Work-Life Conflict: Factors Associated with Negative Spillover from Home to Work

Susan Schmidt

Faculty Sponsor: Enilda Delgado, Department of Sociology/Archaeology

ABSTRACT

Work-life conflict can have adverse affects on both families and workplaces, impacting the wellbeing of society as a whole. One area of existing research on work-life conflict has focused on negative spillover from home to work. More specifically, when the stress from factors in individuals' home and family life extends into and adversely affects functioning in the workplace. The purpose of this study was to further examine the factors associated with negative home-to-work spillover through a quantitative study of secondary data. Using nationally representative data from the 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, this study analyzed home and family characteristics, occupational characteristics, and demographic characteristics of employed adults in the United States to identify which factors were most significantly predictive of negative home-to-work spillover. Stress in personal/family life was identified as the most significant predictor of negative spillover for both males and females. Among males, division of cleaning responsibilities and occupation were also significant predictors. The presence of children under the age of six in the home was found to be a significant predictor of spillover for females.

INTRODUCTION

The ability to successfully balance the role expectations of work and home life is an ongoing matter affecting working individuals. Factors in both the workplace and at home can impede one's ability to effectively balance the role expectations of work and home, creating conflict between these two domains. Work-life conflict can have adverse affects on both families and workplaces, impacting the wellbeing of society as a whole. Adverse affects associated with high levels of work-life conflict include increased anxiety and depression (McBrier et al. 2003), poor job performance, and increased absenteeism (Anderson et al. 2002; Frone 2003). A study by Williams (2005), comparing survey data on working adults in the United States in 1977 to similar 1997 data, found that instances of self-reported work-life conflict had increased from the earlier data, adding to the importance of this topic being further examined.

Within the existing research on work-family conflict, attention has been given to the concept of negative spillover between the role expectations of work and family, that is, when the stress from the roles in one of these domains extends into and negatively affects the roles in the other domain (Kiger et al. 2007; Westman 2005). While previous research has been conducted on both facets of negative spillover, from home to work and from work to home, this study exclusively focused on the predictors of negative spillover from home to work. Reflecting the trend of women entering the workforce in large numbers over the past few decades, much of the previous research has focused on gender differences in negative spillover from home to work. Associated with this trend, many previous studies have also chosen to focus on particular groups of individuals (e.g. dual-earner couples, parents), leaving few studies conducted regarding predictors of negative spillover from home to work among all working individuals. In an attempt to add to the understanding of negative spillover from home to work for all individuals, this study examined data from the 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce on working individuals regardless of marital or parental status.

Knowing that work-life conflict has increased among U.S. workers and that negative spillover from home to work can have adverse effects on both families and workplaces, it is important to identify both the factors associated with negative spillover from home to work and the groups most affected by it. This study adds to the exiting literature by identifying home/family characteristics, occupational characteristics, and demographic characteristics associated with negative spillover from home to work in hopes of increasing the understanding of what may be done to alleviate the adverse affects it has on families and workplaces.

Home and Family Characteristics

When attempting to identify the predictors of negative spillover from home to work, it is imperative to consider the characteristics in home and family life that are most likely to conflict with role expectations at work. Previous studies have identified the presence of children in the home as one of the most prevalent significant predictors of negative home-to-work spillover, although there are disparities in the research when it comes to determining the extent to which the age of and number of children predict this spillover (Bayfield et al. 2005; Dilworth 2004; Jarvis et al. 2005; Kiger et al. 2007; Maume 2006). The results of one study of working adults found that parents with more children of all ages reported higher levels of negative home-to-work spillover (Brayfield et al. 2005). In contrast, Dilworth's (2004) study of married parents found that having more children in the household actually predicted lower negative spillover from home to work for mothers, although one of the strongest predictors for mothers was the presence of young children in the home. Kiger et al. (2007) also found that mothers with preschool aged children experienced higher levels of negative home-to-work spillover. Furthermore, in a comparison of data on married couples and parents from 1977 to 1997, parental status was the most consistent predictor of work-family conflict for all groups (Winslow 2005). Despite the slight variations in study samples and outcomes regarding age and number of children, these results reveal a consensus among previous research in that workers with children in the home are more likely to experience greater negative home-to-work spillover than workers without children in the home.

In addition to caring for children, workers may also find themselves caring for others, such as elderly parents or other relatives. In Marks' (1998) study on the effects of caregiving on middle aged men and women, caregivers were found to experience more negative home-to-work spillover than non-caregivers. This result was correlated with psychological and physical health issues for the caregivers (Marks 1998). The results of another study, comparing spillover prevalence among different generations, showed that individuals categorized in the 'matures' generation (those over age 51) spent more time caring for an elderly person than individuals in other generational categories. However, this time spent caring for elderly did not contribute to negative home-to-work spillover for matures (Dilworth and Kingsbury 2005). This may be, in part, due to the likelihood that those over age 51 would not have young children in the home or may have older children who can assist in the caregiving. Despite these results, it is important to consider elderly caregiving as a possible predictor of negative home-to-work spillover as it may further add to difficulties of balancing work and home life, as noted in Marks' (1998) study.

Consistent with the idea that caring for others at home, especially young children, may increase negative home-to-work spillover, one would expect that time spent on childcare, household chores, and cooking would also be a factor associated with spillover. Surprisingly, studies that have examined these variables in relation to spillover have not found them to be significant predictors of negative spillover from home to work (Dilworth 2004; Dilworth and Kingsbury 2005). Noted in this literature is the possible inaccuracy of self-reported time spent on childcare and household chores. Supporting this possibility, Coltrane (2001) found that, among married couples, women spent a significantly greater amount of time performing household chores than their husbands, and Hill (2005) found that fathers spent fewer hours on household chores and childcare than mothers. In contrast, the data examined by Dilworth (2004) showed fathers self-reported only a fraction fewer hours spent on housework than mothers. Considering that self-reported time spent on home and family care may not be accurate, it is important to consider alternative ways of measuring household chores and childcare to ensure the reliability of these variables.

Studies also suggest that individuals' assessments of equality or level of satisfaction with home and family life are significant factors associated with spillover. Kiger et al. (2007) found that high levels of satisfaction with how housework was delegated decreased negative home-to-work spillover for women. Furthermore, Dilworth (2004) found decreased family life satisfaction to be one of the strongest predictors of negative spillover. These results suggest the importance of considering perceptions of home and family life, not just time constraint factors at home, when attempting to identify predictors of negative spillover from home to work.

