Constructs of the Work/Life Interface and their Importance to HRD

Heather S. McMillan
Southeast Missouri State University

Michael Lane Morris and E. Kate Atchley
The University of Tennessee

The purpose of this paper is to identify construct definitions and measurement tools for the work/life interface concepts: balance, conflict and facilitation. An understanding of these concepts is critical to HRD professionals because interventions designed to counter work/life interface issues can not be created, and culture changes can not be addressed until the organization understands the nature and the organizational implications of employees' work/life interface.

The attainment of work/life balance continues to be the mythical quality standard for not only individuals in the workforce, but also for the organizations that employ them. Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw define work/life balance as "the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in – and equally satisfied with – his or her work and family role" (2003, p. 513). Building on Marks and MacDermid (1996), Greenhaus, et al. contend that balance is an interrole phenomenon which three components: time (i.e. equal division of time between roles), involvement (i.e. equal psychological involvement in roles), and satisfaction (i.e. equal satisfaction gained from both roles). Balance is considered a continuum reflecting an individual's life orientation across roles with balance at one end and imbalance at the other (Greenhaus, et al.). The current trend in work/life research is to examine the idea of conflict (i.e. the negative interaction between work and life) and enrichment (i.e. the positive interaction between work and life).

In the 2007 Society for Human Resource Management's (SHRM) Job Satisfaction Survey Report, "flexibility to balance life and work issues" ranks as "very important" for 52% of respondents and 48% of HR professionals (Frincke, 2007, p. 27). For individual workers, work/life balance ranked fourth in importance, behind compensation, benefits and job security, each of which can be argued as a contributor to achieving work/life balance. Despite ranking as "important" or "very important" in each satisfaction survey since 2002, SHRM reports that the responsiveness of organizations to these issues has only increased slightly from 2006 (Frincke).

Due to its predominance in human resource management (HRM) literature and relative obscurity in human resource development (HRD) literature, one might conclude that work/life balance is only a HRM issue (Morris & Madsen, 2007). Traditionally, work/life issues have fallen under the purview of HRM because the benefits designed to address them (e.g. leave programs and flexible schedules) have been considered perks that are a "necessary evil" of doing business. Friedman, Christensen and DeGroot suggest that these programs rarely help the majority of employees achieve sustainable balance because they do not permeate the organization's culture (2000). Swanson and Holton contend that one of the functions of HRD, organization development, involves changing the organization's processes in order to improve performance (2001). Therefore, both HRM and HRD can focus individual and organizational learning and change that supports its employee's need for work life balance, which research has shown can ultimately contribute to the organization's competitive advantage and overall performance (e.g., Arthur & Cook, 2003, 2004; Cascio, 2006; Christensen, P. M., 1997; Halpern & Murphy, 2005; Kane, 1999, Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000; Pfeffer, 1994). Marques (2006) further contends that this level of integration "translates into enhanced attunement between workers' and organizations' needs and workers' work-life balance" (2006, p. 117).

In her 2003 HRDI manuscript, Janet Polach issued a call to action for HRD professionals to "move the issue [of work/life balance] beyond programs to instill a way of thinking throughout corporations on the need for balancing work and life successfully and equitably" (p. 58). It is the contention of these authors that in order to address this call, HRD professionals must first understand what aspects of work and life are creating conflict or enrichment opportunities for employees. Essentially, HRD interventions to counter work/life interface issues can not be created, and culture changes can not be addressed until the organization understands the nature and the organizational implications of employees' work/life interface. This level of understanding can be obtained and/or fortified through

the use of organization feedback systems, culture surveys, performance appraisal and communication systems and the use of metrics to quantify utilization of existing policies and programs. Additionally, professionals need to understand the implications of the work/life interface on other HRD interventions (i.e. those whose purpose does not specifically include work/life issues). Furthermore, Morris and Madsen note that "by better understanding work-life theory, issues, challenges, and possible solutions, HRD professionals can strategically change the work culture, redesign work, implement training programs, and tailor career programs or assistance strategies enabling employees to be more engaged, productive, and fulfilled' (2007, p. 440).

Research Purpose

In order to address Morris and Madsen's (2007) call for understanding, we present a review of the constructs of balance, conflict and enrichment and measurement tools to evaluate them. Additionally, we present future research initiatives to increase the usefulness of these measures. The examination of specific interventions, including their development and effectiveness, is beyond the scope of this review. Our goal is to further the conceptualization of the work/life interface in HRD.

