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WHEN WORK AND FAMILY ARE ALLIES: A THEORY OF WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

JEFFREY H. GREENHAUS
Drexel University

GARY N. POWELL
University of Connecticut

We define work-family enrichment as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role. In this article we propose a theoretical model of work-family enrichment and offer a series of research propositions that reflect two paths to enrichment: an instrumental path and an affective path. We then examine the implications of the model for future research on the work-family enrichment process.

In the past twenty-five years, scholars have produced a substantial body of literature on the intersection of work and family lives (Barling & Sorensen, 1997; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999). Faced with an increasing representation of dual-earner partners and single parents in the workforce, a blurring of gender roles, and a shift in employee values (Greenhaus & Singh, 2004), researchers have sought to explain the numerous ways in which work and family roles are interdependent (Barnett, 1998, 1999; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Lambert, 1990; Repetti, 1987). Our purpose in this article is to present a theory of work-family enrichment that specifies the conditions under which work and family roles are “allies” rather than “enemies” (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000).

As many scholars have observed, the work-family literature has been dominated by a conflict perspective (Barnett, 1998; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Haas, 1999). Derived from a scarcity hypothesis that assumes a fixed amount of time and human energy, proponents of the conflict perspective assume that individuals who participate in multiple roles (such as work and family) inevitably experience conflict and stress that detract from their quality of life. Marks (1977) and Sieber (1974) were skeptical of the conflict perspective and suggested that the advantages of pursuing multiple roles are likely to outweigh the disadvantages—an expansionist hypothesis (Barnett & Baruch, 1985). However, much of the research on the work-family interface continues to emphasize conflict, stress, and impaired well-being.

Recognizing the preoccupation with conflict and stress, in several recent reviews, researchers have called for a more balanced approach that recognizes the positive effects of combining work and family roles (Barnett, 1998; Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999), and Grzywacz (2002) has recently proposed one theory of the positive interdependencies between work and family roles. Indeed, researchers have increasingly examined positive relationships between work and family lives, employing such concepts as enrichment (Kirchmeyer, 1992a; Rothbard, 2001), positive spillover (Crouter, 1994b; Grzywacz, 2000; Grzywacz, Almeida, & McDonald, 2002; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a,b; Hammer et al., 2002; Hanson, Colton, & Hammer, 2003; Kirchmeyer, 1992b, 1993, 1995; Stephens, Franks, & Atienza, 1997; Sumer & Knight, 2001; Voydanoff, 2001), enhancement (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002; Tiedje et al., 1990), and facilitation (Frone, 2003; Tompson & Werner, 1997; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). The increased emphasis on positive interdependencies between work life and family life is consistent with emerging trends in psychology (Seligman, 2002), organizational behavior.
(Luthans, 2002), and family studies (Patterson, 2002) that focus on strengths rather than weaknesses—on health rather than illness—in understanding the potential of individuals and social systems. However, the absence of a comprehensive theoretical framework in which to examine the positive effects of combining work and family roles (Frone, 2003) has hindered research in this area.

**ROLE ACCUMULATION AND WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT**

There are three ways in which participation in multiple roles—often referred to as role accumulation—can produce positive outcomes for individuals (Voydanoff, 2001). First, work experiences and family experiences can have additive effects on well-being. Research has consistently demonstrated that role accumulation can have beneficial effects on physical and psychological well-being (Barnett & Hyde, 2001), especially when the roles are of high quality (Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, & Crouter, 2000). In addition, satisfaction with work and satisfaction with family have been found to have additive effects on an individual's happiness, life satisfaction, and perceived quality of life (Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992; Rice, McFarlin, Hunt, & Near, 1985). Such research suggests that individuals who participate in—and are satisfied with—work and family roles experience greater well-being than those who participate in only one of the roles or who are dissatisfied with one or more of their roles.

Second, participation in both work and family roles can buffer individuals from distress in one of the roles. For example, research has shown that the relationship between family stressors and impaired well-being is weaker for individuals who have more satisfying, high-quality work experiences (Barnett, Marshall, & Sayer, 1992; Voydanoff & Donnelly, 1999). In a similar vein, the relationship between work stress and impaired well-being is attenuated for individuals who have a more satisfying, high-quality family life (Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992). These moderator effects suggest that a diverse portfolio of social roles buffers an individual from distress stemming from one particular role, much like a diverse financial portfolio protects an individual's financial well-being from declining performance in one segment of the economy (Sieber, 1974). Individuals who accumulate roles may compensate for failure in one role by falling back on gratification in another role (Sieber, 1974).

Third, experiences in one role can produce positive experiences and outcomes in the other role. This mechanism differs from the two previous mechanisms because it represents a transfer of positive experiences from one role to the other role. Marks (1977) has argued that participation in some roles creates energy that can be used to enhance experiences in other roles. Sieber (1974) has proposed that resources acquired in one role as a by-product of social relationships (e.g., recommendations to third parties, connections, inside tips) may be reinvested in other roles. Also, as individuals accumulate a variety of roles, their personalities may be enhanced as they learn to be tolerant of discrepant views and flexible in adjusting to the demands of diverse role senders; they may then benefit from their expanded personalities in all roles (Sieber, 1974).

