’ experiences of positive spillover, and indeed, active coping strategies were more predictive of positive spillover than was gender. Once again, Kirchmeyer found support for the notion that the benefits of role accumulation outweigh the costs. She also cautioned that reducing involvement in one domain might also reduce individuals’ potential to experience positive outcomes in other domains.

Sumer and Knight (2001) examine how individuals with different attachment styles experience various levels of positive and negative spillover. The researchers take an individual difference approach to studying work-family linkages, noting, “attachment theory provides a platform for studying the question of work-nonwork relationships from a developmental/personality perspective” (p. 654). Sumer and Knight hypothesize that securely attached individuals (i.e., people who feel positively about themselves and those around them, and who value autonomy and close, connected relationships with others) would be more likely to experience positive spillover in work and family spheres than would individuals with preoccupied, fearful, or dismissing attachment styles. In this study, positive spillover is assessed within a
larger measure developed specifically for the investigation, the Work-Family Linkage Questionnaire (WFLQ), a 27-item self-report measure. The majority of the spillover items were adapted from the following authors: Kirchmeyer (1992a), and Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly (1983, as cited in Sumer & Knight, 2001). The WFLQ positive spillover subscales consist of four items measuring positive spillover from work to home, and five items measuring positive spillover from home to work. Results largely demonstrate support for Sumer and Knight’s hypothesis regarding securely attached individuals, with one exception: with respect to positive spillover from work to family, the difference between securely attached and preoccupied individuals was not significant (Sumer & Knight, 2001).

Stephens, Franks, and Atienza (1997) examine spillover among a sample of adult working women caring for their ill or disabled parents, with a view toward understanding the impact of positive and negative spillover on caregivers’ psychological well-being. Spillover is assessed in both directions, meaning from the caregiver role to the employment role, and vice versa. As well, the researchers seek to discover the relationships between spillover and positive affect or depression. Spillover is also investigated as a potential mediator of the relationship between role satisfaction and stress, and psychological well-being. Stephens and her colleagues hypothesize that spillover of positive experiences from one role to another would mediate the relationship between satisfaction in a particular role and positive affect. In this study, positive spillover is measured using three items for each direction (caregiving to employment and employment to caregiving) developed by Stephens and her colleagues; positive spillover is conceptualized in this study as “greater confidence and better moods in one role as a result of experiences in another role during the past month” (p. 32). The items are non-parallel, meaning different items represented positive spillover for each direction. Results indicate that each item representing positive spillover was endorsed by at least 60% of the sample. With respect to positive spillover’s contributions to well-being, only positive spillover from employment to caregiving contributed significantly to the variance in positive affect, whereas positive spillover from caregiving to employment was not a significant contributor. Finally, for positive spillover in both directions, the hypothesis that spillover was a mediator of the relationship between role satisfaction and positive affect was not supported.

Enhancement. Based on a role accumulation perspective, Ruderman and her colleagues (2002) study women managers to discover the potential benefits of occupying multiple roles, as well as to investigate the circumstances through which such positive outcomes may accrue. Ruderman and her colleagues (2002) noted two categories of managerial resources that could be enhanced through involvement in multiple roles, based on the role accumulation literature: psychological resources and social support. They also note a third category through which managerial resources could be enhanced, this time, from managerial learning research: further occasions to hone managerial skills. Ruderman and her colleagues are interested in advancing the understanding of the relationship between commitment to multiple roles and outcomes for women, and
therefore conduct their research in two phases. The first part entails a qualitative analysis of how women themselves view nonwork roles as contributing to their role in management. This exploratory, interview-based format allows the women to specify the types of nonwork roles that were salient to them, without assuming that these would necessarily be the roles of spouse, parent, and employee. It is designed to discover the “shared resources, skills, and outlooks that could be integrated or expanded across personal and professional domains” (p. 371). The second study seeks to go beyond transfer of skills to determine potential quantifiable relationships between occupying multiple roles and both psychological well-being and multi-rater measures of management skills. The two studies, taken together, are meant to “generalize the links between personal roles and managerial skills suggested by the first study to a more generic relationship between non-work roles and managerial effectiveness” (p. 371).