Work/life Balance Construct Definition

Work/life (family) balance has been given multiple, and at times, inconsistent definitions throughout research. In 2003, Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw, as well as Frone, published well-regarded and highly cited manuscripts on work-life balance. Greenhaus, et al., (2003) proposed a definition of balance that attempted to combine the different foci of prominent researchers in the field: equality (Clark, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 2000; Marks & MacDermid, 1996; Mead, 1964) and engagement (Marks & MacDermid). To this end, they defined balance as "the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in – and equally satisfied with – his or her work and family role" (Greenhaus, et al., p. 513). They further contend that this definition follows the work of Marks and MacDermid in that it provides a broad enough definition to include both positive and negative balance. To this end, balance becomes a continuum with imbalance (in either role) anchoring one end, and balance (again in either role) anchoring the other end. Furthermore, Greenhaus, et al. propose three components of balance:

- Time Balance – where time is divided equally between roles.
- Involvement Balance – where an individual has equal psychological involvement in both roles.
- Satisfaction Balance – where equal satisfaction is gained from both roles.

Rather than focusing on engagement and equality, Frone contends that balance occurs when there is a "lack of conflict or interference between the work and family roles" (2003, p. 145). Unlike the Greenhaus, et al. (2003) definition, Frone's definition helps move away from the "zero-sum gain" concept by focusing on the idea that balance can occur without spending exactly the same amount of time in both roles. He proposes a taxonomy of balance based on the type of interaction (conflict versus facilitation) and direction of influence (W-F versus F-W). Frone contends that balance occurs when an individual experiences low levels of interrole conflict in combination with high levels of interrole facilitation. It is interesting to note that Frone's definition utilizes the constructs of conflict and facilitation to define balance. This reflects the circular nature of work-life research that is seen in the literature.

In an ADHR special issue, Grzywacz and Carlson define work/life balance as "accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domains" (2007, p. 458). They contend this definition is superior to its predecessors because it is extends on Marks and MacDermid's (1996) role-balance theory that contends it is possible to be fully engaged in both roles without sacrificing one for the other. Additionally, by focusing on activities rather than satisfaction, Grzywacz and Carlson's definition views balance "as a social rather than a psychological construct and it takes on meaning outside the individual. Giving work-family balance meaning outside the individual has significant implications for validating measures and for designing studies to test and refine theories of work-family balance" (2007, p. 458). Finally, their definition focuses on the interaction between work and family, rather than treating them individually. While this definition advances construct conceptualization, we contend that the best definition for balance must include both the social and psychological in order to capture the importance of balance for individuals, families, organizations and community.

Work/life Balance: Comparing the Measures

Measuring balance has been difficult due to a lack of consistency in construct definitions, and therefore an inability to develop a consistent operational definition. Historically, these balance measurements have been based on an individual's self-reported assessment of balance and have therefore been limited in their interpretability (Greenhaus, et al., 2003). In reviewing the literature, we have identified methods for measuring balance that have achieved some measure of psychometric validity

Hill, et al. (2001) treated balance as a dependent variable measured using a composite score of five items measured using a 5 point scale about an individual's ability to balance his/her work and family demands (e.g. "How easy or difficult is it for you to balance the demands of your work and your personal family life") (p. 52). These measures resulted in a Cronbach's alpha = .83.

Greenhaus, et al. (2003) shifted balance measurement from a subjective-style measurement to one grounded in measuring the equality of time, involvement and satisfaction and individual felt in his/her work and family roles. Their measurement style supported the continuum theory, by following Deephouse's (1996) calculation to create a -1 to +1 scale where zero represented an equal amount of time, involvement or satisfaction in both roles. Imbalance occurs on either side of zero, with positive scores indicating work-leaning imbalance and negative scores indicating a family-leaning imbalance. The authors did not provide samples of their measures, but did report the following alphas: involvement $\alpha = .86$; career satisfaction $\alpha = .86$, and family satisfaction $\alpha = .78$. An alpha score was not provided for the time balance measurement.