Occupational and Educational Characteristics

In addition to home and family characteristics, occupational and individual characteristics related to employment may affect work-life conflict, leading to greater spillover from home to work. In particular, studies have found that employees who reported feeling time pressure on the job were more likely to experience negative spillover from home to work (Brayfield et al 2005; Jarvis et al. 2005; Voydanoff 2005). A study by Jarvis et al. (2005) found that individuals employed as professionals experienced higher levels of negative spillover from home to work than individuals working in all other occupational categories. Furthermore, a study of married full-time workers with children found the same results, but occupational category was only a significant predictor of negative home-to-work spillover for women, revealing that other factors may be impacting these results (Maume 2006).

Similarly, Brayfield et al. (2005) found that flexibility in workplace scheduling to attend to family responsibilities decreased negative home-to-work spillover, but only for men, while Keene et al. (2005) found no gender differences in spillover among workers with flexible schedules. In addition, some studies have found that females were more likely than males to have self-imposed adjustments to their work because of family responsibilities (Keene and Reynolds 2005; Maume 2006). These results suggest that the additional factors that may mitigate occupational characteristics associated with negative home-to-work spillover may differ for men and women.

In examining how the number of hours worked outside of the home predicts negative home-to-work spillover, the results also differed somewhat based on gender. One study, focusing solely on dual-earner couples, found that as hours worked increased, negative home-to-work spillover increased, but this was significant for men only (Kiger et al. 2007). Hill (2005) found that fathers worked more hours outside the home than mothers, but fewer hours on childcare and household chores. Inconsistent with the results presented by Kiger et al. (2007), Hill (2005) also found that, even though fathers had a higher number of work hours than mothers, fathers experienced less home to work conflict than mothers. Another study yielded similar results, revealing a positive relationship between work hours and negative home-to-work spillover for women (Maume 2006). Dilworth (2004) found that, for mothers only, the number of hours worked outside of the home was a significant predictor of negative home-to-work spillover, even though mothers reported working less average hours than fathers. Voydanoff (2005) also found hours worked outside the home to be significantly related to negative home-to-work spillover, although it was interestingly negatively related. These results show that there is definitely an inconsistency in the literature in regards to how hours work per week affect negative spillover from home to work. The differences in these results may be due to the fact that these some of these studies focused on particular groups (e.g. married couples, parents) or used differing data and therefore also operationalized the spillover variable differently. In addition, the control and predictor variables used often varied from one study to another, possibly adding to the differences in these findings.

In relation to occupational characteristics, educational characteristics may also be important factors associated with negative spillover. Studies have found a higher level of education to be associated with a higher level of negative home-to-work spillover (Brayfield et al. 2005; Dilworth 2004; Voydanoff 2005). This may be due to the fact that individuals with higher education levels occupy employment positions that are more demanding or require longer hours of work. These results would be consistent with results, mentioned earlier, that found individuals employed as professionals and individuals feeling time pressure on the job were more likely to experience negative home-to-work spillover.

Demographic Characteristics

Demographic characteristics are also important to consider when examining factors associated with negative spillover from home to work, as both possible predictors and controls. As already made apparent, gender stands out as an important and not fully understood component in predicting negative home-to-work spillover. The primary focus of many studies has been on gender differences in the prevalence of negative home-to-work spillover. As discussed earlier, gender differences have been shown to exist among several factors associated with negative spillover from home to work, but the existing literature reveals an inconsistency in determining whether gender itself is a significant predictor. Keene and Reynolds' (2005) study of married workers revealed that women were more likely than men to report their job performance had been adversely affected by family demands, and that women made more work adjustments due to family demands than men. Furthermore, some studies have shown that women are more likely to experience negative spillover than men (Jarvis et al. 2005; Voydanoff 2005). In contrast, a study by Cook and Minnotte (2008) found no significant difference between family to work conflict between men and women. Given the complexity of the factors that predict negative spillover from home to work for men and women, further research into these disparities is warranted.

In addition to gender, the demographic characteristics of race and age are important components to include when determining factors associated with negative home-to-work spillover. A study by Jarvis et al. (2007), focusing on variations in spillover in relation to race and gender among married workers, found the most significant gender disparities in negative home-to-work spillover among Hispanics. This study suggested that gender role attitudes might have contributed to these results, as it also found that Hispanics held the most traditional attitudes about work and childcare responsibilities for men and women. Knowing that race and ethnicity may influence attitudes, it is important to incorporate this factor into any study involving spillover. In addition, employees identified as belonging to the baby boom generation (aged 33-51) were found to experience more negative spillover when compared to adults in other generations (Dilworth and Kingsbury 2005), revealing that age is an important factor to control for as well.

Theoretical Framework

The concept of spillover can be better explained by understanding the multiple roles perspective. This model explains that individuals occupy different roles (e.g. worker, parent) that are accompanied by different role expectations (Wallen 2002). While these roles may take place in separate areas of one's life (e.g. home, workplace), the boundaries of these areas are not impermeable to the effects of experiences in other areas of life. This idea creates the foundation for the concept of spillover between the roles of work and home life, when the effects of factors in one domain of life spillover and affect another domain, either positively or negatively (Cohen et al. 2008; Wallen 2002).

One important concept that falls under the multiple roles perspective and gives greater understanding to work-life conflict and spillover is role conflict. When the role expectations of one's home life compete with one's role expectations in the workplace, individuals experience role conflict (Cohen et al. 2008). This concept, that conflict occurs between the role expectations of work and home life, adds to the understanding of the basis of negative spillover from home to work, the primary focus of this study. Negative home-to-work spillover occurs when the stress from roles in the home and family domain extends into and negatively affects the roles held by individuals in the workplace (Cohen et al. 2008; Kiger et al. 2007; Westman 2005). The purpose of this study is to determine the characteristics most significantly predictive of individuals' likelihood to experience negative spillover from home to work.

Current Study

While there is a substantial background of research on negative spillover from home to work, this study adds to the collective understanding of the topic by using the most recent available data on which studies on this topic could not be found in the existing literature. Using the framework set forth by previous studies, the focus of this study was on identifying the strongest predictors of negative home-to-work spillover among adult workers in the United States. Because of the inconsistencies that existed in previous research regarding gender, this study focused on identifying the strongest predictors for males and females separately.

