

Improving work outcomes: the value of couple and family relationships

Literature Review

Supported by the Department for Work and Pensions contract 2015-2016

Braybrook, D., Coleman, L., Houlston, C., Martin, A. and Green, H. (June 2015)



CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Are poor couple/family relationship situations linked with problems at work?.....	i
Are good couple/family relationship situations linked with better work outcomes?.....	ii
What interventions help to improve work outcomes?	iii
What next?	iv
<i>Glossary of Key Terms</i>	1
How are couple & family relationships linked to work?	1
The Role of Couple/Family Relationships in Employee Engagement	2
1. Are poor couple/family relationship situations linked with problems at work?	6
Background.....	6
Family-Work Conflict is associated with lower employee engagement	7
Lower job satisfaction	8
Poorer employee health	9
Less organisational citizenship behaviours	10
Absenteeism and lower concentration at work.....	10
Poorer interactions with colleagues	11
Negative crossover.....	12
The reciprocal relationship between family-work conflict and work outcomes	12
2. Are good couple/family relationship situations linked with better work outcomes?	15
Background	15
Family-Work Enrichment is associated with better employee engagement	16
Higher job satisfaction	17
Higher organisational commitment	18
More concentration	19
Better interactions with colleagues	19
Skill transference.....	20
Positive crossover.....	21
Couple communication and work outcomes	22
3. What interventions help to improve work outcomes?	24
Implementing workplace policy	24
Improving supervisory support.....	25
Improving couple and family relationships	28
Conclusion	31
Recommendations	32
Research	32
Interventions	33
References	35
Appendices	40
Appendix I: Review Method	40
Appendix II: Evidence Summary	42

Executive Summary

This report sets out the evidence on the importance of couple and family relationships in *employee engagement*. It is intended to be a comprehensive and up-to-date summary of academic evidence. Although written with employers and human resource managers in mind, it is nonetheless also suitable for a wide readership.

Priority has been given to the latest evidence, as well as meta-analyses, and longitudinal research where possible. The full report contains a diagrammatic representation demonstrating how couple and family relationships link to work outcomes, as well as a summary table of the literature reviewed.

This review demonstrates that couple and family relationships can have considerable associations with a variety of work outcomes. As such, it is important to consider these interactions when looking at ways to improve both personal relationships and work productivity.

Are poor couple/family relationship situations linked with problems at work?

Though causal relationships are difficult to confirm, the evidence gathered in this report suggests that poor couple and family situations are associated with problems at work.

Notably, conflicts between couple/family relationships and work have been associated with lower job satisfaction, self-rated work performance and manager-rated work performance. This suggests that when couple and family relationships conflict with work, work outcomes may suffer. This may come about through factors such as reduced concentration or work absences.

The interactions between an individual's personal life and work life are not always direct. Poor relationships may impact upon work outcomes indirectly through associations with stress, health problems, depression and psychological strain.

It is vitally important to consider that the associations between poor couple/family situations and work have been shown to interact in a reciprocal way – for example, when a couple argues, work productivity may suffer, thereby requiring more time at work, which reduces the time available for employees to rectify their couple/family relationship issues. This may lead to a 'spiral of loss', whereby resources from both family and work domains are depleted. These associations may also operate in a simultaneous manner – for example, family interferences with work may create more stress at home as employees seek to reduce these interferences, but they also created problems at work, as work outcomes begin to suffer.

However, some research demonstrates that work interferences with the family domain have a stronger impact on work outcomes (i.e., through responses to stressors, such as burnout, depression and headache) than family interferences with work. Nevertheless this is not to say that the links between family interferences with work and work-related outcomes are unimportant. Instead, the lack of work in this area means it is difficult to assess the relevance of specific elements of strain and suggests a need for further focus.

Are good couple/family relationship situations linked with better work outcomes?

The research examining how couple and family relationships might improve work outcomes is a developing area. While the current evidence offers few meta-analyses making causal links between the two, as interest increases and more empirical research is being to be published, this area is becoming stronger.

It has been suggested that good and stable couple relationships increase the likelihood of couple/family relationships enriching work, which in turn can result in better work performance.

Partner support may be important in an employee's experiences of work. Associations have been found between levels of positive social support from partners and work-related factors such as job control and job security.

The link between good couple/family situations and work is supported by the concept of skill transference, whereby skills learned and/or practised in the couple/family domain might be utilised at work, to improve work outcomes. For example, learning how to recognise and respond to emotions in couple and family relationships can be important in improving working relationships, particularly between supervisors and their employees.

Another related area is that of positive crossover, whereby, an individual's job-related self-efficacy, for example, may be transmitted to their partner, which indirectly improves their partner's work engagement. Other areas such as more energy and positive mood can cross over between partners in this way.

Communication in couple and family relationships is also linked to work outcomes. Constructive ways of communicating within a couple relationship is associated with less conflict between work and family, and is related to greater relationship satisfaction. This suggests that good couple communication benefits work as well as relationships.

What interventions help to improve work outcomes?

Research suggests that working to improve couple and family relationships has the potential to reduce the conflicts between family and work domains, improving employee engagement, and ultimately improving work outcomes such as performance, and wider working relationships.

Though the research in this area is still developing, one way that work outcomes may be improved is through interventions that improve couple communication.

Couple- and family-supportive work policies such as flexible working may set the scene for improvements in couple and family relationships. However research shows that other mechanisms that support couple and family relationships on a day-to-day level, such as supportive leaders and a supportive work-family climate, must be in place to ensure that employees use such policies to their advantage.

Supportive leaders who encourage their staff to utilise couple/family policies are important. Day-to-day support from supervisors in the area of family and relationships may help to create a family-friendly workplace, as they help to show employees that their supervisors care about their personal and family needs. This may then lead to more positive perceptions of their work organisation, leading to more job satisfaction and commitment to their job.

Interventions that train supervisors in supporting their employees in family and relationships have been found to be effective in reducing conflicts between family and work domains. By using a reliable research design, where one group who do not receive the intervention (i.e., control) is compared with those who do, researchers have demonstrated that the conflict between family life and work can actually be altered at work, and should not be cast aside as private issues of employees.

Another group of interventions focus on delivering couple- and family-related training directly to employees. Some aim to reduce work interferences with couple and family relationships, while others focus on teaching parenting skills and stress management. The outcomes of these interventions are variable, but a number have been associated with work-related outcomes, such as reductions in physical strain, emotional strain, and stress, as well as improvements in work-related efficacy.

What next?

Recommendations for future research:

- Most research that has been conducted on the interactions between work and family domains is cross-sectional, and so more longitudinal work will help to further clarify the directions and strengths of relationships between the two.
- There is currently more research on how poor interactions between the couple/family domain and the work domain are linked with poorer outcomes. More research needs to explore how positive interactions may lead to better outcomes (in both family and work domains).
- More research should consider how couple and family relationships impact on work, as much existing focus is on how work impacts upon family.

Recommendations for future interventions:

- Organisational policy (e.g., flexible working) is important, but if there is not an ethos supportive of employees' couple/family situations, people are less likely to utilise these policies.
- Training line managers to support their teams' couple and family relationships helps to reduce conflicts between work and couple/family relationships. If employees believe their line managers care about their relationships at home they may be more likely to utilise related workplace benefits, and also have a more positive view of their workplace. This is a rich area for potential intervention.
- A small number of interventions have worked *directly* with the employees to try and improve their couple/family relationships, and results have demonstrated that these interventions can help to reduce conflicts between work and couple/family life, and may also help to improve work outcomes. Research also suggests that there is interest in this direct approach among employees in England, and so this may be a good format to pursue in future intervention development.

Glossary of Key Terms

Association is a term used throughout this report which refers to research that has found links between two factors, but due to the way data has been collected the direction of these links is unclear, while causal relationships cannot be established. *Longitudinal studies*, which include repeated data collection at specified points over time, provide more reliable insights as they help researchers to decipher what direction these relationships function in, and also help to establish if there is a *causal* pathway, or if the links are the product of another factor. *Meta-analyses* also help to provide stronger insight on the strength of particular links by drawing together collections of research studies on the same topic.

Crossover is when skills or emotions possessed by an employee are transmitted to their partner, thus impacting upon their partner's work-related outcomes.

Employee engagement is important because a disengaged workforce is linked to reduced productivity and is therefore costly. It is defined in various ways in the academic literature, yet there is clear and persistent acknowledgement of the links between employee's attitudes, behaviours and organisational outcomes, and is synonymous with concepts such as *work engagement*, *organisational commitment*, *organisational citizenship behaviour*, *absenteeism* and *job satisfaction* (Rayton, Dodge, & D'Analeze, 2012). "[A]n engaged employee experiences a blend of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job involvement and feelings of empowerment. It is a concept that is greater than the sum of its parts" (MacLeod & Clarke, 2009, p. 9).

Family supportive supervisory behaviours (FSSB) can be understood as the practices of supervisors that help their employees to reduce conflict between family and work domains.

Family-work conflict (FWC) can be understood as the family acting as an inhibitor to optimum participation in paid work life (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Family-work enrichment (FWE) can be conceptualised as how participation in the family role is made easier by, or benefits from enhanced performance in, the work role (Shockley & Singla, 2011).

Job satisfaction is the combination of what an employee feels and thinks about his/her job, in terms of the amount of pleasure they derive from it (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014, p. 2386).

Organisational citizenship behaviour are behaviours that are not part of a job role but that benefit the organisation (Lambert, Kelley, & Hogan, 2013).

Organisational commitment is the level of loyalty between an employee and their employer.

Work engagement is characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption in one's work.

Work-family conflict (WFC) poses that the limits placed on individuals' time and energy through work cause tension and lead to conflict with home life (Cooklin et al., 2015) .

Work-family enrichment (WFE) can be conceptualised as how participation in the work role is made easier by, or benefits from enhanced performance in, the family role (Shockley & Singla, 2011).

Work outcomes is an umbrella term used in this report to encapsulate a range of factors that impact work including productivity, performance, effectiveness and innovation.

Skill transference is when skills learned and practiced either in the family or work sphere are used to improve outcomes in the other sphere.

How are couple & family relationships linked to work?

This paper sets out the evidence on the importance of couple and family relationships in *employee engagement*¹ and *work outcomes*². It is intended to be comprehensive and up-to-date summary of academic evidence and is written with employers in mind, though is it suitable for a wide readership.

In the past decade the interest in employee engagement has increased, and, following a request by the UK Government, MacLeod and Clarke (2009) produced a comprehensive review evidencing the strong links between employee engagement and work productivity, performance and innovation. Subsequently, the UK coalition Government made a call for further evidence, and the Employee Engagement Taskforce responded with a convincing report that supports a positive causal and reciprocal relationship between employee engagement and work productivity (Rayton et al., 2012, p. 9). A quantitative review concluded that “an engaged workforce will likely perform their tasks more efficiently and effectively” (p.123) and “will be more likely to create a social context that is conducive to teamwork, helping, voice, and other important discretionary behaviors that can lead to organizational effectiveness” (p.124) (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011). Vitality for employers, it is well-established that “**a disengaged workforce is costly**” (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014, p. 2382).

In relation to the aforementioned reviews, and as will be demonstrated in the following report, employee engagement is undoubtedly affected by the ways that family and work interact. Employee engagement is synonymous with concepts such as *work engagement*, *organisational commitment*, *organisational citizenship behaviour*, *absenteeism* and *job satisfaction* (Rayton et al., 2012), all of which are implicated in family-work interactions, and which are related to work productivity and performance. While there are distinct differences between these concepts in terms of their linkages to attitudes, behaviours and workplace outcomes, both of the UK Government-funded reviews highlight the reciprocal relationships between them. So, for example, job satisfaction (attitude) may lead to an employee going the extra mile in their work (behaviour), which enables them to produce an exemplary report (workplace outcome). By clearly highlighting the links between employee engagement and family-work interactions it is hoped that the importance of couple and family relationships for work outcomes can be realised.

¹ ‘Employee engagement’ is an umbrella term used here to encapsulate employees’ workplace vigour, dedication, absorption and empowerment.

² ‘Workplace outcomes’ is an umbrella term used throughout this report encapsulating factors such as work productivity, performance, effectiveness and innovation.

Providing the background to this report, in 2012, OnePlusOne and Working Families conducted a cross-sectional survey with 2,027 UK respondents with an aim of exploring the association between work engagement and relationship quality (i.e., subjective evaluation of their romantic relationship) (Burnett, Coleman, Houlston, & Reynolds, 2012). Results showed a significant link between the two concepts, with those who reported higher relationship quality reporting higher work engagement. The qualitative findings of the study further supported this link and, taken together, the results suggest that “it is in the employer’s interests to recognise Relationship Quality as an asset, and one that should be maintained and supported” (Burnett et al., 2012, p. 11) in order to improve employee engagement.

Calls for a holistic approach to addressing and supporting the interaction between family/couple relationships and work can also be found in a growing body of recent literature (Van Acker, 2015; Whiston & Cinamon, 2015). However, while family/couple-work interactions may be reciprocal, the focus of the majority of existing research (and interventions) is on exploring (and relieving) the impact of work on couple relationships and family life. In comparison, there is a dearth of available research and, in turn, intervention efforts, exploring the interactions in the opposite direction – that is, how couple/family relationships might impact upon work, and particularly on how positive relationships may enrich work outcomes.

This review brings together evidence which considers the impact of couple/family relationships³ (good and bad) on workplace outcomes, with an overarching aim of showing how improving relationships can be beneficial to employee engagement, and therefore ultimately work outcomes.

Priority has been given to the latest evidence, as well as meta-analyses, and longitudinal research where possible. Details on the review method and a summary of the literature reviewed is available in Appendix I.

The Role of Couple/Family Relationships in Employee Engagement

In the following chapters the way that poor and good couple and family relationship situations interact with work outcomes will be covered. Relevant research is grouped under topic headers that are linked with work outcomes. *Figure 1* below provides an overview of the key factors that link

³ It is important to highlight that much of the literature considers the construct of ‘family’, which often *includes* couple relationships, rather than solely focussing on couple relationships. Therefore some of the literature reviewed focuses on ‘family’. Where ‘couples’ are the specific focus of a study, this is highlighted in the text.

couple and family relationships to work outcomes. The evidence linking couple/family relationships to these key areas is explored in more detail throughout the report.

Figure 1: Factors that link couple and family relationships to work outcomes



As the relevance of some of these areas for work outcomes may not be immediately obvious, this section of the report aims to briefly clarify these links under headings that correspond with the diagram above. In this way, this section also serves as a reference point for the review, so that readers can refer back to remind themselves of the important links between factors explored in the literature on work and family/couple relationships and work outcomes.