In an English study, Dex and Bond (2005, utilizing a 7 and 10 item checklist (seven items for single individuals and the same seven plus three items for individuals with families) for individuals to calculate their level of balance. Example questions include "At the moment, because the job demands it, I usually work long hours" and "There isn't much time to socialize/relax with my partner/see family in the week" (p. 630). Alphas for the full family scale were considerably greater than those for the individual scale ($\alpha = .80$ versus $\alpha = .66$, respectively). This scale is particularly unique because it provides rich data for researchers and immediate feedback for participants.

Work/life Conflict Construct Definition

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), influenced by the work of Kahn, et al. (1964), are credited with creating the seminal definition (MacDermid & Harvey, 2006) of work-family conflict: "a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" (p. 77). By virtue of twenty-one years of additional research, Greenhaus, Allen, and Spector (2006), influenced by the work of Edwards and Rothbard (2000), have expanded the definition to include conflict that occurs when one role interferes with an individual's effectiveness in the other role. "Therefore, the essence of work-family conflict is interrole interference, and work-family conflict could just as easily be referred to as work-family interference" (Greenhaus, et al., 2006, p. 64). Conflict is considered a bi-directional construct, in that work can interfere with family and family can interfere with work (Frone, 2003; Hammer & Thompson, 2003).

Three types of conflict have been identified in literature: time-based, strain-based and behavioral-based (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Time-based conflict is considered the most prevalent type of conflict (Hammer & Thompson, 2003). It occurs in one of two ways: (1) the amount of time spent in one role takes away from the amount of time available for the other role, and (2) preoccupation with one role impairs the ability to function in the other role, despite the individual's physical presence (aka presenteeism) (Bartolome & Evans, 1979). Time conflict combines the schedule conflict and excessive work time concepts identified by Pleck, Staines, and Lang (1980) with role overload, originally identified by Kahn, et al. (1964). Time-based conflict also reflects scarcity theory, in that the total amount of time and/or energy available to an individual is fixed, and participation in multiple roles decreases the total amount of time and/or energy available to meet all demands, thereby creating conflict (Marks, 1977) and strain on the individual (Goode, 1960).

Work-related time conflict is generally based on the number of hours that an individual works per week (Burke, Weir & Duwors, 1980; Keith & Schafer, 1980; Pleck, et al., 1980). These hours include not only time physically spent on the job, but time spent in commuting and work-travel (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). Pleck, et al. contends that overtime and shiftwork also contribute to work-related time conflict. Family-related time conflict involves the amount of time spent with family or dealing with family members detracting from time that could be spent at work (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Research has found that, generally speaking, married females experience more family-related time conflict than single females and mothers experience more conflict than non-mothers (Bohen & Viveros-Long; Herman & Gyllstrom, 1977). Of course, since every individual is different, this scenario will not hold true for everyone (Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Pleck, et al). Lambert's accommodation theory suggests that individuals can accommodate time demands in one role by decreasing the amount of time in the other

role (1990). Segmentation theory suggests that individuals intentionally compartmentalize their roles to prevent presenteeism (Greenhaus & Singh, 2003; Lambert, 1990).

Strain-based conflict occurs when the strain (or stressors) felt in one role make it difficult to perform in the other role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Again building on the work of Pleck, et al. (1980), strain-based conflict is based in the idea of fatigue and irritability created from one role affecting the activities in the other role. Strain-based conflict also reflects person-environment (P-E) fit theory, developed by Kahn, et al. (1964). P-E fit is based on conflicting role demands, where fit is defined as the match between an individual's knowledge, skills and abilities (KSA's) and the role he/she is asked to perform. When KSA's don't match the expectations of the role (whether work or personal), a lack of fit develops, ultimately leading to stress (both positive and negative) (Nelson & Simmons, 2003). Work-related strain conflict has been positively related to job ambiguity and negatively related to leader support and facilitation (Jones & Butler, 1980; Kopelman, Greenhaus & Connolly, 1983). Work-related strain has also been related to stressful events at work or job burnout that result in fatigue or depression in the family role (Bartolome & Evans, 1980; Jackson & Maslach, 1982). Family-based strain conflict primarily occurs when spousal career and family expectations are not in congruence (Beutell & Greenhaus, 1982; Chadwick, Albrecht & Kunz, 1976; Eiswirth-Neems & Handal, 1978).