The first study reveals that indeed, women perceive their nonwork roles to hold resources that are clearly relevant to their performance as managers (Ruderman et al., 2002). The six themes of resources identified are as follows: Opportunities to enrich interpersonal skills; psychological benefits (including self-esteem and confidence) [also see Barnett & Hyde, 2001]; Emotional support and advice; Handling multiple tasks; Personal interests and background (useful for providing insights and garnering information relevant to work); and, Leadership (community involvement and volunteer work teaching comfort with authority, achieving goals through others, and how to implement organizational systems, for instance). The study thus extends the findings of the role accumulation literature suggesting that multiple roles provide benefits beyond the previously noted psychological well-being and emotional support; clearly, nonwork roles can enhance managerial skills.

Study two, involving a different sample of women, uses quantitative analysis to determine the relationship between women managers’ commitment to multiple roles (assessed through 21 items measuring perceptions of personal investment in five key life roles: occupational, marital, parental, community, and friendship) and psychological well-being, as well as managerial skills. The term commitment represents a different concept than simple role occupancy; it reflects the significance that particular role holds for an individual, and the degree of investment in the role (Greenberger & O’Neil, 1993, as cited in Ruderman et al., 2002). The researchers create a summary measure of participants’ commitment to the nonwork roles entitled, multiple life role commitment measure (p. 376). Their results indicate that managerial women who are committed to several roles are apparently highly satisfied with their lives in general, have a solid sense of self-worth, and, “acknowledge and accept multiple aspects of themselves” (p. 379). Additionally, multiple role commitment correlated with interpersonal skills and managerial task-related skills, as perceived not only by the focal managerial women, but also, their superiors, peers, and subordinates.

Ruderman and her colleagues’ (2002) study conforms closely to the concept of “enhancement” discussed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006), because it assesses how experiences in one role can produce positive experiences and outcomes in the other role; in other words, it assesses for the transfer of resources. Where it differs from
enrichment as defined by Greenhaus and Powell is in its failure to specify how the resources are “successfully applied in ways that result in improved performance or affect for the individual” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, as cited in Carlson et al., 2006).

In another study, Tiedje, Wortman, Downey, Emmons, Biernat, and Lang (1990) examined how professional women perceive the combination of their work and family roles and the implication of their perceptions for their mental health and role satisfaction. Tiedje and her colleagues hypothesized that women who perceive high levels of enhancement and low levels of conflict will experience less depression and increased satisfaction with both their work and family roles. Perceptions of enhancement were measured using a scale developed specifically for this investigation, with data emerging from pilot interviews in which 69 women were asked about their views on combining work and family roles. Nine enhancement items were used. The results demonstrated, in accordance with the role accumulation hypothesis (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974), that occupying the roles of wife, mother, and professional need not result in conflict; however, balancing multiple roles does not always result in perceptions of enhancement, either. The researchers indeed found that women who experienced low conflict and high enhancement were less depressed and more satisfied with their roles as parents. Furthermore, the study supported the notion that conflict and enhancement are two distinct constructs (Tiedje et al., 1990).

Facilitation. Grzywacz and Bass’ (2003) study aims to promote greater understanding of the concept of work-family fit, defined initially by Barnett (1998) as “a dynamic process of adjustment between work conditions and the characteristics of workers and their strategies to meet their own needs, as well as the needs of the other people or entities in their social system, and their interconnections (pp. 143–144). Grzywacz and Butler (2005) describe fit as an overarching concept that specifies how conflict and facilitation operate together. Grzywacz and Bass note that fit has not been clearly defined in the literature, and has often been conceptualized as the absence of conflict. Once again, there is a lack of “theoretical basis” as to how facilitation and conflict interact to produce desirable work or family outcomes (p. 249). Accordingly, Grzywacz and Bass attempt to articulate a more precise specification of work-family fit, using family resilience theory as a backdrop. Family resilience theory posits that a family’s resources or capabilities allow it to thrive in the face of significant risk (see Patterson, 2002). According to this theory, work-family facilitation may be the means through which conflict is diminished or eliminated, or tolerated more effectively. In the study, work-family facilitation is measured using six items, three for each direction (family to work and work to family). As in prior studies (e.g., Grzywacz, 2002), facilitation is actually measured using items more indicative of positive spillover, because when this study was conducted, no empirically validated measure of facilitation existed (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005). Grzywacz and Bass’ results indicate that work-family facilitation may moderate the effects of work-family conflict by “offsetting or redefining the meaning of the incoming stressor, thereby eliminating its threat” (p. 255). In other words, according to their general pattern of results, facilitation operates by buffering the effects of conflict. In the study, facilitation is also correlated with enhanced mental and physical wellness (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005).
Another study by Wayne, Musisca, and Fleeson (2004), examines the role of personality as an antecedent of both work-family conflict and facilitation (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). In this study, facilitation is defined as “occurring when participation in one role is made better or easier by virtue of participation in the other role” (p. 109). The authors propose that an individual’s personality can influence the level of facilitation that he or she experiences in work and family spheres. The study uses the Big Five (McCrae & Johnson, 1992) as a comprehensive personality measure to advance the research that has found relationships between isolated personality traits such as negative affectivity (Carlson, 1999, as cited in Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2004) Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. The researchers aim to include the positive side of the interface, or facilitation, in addition to conflict, ensuring to examine both directions of influence (family to work and work to family), and consequences of facilitation on work and family outcomes (namely, job and family effort and satisfaction). One of the key advances in the methodology of this study versus its predecessors is its use of a large, national random sample so that results could ostensibly be generalized more broadly than those of previous studies that tended to look at a small range of occupations and family structures (Wayne et al., 2004).