Attendance at work is explored in this review through ‘absenteeism’. While obvious, employees need to ‘attend’ work (whether working on site or from home) in order to contribute *at all* to work productivity and performance.

Concentration is associated with work outcomes through interaction with work performance and productivity, and research demonstrates links between an employee’s concentration and their work performance (Nohe, Michel, & Sonntag, 2014). If employees are unable to concentrate on their work tasks it is likely that the work they do will take longer to complete, or that the work they produce may contain error.

Crossover refers to the ways that the skills, effectiveness or emotions of one partner crossover to the other. This has implications for work outcomes as if, for example, an employee is performing well at work this may be communicated to one’s partner and these positive emotions may feed into that partner’s work engagement. In the same way, negative crossover may occur whereby a partner

who is struggling at work vents to their partner, resulting in their partner worrying about them and concentrating less in their own work.

Employee health is broad area, and though we intuitively know it often impacts upon work, it is nevertheless important to consider this openly. Supporting the link between stress-related issues and work outcomes, a recent meta-analysis demonstrated that self-reported work stress is linked to primary health outcomes such as anxiety, psychological distress, emotional exhaustion, headache, fatigue and gastrointestinal problems (Ganster & Rosen, 2013), while another review demonstrates that depression has been linked to work outcomes such as poorer work performance and increased absences (Lerner & Henke, 2008). Taken together, these reviews provide support for the importance of health maintenance in work productivity and performance.

Interactions between colleagues and leaders impact upon work outcomes as they influence the ability to build or break down positive working relationships. For example, some studies which explore the importance of within-work interactions and employee engagement demonstrate that trust between leaders and employees is important for employees to feel they are able to make suggestions to improve work outcomes, while trust between team members has been linked to employee engagement indications such as job satisfaction (Anderson, 2014). Other empirical research demonstrates that leaders' abilities to recognise their subordinates emotions is linked to better performance amongst their employees (Vidyarthi, Anand, & Liden, 2014).

Job satisfaction (i.e., the degree of pleasure derived from the job) is one feature of an individual's relationship with their work that is covered considerably in the literature exploring the linkages between couple/family relationships and work. While the relationships between job satisfaction and employee engagement, and therefore work productivity, may not be immediately obvious, one recent UK-based study helps to demonstrate this clearly. The recent study investigated the directional links between job satisfaction, *work engagement*⁴, and job performance using a follow-up survey design with a 1-year gap in between the surveys (Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, & Rayton, 2013). Analysis of responses from 199 clerical employees in the lending division of a UK-based bank demonstrated that job satisfaction preceded work engagement, which was significantly linked to job performance (Yalabik et al., 2013) – in other words, employees with higher job satisfaction were more engaged in their work, and more engaged employees performed better in their job.

Organisational citizenship behaviours are behaviours that are not part of a job role but benefit the organisation (Lambert et al., 2013). While these behaviours are not essential requirements to

⁴ *Work engagement* was defined in their study as “an independent, persistent, pervasive, positive and fulfilling work-related affective–cognitive and motivational–psychological state” (Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, & Rayton, 2013, p. 2801)

perform satisfactorily in a job, a meta-analysis based on 168 independent samples (equating to 51,235 individuals) highlighted that the willingness of employees to go beyond the 'call of duty' (i.e., organisational citizenship behaviour) was correlated with work productivity and efficiency (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009).

Organisational commitment can be defined as the level of loyalty between an employee and the organisation they are working for. It may include an individual employee's belief in their organisation's goals, as well as their willingness to pursue these goals, thus demonstrating a link with work performance. One meta-analysis used data from 93 studies (equating to 111 samples) and reported an association between organisational commitment and work performance (Ricketta, 2002).

Skill transference can impact upon work outcomes in a plethora of ways. If skills learned in positive couple/family relationships are used in work they can enrich work outcomes. Importantly, one recent literature review highlighted that employees' couple and family relationships are the central in the development of emotional and social skills, which consequently determine job performance (Koubova & Buchko, 2013).

1. Are poor couple/family relationship situations linked with problems at work?

Background

The construct describing the conflict between family and work was popularised almost 30 years ago, and is defined as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

“Conflict tends to occur in 3 main areas: *pressure on time*, where an individual is either physically or mentally preoccupied with one role whilst in the other; *strain based pressures*, refers to factors in one role that induce stress and tension in the other role, such as role ambiguity, role overload, lack of support; and finally *behavioural incompatibilities*, where expectations of behaviour required in one role are incompatible with behaviours associated with the other” (Burnett et al., 2012, p. 17).

These conflicts can take place in both directions – that is, the limits placed on individuals through participation in one domain (i.e., family or work) cause tension and lead to conflict in the other. However, while both are relevant, the main focus in this review is on *Family-Work Conflict*. Family-work conflict can be understood as the family acting as an inhibitor to optimum participation in paid work life (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Notably, it may be that the *kind* of conflict experienced (i.e., work-family or family-work) depends on job type, and may even vary over time in the same job, depending on the requirements. It has been suggested that the high level of home-working involved in some jobs may result in higher levels of family-work conflict than work-family conflict – for example teachers may have papers to mark and lessons to plan during their time at home, and family may conflict with them completing such tasks (Haslam, Sanders, & Sofronoff, 2012, p. 77).

The impact of family life on paid work has been acknowledged as a neglected element of the work-family interface (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011; Shockley & Singla, 2011), yet this review also includes literature on the negative impacts that paid work may have on family where deemed relevant. The following examples of studies exploring work-family conflict help to illuminate the directional nature of the conflict between family and work. One recent cross-sectional study of 1,878 Australian mothers reported a significant positive association between work-family conflict and poorer couple relationships (Cooklin et al., 2015), and another study demonstrated how couple separation due to military deployment significantly reduced relationship satisfaction and social support (Andres, 2014).

While research has demonstrated that the negative association between work-family conflict and marital satisfaction is amplified in the presence of high family-work conflict (Minnotte, Minnotte, & Bonstrom, 2014), there has been a relative lack of research considering how poor relationships relate to work directly. The following section aims to pull together the work that *does* exist to clarify these links.

Family-Work Conflict is associated with lower employee engagement

This section provides a brief introduction to some of the general links between poor couple/family relationship situations, employee engagement, and work outcomes. A meta-analysis published in 2005 found that across the studies included in their analysis, family-work conflict and work-family conflict had similar correlations with indicators of organisational withdrawal, and therefore employee engagement, including tardiness, absenteeism, intent to leave, intent to search for a new job, and turnover (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005, p. 228) – all of which link to work productivity and performance. Another particularly interesting finding comes from a more recent empirical study involving 427 Italian employees which found that “aspects of family life that influence work negatively have a decreasing effect on work engagement more than how working life aspects can adversely affect family life” (De Simone et al., 2013, p. 849). While these findings were cross-sectional, and therefore causal pathways cannot be identified, the results suggest that working to improve couple and family relationships has the potential to improve work outcomes.

Literature on partner support offers additional insights into alternative mechanisms within couple relationships that interact with work-related outcomes. A longitudinal study by Leach and Butterworth (2012) used data from a representative community sample of 2,054 employees in marriage-like relationships⁵ to investigate the link between high job demands, low job control and job insecurity. Results showed that all of these job adversities were independently associated with lower levels of positive social support from partners, while there was a linear relationship between the number of adversities and less support. These findings are supported by another study that explored the negative interactions between work and the family domain and the interactions these have with work outcomes (Green, Schaefer, MacDermid, & Weiss, 2011). After surveying 139 couples analysis showed that an employee’s work-family conflict can lead to their partner reacting with negative emotions and blame, which was associated with employees’ lower commitment to their career and exploration of other job alternatives (Green et al., 2011). These studies suggest that

⁵ ‘Marriage-like relationships’ encompass those couples who are cohabiting and/or married.

partner support for an employee's career is associated with employee's work experiences, resources and commitment.

Offering further evidence of the importance of couple relationships in work outcomes, the Tavistock Centre for Couple Relationships carried out their 'Engaging businesses to support relationships' survey of 233 senior HR staff working at London-based companies (Hancock & Page, 2013). Results showed that almost 95% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that employees' couple relationship difficulties affected their work performance, and almost a third encountered an employment issue linked to an employee's relationship every 1-6 months (TCCR, 2013). Seeking the view of employees, a recent UK study (Hancock & Page, 2013) administered an online cross-sectional survey at a private company, to explore their opinions of family-work conflict. Of the 165 respondents, over a third (37%) of men and almost half (49%) of women reported family-work conflict had impacted upon work performance within the previous year, which they linked to fatigue, irritability, reduced concentration and problems with decision-making.

The negative relations between family-work conflict and work outcomes were also demonstrated by a meta-analysis conducted by Hoobler and colleagues (2010) who sought to explore whether conflict between family and work led to a glass-ceiling-like career effects – that is, it whether employees who experienced conflicts between the family and work domains suffered from organisational level career barriers, such as fewer promotions. Their results demonstrated that family-work conflict was negatively related to salary, career satisfaction, manager-rated work performance and self-rated work performance. This further demonstrates that family-work conflict is associated with work outcomes.

While the abovementioned research demonstrates links between family interferences with work and work outcomes at a general level, the following six subsections focus on research evidence relating to specific aspects of employee engagement as illustrated in *Figure 1*.

Lower job satisfaction

As explained in section 1, job satisfaction has clear links with employee engagement, and therefore work outcomes. In relation, one meta-analysis included 178 articles to explore the strength of the relationship between different problems in family life and their impact upon work (Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007). Family stress, which included role overload, and family conflict (including marital conflict/tension), was strongly correlated with family interferences with work, and also negatively correlated with job satisfaction (Ford et al., 2007). Therefore, though the link found between family stress and the work domain was not as strong as the link between job stress and the family domain,

these correlations are nevertheless significant (Ford et al., 2007), and are especially important for employers given the role of job satisfaction in work outcomes.

Shockley and Singla (2011) extended these investigations in their meta-analysis, in which they sought to examine the pattern of relationships between family-work interactions and job and family satisfaction. Findings showed that family interferences with work were more strongly linked to family satisfaction than job satisfaction, but it is vital to note that the link between family interference with work and job satisfaction was still significant (Shockley & Singla, 2011).

In another meta-analysis, Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran note that “repeated interruption of work role performance by family demands may be a stronger instigator of decreased job satisfaction” than when work interrupts an individual’s ability to meet their family demands (2005, p. 230). So, for example, an employee may be going through a rough patch in his romantic relationship and he ends up spending more time and thought figuring out how to ease his relationship problems, and he is also coming into work stressed and tired due to the arguments ensuing with his partner – this distracts him at work, thus reducing his work performance and productivity.

All of these meta-analytic studies highlight the importance of couple and family relationships in job satisfaction, and therefore work outcomes. More recent empirical research backs up their findings. For example, a study utilising data from 439 Australian social workers found that family-work conflict was a significant predictor of reduced job satisfaction (Kalliath & Kalliath, 2015). Another recent study conducted with 281 American couples found that negative marital interactions were associated with significantly lower job satisfaction for men⁶, with reduced concentration, lack of social support and a drain on physical and emotional resources suggested as possible pathways for this shortcoming (Sandberg et al., 2013).

Poorer employee health

In a recent meta-analysis of 98 cross-sectional studies authors reported that “[work interfering with family] was more strongly related to work-related outcomes than to family related outcomes, and [family interfering with work] was more strongly related to family-related outcomes than to work-related outcomes” (Amstad et al., 2011, p. 160). However, the **researchers did find consistent support for a negative association between family interfering with work and work-related performance**, and it was also significantly correlated with emotional exhaustion. When considering particular areas of work-related outcomes they reported that family interference with work had the

⁶ A significant relationship was not identified for women, yet the authors suggest that this may be due to the fact that only 52% of women reported working at least 40 hours per week, compared to 94% of men (Sandberg et al., 2013, p. 817).

strongest negative associations with general stress, work-related stress, burnout/exhaustion, and health problems⁷. Importantly, family interference with work was found to have the strongest overall relationship to outcomes including stress, health problems, depression, life satisfaction and psychological strain. This indicates that outcomes in an individual's personal life impact areas of life, that, though not considered part of the work domain, may impact on work outcomes indirectly.

Less organisational citizenship behaviours

Notably, organisational citizenship behaviour is synonymous with employee engagement, and therefore work outcomes (as explained at the beginning of this review). Given the importance of this link, it is interesting to note that in their meta-analysis Amstad and colleagues (2011) found that family interferences with work were negatively associated with organisational citizenship behaviours. While these results should be interpreted with caution as only 3 studies in the meta-analysis explored the links between family interferences with work and organisational citizenship behaviours, they are further supported by a more recent empirical study involving 160 correctional staff at a maximum security prison in the USA (Lambert et al., 2013). The authors reported that family-work conflict was negatively associated with organisational citizenship behaviours. Given that family-work conflict may be indicative of high demands or problems in couple/family relationships it is not surprising that employees experiencing those may not be in a position to 'go the extra mile' at work.

Absenteeism and lower concentration at work

In their recent survey research, 'Engaging businesses to support relationships', the Tavistock Centre for Couple Research found that family-work conflict was linked to employee absence (in the past 5 years) of 64% of men and 72% of women (TCCR, 2013). Providing stronger support for this link with absenteeism, another study utilised a longitudinal design in which data was collected twice, a year apart, in a Dutch subsidiary of an international financial consultancy firm to assess how home domains (including home demands and the quality of time spent at home) effected unplanned absenteeism and health (ten Brummelhuis, ter Hoeven, de Jong, & Peper, 2013). *Home demands* were assessed using a scale that measured physical, emotional and psychological demands, while home quality time measured social interactive and relaxing time at home (ten Brummelhuis et al.,

⁷ The effect sizes reported were small to moderate, and aside from the results regarding work-related stress which included 13 studies, due to the lack of work on these individual indicators, the authors advise caution in interpreting these results (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011).

2013, p. 279). An online questionnaire was filled out by 1,014 employees, and absence records were also utilised – results demonstrated that those with heavy burdens at home reported more psychological stress; including unhappiness, depression and loneliness; as well as more physical problems such as difficulties concentrating and severe headaches. These issues, along with less quality time at home, were related to diminished work motivation, and longer and more frequent absences in the following year. Relatedly, in exploring family-work conflict amongst 344 American employees, Ferguson and colleagues reported that “the more draining the experience of family-to-work conflict the more likely the individual was to engage in deviant behaviors [e.g. ‘slack off’ work or attend to non-work matters whilst at work] and that these effects exist beyond those exhibited by work related factors such as work stress” (2012, p. 254).