Behavioral-based conflict occurs when the behaviors required in one role are incompatible with the behaviors required in the other role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985): "behaviors that are expected or appropriate in the family role (e.g. expressiveness, emotional sensitivity) are viewed as inappropriate or dysfunctional when used in the work role" (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997, p. 4). As previously noted, this is bi-directional in nature in that aggressive behaviors that may be required at work are considered inappropriate at home (Hammer & Thompson, 2003).

Work/life Conflict: Comparing the Measures

Conflict has been a mainstay for researchers for more than thirty years. To this end, a litany of scales measuring conflict has been proposed in the literature (e.g. Bedeian, Burke & Moffett, 1998; Burke, 1988; Burke, et al., 1979; Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Frone, et al., 1992; Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991; Kopelman, et al., 1983; MacDermid, et al., 2000; Parasuraman, et al., 1989; Rice, Frone & McFarlin, 1992). However, as discussed by Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian, some of these scales have significant variability in psychometric properties; others are so lengthy to be burdensome to the respondent; and others combine work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict into a single construct (1996). In a review of the literature, both the Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) and Netemeyer, et al. (1996) scales address the bi-directional (FW and WF) nature of conflict, have demonstrated adequate psychometric properties and address the components of conflict: time, strain and behavior (Note: the Netemeyer, et al. scale address only the time and strain components of conflict). Due to their thoroughness, only these two scales will be discussed.

The Netemeyer, et al. (1996) scale addresses the bi-directional time and strain components of conflict, but neglects the behavioral component, an acknowledged limitation to the scale: "First and foremost, the scales derived in this study are not as useful as scales that use a multidimensional approach to the measurement of WFC and FWC" (1996, p. 408). The Carlson, et al. (2000) scale taps bi-directionality in all three components of conflict: time, strain and behavior. Both scales are relatively short (10 and 18 questions, respectively), which is a key factor in encouraging completion (DeVellis, 2003). Both scales are set up in a statement format and use a 1 to 5 Likert scale to indicate the level of agreement with or frequency of each statement, with higher values indicating a stronger level of agreement or frequency. An example of a Netemeyer, et al. frequency question is: "The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life" which is tied to the frequency scale (1 = never, 5 = all of the time) (p. 410). An example of a Carlson, et al. attitudinal question is: "The behaviors that work for me at home with my family do not seem to be effective at work." which is tied to the agreement scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) (p. 274).

Table 1: *Psychometric Comparisons of the Netemeyer, et al. and Carlson, et al. Conflict Scales*

	Netemeyer, Boles & McMurrian Conflict Scale (1996)	Carlson, Kacmar & Williams Conflict Scale (2000)
Number of samples and/or studies used for item generation and judging	3 samples	3 studies
Confirmatory Factor Analysis to purify measures	43 items reduced to 10 items	30 items reduced to 18 items
Fit Indicators	GFI, CFI & TLI all >.90	CFI = .95, RMSEA = .06
Discriminant Validity	Phi (Φ) values from .33 - .48,	Phi (Φ) values from .24 - .83 (only 2

	indicating different constructs for work-family (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC)	above .60) indicating different constructs for the six factors of conflict
Internal Consistency	Cronbach alpha values from .85 - .90 for two constructs in the three samples	Cronbach alpha values from .78 - .87 for the six conflict factors
External Validity	Zero-order correlations between other study variables and WFC and FWC variables support both directionality and relationships hypothesized by authors	Zero-order correlations between other study variables and six conflict factors support both directionality and relationships hypothesized by authors.

Work/life Enrichment Construct Definition

Researchers disagree as to what comprises the positive side of the work/life interface. Frone (2003) suggests that facilitation, enhancement, integration and enrichment are simply synonyms for the positive side of the work-life interface. Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne and Grzywacz contend, however, that each of Frone's "synonyms" are actually distinct constructs describing different aspects of positive work-life interface (2006). As seen in the following reviews, the "constructs" are more alike than they are different in both their definition and theoretical bases. Additionally, as with conflict, each of the "constructs" of enrichment is considered to be bi-directional in nature.