The following hypotheses were tested:

H1: Female workers are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than male workers (Jarvis et al. 2005; Keene & Reynolds 2005; Voydanoff 2005).

H2: Workers with children under the age of six in the home are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than workers without children under the age of six in the home (Bayfield et al. 2005; Dilworth 2004; Jarvis et al. 2005; Kiger et al. 2007; Maume 2006; Winslow 2005).

H3: Working mothers are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than working fathers (Dilworth 2004; Jarvis et al. 2005).

H4: Workers employed as managers/professionals are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than workers in all other occupational categories (Jarvis et al. 2005; Maume 2006).

H5: Workers with higher levels of education are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than workers with lower levels of education (Brayfield et al. 2005; Dilworth 2004; Voydanoff 2005).

DATA AND METHODS

The data used for this study come from the 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW). The NSCW, conducted by the Families and Work Institute, has been completed every five years since 1992 and provides survey data on a nationally representative sample of employed adults in the United States. The most recent study consists of data from 3,502 individuals surveyed from November 2007 through April 2008. Telephone interviews were conducted using a cross-sectional random sample of employed adults. The interviews, averaging 50 minutes in length, asked questions about the respondents' attitudes and behaviors associated with family and work life. Because self-employed individuals have presumably different working conditions than individuals working for an employer (e.g. ability to set own hours), their data was excluded from this study. The sample analyzed for this study included 2,769 wage and salaried workers.

Measures

Negative spillover from home to work. This variable is an index included in the NSCW data. To assess negative spillover from home to work, respondents were asked how often in the past three months they: did not have enough time for their job because of their family or personal life; their family or personal life drained them of the energy they needed to do their job; their family or personal life kept them from doing as good a job at work as they could; they have been in a bad mood at work because of their personal or family life; their personal family life kept them from concentrating on their job. Responses ranged from 1=never through 5=very often. The negative spillover

from work to home index (Cronbach alpha = .801) is an average of these five variables and is coded as 1 = low spillover to 5 = high spillover.

Home and family characteristics. Because negative spillover from home to work measures the effects of personal/family life on individuals' functioning in the workplace, this study focused on examining factors found to be significant predictors of spillover in previous research. The variables used included marital status, children under six in household, elderly caregiver status, division of cooking responsibilities, division of cleaning responsibilities, and stress in personal/family life.

Marital status is a dichotomous variable measuring whether or not the respondent reported having a spouse or partner in residence. Respondents reporting children under the age of six in household was defined as children living with the respondent for at least half of the year. To measure elderly caregiver status, respondents were asked the following question: "During the past year, have you provided special attention or care for a relative or in-law 65 years old or older – helping with things that were difficult or impossible for them to do themselves?" To assess division of cooking and cleaning responsibilities, respondents were asked "In your household, who takes the greatest responsibility for cooking?" and "In your household, who takes the greatest responsibility for cleaning?" For analysis purposes, both of these variables were recoded into the following four separate dichotomous variables that reflected responses to the questions asked of respondents: I do vs. Other; My spouse/partner does vs. Other; I share this responsibility about equally with my spouse/partner vs. Other; and Someone other than self or spouse/partner vs. Other. Finally, to measure stress in personal/family life, respondents were asked the following question: "Not thinking about work, how stressful has your personal and family life been in recent months – extremely stressful, very stressful, somewhat stressful, not very stressful, or not stressful at all?"

Occupational and educational characteristics. Because certain occupational and educational factors have been shown by previous studies to be significantly related to negative home-to-work spillover, this study included these measures in its analysis. These variables included education level, occupational category, hours worked per week, and schedule flexibility to manage work and family. To assess education level, respondents were asked: "What is the highest level of schooling you have completed?" The six categories of responses included: less than high school diploma, high school or GED, some college/no degree, associate degree, four-year college degree, and graduate/professional degree. Occupational category is a dichotomous variable that measures whether the respondent is employed in a manager/professional occupation or other occupational category in their main job. Hours worked per week is a measure of all hours worked per week in all jobs. Schedule flexibility to manage work and family was measured by asking respondents how much they agreed or disagreed that they had schedule flexibility to manage work and family. Responses were recorded on a four-point scale, from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Demographic characteristics. Additional factors commonly used in spillover research were incorporated in this analysis. These variables included gender, age, race, and family income. Gender is measured as a dichotomous variable. Because of the small number of non-white respondents in the sample, race was dichotomized into white non-Hispanic and other. Age of respondent is measured in years. Total annual family income was measured in the following quintiles and represents 2008 dollars: < $32,240; $32,241 to $55,120; $55,121 to $78,000; $78,001 to $114,400; and > $114,400.

Statistical Analysis

A quantitative analysis of the data was used to examine factors associated with negative spillover from home to work for female and male respondents separately. Univariate analyses (frequencies and descriptive statistics), bivariate correlation analyses, and multivariate analyses using ordinary least squares regression were conducted to test the hypotheses and to identify the strongest significant predictors of negative spillover from home to work. While the N values presented were calculated using unweighted data, the variable wagewt3 was used to weight the data for the remainder of the analyses in this study to ensure that a reliable representation of the United States population was provided.

RESULTS

Descriptive characteristics of male and female wage and salaried workers are presented in Table 1. The results showed that, on average, female workers reported slightly higher negative spillover from home to job than males, with mean scores of 2.14 and 2.08 respectively. These scores indicate that both male and female respondents reported levels of negative spillover that fall below the mid point of low and high negative home-to-work spillover.