Wayne and her colleagues (2004) clearly explicate the fact that research on the concept of work-family facilitation, and the theories behind it “are in their infancy” (p. 111), and at the time of publication, no single established definition of facilitation or empirically valid measures of the concept existed. They therefore define facilitation as “occurring when, by virtue of participation in one role (e.g. work), one’s performance or functioning in the other role (e.g. family) is enhanced”. In light of the more recent differentiation of concepts discussed earlier in this literature review, it is easy to see how semantics can change one’s entire operationalization of a variable. Interestingly, Wayne and her colleagues’ (2004) definition of facilitation appears to be the closest to Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) concept of enrichment, given the inclusion of the idea that there must be an impact on performance in order to constitute “facilitation”. Greenhaus and Powell consider studies that evaluate the positive effects of experiences in one role on experiences or outcomes in the other role to be consistent with their concept of “enrichment” (p. 74). However, Carlson and her colleagues (2006) note that the study does not actually “measure improvement of performance in the receiving domain”, a necessary distinction between positive spillover and enrichment (p. 135).

Work-family facilitation is operationalized as follows: work involvement results in skills, behaviours, or positive mood which then positively influences the family. Family-work facilitation is operationalized as such: family involvement results in positive mood, support, or sense of accomplishment that improves coping, increases work effort, enhances confidence, or reenergizes (Wayne et al., 2004). Facilitation is measured using eight items, four each for work-family and family-work. The researchers in this study hypothesize that work to family facilitation would be positively related to family effort and satisfaction and that family to work facilitation would be positively related to job effort and satisfaction (Wayne et al., 2004).
In examining whether the Big Five personality traits predict work-family facilitation, Wayne and her colleagues (2004) find that personality traits indeed significantly predict the degree of facilitation. Specifically, extraversion was positively related to both directions of work-family facilitation, and conscientiousness and agreeableness was positively related to family-work facilitation, but not work-family facilitation. Openness to experience was positively related to work-family facilitation but not family-work facilitation. Finally, the results yield a weak yet statistically significant negative relationship between neuroticism and work-family facilitation.

As for the effects of facilitation on work-family outcomes, the authors discover that, contrary to their hypothesis, work-family facilitation was unrelated to family satisfaction and negatively related to family effort. However, a surprise finding is that work-family facilitation was positively related to job satisfaction and work effort. As well, family-work facilitation was only related to job effort, and not job satisfaction, lending only partial support to their hypothesis. A second surprise finding is that family-work facilitation was positively related to family satisfaction and family effort. As the authors rightfully note, the processes of the relationship between facilitation and outcomes in the spheres of work and family will be understood only with increasing theoretical development (Wayne et al., 2004). Moreover, a major issue methodologically is the use of a non-established measure of facilitation in this study, due to the lack of a valid measure of the concept altogether. As such, the authors call for greater effort with respect to scale development and construct validation.