Another study, Unger and colleagues (2014) found that during days when relationship quality was poor and there was a high degree of relationship hassles, employees reduced the time they allocated to work and shifted their attention and time to their private life. This work is further supported by another recent diary study by Nohe and colleagues (2014), which examined whether daily family-work conflict was associated with daily job performance using records covering 390 days supplied by 95 employees in a German organisation. Results demonstrated that family-work conflict was linked to lower levels of concentration, which, in turn, was associated with lower levels of job performance. The authors highlight that supervisory support, education for employees on handling the family-work interface, and intervention programmes specifically focussing on couples may help to reduce such family-work conflict (N.B. such interventions will be considered further in section 4).

Poorer interactions with colleagues

A recent diary study, which examined 800 diary entries from 160 participants across 25 different organisations, provides further support for the existence of negative links between family-work conflict and work outcomes (Sanz-Vergel, Rodríguez-Muñoz, & Nielsen, 2015). They found that family-work conflict “increases interpersonal conflicts at work on a daily basis”, and it is suggested that this may be because “family interference makes the employee irritable, reacting negatively towards colleagues instead of using more adaptive strategies such as seeking support or being assertive” (Sanz-Vergel et al., 2015, p. 11).

In addition, if an employee acts as a leader (i.e., supervisor/line manager) to other employees, their family-work conflict may be important in a number of ways, because not only does family-work conflict have the potential to impact upon the leader’s work engagement, but the negative outcomes of such conflict also appear to be transmitted over to impact upon their subordinates’

work engagement (ten Brummelhuis, Haar, & Roche, 2014). Given this finding, ten Brummelhuis and colleagues conclude “that limiting detrimental family-to-work spillover would benefit leaders and their followers” (p. 944). Building on this negative transfer, it is suggested here that the detrimental impacts of family-work conflict could also cross over to peers at work, rather than just filtering down to subordinates, however no research has been located in relation to this.

Negative crossover

Research demonstrates evidence of negative crossover of skills or emotions related to work outcomes, whereby fatigue or expressions of work-related doubt in an employee may impact negatively on their partner’s work outcomes. For example, one USA study involving 190 employees and their partners found that an employee’s work-family conflict crossed over and thus impacted upon their partner’s family-work conflict, causing more deviant behaviours, which may undermine work outcomes (Ferguson et al., 2012). Sanz-Vergel and colleagues (2015) also found evidence of employees’ family-work conflict, conflicts at work, and conflicts at home crossing over to partners’ experiences of conflicts at home. Furthermore Carlson and colleagues (2015) carried out research with 639 married couples in full-time employment and found that as employees struggle to balance their work, the strain involved in this crosses over to their spouses. These negative exchanges between partners therefore have implications for both partner’s work outcomes, as the issues that one partner has might impact negatively on their significant other’s work engagement and related outcomes.

The reciprocal relationship between family-work conflict and work outcomes

The majority of studies included in the aforementioned meta-analyses are cross-sectional studies, and as a result researchers are unable to decipher causality. However, one recent meta-analysis of 33 panel studies (i.e., where the same groups of people are followed over a period of time) recognised this and sought to explore longitudinal relationships between work, family and strain (i.e., psychological, behavioural and physiological reactions to environmental demands, threats and challenges, including responses such as burnout, depression and headache). Nohe and colleagues (2015) specifically aimed to disentangle the extent to which strain was caused by family interfering with work or work interfering with family, and also the direction of the relationship (i.e., does family interfering with work cause strain, or are family interferences with work caused by strain?). The first notable finding was that, over time, work interfering with family seemed to have a stronger impact on strain than family interfering with work. Unfortunately the studies in this meta-analysis did not

provide sufficient information to differentiate between time-, behaviour-, or strain-related facets, meaning that it was not possible to consider if there were particular elements of family interferences with work that were more poignant in strain. Particularly important for this review is that Nohe and colleagues also identified a reciprocal relationship between family interfering with work and strain. This provides rebuttal to the previously assumed unidirectional nature of the relationship, whereby family interferences with work were assumed to *cause* strain. Instead, the results suggest that individuals may enter a 'spiral of loss' (Nohe et al., 2015).

The 'spiral of loss' originates in the idea of resource loss, which links to the literature covered above on family interferences with work. This concept assumes that "people expend resources to address the presence of a stressor" (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012, p. 3). Furthermore, stress occurs when such resources are lost, or there is a threat of loss. When resources are lost that individuals are motivated to maintain, this is likely to lead to more conflict between family/relationships and work. When no action is taken to maintain or recover these resources this may lead to a spiral of loss, in which resources continue to be lost from multiple areas of life (van Steenbergen, Kluwer, & Karney, 2014). Considering the focus of this review, one example may be that a couple is having personal problems, and this leads to a deterioration of concentration on paid work. In turn, more time is required to complete work tasks which means less time can be spent on re-establishing the couple relationship – for example, overtime may be required – which thus leads to further deterioration of the couple relationship, and so the spiral continues.

Overall, though the meta-analyses presented here tend to find that workplace outcomes may be impacted *more* by work-family conflict than by family-work conflict, family and couple relationships are shown to be significant in work outcomes, and these relationships should not be neglected (Amstad et al., 2011, p. 161). With this in mind, Amstad and colleagues (2011, p. 161) draw attention to the possibility of a feedback loop, whereby family-related issues may be an antecedent for family interferences with work rather than a consequence of them. In other words, family-related issues worsen one's family-related wellbeing. A negative state of family-related wellbeing, *in turn*, creates family interferences with work, which influences one's work-related wellbeing. Alternatively, they suggest that a stressful family environment may impact upon an individual's wellbeing by affecting their family-related wellbeing directly and *simultaneously*, thereby creating family interferences with work, which influences both family-related wellbeing *and* work-related wellbeing. So rather than a unidirectional process as suggested by the feedback loops, this gives evidence for a reciprocal spiral. Whether operating in one direction or reciprocally, each process draws attention to the importance of family and couple relationships in work outcomes.

As demonstrated throughout this section on family-work conflict, there is a growing body of empirical coverage on how couple and family relationships can impact negatively on work outcomes. Although the focus has traditionally been placed on exploring how work impacts upon family life (possibly due to the research interests and background of those conducting research in this area), this section demonstrates that there is enough evidence to suggest that a focus on strengthening and improving relationships at home would have a beneficial impact on work outcomes.

While the work considering poor family/couple outcomes is undoubtedly important for gauging a whole picture of how relationships impact upon work, it is vital to consider the lesser explored, but extremely important positive links that exist between good relationships and work, as covered in the following section.

2. Are good couple/family relationship situations linked with better work outcomes?

Background

In contrast to the previous section, which considered the associations between poor couple and family relationship situations and work outcomes, this section demonstrates how good family/couple relationship situations might support better work outcomes. While family-work conflict is related to the idea that individuals have a finite amount of resources (e.g., time spent with family subtracts from time spent doing work), the concept explored in this section works off a different principle – family-work enrichment.

Family-work enrichment can be understood as how participation in one role is made easier by, or benefits from enhanced performance in, the other role (Shockley & Singla, 2011). Here family-work enrichment will be used as an umbrella term that encapsulates all positive interactions (e.g. enhancement, positive spillover, facilitation⁸) representing facets of couple/family life that are positively related to outcomes in work life. Rather than a spiral of loss as associated with family-work conflict, family-work enrichment can be viewed in relation to a ‘spiral of gain’ – positive resources in one sphere are conserved and in turn create positive outcomes in the other (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).

The ‘spiral of gain’ originates in the idea of resource attainment, which links to the literature covered in this section on how family and work can enrich one another. When resources are gained, this may lead to enrichment, as those resources are used to obtain further resources which are valued by the individual, thereby creating a spiral of gain, and a consequent accumulation of resources (van Steenbergen et al., 2014). Entering this spiral may improve individual outcomes by creating a buffer for when difficult times crop up (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). Resource gain draws from the idea that managing multiple roles may facilitate the acquisition of resources, rather than just depleting them (e.g. through skill acquisition, or resource replenishment). So, for example, an individual may have a very supportive partner who encourages and supports them in their paid work. This provides them with positive emotions which are then transferred to the work environment, as they are able to focus on their work, and their partner’s encouragement has increased their self-belief. This effectiveness at work allows the individual to avoid overtime and

⁸ While enhancement, positive spillover and facilitation have some differences, they are often used interchangeably in the literature (Russo & Buonocore, 2012, p. 217). For brevity, this is the approach taken in this report.

spend quality time with their partner regularly, which in turn improves the couple relationship further.

Couple and family relationships are a valued part of many people's lives. However if there are problems in these relationships, they may take up more of employees' emotional resources, and potentially their time. Given that those with more job resources (i.e., aspects of the job that are either functional in achieving work goals, reducing job demands, or stimulating personal growth, learning, and development) perform better at work (Akkermans, Schaufeli, Brenninkmeijer, & Blonk, 2013), it then seems logical that the resources developed or freed by improving couple/family relationships may also benefit employees in their workplaces.

Family-Work Enrichment is associated with better employee engagement

This section provides a brief introduction to some of the general links between good couple/family relationship situations, employee engagement, and work outcomes. In one recent article the authors highlight that "**when spouses have a good and stable marriage, they are more likely to experience family-work enrichments, which can result in better performance at work, and attainment of even more resources at work**" (van Steenbergen et al., 2014, p. 192). This study, which focussed on how *work-family enrichment* (i.e., when work experiences improve the quality of family life) and conflict interact with marriage, showed that even though anger and withdrawal stemming from work-family conflict were negatively correlated with marital positivity, work-family enrichment was a stronger predictor of marital positivity (van Steenbergen et al., 2014). This suggests that 'resource gain' is actually stronger than 'resource drain', despite the majority of research focussing on the latter. Though no meta-analyses have been located on this topic, a number of empirical studies have reported that enrichment processes between couple/family relationships and work have a positive impact on work outcomes (Tsionou & Konstantopoulos, 2015).

Longitudinal work helps to further assess the associations between family and work enrichment processes and work outcomes over time. In their study, Moazami-Goodarzi and colleagues carried out a longitudinal project exploring the associations between vigour at work and work-family enrichment. Though focussing on work-family enrichment, it is interesting to note that results showed a bi-directional positive link between vigour at work and work-family enrichment: vigour at time 1 positively predicted work-family enrichment at time 2, and that work-family enrichment at time 2 positively predicted vigour at time 3 (Moazami-Goodarzi, Nurmi, Mauno, & Rantanen, 2014). They concluded that organisations will benefit from developing interventions which facilitate

resource generation (e.g. support, control at work and positively challenging tasks) between the workplace and family.

Similarly, Timms and colleagues (2015) carried out a survey with 420 employees at two time-points and reported that work-family enrichment predicts work engagement. More specifically they found that experiences at work that facilitate positive mood and a ***sense of confidence in family life*** are associated with work engagement and family satisfaction, and conclude that “enriched experiences at the workplace provide tangible benefits to people's family lives and long-term returns to organizations in the form of ongoing employee engagement”.

Considering the results of these studies, it is suggested here that one way of generating such resources in work (thereby potentially helping to create work-family enrichment, and in turn, workplace engagement) may be through supporting couple/family relationships through workplace policy, programmes and supervisory support, all of which are further described in section 3. However, first, the remainder of this section seeks to explore how family and couple relationships might be positively related to other outcomes considered beneficial for work. The following six subsections focus on research evidence relating to specific aspects of employee engagement as illustrated in *Figure 1*.

Higher job satisfaction

As described previously, higher job satisfaction is associated with more employee engagement, and better work outcomes. In relation, one meta-analysis found that family support, which included spouse support and general family support, was negatively and significantly correlated with family interferences with work, and positively correlated with job satisfaction (Ford et al., 2007). In other words, family and spousal support was linked to less family interferences with work and higher job satisfaction. In relation, another meta-analysis included 25 studies to assess the links between family-work enrichment and certain family and work-related outcomes (McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2009). Results showed family-work enrichment had a positive relationship with job satisfaction, yet the direction of these relationships could not be established. An example of empirical work that supports these meta-analyses comes from Balmforth and Gardner (2006) who found that respondents with higher levels of enrichment between family to work reported higher levels of job satisfaction.

These abovementioned findings were to some extent contradicted by a meta-analysis which found that the path between family-work enrichment and family satisfaction was stronger than the path

between family-work enrichment and job satisfaction, while work-family enrichment was more strongly correlated with job satisfaction than family satisfaction (Shockley & Singla, 2011). Again, due to the cross-sectional nature of the studies included in the meta-analysis, causal pathways could not be established. Such findings are replicated by a recent study of Italian employees – however, though results demonstrated that work-family enrichment has a stronger positive relationship with work engagement than family-work enrichment, a relationship was reported between the latter (De Simone et al., 2013). Taken together, these studies suggest a positive link between family-work enrichment and job satisfaction.

Higher organisational commitment

As described in section 1, organisational commitment can be defined as the level of loyalty between an employee and their employer. Family-work enrichment has been noted as being associated with this. For example Balmforth and Gardner (2006) reported a positive relationship between family-work facilitation and organisational commitment, and a negative relationship to turnover intentions. Such findings are also supported by a meta-analysis, which found that family-work enrichment had a positive relationship with organisational commitment (McNall et al., 2009).

These findings are reinforced by a couple of more recent empirical studies that focus in on the value of partner/family support in levels of commitment to career and organisation. One study, involving 1,436 Canadian lawyers who were married or living in common law partnerships, demonstrated that “support from one’s spouse is related to career commitment, where the more satisfied the lawyer is with his or her marital relationship, the more committed they are to their legal career” (Wallace, 2013, p. 146). The authors go on to suggest that those “who are more satisfied with the quality of their marital relationship, may find that their spouse supports their career, and listens and empathizes with the stresses of their work, which enhances their work attitudes” (p. 147).

Furthermore, Wayne and colleagues (2013) surveyed 453 employees and their partners (i.e., 906 respondents) – results demonstrated that employees’ perceptions of the family supportiveness of their organisation was negatively associated with work-family conflict. In turn, this was related to their partners’ higher commitment to the employees’ work organisation, which was positively related to employees’ own organisational commitment (Wayne et al., 2013). Following on from these studies, spousal support for an employee’s career has also been found to decrease the odds of turnover (Huffman et al, 2014).

More concentration

A recent empirical study by Unger and colleagues (2014) explored how relationship quality was related to the time use of 76 cohabiting couples who worked, at least 20 hours per week, in German and Austrian universities and other research organisations. A survey was filled in 3 times per day by each partner resulting in data from 468 days. They found that ***on days when employees reported high relationship quality and low degree of hassle more time was allocated to the work domain.*** Though much research explores the negative impact of family issues on work, this study also demonstrates that ***higher relationship quality is related to higher work engagement,*** thereby suggesting that increasing relationship quality of employees has the potential to improve their work outcomes.