Table 1. Descriptive Characteristics of Wage and Salaried Males and Females

Variable	Males (N=1253) Valid % or Mean	(N)	Females (N=1516) Valid % or Mean	(N)
Negative spillover from home to job	2.08	(1251)	2.14	(1515)
Marital status				
Spouse/partner in residence	70.7	(915)	61.6	(900)
All other arrangements	29.3	(335)	38.4	(610)
Any children under 6 in household				
Yes	21.6	(236)	17.9	(193)
No	78.4	(1017)	82.1	(1323)
Care for relative/in-law >65 in past year				
Yes	24.5	(345)	27.0	(438)
No	75.5	(908)	73.0	(1078)
Who takes most responsibility for cooking				
I do	33.2	(459)	67.0	(1093)
My spouse/partner does	35.4	(480)	10.3	(155)
Share about equally with spouse/partner	21.9	(251)	15.5	(198)
Someone other than self or spouse/partner	9.5	(58)	7.2	(70)
Who takes most responsibility for cleaning				
I do	26.1	(360)	71.0	(1122)
My spouse/partner does	36.3	(499)	6.3	(95)
Share about equally with spouse/partner	26.9	(296)	14.8	(201)
Someone other than self or spouse/partner	10.6	(95)	7.9	(98)
Stress in personal/family life				
Not at all stressful	21.1	(264)	15.8	(231)
Not very stressful	31.6	(417)	32.2	(494)
Somewhat stressful	34.9	(421)	34.9	(526)
Very stressful	9.1	(102)	9.8	(153)
Extremely stressful	3.2	(45)	7.3	(112)
Education				
Less than high school diploma	6.4	(33)	4.3	(38)
High school or GED	34.9	(282)	33.6	(314)
Some college, no degree	19.0	(252)	21.6	(336)
Associate degree	8.7	(113)	9.4	(164)
Four-year college degree	19.9	(329)	21.3	(399)
Graduate or professional degree	11.0	(244)	9.8	(265)
Occupation				
Manager/professional	30.9	(498)	39.0	(707)
Other	69.1	(728)	61.0	(790)
Hours worked per week in all jobs	45.8	(1232)	40.7	(1491)
Schedule flexibility to manage work/family				
Disagree	20.5	(246)	19.4	(289)
Agree	79.5	(1003)	80.6	(1223)
Age	39.9	(1240)	41.3	(1490)
Race				
White non-Hispanic	70.5	(1043)	66.1	(1201)
Other	29.5	(206)	33.9	(308)
Family income				
< $32,240	22.5	(187)	28.5	(303)
$32,241 - $55,120	19.2	(230)	19.9	(313)
$55,121 - $78,000	20.2	(246)	17.7	(283)
$78,001 - $114,400	20.2	(262)	17.3	(259)
> $114,400	17.9	(290)	16.5	(273)

Source: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce
N values calculated using unweighted data
Valid percents and means calculated using weighted data

Home and family characteristics of the sample show some differences between male and female workers. The most substantial difference is revealed in distribution of household chores. When asked about cooking, females were twice as likely as men to report they were most responsible for this in their household. Additionally, over three times as many men reported that their spouse/partner was most responsible for cooking. This trend continued and the gap widened when respondents were asked the same question about cleaning. Nearly three times as many women than men reported they were most responsible for cleaning, and six times as many men than women reported that their spouse/partner did the most cleaning. To further examine these results, crosstabs were run on these variables by marital status for both men and women. These analyses showed that, regardless of marital status, females were most likely to report that they themselves take most responsibility for cooking and cleaning. Additionally, among married males, the majority of respondents reported that their spouse/partner was most responsible for cooking and cleaning in the household.

In addition to division of household chores, 34.9% of both men and women reported that their personal/family life was somewhat stressful, the most common reported answer among respondents. However, women were more likely to report their personal/family life as extremely stressful than men, and men were more likely than women to report that their personal/family life was not at all stressful. Slightly more women than men reported providing elderly care in the past year, although nearly two-thirds of all the respondents did not report being elderly caregivers. Furthermore, the sample consisted of about 9% fewer married women than married men, and slightly fewer women than men reported having children under 6 in their household.

In addition to home and family characteristics, the results shown in Table 1 also present differences in the occupational and educational characteristics of male and female workers. The majority of men and women were not employed as managers and professionals, but women were more likely than men to be employed in this category. The most common reported education completed for both men and women was high school or GED, with a little over one third of the sample falling in this category. Slightly more women than men reported completion of a four-year college degree, and slightly more men than women reported completion of a graduate or professional degree. Men reported, on average, working about 46 hours per week, about five more hours than women. The majority of respondents, nearly 80% of both men and women, said they had schedule flexibility to manage work and family.

Demographic characteristics of the sample are also presented in Table 1. The average age of respondents was similar, with men averaging about age 40 and women averaging about age 41. The majority of the respondents were White non-Hispanic, with slightly more men than women falling into this category. Males in the sample reported slightly higher average family incomes than females, although the data were relatively evenly distributed among both men and women, with the most common income level reported under $32,240.

Bivariate Analysis

The results of analyses of variables for male and female workers using bivariate correlations are presented in Table 2. Among males, eight of the independent variables were significantly correlated with negative spillover from home to work, and among females seven were significantly correlated. The variables not significantly correlated to negative spillover, for neither males nor females, included race, education, marital status, occupation, family income, hours worked per week in all jobs, and division of cooking labor in household. The strength of association for all variables found significantly correlated with negative spillover from home to work ranged from weak to moderate.

Analyses revealed that stress in personal/family life was the strongest significantly correlated variable to negative spillover for both men and women. This variable was positively correlated with the dependent variable, revealing that respondents who were more likely to report higher levels of stress in their personal/family life were more likely to report higher levels of negative spillover from home to work.

As illustrated in Table 2, analyses showed some differences between males and females in the remaining significantly correlated variables. The second strongest significantly correlated variable for females was whether or not the respondent reported having any children under six in the household. This variable was also significantly correlated for males, but the strength of association was higher for females. For both males and females, having children under the age of six in the household was associated with higher levels of negative home to work spillover. The second strongest significantly correlated variable for males was age. This was the third strongest variable for females. The strength of this correlation was nearly identical for males and females, and revealed that older respondents were less likely to report negative spillover than younger respondents.

The third most significant variable for males was the question of whether the respondent or someone else takes most responsibility for cleaning in the household. This variable was significant for females as well but was more strongly and significantly associated for males. Both male and female respondents who identified themselves as most responsible for cleaning reported higher levels of negative spillover from home to work. This variable fell

under the grouping of four dichotomous variables that asked who takes most responsibility for cleaning in the household.