In Hill’s (2005) study, work-family facilitation is measured using a two-item scale, and family-work facilitation is measured with a single item. Hill seeks to examine how working fathers and mothers in the United States are alike or different with respect to work, family, and individual characteristics; work-family conflict and facilitation; and work, family, and individual outcomes. Hill hypothesizes that work, family, and individual supports would be positively related to both directions of facilitation, and that work-family facilitation would have direct effects on work, family and individual outcomes, as well as satisfaction. Hill’s study is particularly concerned with the experiences of working fathers, as the researcher notes a dearth of literature specifically geared toward understanding how conflict and facilitation occur in fathers’ lives. Hill hypothesizes that there would be a positive relationship between being a working father and work-to-family facilitation, and a negative relationship between being a working father and family-to-work facilitation.

Hill’s (2005) results reveal that work-to-family facilitation is positively related to job satisfaction and life satisfaction, and negatively related to individual stress. Hill also finds that family-to-work facilitation is positively related to marital satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction, and negatively related to organizational commitment. In terms of the hypothesized gender differences, Hill finds that being a working father is not significantly related to either direction of facilitation. However, Hill reports two significant interactions in which gender moderates the association between work-family facilitation and conflict and work, family, and individual outcomes: First, there is a weaker positive association between family-to-work facilitation
and marital satisfaction for working fathers than for working mothers. Second, family-to-work facilitation is negatively related to organizational commitment for working fathers, while positively related for working mothers. In discussing his results, Hill also calls for greater attention to instrument development so that facilitation can be measured with the same rigor as conflict.

In sum, it is evident from the foregoing review that the development of testable theories regarding the positive side of the work-family interface has been hampered by a number of issues, including the difficulty defining and operationalizing the various constructs, the inadequacy of measures, and the multitude of variables under study. In order to draw meaningful conclusions about cross-role relationships, these issues must be resolved. The new theoretical model of work-family enrichment postulated by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) attempts to address the lack of meaningful theory in the literature by defining and operationalizing the construct of enrichment, and offering a series of proposals as to how enrichment likely occurs. This represents a significant step toward greater scientific rigor within the study of the benefits of cross-role relationships.

A THEORETICAL MODEL OF WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theoretical model of work-family enrichment extends the literature by “incorporating a wider range of resources generated in one role that may be applied to another role and proposing two different paths by which resources from one role may be applied to another” (p. 74). The authors note that previous research on enrichment using self-report measures failed to provide theoretical insight into the processes by which a full range of variables can produce the phenomenon of enrichment. The researchers therefore identify five kinds of resources theorized to promote enrichment: Skills and perspectives; Psychological and physiological resources; Social-capital resources; Flexibility; and, Material resources. As well, studies indicating a positive relationship between work and family experiences and outcomes have yet to specify the process of how certain role experiences (work or family) enrich experiences and outcomes in the other domain. Greenhaus and Powell therefore propose two mechanisms by which the promotion of enrichment may occur: The Instrumental path and the Affective path. To address another missing link in the literature, the authors identify three potential moderators that specify the conditions under which resources in one role are most likely to result in high performance or positive affect (i.e., quality of life) in another role. These moderators are: the salience of the role in the receiving domain (i.e., Role B in figure 1 below); the perceived relevance of the resource to the role in the receiving domain; and, the consistency of the resource with requirements and norms of the role in the receiving domain.

Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theoretical model of work-family enrichment may be viewed as a conceptual framework to extend Super’s (1940, 1990) broad theory that roles can be extensive within the life space. As indicated earlier, Super was interested in how individuals organize their life-careers, and in the interaction of multiple roles that are played in different environments. While Super’s view that
life roles can be supportive of one other is certainly consistent with the expansionist hypothesis within the role accumulation literature, what was sorely lacking in Super’s proposition is an explanation of how these roles can be supportive. Greenhaus and Powell’s model addresses this gap in its attempt to specify the elements that allow for benefits to accrue to individuals who occupy multiple roles. Figure 1 below depicts Greenhaus and Powell’s theoretical model of work-family enrichment (p. 79):

![Figure 1. Model of work-family enrichment.](image)

This section will describe the elements of the model (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 79; see Figure 1 above) in greater detail. First, as indicated earlier, the construct of enrichment is defined by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) as experiences in Role A (i.e. family or work) improving the quality of life in Role B (family or work). Greenhaus and Powell operationalize “quality of life” as encompassing high performance and positive affect (p. 80). The overarching idea is that resources generated in Role A can promote high performance and positive affect in Role B and that the extent to which a resource heightens performance and positive affect is moderated by the salience of Role B, the perceived relevance of the resource to Role B, and the consistency of the resource with the requirements and norms of Role B. Greenhaus and Powell define a resource as, “an asset that may be drawn on when needed to solve a problem or cope with a challenging situation” (p. 80); they refer to prior research (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Grzywacz, 2002) demonstrating that resource generation is integral to enrichment. This proposition is the first element of the model that serves to expand upon Super’s notion
that roles can be extensive; Greenhaus and Powell suggest that the benefits of occupying multiple roles stem from the resources offered by or created in each role.