Better interactions with colleagues

Notably, supervisors have often been highlighted as instrumental in facilitating positive relationships between family and work. Family-supportive supervisory behaviour (discussed further in section 4 on interventions), is a concept commonly explored in the existing literature. However recent work highlights the seemingly obvious, but surprisingly overlooked fact, that supervisors also have their own couple and family relationship issues. In acknowledging this, a group of researchers sought to explore how the family matters of leaders (e.g. supervisors/line managers) impacted upon their own work outcomes, and also how they impacted upon the work outcomes of the employees they supported (ten Brummelhuis et al., 2014). The study was conducted across 260 organisations in New Zealand, and involved 199 leaders and 456 of their subordinates. Leaders were surveyed first on their family-work enrichment and conflict, then again one month later on job burnout (i.e., emotional exhaustion and cynicism), work engagement (i.e., vigour, dedication and absorption), and positive and negative affect (e.g. upset, irritable, enthusiastic, interested). A week after the completion of the second leaders' survey, subordinates completed a survey on their own burnout, work engagement, and positive and negative affect, as well as rating their supervisor's supportive behaviours. While family-work conflict was detrimental to work outcomes (as discussed in section 2), this study also demonstrated that:

“leaders who experienced high levels of [family-work enrichment] were more enthusiastic, vigorous, and dedicated at work. Leaders were able to transfer these positive feelings to their followers, boosting the work engagement of followers.”

(ten Brummelhuis et al., 2014, p. 939)

Notably, these results demonstrate that “[l]eaders’ family matters first spill over to the work domain, affecting leaders’ well-being, and those well-being outcomes in turn cross over to followers at work” (p. 939). The indirect effect of leader’s family-work enrichment on their subordinates work engagement was a significant finding, and the authors conclude their article by noting “the importance of work-life balance and having good relationships at home ... family life can facilitate managers in fulfilling their work role. Investing in the family role may thus also be professionally rewarding, contributing to inspiring and successful leadership” (p. 944).

Skill transference

Another way in which couple/family relationships may improve work outcomes is through *skill transference*. That is, the skills learned and practiced in relationships at home and in the family domain have been shown to improve outcomes in the work domain. One cross-sectional study, conducted in 2006, with 58 employees in a human resource consultancy in New Zealand explored how couple and family relationships might enrich work life and improve outcomes (Balmforth & Gardner, 2006). Furthermore, a qualitative study conducted in the Netherlands involved semi-structured face-to-face interviews with 25 employees in which they sought to explore different aspects (i.e., time-based, energy-based, behavioural and psychological) of family-work enrichment and work-family enrichment (van Steenbergen, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2007). Quotes taken from participants of the two studies help to elucidate how good couple/family relationships may contribute to family-work skill transference:

“Family experience both in negotiations with my marriage partner and raising my children have helped negotiation skills at work, and expanded my understanding of human nature. In turn work has improved my communication skills and patience to use at home.”

(participant in Balmforth & Gardner, 2006, p. 73)

“It’s fun being a dad. It gives you a lot of pleasure and positive energy, which makes itself felt at work.”

(participant in van Steenbergen et al., 2007, p. 285)

Positive crossover

The transmission of beneficial skills occurs not only between domains, but also between partners. A number of interesting studies have demonstrated that an ***individuals' sense of job-related self-efficacy can also cross over to their partner, thus indirectly improving their partner's work engagement*** (Demerouti, 2012; Neff, Niessen, Sonnentag, & Unger, 2013). For example, Demerouti (2012) explored how the resources of one partner might improve the work outcomes of their significant other through various pathways with 131 dual-earner couples in the Netherlands. Results showed that the job resources of an employee impacted upon their energy at home, which in turn impacted upon their partner's assessment of their own home resources, which then impacted that partner's energy.

Further support for the crossover of ability at work based on a partner's influence comes from a diary study involving 500 entries from 100 Spanish employees (50 cohabiting, dual-earner heterosexual couples) (Rodríguez-Muñoz, Sanz-Vergel, Demerouti, & Bakker, 2014). The authors demonstrated that employees' work engagement (i.e., vigour and dedication) was positively related to their partners' daily happiness through the employees' own daily happiness (Rodríguez-Muñoz et al., 2014). This shows that it is not only skills, but also mood, that may cross over between partners, and it is suggested here that these emotions may materialise in the workplace.

Neff and colleagues (2013) conducted a similar investigation in Germany, employing an online questionnaire with 204 participants (102 heterosexual, cohabiting couples) to explore vicarious experience (whereby partners act as models for one's own self-expectations) and verbal persuasion (whereby partners express belief in their partner's work-related ability) as the mediators in this process – results suggested that ***“one's partner can not only positively affect one's job-related self-efficacy through crossover processes, but this transmission in turn is related to one's work engagement”*** (p.821).

In relation, Tement (2014) explored how family support may be related to work engagement via its association with self-efficacy (i.e., how well one judges they can cope and deal with the demands of a given situation). After surveying 756 employees who worked at least 20 hours per week (84.1% were either married or in a long-term relationship), results demonstrated that family support was most strongly and positively related to self-efficacy amongst those with low positive affectivity (defined as a tendency towards positive emotionality, characterised by being energetic, determined, concentrated and engaged). The authors suggest that this may indicate that social support acts as an

enabler for improved self-efficacy, which demonstrates how good quality, supportive couple relationships have potential to enable work engagement.

These links to both –family-work enrichment and conflict suggest that supporting couple relationships is also important in a more indirect manner, especially amongst dual-earner couples, as it enables the positive crossover of work-related outcomes from one partner to another. Presumably, healthier couple relationships with better communication are likely to offer more avenues for positive crossover to occur.

Couple communication and work outcomes

One of the key ways that couple relationships may play a part in family-work enrichment is through couple communication. In one recent study Carroll and colleagues (2013) surveyed 1,117 full-time employed married couples to explore the relationship between the couple's communication practices, marital satisfaction and work-family conflict. While work-family conflict was significantly negatively related to marital satisfaction, communication played an important role in mediating that relationship. Results showed that, while destructive communication (e.g. criticism, defensiveness, contempt, avoiding, defensiveness) was significantly and positively associated with work-family conflict and significantly negatively associated with marital satisfaction, constructive communication (e.g. empathy, the ability to calm oneself during an argument, clarity of expressing oneself with partner) was significantly and negatively related to work-family conflict and positively related to marital satisfaction. In other words, couples who communicated positively with each other tended to be happier in their marriages and experienced less work-family conflict. Notably the authors highlight the destructive communication also has the ability to impact on the work domain, as the poor marital communication may worsen health and increase depressiveness, which may reduce work satisfaction – ultimately, through the impact on work-family conflict this may in turn lead to a spiral of loss. The authors conclude:

“since the mastery of communication skills seems to ameliorate the effects of [work-family conflict] on marital satisfaction, an employee’s marital communication skills is a potentially rich point of intervention. Managers could offer marital communication skills training in their workplace, allowing an opportunity for their employees to increase their marital satisfaction even though work demands may still remain high. A side benefit might be that these same communication skills may help make the employees more effective on the job as well.”

(Carroll et al., 2013, p. 540)

Therefore, though Carroll and colleagues focussed on work-family conflict, their findings with regards to constructive communication actually demonstrated how communication skills may enrich the work domain.

A student project followed this up by exploring the relationship between couple communication, relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction and family-work conflict/work-family conflict (Konik, 2014). Though results should be interpreted with caution given that this work has not been officially peer-reviewed, it was considered reasonable to include this study due to the lack of research on the interaction between couple communication and work performance. Konik (2014) surveyed 93 employees in relationships, and analyses demonstrated that overall communication skills were significantly, negatively related to lower levels of family-work conflict. More specifically, conflict management skills, comforting skills, ego support skills, referential skills (i.e., the ability to explain things clearly), and conversational skills were negatively and significantly related to family-work conflict at an individual level. Furthermore, avoidant communication patterns, were most significantly related to family-work conflict, even more so than negative communication. Konik concludes that workplace interventions to improve communication skills may be useful for home and work outcomes.

In relation to the previous two studies, McAllister and colleagues (2012) used data on 567 couples in the USA, who all had a child aged 10-11, to explore how couple emotional intimacy, defined as the level of emotional support and connectedness in a relationship, impacted upon perceptions of work. The authors found that partner's perceptions of the emotional intimacy in their relationship was associated with less concerns about their job, and with their paid work being more rewarding. In other words, ***“an emotionally supportive partner can lead an individual to perceive their job in a more positive light than they would otherwise”*** (McAllister, Thornock, Hammond, Holmes, & Hill, 2012, p. 342). As suggested by the authors, the emotional connection between partners may act as a buffer against job concerns, and lessen their negative influence on the employee.

“In addition, positive emotions from couple emotional intimacy may spill over into the workplace, leading employees to view their jobs as more rewarding. These perceptions may also influence workers to be more engaged in their jobs and to contribute more positively to the emotional climate of their work groups.”

(McAllister et al., 2012, p. 342)

Taken together, these studies on couple communication give preliminary evidence that improving couple communication and related emotional intimacy is one avenue for employers to enrich the family-work interaction, in turn improving employee engagement and work outcomes. Notably, a recent literature review highlighted that employees' couple and family relationships are vital in the development of such emotional and social skills (Koubova & Buchko, 2013).

3. What interventions help to improve work outcomes?

This section considers how interventions delivered in or through the workplace that focus on supporting and improving couple/family relationships may help to improve work outcomes.

Implementing workplace policy

In exploring the literature on couple/family relationships and employee engagement it became apparent that many of the initial efforts to lessen the conflict between work and home life focussed on the effectiveness of work policies, such as flexible working and on-site child care. One meta-analysis, including a combined sample of 72,507 employees, explored the effectiveness of general work support (i.e., support for personal effectiveness at work) and family-specific work support (i.e., helps employees to jointly manage work and home interactions), at both organisational and supervisory levels (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). Family-specific support at both levels was more strongly related to work-family conflict (Kossek et al., 2011).

In relation, more recently, researchers have suggested that even in organisations where such policies are in place, employees may be reluctant to take advantage of them due to a fear of negative career consequences (Bagger & Li, 2014; McCarthy, Cleveland, Hunter, Darcy, & Grady, 2013). It may be that this relates to the overall ethos of the company and the values and attitudes it supports in everyday practice attitudes.

Notably, family supportive practices may also have different meanings depending on ethnicity and potential related cultural norms – for example Khokher and Beauregard (2014) find that amongst newly expatriate Pakistani workers in the UK, because familial childcare is strongly preferred, “part-time or flexible hours have the potential to significantly affect employment outcomes for Pakistani expatriate women, who, in the absence of extended family to provide care for children, might not otherwise return to work following childbirth”. Another recent study explored employees' utilisation of work family policies across five Western European countries, and the study showed that the level

of utilisation differed across countries welfare state regimes and with levels of national gender equality (Beham, Drobnič, & Präg, 2014). Taken together, such findings suggest that implementing family policies in workplaces, without also ensuring other mechanisms are in place to encourage employees to use them to their advantage, and in line with their specific personal requirements, are limited in their ability to improve the exchange between relationships at home and work outcomes.

Improving supervisory support

Supervisors/line managers have been found to be central to creating a family-friendly workplace. In relation, the meta-analysis mentioned above concluded that their “study clearly demonstrates that supervisors are the mechanism for shaping views of general and work– family-specific support and its association with work–family conflict” (Kossek et al., 2011, p. 304).

Family-supportive supervisory behaviours (FSSB) can be understood as the practices of supervisors that help their employees to reduce conflict between family and work domains. Much empirical work supports the idea that “**when employees believe that their supervisors care about their family needs, they may respond by having more positive perceptions of their work environment**” in the form of greater job satisfaction and stronger commitment to continuing employment in that organisation (Bagger & Li, 2014, p. 1126). Furthermore, it has been suggested that supportive colleagues and supervisors provide a more informal, less visible way to support work-family balance (de Janasz, Behson, Jonsen, & Lankau, 2013). In their study involving 560 employees of an American Fortune 500 company, de Janasz and colleagues (2013) found that direct support offered by a mentor, and contextual support gauged through supportive work-family cultures, helped employees to balance their roles. More specifically, and very importantly, **a mentor was significantly related to commitment to the job**, while a supportive work-family culture was associated with less work-family conflict.

Another valuable study was conducted with 5 large government organisations and 10 large private sector organisations in Ireland, and involved 15 human resources managers, 133 supervisors and 729 employees (McCarthy et al., 2013). Results demonstrated that supervisor support is a critical skill to develop among leaders because it helps better work-life balance, specifically in terms of less role conflict, greater job satisfaction and less turnover intentions (McCarthy et al., 2013). In relation, Bagger and Li (2014) conducted two studies to explore the relationships between FSSB and employees’ attitudes and behaviours. They found that offering support to their subordinate in family matters helped supervisors to establish high quality relationships with their employees, which lead to higher job satisfaction and lower turnover intentions among their employees. Furthermore, supportive supervisors was particularly effective at improving work outcomes when family-related

benefits at work were low (Bagger & Li, 2014). Similar results are reported in another study which included 503 employees and their spouses, demonstrating that FSSB and work boundary flexibility helps employees manage the work-family interface, and thus contributes to their commitment to the organisation (Ferguson, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2014). Ferguson and colleagues also demonstrate that such work support impacts upon spouses' commitment to their partner's organisation which, in turn, plays an important role in employees' attitude towards the organisation (p.25).

The supportiveness of supervisors may also potentially be linked to positive emotions stemming from the work environment. In relation, one longitudinal study, involving 200 employees from a Dutch university, explored how work-related positive emotions are linked to increased resources and work engagement. They found that though there does not appear to be a clear causal sequence, positive emotions, personal resources and work engagement constitute a loop so that "employees who experience positive [work-related] emotions are likely to feel more positive about their work-related abilities" (Ouweneel, Blanc, & Schaufeli, 2012, p. 549). Linked to this, another study, involving 214 employees, found that the moods and psychological resources generated through work that then go on to impact the family partially mediate the relationship between supervisor support and job satisfaction (Nicklin & McNall, 2013). Finally, a particularly helpful longitudinal study, conducted in three waves in 2008, 2009 and 2010, examined how social support provided by those at work (i.e., supervisors and colleagues) impacted upon work-family enrichment (Cheng, Mauno, & Lee, 2014). Results "suggest that, in the presence of high job insecurity, employees who are receiving more social support tend to report better occupational well-being" (p. 1285), in terms of vigour at work and job satisfaction.