Table 2. Correlation of Independent Variables with Negative Spillover from Home to Work

Independent Variable	Males Pearson's r		Females Pearson's r	
Marital status	.046		.005	
(Spouse/partner in residence=1, All other arrangements=2)				
Any children under 6 in household (Yes=1, No=2)	-.069	**	-.135	**
Care for relative/in-law >65 in past year (Yes=1, No=2)	-.034		-.060	*
Who takes most responsibility for cooking				
I do vs. Other	-.036		-.038	
Spouse/partner vs. Other	.048		.004	
Equally shared with spouse/partner vs. Other	.016		.018	
Someone other than self or spouse/partner vs. Other	-.043		.040	
Who takes most responsibility for cleaning				
I do vs. Other	-.084	**	-.062	*
Spouse/partner vs. Other	.063	*	.008	
Equally shared with spouse/partner vs. Other	.056	*	.058	*
Someone other than self or spouse/partner vs. Other	-.060	*	.022	
Stress in personal/family life	.458	**	.428	**
(Not at all stressful=1, Not very stressful=2, Somewhat stressful=3, Very stressful=4, Extremely stressful=5)				
Education	-.026		.050	
(Less than high school diploma=1, High school or GED=2, Some college, no degree=3, Associate degree=4, Four-year college degree=5, Graduate or professional degree=6)				
Occupation (Manager/Professional=1, Other=2)	-.035		.002	
Hours worked per week in all jobs	.026		.030	
Have schedule flexibility to manage work and family	-.082	**	-.065	*
(Disagree=1, Agree=2)				
Age	-.097	**	-.095	**
Race (White non-Hispanic=1, Other=2)	.031		-.016	
Family income	-.044		.012	
(< $32,240=1, $32,241 to $55,120=2, $55,121 to $78,000=3, $78,001 to $114,400=4, >$114,400=5)				

Source: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce
All values calculated using weighted data
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Among this grouping of variables, sharing the responsibility with spouse/partner was also significantly correlated for both men and women. For male respondents only, those reporting that their spouse/partner is responsible for cleaning reported statistically significant lower levels of spillover. Additionally, male respondents reporting that someone other than themselves or their spouse/partner is responsible for cleaning was significantly correlated, but the number of respondents in this category was so small that caution should be used in giving credence to this variable.

The fourth strongest variable significantly correlated for both males and females was schedule flexibility to manage work and family. Among both men and women, respondents who reported a lack of schedule flexibility to manage work and family were more likely to report higher levels of negative spillover from home to work. This variable was more significantly and strongly correlated to negative spillover for men than women. The variable that identified if respondents provided special care for a relative/in-law over sixty-five in the past year was significantly correlated to negative spillover for women but not for men. Women who reported providing this care were more likely to report higher levels of negative spillover from home to work than women who did not.

Multivariate Analyses

Before comparing male and female workers separately, a preliminary linear regression analysis was run to determine if gender was a significant predictor of negative home-to-work spillover. The unstandardized beta coefficient for gender was .058 ($p<.05$), revealing that gender is a significant predictor of negative spillover from home to work. The results of this initial analysis supported Hypothesis 1, that female workers are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than male workers, with female respondents reporting a .058 higher score on the negative spillover index than males.

Because the variable measuring stress in personal/family life may be considered closely related to the dependent variable, the Durbin-Watson test was run to test for the presence of autocorrelation. The result (1.997) revealed that autocorrelation was not evident between these variables. Furthermore, the presence of multicolliniarity was not apparent among any of the variables in this study when correlations were examined.

The results of analyses of variables for male and female workers using linear regression are shown in Table 3. Three separate models were run, with additional predictor variables entered into each model. The first model contains variables that were significantly correlated to negative spillover from home to work, except for the variable that measured stress in personal/family life. Although no autocorrelation was determined between this variable and the dependent variable, it was not included until the final model as a cautionary measure. This choice also reflected the idea that stress in personal/family life may be caused by the other independent variables. Predictor variables were added to Model 1 to create the second and third models. The remaining variables not included in Model 1 were entered to run Model 2, except for the stress in personal/family life variable, which was the only addition variable added to compose Model 3. The adjusted R-squared values are included in Table 3 below the grouping of variables in each model.

The first linear regression model, presented in Table 3, revealed differences between male and female workers in predictors of negative spillover from home to work. Among male respondents, the strongest predictor of negative spillover was whether or not their spouse/partner takes most responsibility for cleaning in the household. Males who reported that their spouse/partner is most responsible for cleaning experienced lower levels of negative spillover than males who reported that they themselves took most responsibility for cleaning. Whether or not the cleaning responsibility was shared equally with a spouse/partner was also a significant predictor of spillover for males. Males who reported that they share this responsibility equally with their spouse/partner were also less likely to experience negative spillover than males who reported themselves as most responsible for cleaning in the household, and this was the second strongest predictor of spillover among males. None of the variables measuring division of cleaning responsibility were found to be significant predictors of negative spillover from home to work for females in Model 1, although sharing the responsibility equally with a spouse/partner approached statistical significance.

Among female respondents, the strongest predictor of negative home-to-work spillover in Model 1 was the presence of children under the age of six in the household. This variable was also a significant predictor among males, although it was a stronger and more significant predictor among females. Females with children under the age of six in the household were more likely to report higher instances of negative spillover than females without children under the age of six in the household. Whether or not respondents reported that they had provided special care for a relative/in-law over the age of 65 was the second strongest predictor of negative spillover among females. Female respondents who reported providing elderly care within the last year were more likely to experience negative home-to-work spillover than female respondents who did not report providing this care. This variable was not a significant predictor of spillover among males.

Model 1 also revealed that schedule flexibility to manage work and family was a significant predictor of negative spillover from home to work, but only among male respondents. Males who more strongly agreed that they had schedule flexibility reported less negative spillover than males who more strongly disagreed with the statement 'I have the schedule flexibility I need to manage personal and family responsibilities.' Overall, Model 1 explains 3.3% of the variation in negative spillover from home to work for males, and 2.4% of the variation for females.