Now to define the five resource types more concretely: First, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) define *skills* as “a broad set of task-related cognitive and interpersonal skills, coping skills, multitasking skills, and knowledge and wisdom derived from role experiences” (p. 80). *Perspectives* are defined as “ways of perceiving or handling situations” (p. 80). *Psychological and physical resources* are defined as “positive self-evaluations… personal hardiness… positive emotions about the future… and physical health” (p. 80). Greenhaus and Powell use Adler and Kwon’s (2002) definition of *Social capital*: “the goodwill that is engendered by the fabric of social relations and that can be mobilized to facilitate action” (p. 80). More specifically, Greenhaus and Powell focus on two forms of social capital resources in their model: influence and information. These resources stem from “interpersonal relationships in work and family roles that may assist individuals in achieving their goals”.

*Flexibility* is defined as, “discretion to determine the timing, pace, and location at which role requirements are met”. The last of the five key resources identified in Greenhaus and Powell’s theoretical model is *Material resources*, defined as, “money and gifts obtained from work and family roles” (p. 80).

Now to define the two paths to enrichment - the mechanisms thorough which resources accrued in Role A can result in high performance and positive affect in Role B - the *instrumental path* and the *affective path* (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). The instrumental path describes how a resource originating in Role A is transferred and has a direct “instrumental” effect on performance in Role B (see arrow 1 in Figure 1). There are numerous empirical findings that support the existence of the instrumental path to enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). As described earlier in this literature review, the instrumental path to enrichment is exemplified when Ruderman and her colleagues’ (2002) research participants reported that numerous resources from their personal lives improved their performance as managers; namely, interpersonal skills, respect for individual differences, and multitasking abilities. Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) found that flexibility in one’s work role provides opportunity for individuals to engage more fully in family activities and thus enriches family role performance. The proposition that resources generated in one role can directly affect performance in another role is a second element of Greenhaus and Powell’s model that serves to expand upon Super’s notion that roles can be supportive of one another.

The second mechanism, the “affective” path operates when a resource in Role A produces positive affect within that role, and as this positive affect is experienced, it is transmitted to Role B, enhancing performance and positive affect within Role B. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) define *positive affect* as “positive moods and positive emotions derived from role experiences” (p. 82). The researchers mention that positive affect experienced in one role can impact functioning in another role; as such, they note that there are two elements to the affective path that require explanation; first, that the accumulation of resources in Role A produces positive affect in Role A, and second, that positive affect experienced in Role A in turn positively impacts performance in Role B.
Greenhaus and Powell (2006) further describe the first element; specifically, they note that there are two ways in which resources derived from Role A can produce positive affect in Role A. First, resources derived from Role A directly promote positive affect in Role A (see arrow 2 in Figure 1). For example, social support obtained in the workplace enhances positive feelings about one’s work role (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Second, resources derived in Role A may improve performance in Role A (see arrow 3 in Figure 1) which then promotes positive affect in that role (see arrow 4 in Figure 1). In other words, sensing that one is doing well in a role often leads to positive feelings.

The second element of the affective path is how positive affect in Role A facilitates performance in Role B (see arrow 5 in Figure 1). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) draw primarily upon Rothbard’s (2001) research indicating that there are three mechanisms through which positive affect in one role can enhance performance in another role; Rothbard’s three explanations are founded on the premise that positive affect increases engagement which then affects performance: 1) Given that positive affect is related to benevolence and helping behaviour, a person experiencing positive affect is more likely to be psychologically available to engage in another role. 2) Positive affect is correlated with outward focus of attention, presumed to promote positive interpersonal interaction. 3) Positive affect can increase a person’s energy level, implicated in the ability to remain engaged in another role. In concluding their description of the paths to enrichment, the authors highlight that both the instrumental and affective path to enrichment can promote positive affect in Role B because of the effect of performance in Role B on positive affect in that role (see arrow 6 in Figure 1). The proposition that resources generated in a (work or family) role produce positive affect in that role, and second, that positive affect experienced in a (work or family) role in turn positively impacts performance in the other role, is a third element of Greenhaus and Powell’s model that serves to expand upon Super’s notion that roles can be supportive of one another.