Given this background to FSSB, one exemplary randomised controlled study assessed the effectiveness of an intervention to increase supervisors' family-supportive behaviours (Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011). There were 6 intervention sites, and 6 control sites, all of which were supermarkets. Supervisors at the intervention sites undertook a blended learning programme, consisting of computer-based training and a 1-hour face-to-face training element (N.B. details of content of each provided in article). Following their training, 39 supervisors changed their behaviour, and 32 of those took part in voluntary monitoring of those changes over the following 3-5 weeks. In conjunction with the supervisory training, 360 employees took part in baseline questionnaire, and 239 completed follow-up questionnaires, which assessed FSSB, work-family conflict/family-work conflict, job satisfaction and intentions to quit, and physical health. Results showed that the intervention was positive for those employees with the higher levels of family-work conflict, but may have negative impact on those with low family-work conflict. Hammer and

colleagues hypothesised that this may be because supervisors focussed their attentions on those they believed had higher family-work conflict, or that the company had focussed resources on an area that they were unlikely to need/use. Whilst more research is required to clarify these links, the utilisation of a blended learning programme delivered to line managers appears helpful for those employees in most need.

In 2014 the initial intervention from Hammer and colleagues (2011) was further developed (Kossek, Hammer, Kelly, & Moen, 2014). Using their initial pilot study and another model created by researchers the team created STAR (Start. Transform. Achieve. Results.), which focussed on a whole systems change approach to work-family conflict. It targeted multiple areas of work; including the organisation (work-family culture, leader and member behaviours, the structure of work), work teams and units, and individual behaviours (leader behaviours and self-monitoring); and included facilitator run participatory sessions (including scripts and interactive activities), and a computer-based training segment for FSSB. Their 2014 article presents a comprehensive case study of the delivery of this intervention to 15 nursing homes and “several dozen” teams in an IT unit, which would be helpful in the design of a similar intervention, but unfortunately they do not offer a systematic evaluation of the STAR programme effectiveness.

The above interventions are supported by another recent study, which employed training in the information technology division of an American Fortune 500 company (Kelly et al., 2014). The study included training for supervisors on strategies to demonstrate support for employee’s personal and family lives, and also participatory training for employees and managers to encourage new working practices that increase employees’ control over work time, shifting the focus to results rather than face time (Kelly et al., 2014). Overall, 694 employees completed both the baseline and 6-month follow-up stages, and results showed that the intervention impacted upon perceived FSSB more so among those employees who reported lower FSSB, and higher levels of family-work conflict and work-family conflict at baseline. Notably, fathers and ‘sandwich-generation’ employees (i.e., those with at least one child as well as adult care responsibilities) reported stronger effects of the intervention on support for family and personal life than mothers, which is suggested as possibly due to the normative roles of women as mothers and carers (Kelly et al., 2014, p. 504). Vitality, the flexibility and FSSB encouraged by this intervention may be increasingly important given the ageing population in the UK, and the increased care needs that accompany this (National Audit Office, 2014). Furthermore, the study demonstrated that those employees who engaged more in the intervention experienced significant and larger decreases in both family-work conflict and work-family conflict. The authors concluded that, through employing a rigorous randomised-trial design,

they “**demonstrated more conclusively that work-family conflicts are not simply private troubles of individual workers, but can be changed within workplaces**” (Kelly et al., 2014, p. 24).

In relation to the idea that work-family conflicts are not simply private troubles, a novel area of research provides interesting food for thought. Though the area is in its infancy, and thus should be interpreted with caution, one recent study explored the impact of conflict between work and family domains beyond personal work factors such as work engagement and productivity. Scott and colleagues (2015) demonstrated that an employee’s experience of work-family conflict is linked to their engagement in social undermining behaviour at work, whereby they may purposefully engage in damaging actions such as taking credit for a co-worker’s work, withholding information or engaging in slander. They suggest that this is explained by an employee’s perceived lack of fit with their organisation, which then links to that employees weakened sense of work-related identity, loyalty and commitment. These actions would undoubtedly have consequences for work outcomes.

Furthermore, Odle-Dusseau and colleagues (2013) recently conducted a longitudinal study to assess how family-supportive behaviours of supervisors, and family supportive organisational perceptions of their staff may predict job attitudes (i.e., organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and intentions to leave). A survey was conducted at two time points, with 174 participants to assess these factors, and supervisor ratings of employee performance were also collected. The results of their study indicated that, over time, employee perceptions of their supervisor’s family-supportive behaviours were significantly related to employees’ organisational commitment and intentions to leave, as well as to supervisor ratings of employees’ job performance. In addition, as suggested by the authors, while couple/family supportive organisational policies are still important, “the data support the argument that informal sources of support (i.e., FSSB) are more essential to helping employees manage work and family domains than formal sources of support (i.e., availability of formal benefits)” (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2013, p. 36). Therefore they conclude that “**[i]f supervisors have such a direct effect on their employees’ performance, it follows that providing information or training to supervisors on how to conduct themselves in more “family supportive” ways has the potential for improving employee performance**” (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2013, p. 36).

Improving couple and family relationships

While supporting employees’ relationships and family life through supervisory support may be important, another approach to improving the family-work interface is through workplace interventions that engage with employees directly. As detailed in the previous sections, a number of recent studies have concluded that an intervention to improve couple/family relationships may be

beneficial to work outcomes. However, there has been a mismatch between these suggestions and the actual delivery and evaluation of interventions that may lead to such improvements. The following section covers a small array of diverse interventions that have been delivered to couples/parents in order to improve relationships. The impact of these on work outcomes is also considered.

One recent study aimed to help dual-earner couples to manage work interferences in their romantic relationships (Bowers, Wiley, Jones, Ogolsky, & Branscomb, 2014). The intervention delivered a module entitled 'Managing Work and Your Couple Relationship' (which was drawn from a larger programme, developed by researchers, called 'Intentional Harmony: Managing Work and Life'). The aim was to "enhance individuals' involvement in their romantic partner role by improving their work-partner balance strategies and skills as well as their relationship satisfaction" (p. 59), with a focus on negative spillover from work into the couple relationship. Using a control (23 couples) and an intervention (24 couples) group, this study offered rare insight into the effectiveness of this kind of programme. Partners had self-identified themselves as being in a current committed relationship, and they and their partner had to be working for at least 20 hours per week to be included in the study. After pre-test, the module was delivered to the intervention group through a 2-hour interactive workshop using a PowerPoint presentation, video vignette and 3 handouts containing practical strategies distributed at the end. Over the following 3 weeks, one handout per week was mailed to the intervention couples by the project coordinator, and a post-test was completed 4 weeks after the workshop. Although there were no significant differences in relationship satisfaction, results showed that, compared to the control group, those intervention couples had improved the balance of work and their romantic relationships. Specifically, when compared to controls, the intervention group were significantly better at management of work-partner role conflict and in their partner practices (e.g. being sensitive to a partner's needs and creating opportunities for relaxed couple interaction), and there was also a greater reduction in physical and emotional strain. As noted in section 1, better employee health is associated with better work outcomes. Despite the positive results, a number of relationship outcomes did not show significant improvements (i.e., attention to one's role as a partner, organisation, management of overload and time conflicts), and the authors suggest that while helpful strategies were introduced in the intervention, the implementation of these strategies may require "more feedback and practice than possible in the brief format" (p. 68). This links back to the previous focus of this section – the importance of supervisory/line manager support in relationships – as it may be that by training supervisors they can offer an ongoing source of information and support in improving work and relationship outcomes.

Though designed with a focus on improving parenting and reducing related stress levels, one recent study reports on a workplace intervention (Workplace Triple P), which was delivered to teachers in Australia (Haslam et al., 2012). The programme teaches parenting skills to enable employees to parent more effectively, and coping skills to help employees to better manage their emotions and stress. Results show that when compared to those in the control group, employees in the intervention condition reported significantly lower levels of both family-to-work conflict and work-to-family conflict, higher levels of work-related efficacy, and lower levels of work-related stress (Haslam et al., 2012, p. 75). Furthermore, in the intervention group, child behaviours improved and parents reported significantly less dysfunctional parenting (i.e., lax, overreactive or verbose). Workplace Triple P was also delivered in Germany and the researchers explored mediators of the effects of the programme – results showed that reductions in individual stress levels were mediated by decreased levels of dysfunctional parenting (Hartung & Hahlweg, 2011). Notably, while ‘Workplace Triple P’ targeted parenting techniques in particular, it is not difficult to imagine that by, for example, teaching positive couple communication strategies (shown to impact positively on work engagement at the end of section 2 on family-work enrichment), an intervention to help improve couple relationship communication may have potential to help to relieve family-work conflict and/or work-family conflict, yet such a programme would need to be developed and evaluated to assess this.

Notably, a study conducted in the UK investigated interest in workplace interventions for family issues, amongst 721 working parents (362 males and 359 females) employed in organisations throughout England (Sanders, Haslam, Calam, Southwell, & Stallman, 2011). The vast majority of men (86 percent) and women (90 percent) reported they would attend a workplace parenting intervention if one were available, although unfortunately no indication was given as to whether the parents were in relationships or not. Furthermore, 96 percent of those surveyed endorsed the idea that “organisations that support employees better manage work and family demands are demonstrating they care about individual employees”, 87 percent endorsed the survey item stating “difficulties balancing work and family can impact job performance and work satisfaction”, whilst the least endorsed item was “my organisation supports me in managing my work and family commitments” (53 percent) (Sanders et al., 2011, p. 192).

Whilst cost-benefit analysis would be helpful for demonstrating the usefulness of such interventions, the only study found which focusses on costing, only details the implementation costs without

considering the savings of family-work interventions over time (Barbosa, Bray, Brockwood, & Reeves, 2014). This is unfortunate, as data was collected at 6, 12 and 18 months in order to evaluate the effects of the intervention. Furthermore, the implementation costs detailed in this study are related to a complex training programme spread over 4 months. This involved six face-to-face participatory training sessions delivered to managers and employees; a computer-based training session for managers on supportive behaviours known to affect outcomes; and two 2-week behavioural self-monitoring periods, during which managers monitored their supportive behaviours. Due to the multiple-strategy approach taken in this study and the lack of cost-benefit analysis, inclusion of the costs was not considered generalizable enough for the current review.

Conclusion

By exploring the processes involved in conflict and enrichment between the domains of family and work this review sought to demonstrate the couple and family relationships have an important role to play in employee engagement and work outcomes, such as productivity and performance. Not only does this review demonstrate the importance of good couple and family relationship situations for work through, for example, reducing conflicts and facilitating enrichment between domains, but vitally, it also shows how workplace settings can contribute to the maintenance of couple/family relationships through various interventions. Put more simply, workplaces seem to benefit from good couple and family relationships, while they also have the ability to strengthen them through workplace interventions.

Attention has been drawn to the lack of research available considering impacts of couple and family relationships on paid work outcomes, such as productivity and performance. However, the literature on the topic is undoubtedly growing. In particular, there is a specific lack of attention afforded to the *positive* impacts of couple and family relationships on the work domain. While few meta-analyses exist on this topic, recent empirical work demonstrates associations between the two. More work exists on the conflict between couple/family relationships and work. In relation, some meta-analyses have demonstrated that work interferences with family are associated with work outcomes more than family interferences with work are associated with work outcomes. However, it is very important to reiterate that, in conjunction with recent empirical work, they also demonstrate that even though the link may not be as strong, couple and family relationships have considerable associations with work productivity and performance.

This review also sought to summarise the small number of studies located that made specific efforts to support couple/family relationships through workplace interventions. While workplace policy links to official changes that might be made in organisations in order to support couples, research has demonstrated that putting these policies in place is not necessarily sufficient in encouraging employees to utilise them. Supportive leaders, who encourage their staff to take advantage of these policies appears to be one key way in which work may encourage better couple and family relationships, which in turn may help to improve work outcomes. Workplace interventions may also teach couples new skills and techniques that enable them to handle their couple and family relationships better. By assisting employees in gaining such skills, work organisations may not only assist their employees in entering a gain spiral, but they may also improve their employees organisational commitment and reduce their intention to quit, as they demonstrate their care for their employees personal lives, at a level beyond basic requirements rooted solely in work-based results.

Recommendations

This report concludes with a consideration for future research and intervention efforts that would help to strengthen the case for the importance of couple and family relationships in work outcomes.

Research

The literature review carried out for this report demonstrated that while the relationships between couple/family relationships and work have been explored a considerable amount, the majority of this work tends to focus on how work impacts upon couple relationships. Notably, as work-family conflict has been shown by some to be more important in work outcomes than family-work conflict, researchers often overlook the fact the latter is still a significant factor and thus should not be forgotten (Amstad et al., 2011). As such, opportunities for improving work outcomes through further exploration of family-work interactions should be grasped.

Possibly due to the fact that problems (i.e., conflict) between family and work domains are more apparent in day-to-day settings, the consideration of how they might enrich one another is considered less in the literature. More recently, researchers have begun to notice enrichment processes as a way that work outcomes might be improved. However, meta-analyses focussing solely on enrichment (i.e., including concepts such as facilitation, positive spillover, and enhancement) would help to strengthen the evidence base in this area.

Finally, the way that interventions might offer avenues to improve work outcomes by supporting better couple/family relationships is ripe for exploration. While it is difficult to know what other efforts might be going on under the radar, researchers, those delivering interventions, and work organisations are all urged to push for these efforts to be shared. By implementing evaluation of these programmes from the beginning, those invested in improving these relationships, and ultimately work outcomes, can learn from each other, and continually improve the effectiveness of such interventions.

Interventions

The section on interventions provided insight into efforts made by work organisations to help improve the interactions between family/couple relationships and work.

Firstly, implementing organisational policy that supports better couple and family relationships has an important role to play in strengthening these relationships, and in turn, employee engagement and related work outcomes. However, research has demonstrated that such actions represent an (albeit important) first step. If employees do not feel 'safe' in utilising these policies, for fear that doing so is atypical and may hinder the way they are viewed at work, it is less likely that benefits will be felt at both an individual and an organisational level. So while one recommendation for supporting positive work outcomes is to implement organisational policies that support couple and family relationships, the way that organisations support relationships needs to more than a 'tick-box' exercise.

One key way that employers may demonstrate this is by training employees (particularly those who are responsible for teams or other workers, such as supervisors and line managers) to support others in reducing conflicts between home and work life. They may also employ interventions that work directly with employees to improve their couple and family relationships – given the associations between good and bad couple/family relationships and work outcomes, as covered in sections 2 and 3, this is considered a rich area for intervention.

Notably, some of the interventions delivered to date have a clear focus on assessing improvements in couple/family relationships following the intervention, rather than on assessing the interventions impact on work outcomes. However, here it is considered that an intervention that reduces physical and emotional strain amongst couples also has the potential to improve work outcomes through helping to stem spirals of loss and creating spirals of gain. In relation, some research covered in this

review draws attention to the reciprocal nature of outcomes for couple/family relationships and work. Therefore interventions, and related evaluations of those, could focus on changes in both family and work domains for a more complete picture.