Table 3. OLS Regression Predicting Negative Spillover from Home to Work Among Male and Female Workers

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Predictor	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)
Constant	2.901 (.196) **	3.132 (.229) **	3.189 (.322) **	2.892 (.303) **	2.045 (.303) **	1.75 (.306) **
Age	-.004 (.002)	-.004 (.229)	-.004 (.002)	-.006 (.002) *	-.002 (.002)	-.003 (.002)
Any children under 6 in household	-.131 (.062) *	-.232 (.081) **	-.105 (.063)	-.260 (.083) **	-.082 (.055)	-.248 (.074) **
Responsibility for cleaning						
Spouse/partner	-.162 (.060) **	-.075 (.095)	-.186 (.083) *	-.089 (.098)	-.161 (.071) *	-.165 (.095)
Share equally with spouse/partner	-.165 (.076) *	-.133 (.070)	-.210 (.092) *	-.161 (.082) *	-.184 (.079) *	-.118 (.071)
Other than self or spouse/partner	-.012 (.096)	-.080 (.118)	-.011 (.127)	-.086 (.131)	.023 (.115)	-.074 (.101)
Care for relative/in-law >65 in past year	-.071 (.051)	-.115 (.053) *	-.083 (.052)	-.119 (.055) *	-.034 (.046)	-.042 (.049)
Schedule flexibility to manage work and family	-.117 (.058) *	-.105 (.067)	-.112 (.062)	-.091 (.069)	-.088 (.054)	-.044 (.066)
Adjusted R-Squared	.033	.024				
Marital status			-.084 (.091)	.069 (.069)	-.088 (.077)	.049 (.063)
Responsibility for cooking						
Spouse/partner			-.003 (.070)	.035 (.079)	.042 (.061)	.100 (.070)
Share equally with spouse/partner			.001 (.075)	-.004 (.091)	.066 (.066)	.013 (.078)
Other than self or spouse/partner			.039 (.154)	-.088 (.140)	.108 (.141)	-.022 (.118)
Race			-.009 (.063)	-.055 (.067)	.042 (.056)	.025 (.061)
Occupation			-.117 (.054) *	.065 (.064)	-.113 (.049) *	.045 (.055)
Education			-.004 (.017)	.027 (.025)	-.007 (.015)	.031 (.022)
Hours worked per week in all jobs			.002 (.002)	.003 (.002)	.003 (.002)	.001 (.002)
Family income			-.020 (.022)	.018 (.026)	-.008 (.019)	.018 (.023)
Adjusted R-Squared			.045	.050		
Stress in personal/family life					.279 (.022) **	.296 (.028) **
Adjusted R-Squared					.229	.228

Source: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workfoce
All values calculated using weighted data
Beta = Unstandardized Beta Coefficient; SE = Standard Error
* p < .05   ** p < .01

Also presented in Table 3, Model 2 expanded on Model 1 by adding the remaining independent variables into the regression analysis, with the exception of the variable measuring stress in personal/family life. Model 2 explained more variation in negative spillover from home to work than Model 1 for both males and females, increasing to 4.5% and 5% respectively. However, the addition of these variables created changes in some predictor variables for both males and females. This included the addition of a division of cleaning responsibility variable as a significant predictor for females. In Model 2, females reporting that they share cleaning responsibilities equally with a spouse/partner were less likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than females who reported they themselves were most responsible for cleaning. Furthermore, Model 2 included the addition of age as a significant predictor of negative spillover for females only. Among female respondents, an increase in age resulted in lower reported levels of negative home-to-work spillover. For males, the addition of occupation as a predictor of negative spillover was revealed in Model 2. Male respondents employed as managers or professionals were more likely to report negative spillover than male respondents employed in all other categories.

Even when controlling for the additional variables included in Model 2, the strongest predictors of spillover for men continued to be two of the division of cleaning responsibilities variables established as predictors in Model 1 – spouse/partner responsible for cleaning and share responsibility equally with spouse partner. Model 2 yielded similar results for females, with children under the age of six in the household as the strongest predictor in both models. However, for males, children under six, as well as schedule flexibility to manage work and family, were no longer significant predictors. For females, providing special care for a relative/in-law over the age of 65 in the past year continued to be a significant predictor of spillover.

Model 3, also presented in Table 3, shows the addition of the variable measuring stress in personal/family life to the regression analysis presented in Model 2. The addition of this variable significantly increased the R-squared value for both the male and female models. Model 3 explained 18.4% more of the variance in negative spillover from home to work among males than Model 2. For females, the addition of this variable in Model 3 increased the explanation of variance in negative spillover by 17.8%. This variable was the most significant predictor of negative spillover from home to work for both men and women.

Children under the age of six in the household remained the only other significant predictor of spillover for females. These results supported both Hypotheses 2 and 3 of this study. Hypothesis 2, that workers with children under the age of six in the home are more likely to report negative spillover than workers without children under the age of six in the home, was supported for females only once all variables were entered in Model 3. This creates support for Hypothesis 3, that working mothers are more likely to report negative spillover than working fathers. Among male respondents, the division of cleaning responsibility variables continued to be significant predictors of spillover for males in Model 3. Additionally, occupation also remained a significant predictor, partially supporting

Hypothesis 4 of this study. Hypothesis 4, stating that workers employed as managers and professionals are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than workers in all other occupational categories, was supported for males only. Hypothesis 5, that workers with higher levels of education are more likely to report negative home-to-work spillover than workers with lower levels of education, was completely unsupported by any analyses in this study, as education was not a significant predictor of spillover for men or women.

DISCUSSION

Overall, the results of this study generally supported all hypotheses apart from the expectation that education would be a predictor of spillover. Stress in personal/family life was found to be the strongest predictor of negative home-to-work spillover for both men and women. These results are consistent with the multiple roles perspective theory used to guide this study. Because this perspective states that the different roles that individuals occupy (e.g. worker, parent) take place in separate area's of one's life (e.g. home, workplace) but are not impermeable to the effects of experiences in other areas of life, it is not surprising that increased stress in personal/family life would extend into and negatively affect the roles held by individuals in the workplace (Cohen et al. 2008; Kiger et al. 2007; Westman 2005). These results were similar to those found by Dilworth (2004), that decreased satisfaction with family life was one of the strongest predictors of negative spillover.

Apart from stress in personal/family life, the results of this study revealed that the predictors of negative spillover from home to work are different for males and females. While inconsistencies exist in the literature as to whether or not gender itself is a significant predictor of negative home-to-work spillover, an initial analysis conducted in this study revealed that females were more likely to report higher levels of spillover than males. This is consistent with the previous findings of Jarvis et al. (2005), Keene & Reynolds (2005), and Voydanoff (2005), but contradicts the results of a study by Cook and Minnotte (2008). Interestingly, the studies that found gender to be a significant predictor of spillover limited data analyzed to specific groups of individuals (e.g. married, dual-earner couples), while the study by Cook and Minnotte (2008) analyzed data from wage and salaried workers regardless of parental or marital status, the same target of this study. Because previous studies have not all focused on comparing gender differences in spillover specifically (e.g. comparing race, age), differing control and predictor variables are often used in each study. In addition, previous studies have used more restricted and older samples of data than used in this study. These factors, as well as the fact that negative spillover has not been consistently operationalized in research, may account for the discrepancies in measuring gender differences in negative spillover from home to work. To obtain a more accurate assessment of gender and its relation to spillover, consistencies in the measures of variables and the comparison of consistent demographic groupings of individuals is warranted.