Integration. Greenhaus and Parasuraman propose that integration occurs "when attitudes in one role positively spill over into another role, or when experiences in one role serve as resources that enrich another role in one's life" (1999, p. 407). Kossek and Lambert (2005) contend that integration is grounded in spillover theory, in that individuals carry attitudes and beliefs from one role to the other. Integration is the polar opposite of segmentation theory (i.e. the intentional separation of the work and family spheres) popular in "old-school" corporate America (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Additionally, integration is supported by P-E Fit theory, which suggests as the work-place level of role integration increases to the point that is consistent with an individual's personal preference, individuals are more likely to negotiate work and family roles to his/her satisfaction (Kreiner, 2006). Fletcher and Bailyn (2005) purport relaxing the spheres of work and family to allow individuals to be involved in both with the expectation that the overall quality of each sphere will be improved. Finally, integration is considered the middle-ground between segmentation (i.e. complete separation of roles) and enmeshment (i.e. complete overlapping of roles) (Chesley, Moen & Shore, 2001; Minuchin, 1974).

Enhancement. Graves, Ohlott and Ruderman (2007) define enhancement as facilitation that occurs when one role increases energy and attitude, and contributes to the development of skills in the other role. Thoits (1987) suggests that an individual's participation in multiple roles may enhance one's energy reserve by increased sources of self-esteem, social identity, resources and rewards available, thereby allowing a greater ability to cope with multiple demands. This role accumulation expansionist perspective is in direct conflict with the scarcity hypothesis that underlies conflict (Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). This is due to the contention that resources are not only augmented by multiple role participation, but that these resources transfer between roles as needed (Graves, et al.). Wadsworth and Owens suggest that because enhancement and conflict are distinct constructs, it is possible to experience high levels of each simultaneously (2007).

Facilitation. Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson and Kacmar define facilitation as "the extent to which an individual's engagement in one life domain (i.e., work/family) provides gains (i.e. developmental, affective, capital, or efficiency) which contribute to enhanced functioning of another life domain (i.e. family/work)" (2007, p. 64). Similar to enhancement, facilitation is rooted in role accumulation expansionist theory (Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005; Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). In addition to expansionist theory, Wayne, et al. contend Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) (Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003) contributes to facilitation because it underscores the positive potential of work-family interface by focusing on the "good" in humanity. Additionally, the Ecological Systems Theory (EST) (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Voydanoff, 2001) contributes to the understanding of facilitation in its assumption that people desire and have the ability to grow and develop.

Wayne, et al. identify three contributors to facilitation: engagement, gains (as proposed by Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne & Grzywacz [2006] in their development of the enrichment construct) and enhanced functioning (2007). They define engagement as the level of intensity an individual applies to role-related activities. Active engagement leads to the development of privileges and benefits that can be carried into the other domain (Sieber, 1974). Gains can be classified into one of four areas: (1) developmental (i.e. the acquisition of knowledge, skills, perspectives or values); (2) affective (i.e. changes behavior and/or attitudes); (3) capital (i.e. acquisition of assets); and (4)

efficiency (i.e. development of an increased focus level) (Carlson, et al.). The acquisition of gains can be transferred between roles, thereby providing positive benefits to both roles (Wayne, et al.). Finally, enhanced functioning relates to improvements in basic life functions, such as communication and problem solving skills (Wayne, et al.).

Enrichment. Greenhaus and Powell define enrichment as "the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role" (2006, p. 73). Enrichment occurs through one of two "paths"; the instrumental path, where resource gains in one role directly increase performance in the other role, and the affect path, where gains in one role indirectly increase performance in the other role due to overall improvements in the individual's positive affect (Carlson, et al., 2006). As previously presented in the discussion of facilitation, enrichment is composed of four "types" of gains: developmental, affect, efficiency and capital (Carlson, et al.). As with enhancement and facilitation, enrichment is grounded in the role accumulation expansionist theories of Sieber (1974), Marks (1977), Barnett and Baruch (1985), and Voydanoff (2001). In direct opposition to Carlson, et al.'s view of distinct constructs, Greenhaus and Powell support the idea that enrichment is synonymous with enhancement, facilitation and integration.

Work/life Enrichment: Comparing the Measures

Due to relatively new focus on accord by researchers, measures that have been used are few and generally lack sound psychometric indicators (with the exception of 2006 Carlson, et al. study) (Wayne, Randel & Stevens, 2006). Additionally, since the positive side of the work/life interface is known by a variety of constructs (e.g., facilitation, enrichment, enhancement) developed scales also reflect these varying constructs. In reviewing the literature, we have found the following scales that have either contributed to the development of the construct, or have shown show bi-directionality, component focus and sound psychometric properties.