As mentioned in section 4, novel research has demonstrated that conflicts between work and family may lead to those experiencing such conflict to behave in ways that undermine workplace relationships and threaten work productivity (Scott et al., 2015). In considering how such threats to work outcomes might be avoided, it is suggested here that improving interactions between an employees' home and work life may have the potential to improve wider organisational relationships.

References

- Akkermans, J., Schaufeli, W. B., Brenninkmeijer, V., & Blonk, R. W. B. (2013). The role of career competencies in the Job Demands — Resources model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*(3), 356–366. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.06.011>
- Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(2), 151–169. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0022170>
- Anderson, S. J. (2014). The Moderating Effect of Within-Team Trust on Employee Engagement and Workgroup Outcomes. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Engaged Management Scholarship, Tulsa, OK, September 10-14, 2014*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Retrieved from <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2555706>
- Andres, M. (2014). Distress, support, and relationship satisfaction during military-induced separations: A longitudinal study among spouses of Dutch deployed military personnel. *Psychological Services, 11*(1), 22–30. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0033750>
- Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2014). How Does Supervisory Family Support Influence Employees' Attitudes and Behaviors? A Social Exchange Perspective. *Journal of Management, 40*(4), 1123–1150. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311413922>
- Balmforth, K., & Gardner, D. (2006). Conflict and Facilitation between Work and Family: Realizing the Outcomes for Organizations. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 35*(2), 69–76.
- Barbosa, C., Bray, J. W., Brockwood, K., & Reeves, D. (2014). Costs of a work-family intervention: evidence from the work, family, and health network. *American Journal Of Health Promotion: AJHP, 28*(4), 209–217. <http://doi.org/10.4278/ajhp.121108-QUAN-542>
- Beham, B., Drobnič, S., & Präg, P. (2014). The work-family interface of service sector workers: A comparison of work resources and professional status across five european countries. *Applied Psychology, 63*(1), 29–61. <http://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12012>
- Bowers, J. R., Wiley, A. R., Jones, B. L., Ogolsky, B. G., & Branscomb, K. (2014). Helping Dual-Earner Couples Manage Work-Partner Interferences: A Program Evaluation. *Marriage and Family Review, 50*(1), 55–75. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2013.851054>
- Burnett, S. B., Coleman, L., Houlston, C., & Reynolds, J. (2012). *Happy Homes and productive Workplaces*. London: OnePlusOne and Working Families.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., & Ferguson, M. (2015). Do the benefits of family-to-work transitions come at too great a cost? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(2), 161–171. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0038279>
- Carroll, S., Hill, E., Yorgason, J., Larson, J., & Sandberg, J. (2013). Couple Communication as a Mediator Between Work-Family Conflict and Marital Satisfaction. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal, 35*(3), 530–545. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-013-9237-7>
- Cheng, T., Mauno, S., & Lee, C. (2014). Do Job Control, Support, and Optimism Help Job Insecure Employees? A Three-Wave Study of Buffering Effects on Job Satisfaction, Vigor and Work-Family Enrichment. *Social Indicators Research, 118*(3), 1269–1291. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0467-8>
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review and Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 89–136. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Cooklin, A. R., Westrupp, E., Strazdins, L., Giallo, R., Martin, A., & Nicholson, J. M. (2015). Mothers' work–family conflict and enrichment: associations with parenting quality and couple relationship. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 41*(2), 266–277. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12137>

- De Janasz, S., Behson, S. J., Jonsen, K., & Lankau, M. J. (2013). Dual sources of support for dual roles: how mentoring and work-family culture influence work-family conflict and job attitudes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(7), 1435–1453. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.709187>
- Demerouti, E. (2012). The spillover and crossover of resources among partners: The role of work–self and family–self facilitation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(2), 184–195. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0026877>
- De Simone, S., Lampis, J., Lasio, D., Serri, F., Cicotto, G., & Putzu, D. (2013). Influences of Work-Family Interface on Job and Life Satisfaction. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 9(4), 831–861. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-013-9272-4>
- Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Hunter, E. M., & Whitten, D. (2012). A two-study examination of work–family conflict, production deviance and gender. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(2), 245–258. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.07.004>
- Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., & Kacmar, K. M. (2014). Flexing Work Boundaries: The Spillover and Crossover of Workplace Support. *Personnel Psychology*, n/a–n/a. <http://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12084>
- Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 57–80.
- Ganster, D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work Stress and Employee Health A Multidisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1085–1122. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313475815>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of Conflict Between Work and Family Roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1985.4277352>
- Green, S. G., Schaefer, R. A. B., MacDermid, S. M., & Weiss, H. M. (2011). Partner Reactions to Work-to-Family Conflict: Cognitive Appraisal and Indirect Crossover in Couples. *Journal of Management*, 37(3), 744–769. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309349307>
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying Work-Family Intervention Processes: The Roles of Work-Family Conflict and Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 134–150. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0020927>
- Hancock, F., & Page, F. (2013). Family to work conflict and the usefulness of workplace support. *Occupational Medicine*, 63(5), 373–376. <http://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqt053>
- Hartung, D., & Hahlweg, K. (2011). Stress Reduction at the Work-Family Interface: Positive Parenting and Self-Efficacy as Mechanisms of Change in Workplace Triple P. *Behavior Modification*, 35(1), 54–77. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0145445510390931>
- Haslam, D. M., Sanders, M. R., & Sofronoff, K. (2012). Reducing Work and Family Conflict in Teachers: A Randomised Controlled Trial of Workplace Triple P. *School Mental Health*, 5(2), 70–82. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-012-9091-z>
- Hoobler, J. M., Hu, J., & Wilson, M. (2010). Do workers who experience conflict between the work and family domains hit a “glass ceiling?”: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 481–494. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.07.001>
- Kalliath, P., & Kalliath, T. (2015). Work-family conflict and its impact on job satisfaction of social workers. *British Journal of Social Work*, 45(1), 241–259. <http://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bct125>
- Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., Oakes, J. M., Fan, W., Okechukwu, C., Davis, K. D., ... Casper, L. M. (2014). Changing Work and Work-Family Conflict: Evidence from the Work, Family, and Health Network. *American Sociological Review*, 79(3), 485–516. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414531435>
- Konik, K. (2014). *The Relation Between Couple Communication and Work-Family Conflict*. Bowling Green State University.
- Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Kelly, E. L., & Moen, P. (2014). Designing work, family & health organizational change initiatives. *Organizational Dynamics*, 43(1), 53–63. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2013.10.007>

- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace Social Support and Work-Family Conflict: A Meta-Analysis Clarifying the Influence of General and Work-Family-Specific Supervisor and Organizational Support. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(2), 289–313. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
- Koubova, V., & Buchko, A. A. (2013). Life-work balance: Emotional intelligence as a crucial component of achieving both personal life and work performance. *Management Research Review, 36*(7), 700–719. <http://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-05-2012-0115>
- Lambert, E. G., Kelley, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 36*(3), 398–417. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2012.706402>
- Leach, L. S., & Butterworth, P. (2012). Psychosocial adversities at work are associated with poorer quality marriage-like relationships. *Journal of Population Research, 29*(4), 351–372. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12546-012-9088-3>
- Lerner, D., & Henke, R. M. (2008). What does research tell us about depression, job performance, and work productivity? *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine / American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 50*(4), 401–410. <http://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e31816bae50>
- MacLeod, D., & Clarke, N. (2009). *Engaging for Success: enhancing performance through employee engagement*. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
- McAllister, S., Thornock, C. M., Hammond, J. R., Holmes, E. K., & Hill, E. J. (2012). The influence of couple emotional intimacy on job perceptions and work-family conflict. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 40*(4), 330–347. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-3934.2012.02115.x>
- McCarthy, A., Cleveland, J. N., Hunter, S., Darcy, C., & Grady, G. (2013). Employee work-life balance outcomes in Ireland: a multilevel investigation of supervisory support and perceived organizational support. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(6), 1257–1276. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.709189>
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2009). A Meta-Analytic Review of the Consequences Associated with Work-Family Enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 381–396. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). Convergence between measures of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(2), 215–232. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.05.004>
- Minnotte, K. L., Minnotte, M. C., & Bonstrom, J. (2014). Work-Family Conflicts and Marital Satisfaction Among US Workers: Does Stress Amplification Matter? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 36*(1), 21–33. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-014-9420-5>
- Moazami-Goodarzi, A., Nurmi, J.-E., Mauno, S., & Rantanen, J. (2014). Cross-Lagged Relations Between Work-Family Enrichment, Vigor at Work, and Core Self-evaluations: A Three-Wave Study. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 1–10*. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9376-3>
- National Audit Office. (2014). *Adult social care in England*. Retrieved from <http://www.nao.org.uk/report/adult-social-care-england-overview-2/>
- Neff, A., Niessen, C., Sonnentag, S., & Unger, D. (2013). Expanding crossover research: The crossover of job-related self-efficacy within couples. *Human Relations, 66*(6), 803–827. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712465095>
- Nicklin, J. M., & McNall, L. A. (2013). Work-family enrichment, support, and satisfaction: A test of mediation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22*(1), 67–77. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2011.616652>
- Nohe, C., Meier, L. L., Sonntag, K., & Michel, A. (2015). The Chicken or the Egg? A Meta-Analysis of Panel Studies of the Relationship Between Work-Family Conflict and Strain. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(3), 403–417. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0038012>

- Nohe, C., Michel, A., & Sonntag, K. (2014). Family-work conflict and job performance: A diary study of boundary conditions and mechanisms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(3), 339–357. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.1878>
- Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Britt, T. W., & Greene-Shortridge, T. M. (2013). Organizational work-family resources as predictors of job performance and attitudes: The process of work-family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(1), 28–40. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0026428>
- Ouweneel, E., Blanc, P. M. L., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Don't leave your heart at home: Gain cycles of positive emotions, resources, and engagement at work. *The Career Development International*, 17(6), 537–556. <http://doi.org/10.1108/13620431211280123>
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122–141. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>
- Rayton, B. A., Dodge, T., & D'Analeze, G. (2012). *Employee Engagement: The Evidence*. Engage For Success.
- Rayton, B. A., & Yalabik, Z. Y. (2014). Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(17), 2382–2400. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.876440>
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 257–266. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.141>
- Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Sanz-Vergel, A., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. (2014). Engaged at Work and Happy at Home: A Spillover-Crossover Model. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(2), 271–283. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9421-3>
- Russo, M., & Buonocore, F. (2012). The relationship between work-family enrichment and nurse turnover. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(3), 216–236. <http://doi.org/10.1108/02683941211205790>
- Sandberg, J. G., Harper, J. M., Jeffrey Hill, E., Miller, R. B., Yorgason, J. B., & Day, R. D. (2013). “What Happens at Home Does Not Necessarily Stay at Home”: The Relationship of Observed Negative Couple Interaction With Physical Health, Mental Health, and Work Satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(4), 808–821. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12039>
- Sanders, M., R., Haslam, D., M., Calam, R., Southwell, C., & Stallman, H., M. (2011). Designing effective interventions for working parents: a web-based survey of parents in the UK workforce. *Journal of Children's Services*, 6(3), 186–200.
- Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Nielsen, K. (2015). The thin line between work and home: The spillover and crossover of daily conflicts. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(1), 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12075>
- Scott, K. L., Ingram, A., Zagenczyk, T. J., & Shoss, M. K. (2015). Work-family conflict and social undermining behaviour: An examination of PO fit and gender differences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(1), 203–218. <http://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12091>
- Shockley, K. M., & Singla, N. (2011). Reconsidering Work—Family Interactions and Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37(3), 861–886. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310394864>
- TCCR. (2013). *Engaging business to support relationships: a report by the Tavistock Centre for Couple Relationships*. London. Retrieved from <http://www.tccr.ac.uk/policy-research/reports/380-employer-report>
- Tement, S. (2014). The role of personal and key resources in the family-to-work enrichment process. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 55(5), 489–496. <http://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12146>
- Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work–home interface: The work–home resources model. *American Psychologist*, 67(7), 545–556. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0027974>

- Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., Haar, J. M., & Roche, M. (2014). Does Family Life Help to be a Better Leader? A Closer Look at Crossover Processes From Leaders to Followers. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(4), 917–949. <http://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12057>
- Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., ter Hoeven, C. L., de Jong, M. D. T., & Peper, B. (2013). Exploring the linkage between the home domain and absence from work: Health, motivation, or both? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(3), 273–290. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.1789>
- Timms, C., Brough, P., O’Driscoll, M., Kalliath, T., Siu, O.-L., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (2015). Positive pathways to engaging workers: Work-family enrichment as a predictor of work engagement. Retrieved from <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84923885086&partnerID=40&md5=0b5ac7080ba836f5c60b32ffcd5e65ad>
- Tsionou, T., & Konstantopoulos, N. (2015). The Complications and Challenges of the Work-family Interface: A Review Paper. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175, 593–600. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1242>
- Unger, D., Niessen, C., Sonnentag, S., & Neff, A. (2014). A question of time: Daily time allocation between work and private life. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 158–176. <http://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12045>
- Van Acker, L. (2015). Investing in couple relationship education in the UK: A gender perspective. *Social Policy and Society*, 14(1), 1–14. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S147474641300047X>
- Van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2007). How work and family can facilitate each other: Distinct types of work-family facilitation and outcomes for women and men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(3), 279–300. <http://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.279>
- Van Steenbergen, E. F., Kluwer, E. S., & Karney, B. R. (2014). Work–family enrichment, work–family conflict, and marital satisfaction: A dyadic analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(2), 182–194. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0036011>
- Vidarthi, P. R., Anand, S., & Liden, R. C. (2014). Do emotionally perceptive leaders motivate higher employee performance? The moderating role of task interdependence and power distance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 232–244. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.08.003>
- Wallace, J. E. (2013). Social relationships, well-being, and career commitment: Exploring cross-domain effects of social relationships. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 50(2), 135–153. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12009>
- Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Family-supportive organization perceptions and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work–family conflict and enrichment and partner attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(4), 606–622. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0032491>
- Whiston, S. C., & Cinamon, R. G. (2015). The work-family interface: Integrating research and career counseling practice. *Career Development Quarterly*, 63(1), 44–56. <http://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2015.00094.x>
- Yalabik, Z. Y., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J. A., & Rayton, B. A. (2013). Work engagement as a mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2799–2823. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.763844>

Appendices

Appendix I: Review Method

Search Terms

Combinations of the following search terms were inputted into academic search engines:

- Relationship quality
- Family-work
- Work-family
- Enhancement
- Enrichment
- Spillover
- Couple Relationship Education (CRE)
- Intervention
- Initiative
- Workplace intervention
- Line-manager
- Work
- Work engagement
- Work productivity
- Job satisfaction

Sources

- Academic Search Complete (searched all databases on this engine, which includes but is not limited to ERIC, MEDLINE, PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, CINAHL Complete)
- Scopus
- Google Scholar was also used to search for 'citing articles'

Limiters

- Literature from 2012 to April 2015 (though older studies were included when required due to the lack of literature on some topics)
- English language

Process

1. Titles read through for relevance.
2. Duplicates removed.
3. Abstracts of remaining articles then read and judged for relevance.
4. Only articles originating from work conducted in the UK (United Kingdom), Europe, USA (United States of America), Australia, Canada were included (the work environments and relationship structures in other countries were considered to be potentially too different to those in the UK).
5. Selected articles of specific relevance were then inputted into a Google Scholar search and "related" and "citing articles" were explored for more relevant literature. Reference lists of relevant articles were used to locate further articles.