Like much of the previous research, gender differences in spillover prevailed throughout this study. Among female workers, even after controlling for all other variables used in this study, the presence of children under the age of six in the home was found to be one of the strongest predictors of spillover. Even though previous research has disagreed to the gendered nature, number, and age of children that contribute negative spillover, there has been a consensus in literature that workers with children in the home are more likely to experience greater negative home-to-work spillover than workers without children in the home (Bayfield et al. 2005; Dilworth 2004; Jarvis et al. 2005; Kiger et al. 2007; Maume 2006). While this variable was also a significant predictor of spillover for males in the first regression model, it was no longer significant once additional variables were entered in subsequent models. The results of this study are similar to results found by studies Kiger et al. (2007) and Dilworth (2004), that the presence of young children in the home is a strong predictor of spillover for mothers.

In addition to caring for children, this study examined whether or not elderly caregiving was a predictor of spillover. The gendered differences in predictors was present in examining this variable as well, with elder care in the past year being a significant predictor of spillover for females until the stress in personal/family life variable was controlled for in the regression. Previous studies have found mixed results in examining eldercare as a predictor of spillover, possibility because of the differences in how this variable has been measured (Dilworth and Kingsbury 2005; Marks 1998). As caregiving in any aspect may further add to the difficulties of balancing work and home life, this study was limited in the area of fully measuring caregiving. The variable used in this study only identified care given to relatives or in-laws over the age of 65 and did not identify the time extent of this care or whether or not the person being cared for lived with the respondent. In addition, no variables were included that identified assistance for caregiving or caring for those beyond children or the elderly, such as seriously ill or disabled children or spouses.

In examining additional home and family characteristics, this study yielded interesting results regarding the division of cooking and cleaning responsibilities. Consistent with previous studies, the division of cooking responsibilities was not found to be a significant predictor of negative spillover for males or females (Dilworth 2004; Dilworth and Kingsbury 2005). But, contradicting these studies, one of the strongest predictors of spillover for males was the division of cleaning responsibilities. Males who reported that their spouse/partner took most

responsibility, and those that reported sharing the responsibility equally with their spouse/partner, reported lower levels of spillover than males who reported that they themselves did most cleaning. The reason for this contradiction may be due to the fact that previous studies have used time variables to measure division of household chores, which may be inaccurately reported, whereas this study used variables measuring perceptions of who takes most responsibility for chores. Studies have shown that females spend more time on household chores than males (Coltrane 2001; Hill 2005). This study consistently shows that females are most likely to report that they themselves are responsible for cleaning and cooking responsibilities, regardless of marital status, whereas studies using time variables did not show much difference between males and females, confirming the increased validity of measuring the division of household chores in this study (Dilworth 2004; Dilworth and Kingsbury 2005). In addition, marital status was controlled for and was not found to be a significant predictor of spillover.

The findings of this study regarding elderly and child caregiver status, as well as the division of cleaning responsibilities, may give credence to gender theory, which asserts that gender is socially constructed (Cohen et al. 2008). The fact that females were found to be most likely to take most responsibility for cooking and cleaning responsibilities, as well as the fact that predictors of negative spillover from home to work included young children in the household, suggests that females may be more affected by factors in the home, possibly because their gender role requires them to take on more household responsibilities than males are expected to take on. Additionally, this would also support the multiple roles perspective theory, because working women would be more likely to have additional responsibilities in the home compared to working men, leading to a higher probability of work-life conflict.

In addition to home and family characteristics, analysis of occupational and educational yielded few significant results for males and females in regards to spillover. The only significant predictor of spillover in this category was occupation for males. This is consistent with a study by Jarvis et al. (2005), but contradicts a study by Maume (2006), which found this to be a significant predictor for females only. Males, on average, worked more hours per week than females, but this was not found to be a significant predictor of spillover for men or women. These results contradict previous studies that have found hours worked per week to be significant predictors of spillover for at least one gender (Dilworth 2004; Hill 2005; Kieger et al. 2007; Maume 2006).

Furthermore, consistent with Brayfield et al. (2005), the results of this study found schedule flexibility to be a significant predictor of spillover for males only. However, this variable was not significant once additional variables were controlled for. One may think that schedule flexibility to manage work and family would have a significant impact on negative spillover, but the fact that nearly 80% of both men and women self-reported having schedule flexibility may suggest that other measures are needed to fully assess the flexibility both men and women have to care for family and work responsibilities. Particularly, Dilworth (2004) found that time taken off of a job to care for a sick child was a significant predictor for fathers only, even though mothers reported taking more days off for this purpose, suggesting that additional factors, such as gender role perceptions, may be influencing reported levels of spillover.

Several previous studies found that employees feeling time pressure on the job were more likely to experience negative spillover from home to work (Brayfield et al. 2005; Jarvis et al. 2005; Voydanoff 2005). This study only found occupational category to be a predictor for males, but one limitation of this study was the fact that occupation was measured using only two categories and a time pressure on the job variable was not included in analyses. Previous research has also found higher levels of education of negative spillover to be associated with negative home-to-work spillover, but this study failed to connect education with spillover. While one may assume the variables used in this study, including educational level, hours worked per week, and family income, would mitigate this lack of specificity due to their relation to occupation, it may be that more specific measures were needed to assess exactly how these variables relate to stress and negative spillover. Additionally, as previously stated, many studies have used more limited and older samples, have used different control variables, or have operationalized negative spillover differently, possibly partially explaining the differences in these results.

In addition to home and family and occupational and educational characteristics, demographic characteristics, including age, race, and family income were also included in this study. The only variable found to be a significant predictor of negative spillover in this group was age for females, although this was no longer significant once stress in persona/family life were included in the regression analyses. These intermediate results showed that, among females, increased age resulted in lower levels of negative spillover. This may be due to the fact that as a female's age increases, they are presumably less likely to have young children in the household. Previous studies have found differences in spillover between age groups (Dilworth & Kingsbury 2005) and races (Jarvis et al. 2007), but this study did not compare these groups specifically. While age and race were not found to be significant predictors in the final regression model, more research between specific groups is warranted based on previous findings.