In terms of moderators of the instrumental path, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) make a significant assumption; that is, individuals consciously transfer and apply resources from one role to another, with the exception of physical and psychological resources. The authors draw on expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) to reason the conditions under which individuals will transfer resources from a role in one domain to a role in another domain. Expectancy theory proposes that a person will be most likely to engage in a particular behaviour when the behaviour is likely to result in a highly valued outcome. According to Greenhaus and Powell’s instrumental path, “the behaviour in question is the application of a resource to Role B, and the outcome is high performance in Role B” (p. 84). The authors also posit that high performance in Role B is most valued when Role B is considered highly salient; that is, when Role B is central to a person’s identity. Greenhaus and Powell refer to social identity theory in making this proposition, noting that social roles comprise the essence of a person’s sense of self. With each different social role, a person experiences different social identities, the importance or salience of which varies and can be organized in a hierarchical fashion (Thoits, 1991). Greenhaus and Powell refer to Thoits’ (1991) research, stating that excelling in a role that is salient to one’s
self-concept is more closely tied to greater well-being than is excelling in a role that is less salient. The key is that the more salient roles provide greater meaning and purpose in people’s lives (Thoits, 1991). This echoes Super’s (1982) work on role salience and the meanings that people ascribe to the various roles they occupy in the life-career rainbow (1980; 1984; 1990).

Another moderating variable related to expectancy theory is that, as Greenhaus and Powell (2006) theorize, “an individual is most likely to apply a resource generated in Role A to Role B when he or she believes that application of the resource will have positive consequences” (p. 84). Greenhaus and Powell refer to this moderator as the *perceived relevance of the resource*. The third moderating variable in the instrumental path is that “resources generated in Role A are more likely to directly promote high performance in Role B when the resources are consistent with the requirements and norms of Role B than when they are inconsistent with the requirements and norms of Role B” (p. 86). Greenhaus and Powell refer to this moderator as the *consistency of the resource with requirements and norms* within the receiving domain. Finally, Greenhaus and Powell postulate one moderator of the affective path: the salience of Role B. Referring once again to Rothbard’s (2001) conceptualization of how positive affect impacts role engagement, Greenhaus and Powell note that “although positive affect derived from one’s family (work) role may expand the tendencies to be helpful, available, and energized, these tendencies may not be applied to a work (family) domain that is peripheral rather than central to one’s self-concept” (p. 86).

Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) proposition that there are specific moderators of the enrichment process represents a fourth element that more clearly specifies Super’s notion that roles can be supportive of one another. Greenhaus and Powell are, in essence, indicating the conditions that they believe can either promote or prevent the occurrence of work-family enrichment.

A VALID GLOBAL WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT SCALE

Greenhaus and Powell (2006), in presenting their theoretical model of work-family enrichment, call for “a measure of global work-family enrichment [to be] developed to determine which factors contribute most prominently to overall enrichment” (p. 86). Most recently, Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, and Grzywacz (2006) have answered this call and published just such a measure, closely based on Greenhaus and Powell’s conceptualization of enrichment, with some exceptions. This section will detail the use of Greenhaus and Powell’s construct of enrichment in developing the first multi-dimensional, empirically valid measure of this concept, as well as the implications for use of the instrument in furthering theoretical development of enrichment through the empirical research propositions suggested by Carlson and her colleagues (2006), as well as Greenhaus and Powell.

Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne and Grzywacz (2006) provide a useful and informative critique of the existing measures of the positive side of the work-family interface, and attribute the shortcomings of these measures largely to inconsistent definitions of the construct under study. As detailed earlier, there are several different labels
ascribed in the literature proposed to represent positive cross-role relationships, including positive spillover, enhancement, and facilitation, but upon closer inspection, none of these matches the recent construct development of enrichment as defined by Greenhaus and Powell (2006). Specifically, none of the published studies actually measured performance improvement in the receiving domain, or Role B, which is a key distinction between positive spillover and enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006). Moreover, none of these other concepts has rigorously developed or validated measures; thus, not only are they inappropriate for measuring enrichment, but also, they are not valid measures of these other “enrichment-like” constructs (Carlson et al., 2006). Another problem associated with the definitional inconsistency and lack of rigor in measurement is that it is difficult to compare findings across studies of the positive work-family interface. A further issue is that existing measures of the positive interface are all unidimensional, whereas empirical findings continue to suggest that enrichment, like the other positive constructs, is multidimensional (Carlson et al., 2006).