6. The final step used the reference list from the OPO 2012 report. Key articles relating to the role of relationships in paid work were searched for on Google Scholar and the “citing articles” list was scanned for relevant publications. The next level of citing articles for key publications found using this method was also reviewed in some cases.

Personal communications with experts

- Contacted Jonathan Swan, Policy & Research Officer at Working Families to ask if he knew of anything relevant – he acknowledged the lack of research and intervention in this area, and forwarded on links to 2 papers which focussed on trust and emotional intelligence between managers and work teams (i.e., did not consider couple/family relationships).
- Contacted Ana Sanz Vergel, Lecturer in Organisational Behaviour at University of East Anglia (and lead author of “The thin line between work and home: The spillover and crossover of daily conflicts”). Again she acknowledged the lack of work in this area, but forwarded on 3 articles, of which 2 were used in the review.

Appendix II: Evidence Summary

Having completed the above steps the final review includes 57 studies specifically relating to the aim of this review. These studies are a combination of meta-analyses and empirical research. A number of additional studies are included as they support certain points made in the review, however these have not been included in the evidence summary table below.

Reference	Key study details
<p>1. Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. <i>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16</i>(2), 151–169.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of 98 peer-reviewed, English-language articles published between 1999-2006, including 427 correlations (166 for FIW and 261 for WIF). 355 of these correlations were based on cross-sectional studies.</p>
<p>2. Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2014). How Does Supervisory Family Support Influence Employees’ Attitudes and Behaviors? A Social Exchange Perspective. <i>Journal of Management, 40</i>(4), 1123–1150.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. A 2-study article: Study 1 (82 employees from a higher education institution) explored if supervisory family support was related to job satisfaction & turnover intentions by administering a questionnaire at 2 time points. Study 2 (225 employees from various organisations) examined if organisational family policies mediated the links between FSSB and job-related outcomes, including questionnaire response from employees & their supervisors.</p>
<p>3. Balmforth, K., & Gardner, D. (2006). Conflict and Facilitation between Work and Family: Realizing the Outcomes for Organizations. <i>New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 35</i>(2), 69–76.</p>	<p>Conducted in New Zealand. Included 58 employees in a human resource consultancy. Questionnaire study explored if FWC/WFC and FWE/WFE was associated with job satisfaction, organisational commitment, organisational citizenship behaviour, and intention to leave.</p>
<p>4. Barbosa, C., Bray, J. W., Brockwood, K., & Reeves, D. (2014). Costs of a work-family intervention: evidence from the work, family, and health network. <i>American Journal Of Health Promotion: AJHP, 28</i>(4), 209–217.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Prospective cost analysis of a randomised controlled trial study of a multi-approach intervention to reduce WFC, delivered in an information technology organisation. The intervention arm was formed of 1,004 employees and 141 managers. The cost analysis identified and measured the resources used, then attached a monetary value to those resources, but did not attach a monetary value to the effects of the intervention.</p>
<p>5. Beham, B., Drobnič, S., & Präg, P. (2014). The work-family interface of service sector workers: A comparison of work resources and professional status across five European countries. <i>Applied Psychology, 63</i>(1), 29–61.</p>	<p>Conducted in 5 European countries (Sweden, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Germany and Portugal). 1,850 married/cohabiting employees living with at least one child responded to a cross-sectional questionnaire that explored cross-national differences in reported levels of work resources that support employees to balance their work and family lives, satisfaction with levels of work-family balance, and levels of work-home interference. In each country employees from 4 service sector organisations were included (financial, information and communication technology, healthcare, and retail).</p>

<p>6. Bowers, J. R., Wiley, A. R., Jones, B. L., Ogolsky, B. G., & Branscomb, K. (2014). Helping Dual-Earner Couples Manage Work-Partner Interferences: A Program Evaluation. <i>Marriage and Family Review, 50</i>(1), 55–75.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Evaluation of a brief 2-hour workshop intervention designed to teach couples (with both partners working at least 20 hours per week) how to manage work interferences in their couple relationships. Randomised controlled trial design (intervention group = 24 couples; control group = 23 couples) enabled effectiveness to be assessed – all participants that responded were married.</p>
<p>7. Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., & Ferguson, M. (2015). Do the benefits of family-to-work transitions come at too great a cost? <i>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20</i>(2), 161–171.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Questionnaire study of 639 married couples in full-time employment that explored the impact of role boundary management on work-family interface, job embeddedness, and relationship tensions. WFC and WFE were also measured as part of the research.</p>
<p>8. Carroll, S., Hill, E., Yorgason, J., Larson, J., & Sandberg, J. (2013). Couple Communication as a Mediator Between Work-Family Conflict and Marital Satisfaction. <i>Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal, 35</i>(3), 530–545.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Questionnaire study of 1,117 married individuals in full-time employment that explored the mediating effects of constructive and destructive communication between partners on the relationship between WFC and marital satisfaction.</p>
<p>9. Cheng, T., Mauno, S., & Lee, C. (2014). Do Job Control, Support, and Optimism Help Job Insecure Employees? A Three-Wave Study of Buffering Effects on Job Satisfaction, Vigor and Work-Family Enrichment. <i>Social Indicators Research, 118</i>(3), 1269–1291.</p>	<p>Conducted in Finland. Repeated measures questionnaire of 926 university employees, working at least 20 hours per week, explored the direct lagged relationship between job insecurity, coping resources (i.e., job control social support, and optimism), and employees' work (vigour and job satisfaction) and family-related outcomes (work-family enrichment). Data collected once per year in 2008, 2009 and 2010.</p>
<p>10. De Janasz, S., Behson, S. J., Jonsen, K., & Lankau, M. J. (2013). Dual sources of support for dual roles: how mentoring and work-family culture influence work-family conflict and job attitudes. <i>International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24</i>(7), 1435–1453.</p>	<p>Conducted online, with Fortune 500 organisation headquartered in USA. Questionnaire study of 454 employees that explored the influence of mentoring support and perceptions of family-supportive work culture on WFC, job satisfaction and affective commitment to the organisation.</p>
<p>11. Demerouti, E. (2012). The spillover and crossover of resources among partners: The role of work–self and family–self facilitation. <i>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17</i>(2), 184–195.</p>	<p>Conducted in the Netherlands. Questionnaire study with 131 dual-earner couples in heterogeneous jobs and organisations. The study explored how job resources impact upon an employee's energy, and in turn how these energy levels then impact their partner's home resources and energy levels. There was also a focus on how work and family-related experiences that improve functioning in personal pursuits interact with energy levels.</p>
<p>12. De Simone, S., Lampis, J., Lasio, D., Serri, F., Cicotto, G., & Putzu, D. (2013). Influences of Work-Family Interface on Job and Life Satisfaction. <i>Applied Research in Quality of Life, 9</i>(4), 831–861.</p>	<p>Conducted in Italy. Cross-sectional questionnaire study with 427 employees in a public service organisation that explored both positive and negative interactions between family and work and their associations with job and life satisfaction.</p>

<p>13. Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Hunter, E. M., & Whitten, D. (2012). A two-study examination of work–family conflict, production deviance and gender. <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i>, 81(2), 245–258.</p>	<p>Conducted online with panel designed to be representative of USA population. 2-study article: Study 1 involved 344 participants who responded at 2 time points. The first survey explored employees’ FWC, while the second survey was conducted 3 months later and explored the deviation from expected quantity and quality of employees’ work (i.e., production deviance). Study 2 involved 190 employees and their partners – employees answered questions on FWC and production deviance, and their partners answered questions on their WFC.</p>
<p>14. Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., & Kacmar, K. M. (2014). Flexing Work Boundaries: The Spillover and Crossover of Workplace Support. <i>Personnel Psychology</i>, (online).</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. 503 married couples, with both spouses working at least 30 hours per week across various industries, responded to an online cross-sectional questionnaire that explored how employees’ perceptions of FSSB and organisational level support shaped perceived ability to flex work boundaries, and how that impacted upon family outcomes and work commitment. Employees’ spouse’s marital satisfaction and commitment to their partner’s work organisation was also explored in relation to the aforementioned factors.</p>
<p>15. Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 92(1), 57–80.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of 178 English-language articles, including articles that explored correlations between any of the following two constructs: job involvement, job stress, work stress, work hours, WIF, and family satisfaction. Articles that explored correlations between the following 2 constructs were also included: family conflict, family stress, family support, family hours, FIW, and job satisfaction.</p>
<p>16. Green, S. G., Bull Schaefer, R. A., MacDermid, S. M., & Weiss, H. M. (2011) Partner Reactions to Work-to-Family Conflict: Cognitive Appraisal and Indirect Crossover in Couples <i>Journal of Management</i>, 37(3), 744-769.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Cross-sectional survey, using paired sample of 139 couples (i.e., 278 individuals), exploring employee’s reported work-family conflict, their partner’s observational appraisal of the same, and related blame and negative emotions expressed by partners. The association between these negative partner reactions and the employees work outcomes was also explored.</p>
<p>17. Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying Work-Family Intervention Processes: The Roles of Work-Family Conflict and Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors. <i>The Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 96(1), 134–150.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Evaluation of a blended learning programme including computer-based and face-to-face training delivered to 39 supervisors in intervention grocery stores. Randomised controlled trial design (6 stores assigned to intervention and 6 to control) enabled effectiveness to be assessed. Evaluation of the training programme is reported. In addition, 239 employees in intervention (n=117) and control (n=122) stores answered pre and post-intervention questionnaires that explored their perceptions of FSSB, WFC, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and physical health.</p>
<p>18. Hancock, F., & Page, F. (2013). Family to work conflict and the usefulness of workplace support.</p>	<p>Conducted in U.K. Cross-sectional questionnaire involving 165 employees from a private sector research and development plant, exploring FWC, its impacts on work outcomes, and workplace support available.</p>

<p><i>Occupational Medicine</i>, 63(5), 373–376.</p>	
<p>19. Hartung, D., & Hahlweg, K. (2011). Stress Reduction at the Work-Family Interface: Positive Parenting and Self-Efficacy as Mechanisms of Change in Workplace Triple P. <i>Behavior Modification</i>, 35(1), 54–77.</p>	<p>Conducted in Germany. Evaluation of a group-based parenting skills training programme designed for working parents. Randomised controlled trial repeated-measures design included 97 parents (42 parents in intervention group, 55 in control group). Pre and post measures administered with an 8-week time lag measured participants’ dysfunctional parenting, stress, and self-efficacy.</p>
<p>20. Haslam, D. M., Sanders, M. R., & Sofronoff, K. (2012). Reducing Work and Family Conflict in Teachers: A Randomised Controlled Trial of Workplace Triple P. <i>School Mental Health</i>, 5(2), 70–82.</p>	<p>Conducted in Australia. Evaluation of a group-based parenting skills training programme designed for working parents. Randomised controlled trial repeated-measures design, including pre- and post-measures administered to both control and intervention groups, and a 4-month follow-up administered to the intervention group. The survey measured participants’ WFC, job-related stress, job-related self-efficacy, parents’ assessment on their child’s problem behaviour, dysfunctional parenting, parenting-related self-efficacy, depression and anxiety. Intervention satisfaction was also assessed.</p>
<p>21. Hoobler, J. M., Hu, J., & Wilson, M. (2010). Do workers who experience conflict between the work and family domains hit a “glass ceiling?”: A meta-analytic examination. <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i>, 77(3), 481–494.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of 96 articles, with a combined sample size of 32,783. Included articles that explored the overall constructs of FWC or WFC, and their correlation with at least one career outcome (i.e., work performance, salary, career satisfaction, and hierarchical level at work).</p>
<p>22. Kalliath, P., & Kalliath, T. (2015). Work-family conflict and its impact on job satisfaction of social workers. <i>British Journal of Social Work</i>, 45(1), 241–259.</p>	<p>Conducted in Australia. 439 employed members of the Australian Association of Social Workers answered a cross-sectional questionnaire which explored WFC, FWC and job satisfaction.</p>
<p>23. Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., Oakes, J. M., Fan, W., Okechukwu, C., Davis, K. D., ... Casper, L. M. (2014). Changing Work and Work-Family Conflict: Evidence from the Work, Family, and Health Network. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 79(3), 485–516.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Evaluation of an intervention designed to train supervisors on how to support their employees’ family and personal lives, as well as participatory training to encourage staff to consider when and where they work. 348 employees made up the intervention group, while there were 346 in the control group. Evaluation, at baseline and 6-months later, measured employee’s perceptions of their schedule control, FSSB, WFC, FWC, time adequacy with family, perceived job pressure and overload and weekly hours worked.</p>
<p>24. Konik, K. (2014). <i>The Relation Between Couple Communication and Work-Family Conflict</i>. Bowling Green State University.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. (<i>Note</i>: this is a bachelor degree honours dissertation). Cross-sectional questionnaire of 93 employees, who were over 18 and identified themselves as in a romantic relationship, that examined the associations between couple communication, FWC/WFC, job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction.</p>