The first work done on developing enrichment measures was purely deductive in nature. In a "virtual think tank" sponsored by the Sloan Foundation, a group of prominent researchers (including MacDermid, Greenhaus, Marks and Voydanoff) collaborated to identify measures for work/life tension, including a bi-directional measure of enhancement. The measures were based on existing research and included questions designed to address energy, strain, time, behavior and support transfer between roles as perceived by the respondent, and energy, strain and time transfer as perceived by his/her spouse/partner. (MacDermid, et al., 2000).

Wayne, et al. (2004) analyzed data collected during the Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) study (sponsored by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Midlife Development) in 1995, which included a bi-directional measure for facilitation written specifically to be symmetrical to the bi-directional measurement for conflict. Initial reliability and validity were determined with a sample size of 1000. The following psychometric properties were identified in the study:

- Internal consistency results for WF facilitation and FW facilitation were $\alpha = 0.72$ and 0.68, respectively.
- Validity was assessed by correlations between the facilitation and conflict variables supporting that distinct constructs were being tapped (WF conflict – WF facilitation r = 0.00, FW conflict – FW facilitation, r = 0.02).

Using the same date, Grzywacz & Butler examined (2005) the WF side of facilitation. Their analysis resulted in an $\alpha = 0.73$, practically identical to the WF facilitation measure derived by Wayne, et al.

The only scale that taps both the bi-directionality and multidimensionality of enrichment (i.e. development, affect, efficiency and capital) is by Carlson, et al. (2006). Approached with the same rigor as their conflict scale, the enrichment scale has the following psychometric properties:

- Two studies were utilized for item generation and judging.
- CFA analysis was conducted to purify measures (30 items were ultimately reduced to 18).
- The six-factor model was tested against three-factor, two-factor and single-factor models to assess:
  - Maximum fit with six factors (CFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.06);
  - discriminant validity (Φ ranged from 0.36 – 0.66, with only two correlations above 0.60 indicating that completed standardized correlations between the six factors are tapping different constructs);
  - internal consistency (development WF $\alpha = 0.73$; development FW $\alpha = 0.87$; affect WF $\alpha = 0.91$; affect FW $\alpha = 0.84$; capital WF $\alpha = 0.90$; efficiency FW $\alpha = 0.92$). Further consistency analyses were conducted on collapsed scales to assist with future research (WF enrichment $\alpha = 0.92$; FW enrichment $\alpha = 0.86$; full scale $\alpha = 0.92$).
- Convergent validity was assessed by performing correlations between the six enrichment factors and two other measures of positive work-family interface (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Sumer & Knight, 2001;

Wayne, et al., 2004). The eight correlations conducted were all significantly moderate with r = 0.40 – 0.65, thereby demonstrating convergent validity.

- Divergent validity was assessed by performing correlations between the six enrichment factors and the six conflict factors. Eleven of the 24 possible correlations were not significant, while the remaining correlations were only moderately significant with r = 0.14 – 0.35, thereby demonstrating discriminant validity.

Using the same 1 to 5 Likert scale for agreement as the conflict survey, an example question from the enrichment survey is: "My involvement with my family makes me feel happy and this helps me to be a better worker" (p. 145).

Finally, Wadsworth & Owens (2007) tested the enrichment questions developed by the MacDermid, et al. (2000) think tank. WF enrichment resulted in an α = 0.74, while FW enrichment resulted in an α = 0.69. Wadsworth and Owens contend that further work needs to be done to develop these scales.

Research Recommendations

More needs to be done by HRD and HRM researchers to further the work/life agenda. To this end, we provide the following research recommendations. Since the conflict and enrichment scales do not share the same strengths (and weaknesses), specific recommendations must be made for each scale before comprehensive recommendations can be made.

Balance. The greatest strength in the current research is the zeal of researchers in attempting to create a single construct definition and measures to evaluate it (e.g. Dex & Bond, 2005; Frone, 2003; Greenhaus, et al., 2003). The concept of balance is a salient topic in corporate America, which lends practical credibility to research initiatives. However, corporate America wants the universal solution that will tell them how they can cost effectively address the work-life balance needs of their employees. At this point, a great deal of research is still in the "ivory tower" fashion. Essentially, researchers are talking the idea to death, without making strong headway into grounding the idea in practical applications for corporate. We believe that balance needs to be measured using both subjective and objective measures in the same survey. Greenhaus, et al. (2003) contend that combining these scales will provide better understanding into how and why individuals consider their lives balanced. If we can elucidate the how's and why's, then HRD interventions can be developed to address the issues.