Carlson and her colleagues (2006) address the limitations of previously published research on the positive interface between work and family by presenting the first empirically valid self-report measure of enrichment, expressly designed so that it “captures the extent to which resource gains experienced in one domain are transferred to another in ways that result in improved quality of life in the other role for the individual” (p. 135). The purpose of this measure is to differentiate enrichment from other constructs representing the benefits of combining work and family roles, and thus further theory building and research. Where Carlson and her colleagues depart from Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theory is that in constructing the measure of enrichment, the former group do not limit themselves ad hoc to the five categories of resource gains specified by Greenhaus and Powell, namely, Skills and perspectives; Psychological and physiological resources; Social-capital resources; Flexibility; and, Material resources. Instead, Carlson and her colleagues (2006) “created an exhaustive list of possible resource gains to ensure that [they] captured the meaningful ways by which work and family benefit each other” (p. 135). They derived items by reviewing the literature, existing scales, consulting experts in the research area, and using personal anecdotes, in order to ensure that more potential resources would be captured in their measure of enrichment. As a result of their item generation exercise, Carlson and her colleagues generated a list of 14 resource gains, as opposed to Greenhaus and Powell’s five categories of resources. These included: “perceptions by others, behaviour, skills, knowledge, perspectives, time, energy, resources, support, self-fulfilment, self-esteem/ self-efficacy, moods, and attitudes” (p. 139). Following an exploratory factor analysis of the 84 initial scale items, Carlson and her colleagues determined that for each direction of enrichment (i.e., work-to-family and family-to-work), three factors captured the resource gains. Interestingly, as suggested in previous research (Frone 2003; MacDermid, 2003), the three factors captured were not identical for each direction, because, as predicted by Carlson and her colleagues, the “function and activities of these two systems are not completely similar and therefore may provide qualitatively different types of resource gains” (p. 135). Carlson and her colleagues labelled the factors as
follows: For the work-to-family enrichment direction, *work-family capital* (psychosocial resources including security, confidence, accomplishment, and fulfilment), *work-family affect* (positive mood or attitude), and *work-family development* (skills, knowledge, behaviours and perspective, indicating intellectual and personal development). For the family-to-work direction, the first two factors were similar to the work-to-family direction: *family-work development* (skills, knowledge, behaviours and perspective), and *family-work affect* (positive mood or attitude). The third factor, unique to the family-to-work direction, was labelled *family-work efficiency* (defined as “when involvement with family provides a sense of focus or urgency which helps the individual to be a better worker” p. 141). After item purification procedures carefully described in their original article (Carlson et al., 2006), the researchers retained 18 items that would comprise the final scale, which they then validated in a number of ways, including assessing content adequacy, dimensionality, reliability, factor structure invariance, convergent validity, divergent validity, and the relationship of the scale to work and family correlates suggested by the literature (Carlson et al., 2006).

The enrichment scale developed by Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, and Grzywacz (2006) offers several improvements relative to other measures of the positive side of the work-family interface. Unlike some other measures of the positive work-family interface (see Kirchmeyer, 1992b; Tiedje et al., 1990), it captures both directions of work-family enrichment (work-to-family and family-to-work). As well, unlike previous measures, it fully captures the complexity of the construct of enrichment by including resources gained in one domain, their transfer to another domain, and their and successful application within the receiving domain, represented by improved functioning. The authors were deliberate in ensuring that for each item, respondents perceived not only the existence of the resources but also, their successful application in the receiving domain. The scale was also deliberately developed to reflect the multidimensional nature of enrichment. Other advantages include its methodological rigor, its having been tested across five samples, its validation in numerous ways, and its assessment in relation to potential antecedents and consequences, as suggested in the existing literature (Carlson et al., 2006).

While the publication of Carlson and her colleagues’ (2006) measure of the enrichment construct is certainly an advancement of the positive work-family interface literature, a global measure of the construct alone is insufficient to elucidate the processes behind enrichment. The theoretical foundation of the measure, however, is definitely relevant to the proposed study, as it was developed using the main theoretical tenets of Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) conceptualization of enrichment and I am thus interested in the theoretical principles that support this measure.

**STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Donald Super’s (1940; 1990) idea that multiple roles could be extensive as opposed to conflictual in an individual’s life space was a pioneering, post-modern thought well ahead of its’ time. What is missing in Super’s writings is an explanation of
how these multiple roles interact to enrich each domain, or “theatre”, as Super stated. Today, it is more widely accepted that there are benefits to devoting oneself to both work and family roles, yet the literature is still largely dominated by a conflict perspective. Although there is some evidence of positive work-family linkages within the literature, there is a problem integrating the empirical findings and understanding the basis for these linkages. As well, the constructs themselves were not based on empirical investigations. Also, the processes by which these relationships occur remain undocumented. Enter Greenhaus and Powell (2006), with a compelling conceptual framework that presents several propositions regarding work-family enrichment. Greenhaus and Powell’s theory of work-family enrichment may indeed be the extension of Super’s early idea that remained undeveloped. The issue is, however (and Greenhaus and Powell readily admit this), that only half the work has been done. The theoretical model of enrichment needs to be validated empirically in order to be considered a viable model to inform us about this intriguing phenomenon. Without rigorous empirical support, it will remain merely another framework to describe the work-family interface with little implication for benefiting individuals, families, or organizations. As Greenhaus and Powell (2006) state, “We recommend that a comprehensive research program be conducted to test the validity of the model proposed…” (p. 86).

As noted earlier, while a global measure of enrichment has recently been published (Carlson et al., 2006), this instrument alone will not allow for the elucidation of the processes underlying enrichment, or for the validation of the complex model. Because its theory development is still at an early stage, the construct of enrichment is ripe for qualitative inquiry. Qualitative research will enable discovery of information to help elaborate this model and extend it further. The current study will become one of the first pieces of empirical evidence to support and enrich the framework presented by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) and elevate it to the status of an empirically validated theory. As such, the current study will seek to provide evidence explaining the interrelationships among the variables proposed by Greenhaus and Powell.

From a psychological perspective, this researcher is interested in understanding more about how people feel about occupying multiple roles. This is relevant to Super’s notion of how individuals organize their life-careers. Can both work and family roles be considered salient to individuals and performance in each not only not suffer, but improve? How are multiple roles supportive of one another? What would be the potential impact of discovering how individuals can perform better in both work and family roles? The current study seeks to deepen our understanding of how individuals’ lives are enriched by occupying work and family roles. Super’s (1940; 1990) idea that multiple roles can be extensive within the life-space has found a compelling potential explanation in the current theoretical model of work-family enrichment postulated by Greenhaus and Powell (2006). The current study seeks to elucidate the processes of work-family enrichment, with the ultimate goal of understanding the factors that facilitate enrichment among workers with families.

Attempting to validate the entire theoretical model of work-family enrichment introduced by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) within a single qualitative study would
be a monumental if impractical undertaking. Since to date, no empirical studies have been conducted to support this framework, the current study seeks to add to the literature by exploring the validity of several of its propositions, and providing a sense of the psychology of enrichment, as only an in-depth exploration of people’s experiences can. Given the limitations of prior quantitative research in elucidating the processes underlying positive work-family linkages, the current study aims to further our understanding of how work-family enrichment occurs. Understanding the processes of enrichment can help to determine the putative antecedents and outcomes of this phenomenon, as only systematic study can reveal the means of facilitating enrichment to the benefit of workers, their families, and their organizations (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005; Kossek et al., 1999).

The particular research method used, the Critical Incident Technique, allows for an in-depth exploration of episodes of work-family enrichment and for verification of Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) proposed pathways to enrichment and the proposed resources that are implicated in enrichment. The semi-structured nature of the interview permits other potential themes to emerge that allows for theory refinement and elaboration. In summary, the goal of the current study is to describe and explain the phenomenon of work-family enrichment, and as such, an in-depth analysis of the conditions under which enrichment occurs is essential. The main research question of this study is: How does occupying work and family roles enhance performance in each domain? Within this investigation, a range of aspects are explored; for example, what dimensions or elements of each domain are transferred and applied to the other domain? What aspects of performance are affected? What are the processes by which work-family enrichment occurs? And, ultimately, how can work-family enrichment be facilitated?