<p>25. Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Kelly, E. L., & Moen, P. (2014). Designing work, family & health organizational change initiatives. <i>Organizational Dynamics</i>, 43(1), 53–63.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Case study of the development of an intervention designed to try and prevent WFC, which takes a multi-pronged approach targeting the organisational culture and policies, work teams and individuals within those. Computer-based training and participatory sessions were the delivery methods used, and the training was delivered in 15 nursing homes and “several dozen” teams in an I.T. unit of a Fortune 500 organisation.</p>
<p>26. Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T. & Hammer, L. B. (2011) Workplace Social Support and Work-Family Conflict: A Meta-Analysis Clarifying the Influence of General and Work-Family-Specific Supervisor and Organizational Support. <i>Personnel Psychology</i>, 64(2), 289-313.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of 115 samples from 85 articles, with a combined sample size of 72,507 employees. Explored the relationship between WFC and employee perceptions of general and work-family specific organisational and supervisory support.</p>
<p>27. Lambert, E. G., Kelley, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behaviors. <i>Journal of Crime and Justice</i>, 36(3), 398–417.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Cross-sectional questionnaire study of 160 employees at a private maximum security prison, exploring strain-based conflict, time-based conflict, behaviour-based conflict and FWC in relation to organisational citizenship behaviours.</p>
<p>28. Leach, L. S., & Butterworth, P. (2012). Psychosocial adversities at work are associated with poorer quality marriage-like relationships. <i>Journal of Population Research</i>, 29(4), 351–372.</p>	<p>Conducted in Australia. Secondary analysis of 3 waves of data from a longitudinal study of people interviewed every four years. Participants were aged 40-44 years during the first wave. This study focussed on data that measured the psychosocial aspects of work and relationship quality, and included 2,054 participants who were married/cohabiting and concurrently employed during at least one wave.</p>
<p>29. McAllister, S., Thornock, C. M., Hammond, J. R., Holmes, E. K., & Hill, E. J. (2012). The influence of couple emotional intimacy on job perceptions and work–family conflict. <i>Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal</i>, 40(4), 330–347.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Cross-sectional questionnaire data collected from 567 partnered parents (93.3% married, 6.7% cohabiting), all in employment. This study explored the influence of couple’s emotional intimacy on job perceptions (i.e., job concerns and job rewards) and FWC/WFC.</p>
<p>30. McCarthy, A., Cleveland, J. N., Hunter, S., Darcy, C., & Grady, G. (2013). Employee work–life balance outcomes in Ireland: a multilevel investigation of supervisory support and perceived organizational support. <i>The International Journal of Human Resource Management</i>, 24(6), 1257–1276.</p>	<p>Conducted in Ireland. Multi-pronged investigation into the availability of work-life balance programmes, employee’s perceptions of supervisory and organisational support for work-life balance, and how these are associated with outcomes including role conflict, job satisfaction, family satisfaction and turnover intentions. 15 HR managers were interviewed regarding the work-life programmes in place, 133 supervisors completed a cross-sectional questionnaire, and 729 employees who reported to those supervisors completed a cross-sectional questionnaire.</p>
<p>31. McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2009). A Meta-Analytic Review of the Consequences</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of studies examining the associations between FWE/WFE and work-related, non-work-related and health-related outcomes. 21 studies (54</p>

Associated with Work–Family Enrichment. <i>Journal of Business and Psychology</i> , 25(3), 381–396.	correlations) assessed WFE, and 25 studies (57 correlations) assessed FWE.
32. Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). Convergence between measures of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: A meta-analytic examination. <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i> , 67(2), 215–232.	Meta-analysis which sought to explore the overlap between measures of FWC and WFC. 25 independent studies, equating to a sample of 9,079, reported in 20 articles, were examined in this study. Studies were only included if they reported a correlation between FWC and WFC, and internal reliability estimates for each measure.
33. Minnotte, K. L., Minnotte, M. C., & Bonstrom, J. (2014). Work–Family Conflicts and Marital Satisfaction Among US Workers: Does Stress Amplification Matter? <i>Journal of Family and Economic Issues</i> , 36(1), 21–33.	Conducted in USA. Secondary analysis of cross-sectional questionnaire data from 2,045 married, employed individuals (1,046 men and 776 women). The article explored the interactions between WFC, FWC and marital satisfaction.
34. Moazami-Goodarzi, A., Nurmi, J.-E., Mauno, S., & Rantanen, J. (2014). Cross-Lagged Relations Between Work–Family Enrichment, Vigor at Work, and Core Self-evaluations: A Three-Wave Study. <i>Journal of Business and Psychology</i> , (online).	Conducted in Finland. Longitudinal questionnaire study with 700 university employees. Data collected at three time points over three years to assess the relations between vigour at work, WFE, and participant’s core self-evaluations (i.e., assessments of their wellness, competence and capabilities).
35. Neff, A., Niessen, C., Sonnentag, S., & Unger, D. (2013). Expanding crossover research: The crossover of job-related self-efficacy within couples. <i>Human Relations</i> , 66(6), 803–827.	Conducted in Germany. Cross-sectional data was gathered from 102 cohabiting heterosexual couples (i.e., 204 individuals), where both partners were employed (1 partner full-time, and the other for at least 20 hours per week). The questionnaire explored how job-related self-efficacy can be transferred from one partner to the next (i.e., crossover) through observing their partner’s practices and through their partner’s expressions of trust in their capabilities.
36. Nicklin, J. M., & McNall, L. A. (2013). Work–family enrichment, support, and satisfaction: A test of mediation. <i>European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology</i> , 22(1), 67–77.	Conducted in USA. Cross-sectional questionnaire data from 214 employed adults explored the mediating role of WFE/FWE between supervisor and family support and job and family satisfaction. Participants were from various industries including the private sector, academia, charities and governmental.
37. Nohe, C., Laurenz L. Meier, Sonntag, K. & Michel, A. (2015) The Chicken or the Egg? A Meta-Analysis of Panel Studies of the Relationship Between Work-Family Conflict and Strain. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> 100, no. 2, 522–536.	Meta-analysis including 33 samples (average sample size = 395) from 30 papers which explored the directional nature of work-related strain and FIW/WIF. 32 samples assessed WIF and strain, while 20 assessed FIW and strain. Studies were only included if they were panel studies, in order to enable the direction of the relationships to be assessed.
38. Nohe, C., Michel, A., & Sonntag, K. (2014). Family-work conflict and job performance: A diary study of boundary conditions and mechanisms. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i> , 35(3), 339–357.	Conducted with internationally operating German company. Repeated-measure daily diary study with 95 employees (equating to 490 days of data) exploring within-person associations between daily FWC, job performance (i.e., concentration, task performance), and psychological detachment from work.

<p>39. Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Britt, T. W., & Greene-Shortridge, T. M. (2013). Organizational work-family resources as predictors of job performance and attitudes: The process of work-family conflict and enrichment. <i>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17</i>(1), 28–40.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Repeated measure questionnaire data gathered from 174 hospital employees (64% married/cohabiting), carried out at baseline and then 5 months later. The questionnaire explored FSSB, employee's perceptions of organisational support for family, FWC/WFC, FWE/WFE, and job related outcomes (including satisfaction, commitment, and intention to leave). Employee's supervisors were also asked to rate the participants work performance.</p>
<p>40. Ouweneel, E., Blanc, P. M. L., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Don't leave your heart at home: Gain cycles of positive emotions, resources, and engagement at work. <i>The Career Development International, 17</i>(6), 537–556.</p>	<p>Conducted in the Netherlands. Repeated measure questionnaire study (wave 2 collected 6 months after wave 1) of 200 university employees (70.5% married/cohabiting) that explored how positive emotions might contribute to work engagement through increasing an employees' personal and job resources.</p>
<p>41. Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Sanz-Vergel, A., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. (2014). Engaged at Work and Happy at Home: A Spillover-Crossover Model. <i>Journal of Happiness Studies, 15</i>(2), 271–283.</p>	<p>Conducted in Spain. A repeated-measure diary study involving 50 cohabiting, dual-earner couples (100 participants) explored if work engagement (i.e., vigour and dedication) of one partner impacted upon their own and their significant other's wellbeing (i.e., happiness). Data was collected once per day over 5 days, providing 500 daily assessments for analysis.</p>
<p>42. Sandberg, J. G., Harper, J. M., Jeffrey Hill, E., Miller, R. B., Yorgason, J. B., & Day, R. D. (2013). "What Happens at Home Does Not Necessarily Stay at Home": The Relationship of Observed Negative Couple Interaction With Physical Health, Mental Health, and Work Satisfaction. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family, 75</i>(4), 808–821.</p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Qualitative data (25-minute videotaped discussion of observed negative couple interactions) and cross-sectional questionnaire data was collected from 281 cohabiting partners (96.5% married) with a child between 10-14 years old. The study explored marriage-work spillover (i.e., FWC), assessing the relations between marital interaction, physical/mental health and job satisfaction.</p>
<p>43. Sanders, M., R., Haslam, D., M., Calam, R., Southwell, C., & Stallman, H., M. (2011). Designing effective interventions for working parents: a web-based survey of parents in the UK workforce. <i>Journal of Children's Services, 6</i>(3), 186–200.</p>	<p>Conducted in U.K. Cross-sectional questionnaire of 721 employed parents exploring experiences and attitudes regarding balance of work and parental responsibilities, perceptions of the workplace as a vehicle for delivery of parenting support interventions, and preferred features of such an intervention.</p>
<p>44. Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Nielsen, K. (2015). The thin line between work and home: The spillover and crossover of daily conflicts. <i>Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88</i>(1), 1–18.</p>	<p>Conducted in Spain. A repeated-measure diary study involving 80 cohabiting, dual-earner couples (160 participants) explored the relationship between conflicts at work and at home by measuring FWC and interpersonal conflicts. Data was collected once per day over 5 days, providing 800 daily assessments for analysis.</p>
<p>45. Scott, K. L., Ingram, A., Zagenczyk, T. J., & Shoss, M. K. (2015). Work-family conflict and social undermining behaviour: An examination of PO fit and gender differences. <i>Journal of Occupational</i></p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Questionnaire data was collected from 391 employed individuals at time 1, and then approximately 8 weeks later. (Note: Couple relationship status was not provided). The study sought to explore associations between WFC, employee's perceptions of their fit with their employing organisation, and social</p>

<i>and Organizational Psychology</i> , 88(1), 203–218.	undermining behaviour directed at their colleagues (i.e., those behaviours aiming to hinder the targets success at work).
46. Shockley, K. M., & Singla, N. (2011). Reconsidering Work—Family Interactions and Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis. <i>Journal of Management</i> , 37(3), 861–886.	Meta-analysis including 153 samples focussing on WFC/FWC and 25 samples focussing on WFE/FWE. The meta-analysis sought to explore the cross-domain perspective vs. the source attribution model of both positive and negative work and family interactions.
47. TCCR. (2013). <i>Engaging business to support relationships: a report by the Tavistock Centre for Couple Relationships</i> . London.	Conducted in U.K. Online survey of 233 HR staff to explore the prevalence of relationship issues among their staff, and their perspectives on whether workplaces are an ideal place to offer relationship support interventions.
48. Tement, S. (2014). The role of personal and key resources in the family-to-work enrichment process. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Psychology</i> , 55(5), 489-496.	Conducted in Slovenia. Cross-sectional questionnaire of 738 participants working at least 20 hours per week (84.1% married/long-term relationship) that explored whether FWE could be explained by examining if perceived self-efficacy mediated the relationship between support from one’s family and work engagement.
49. Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., Haar, J. M., & Roche, M. (2014). Does Family Life Help to be a Better Leader? A Closer Look at Crossover Processes From Leaders to Followers. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 67(4), 917–949.	Conducted in New Zealand. Cross-sectional survey of 199 managers and 456 of their subordinates that explored whether managers FWC and FWE influence their work-related wellbeing (i.e., job burnout and work engagement), and then whether this impacts upon the supportiveness their subordinates perceive them to provide, and their supporters work-related outcomes.
50. Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., ter Hoeven, C. L., de Jong, M. D. T., & Peper, B. (2013). Exploring the linkage between the home domain and absence from work: Health, motivation, or both? <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i> , 34(3), 273–290.	Conducted in the Netherlands. Study utilised questionnaire data from 1,014 employees from a financial consultancy firm, exploring their health issues, job motivation, physical and psychological stress and their home quality time. Absence records (i.e., absence frequency and duration) from the year the questionnaire was administered (control variable) and the following year (dependant variables) were also used.
51. Timms, C., Brough, P., O’Driscoll, M., Kalliath, T., Siu, O.-L., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (in press). <i>Positive pathways to engaging workers: Work-family enrichment as a predictor of work engagement</i> .	Conducted in Australia. Two waves of data collected from 470 employees with family commitments to explore how FWE/WFE contributed to outcomes in work and family life.
52. Tsionou, T., & Konstantopoulos, N. (2015). The Complications and Challenges of the Work-family Interface: A Review Paper. <i>Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences</i> , 175, 593–600.	Literature review of 48 articles which focus on the positive and negative relationships between family and work (i.e., FWC/WFC and FWE/WFE).
53. Unger, D., Niessen, C., Sonnentag, S., & Neff, A. (2014). A question of time: Daily time allocation between work and private life. <i>Journal</i>	Conducted in German and Austria. Repeated-measure questionnaire study with 76 couples (i.e., 152 individuals) who were cohabiting, and each worked for at least 20 hours per week exploring the association between positive and negative experiences in couple

<p><i>of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87(1), 158–176.</i></p>	<p>relationships and the time spent on work. Daily surveys were completed in the morning, after work, at bedtime and during the following morning at least twice per week, providing 468 days of data.</p>
<p>54. Van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2007). How work and family can facilitate each other: Distinct types of work-family facilitation and outcomes for women and men. <i>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12(3), 279–300.</i></p>	<p>Conducted in the Netherlands. Paper covered 2 studies. Study 1 was a qualitative pilot study which involving face-to-face interviews with 25 employees (15 female, 10 male) in an internationally operating financial services organisation to explore WFE and FWE. Study 2 was a quantitative cross-sectional questionnaire of 352 employees who worked at least 20 hours per week exploring FWC/WFC, FWE/WFE, and work and non-work outcomes. The study was not limited to spouse/parents, but this was controlled for in analysis.</p>
<p>55. Van Steenbergen, E. F., Kluwer, E. S., & Karney, B. R. (2014). Work–family enrichment, work–family conflict, and marital satisfaction: A dyadic analysis. <i>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19(2), 182–194.</i></p>	<p>Conducted in the Netherlands. Quantitative cross-sectional questionnaire with 215 dual-earner couples (430 individuals) exploring WFE, WFC, marital behaviours (i.e., anger, withdrawal and positivity) and marital satisfaction.</p>
<p>56. Wallace, J. E. (2013). Social relationships, well-being, and career commitment: Exploring cross-domain effects of social relationships. <i>Canadian Review of Sociology, 50(2), 135–153.</i></p>	<p>Conducted in Canada. Cross-sectional questionnaire of 1,436 married/cohabiting practicing lawyers exploring the associations between the effects of social relationships both within work and at home impact upon overall wellbeing and work commitment.</p>
<p>57. Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Family-supportive organization perceptions and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work–family conflict and enrichment and partner attitudes. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology, 98(4), 606–622.</i></p>	<p>Conducted in USA. Cross-sectional questionnaire of 453 married/partnered couples (i.e., 906 individuals) that explored employee’s perceptions of their organisations family supportiveness and how this linked to their commitment to their job. The employee’s WFC and WFE were assessed, and their partner’s attitudes towards the employee’s work organisation were also gathered.</p>