Conflict. The greatest strength in the current research is the consistency in construct definition. In contrast to the enrichment construct, researchers are generally in agreement that the Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) definition, including the time, strain and behavior manifestations, is the "correct" definition. Therefore, an operational definition has been relatively easy to develop, thereby leading to the recent development of psychometrically sound scales. However, considering this scale is still in its infancy, replication studies need to be conducted to ensure validity across occupation, demographics and relationship statuses.

Enrichment. The greatest strength in the current research is the relatively quick development of rigorously tested psychometric measures (i.e. Carlson, et al., 2006). However, considering this scale is still in its infancy, replication studies need to be conducted to ensure validity across occupation, demographics and relationship statuses. The disagreement between whether integration, enhancement, facilitation and enrichment are the same (e.g. Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) or different constructs (e.g. Carlson, et al., 2006) a serious issue that needs to be further addressed. To this end, an independent validation study comparing the facilitation and enrichment measures needs to be conducted to help determine whether or not they are actually tapping the same construct.

Joint recommendations. Both the conflict and enrichment measures need to be extended beyond the individual level. For example, how do spouses, partners and children perceive balance/conflict/enrichment and do those perceptions correlate with the employee's perceptions? Also, how does individual balance/conflict/enrichment affect the work-group in the organization? What are the effects of balance/conflict/enrichment on organization performance – specifically bottom-line financial outcomes? How do these work/life concepts influence learning, performance and change initiatives? A comprehensive measure utilizing a combination of existing scales (i.e. balance, conflict and enrichment) needs to be developed. To completely understand the negative consequences of conflict, the positive facilitators that serve as mediators must be considered. Finally, what relationship does balance, conflict and/or enrichment have with stress (personal, occupational and family)? Does conflict/enrichment serve as a moderator to the development of stress for certain personality types?

Conclusion

Grzywacz and Carlson (2007, p. 467) contend that "with a solid conceptualization in place, HRD professionals have a foundation upon which to begin creating strategies that contribute to organizational goals by helping workers

achieve work-family balance." We extend this contention by suggesting that in order to obtain this grounding framework, HRD professionals must have a not only a theoretical understanding of balance, conflict and enrichment, but also an understanding of the measurement tools to assess them. Only then can HRD professionals propose interventions to promote organizational and individual development, change initiatives and performance improvement. Our hope is that HRD researchers will contribute to further conceptual and measurement development by conducting research, documenting progress, measuring accomplishment, securing management support and tracking the efficiency and effectiveness of work/life interventions.

Selected References (full references are available upon request)

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(1), 131-164.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*(2), 249-276.

Dex, S., & Bond, S. (2005). Measuring work-life balance and its covariates. *Work, Employment and Society, 19*(3), 627-637.

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

Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(3), 510-531.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Carlson, D. S. (2007). Conceptualizing work-family balance: Implications for practice and research. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9*(4), 455-471.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress.* New York: Wiley.

Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: A construct validation study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32*(2), 198-215.

MacDermid, S. M. (2000). The measurement of work/life tension: Recommendations of a virtual think tank. Boston: Sloan Work Family Network.

Marks, S. R., & MacDermid, S. M. (1996). Multiple roles and the self: A theory of role balance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*(2), 417-432.

Marques, J. F. (2006). The new human resource department: A cross-functional unit. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 17*(1), 117-123.

Morris, M. L., & Madsen, S. R. (2007). Issue Overview: Advancing work-life interaction in individuals, organizations and communities. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9*(4), 439-454.

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

Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1997). The changing world of work and family. In S. Parasuraman & J. H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 3-14). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Polach, J. (2003). HRD's role in work-life integration issues: moving the workforce to change in mindset. *Human Resource Development International, 6*(1), 57-68.

Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review, 39*(4), 567-578.

Wadsworth, L. L., & Owens, B. P. (2007). The effects of social support on work-family enhancement and work-family conflict in the public sector. *Public Administration Review, 67*(1), 75-87.

Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(1), 63-76.

Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work–family experience: Relationships of the big five to work–family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(1), 108–130.