CONCLUSION

This study adds to the existing literature on negative spillover from home to work by identifying characteristics most predictive of spillover among a nationally representative sample of wage and salaried U.S. adults, in hopes of increasing the understanding of what may be done to alleviate the adverse affects it has on families and workplaces. Comparing data on males and females, the results of this study show a clear difference between predictors by gender. Whereas stress in personal/family life was found to be the most significant predictor for both females and males, females were more likely to experience spillover than males. Division of cleaning responsibilities was found to be a significant predictor for males, in that males who had a spouse who shared equally or took responsibility for these chores experienced lower negative home-to-work spillover than other males. Occupation was also found to be a significant predictor of spillover for males, with those employed as managers and professionals experiencing higher levels of negative spillover than males employed in other occupational categories. Additionally, the presence children under the age of six in the home was a significant predictor of spillover for females. These findings suggest that females, particularly those with small children, still have greater role demands placed on them at home than males, leading to higher levels of reported negative home-to-work spillover.

The gendered nature of the results of this study reveals that traditional gender roles are the norm, even when women are employed outside of the home. Given that negative spillover into the workplace can have adverse affects on individuals, families, and workplaces, an increased understanding of and push to improve on these inequalities would benefit all of society. More specifically, the results of this study show that stress and the presence of young children in the household are significant predictors of spillover for women. Because the United States does not provide universal childcare, unlike other industrialized nations, working women may experience stress due to having their young children in often low-quality childcare. Accessibility to quality and affordable childcare, as well as placing value on those who take care of children while their parents are at work, may be a way to reduce negative spillover into the workplace.

While these findings present a greater understanding of factors associated with negative home to work spillover for both males and females, it should be noted that stress in respondents' personal/family life explained the majority of the variation in spillover, suggesting that a limitation of this study is that there are several other factors not included that influence levels of spillover. Furthermore, future studies on spillover may benefit from examining how spillover from both home to work and work to home interact, as the domains of work and home are not exclusive to one another. Comparing this study to much of the previous research is cautioned, as many studies have focused on particular groups (e.g. married or dual-earner couples), whereas this study did not limit data based on parental or marital status. Additionally, no previous studies could be found using this most recent NSCW data, showing the need for more studies using this data. Because many differences appeared between this study and previous studies, it would also be beneficial for future studies to compare the different groups studied in this and previous research, such as married versus other workers, or dual earner couples versus households in which one spouse is not employed outside of the home.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Stella E., Robin T. Byerly, and Betty S. Coffey. 2002. "Formal Organizational Incentives and Informal Workplace Practices: Links to Work-Family Conflict and Job-Related Outcomes." *Journal of Management* 28(6):787-810.

Brayfield, April, Sue Falter Mennino, and Beth A. Rubin. 2005. "Home-to-Job and Job-to Home Spillover: The Impact of Company Policies and Workplace Culture." *The Sociological Quarterly* 46:107-135.

Cohen, Theodore F., Christine DeVault, and Bryan Strong. 2008. *The Marriage and Family Experience: Intimate Relationships in a Changing Society*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

Coltrane, S. 2001. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." In R.M. Milardo (Ed.), *Understanding Families into the New Millennium: A Decade in Review* 427-452. Minneapolis, MN: NCFR, cited in Dilworth, Jennie E. Long. 2004. "Predictors of Negative Spillover from Family to Work." *Journal of Family Issues* 25(2):241-261.

Cook, Allison and Krista Lynn Minnotte. 2008. "Occupational and Industry Sex Segregation and the Work-Family Interface." *Sex Roles* 59:800-813.

Dilworth, Jennie E. Long. 2004. "Predictors of Negative Spillover from Family to Work." *Journal of Family Issues* 25(2):241-261.

Dilworth, Jennie E. Long, and Nancy Kingsbury. 2005. "Home-to-Job Spillover for Generation X, Boomers, and Matures: A Comparison." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 26(2):267-281.

Frone, M.R. 2003. "Work-Family Balance." In J.C. Quick and L.E. Tetrick (Eds.)*, Handbook of Occupational Health and Psychology*:143-162. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, cited in Voydanoff, Patricia. 2005. "Work Demands and Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work Conflict: Direct and Indirect Relationships." *Journal of Family Issues* 26(6):707-726.

Jarvis, Lorna Hernandez, Patricia V. Roehling, and Heather E. Swope. 2005. "Variations in Negative Work-Family Spillover Among White, Black, and Hispanic American Men and Women: Does Ethnicity Matter?" *Journal of Family Issues* 26(6):840-865.

Keene, Jennifer Reid, and John R. Reynolds. 2005. "The Job Costs of Family Demands: Gender Differences in Negative Family-to-Work Spillover." *Journal of Family Issues* 26(3):275-299.

Kiger, Gary, Susan E. Mannon, Krista Lynn Minnotte, and Daphne Pedersen Stevens. 2007. "Examining the 'Neglected Side of the Work-Family Interface': Antecedents of Positive and Negative Family-to-Work Spillover." *Journal of Family Issues* 28(2):242-262.

Marks, Nadine F. 1998. "Does it Hurt to Care? Caregiving, Work-Family Conflict, and Midlife Well-Being." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60(4):951-966, cited in Dilworth, Jennie E. Long, and Nancy Kingsbury. 2005. "Home-to-Job Spillover for Generation X, Boomers, and Matures: A Comparison." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 26(2):267-281.

Maume, David J. 2006. "Gender Differences in Restricting Work Efforts Because of Family Responsibilities." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68:859-869.

McBrier, Debra Branch, Scott Schiemann, and Karen Van Gundy. 2003. "Home-to-Work Conflict, Work Qualities, and Emotional Distress." *Sociological Forum* 18(1):137-164.

National Study of the Changing Workforce. 2008. Families and Work Institute: New York, NY.

Voydanoff, Patricia. 2005. "Work Demands and Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work Conflict: Direct and Indirect Relationships." *Journal of Family Issues* 26(6):707-726.

Wallen, Jacqueline. 2002. *Balancing Work and Family: The Role of the Workplace*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Westman, M. (2005). "Crossover of Stress and Strain Between Spouses." In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E.E. Kossek, and P. Raskin (Eds.), *Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Sloan Work and Family Research Network. Retrieved from http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=1961&area=academics.

Winslow, Sarah. 2005. "Work-Family Conflict, Gender, and Parenthood, 1977-1997." *Journal of Family Issues* 26(6):727-755.