For example, a manager reported how her personal life enhanced her professional life: “I think being a mother and having patience and watching someone else grow has made me a better manager. I am better able to be patient with other people and let them grow and develop in a way that is good for them” (Ruderman et al., 2002: 373). A factory worker in a participative work system explained how work experiences benefited his family life: “I have a 16-year-old son and I use some of the things we do at work with him instead of yelling. We listen better here, we let people tell their side” (Crouter, 1984a: 81).

We believe that this third mechanism best captures the concept of work-family enrichment, which we define as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role. We consider work-family enrichment, like work-family conflict, to be bidirectional. Work-to-family enrichment occurs when work experiences improve the quality of family life, and family-to-work enrichment occurs when family experiences improve the quality of work life.

Although our focus is on work-family enrichment, we do not mean to suggest that the additive and buffering effects of role participation are unimportant. These effects pertain to how work and family experiences enhance overall...
well-being or reduce deteriorations in overall well-being, rather than how they enrich each other. In this article we first review prior research on work-family enrichment. We then propose a theoretical model of work-family enrichment and present a series of research propositions based on the model. Our model goes beyond descriptions of the enrichment process by Sieber (1974) and Marks (1977) by incorporating a wider range of resources generated in one role that may be applied to another role and proposing two different paths by which resources from one role may be applied to another. Finally, we discuss the implications of the model for future research on the enrichment process.

PRIOR RESEARCH ON WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

Here we review two streams of research in which scholars have examined the positive interdependencies between work and family roles. In one stream, researchers have assessed work-family enrichment with self-report scales, often examining the antecedents of enrichment. In the second, researchers have observed positive relationships between work-related and family-related variables that are consistent with the occurrence of work-family enrichment.

We have identified nineteen studies measuring work-family enrichment with self-report scales. As Table 1 shows, most researchers used terms other than enrichment (e.g., positive spill-over) to denote the concept. All but one study (Ruderman et al., 2002) used fixed-response items. Eleven studies measured both directions of enrichment (work-to-family and family-to-work); seven measured only one direction, and one study did not classify the direction of enrichment. Also, fifteen of the nineteen studies assessed work-family conflict, as well as work-family enrichment.

Examination of the nature of the self-report items sheds light on the concept of enrichment. Table 2 contains sample items. Kirchmeyer developed fifteen items, each of which assessed one of Sieber’s (1974) four types of rewards of role accumulation (role privileges, overall status security, status enhancement, personality enhancement). In most of her studies, Kirchmeyer (1992a, b, 1993, 1995) had respondents separately assess the impact of three different nonwork roles (parenting, community, recreational activities) on their work or on their overall lives. Because some of Sieber’s rewards reflect additive (role privileges) and buffering (overall status security) effects, not all of Kirchmeyer’s items assessed what we would consider work-family enrichment. Grzywacz and his colleagues assessed enrichment with six items, three assessing work-to-family enrichment and three assessing family-to-work enrichment, whereas Wayne et al.’s (2004) scale included eight items, evenly split between the two directions of enrichment. All of these items, as well as Hill’s (2005) items, are consistent with our view of work-family enrichment because they assess the positive effect of experiences in one role on experiences or outcomes in the other role. Hammer and colleagues (Hammer et al., 2002; Hanson et al., 2003) also measured both directions of enrichment. In one study, Hanson et al. (2003) reported the results of a factor analysis that distinguished two types of enrichment: (1) instrumental, in which skills, abilities, and values are applied effectively in another role, and (2) affective, in which affect or emotion is carried over from one role to another. We return to this important distinction when we discuss our proposed model of work-family enrichment.

Stephens et al. (1997) focused on one aspect of family life—caregiver responsibility for an ill or disabled parent. Consistent with their definition of enrichment, Stephens et al.’s (1997) items measured the transfer of self-confidence or positive mood from one role to the other. Tiedje et al. (1990) developed a nine-item work-to-family enrichment scale to examine how women’s relationship with their children was affected by their career or work responsibilities. Ruderman et al. (2002; Study 1) coded female managers’ responses to an open-ended question (“Are there any dimensions or aspects of your personal life that enhance your professional life?”) into six themes: interpersonal skills, psychological benefits, emotional support and advice, handling multiple tasks, personal interests and background, and leadership. Unique among the studies reviewed, Tompson and Werner’s (1997) assessed conflict and enrichment (which they termed facilitation) as opposite ends of the same continuum.

The studies identified in Table 1 provide some insight into work-family enrichment. In almost every case in which a study assessed enrich-
### TABLE 1
Studies Measuring Work-Family Enrichment with Self-Report Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Name of Concept</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Correlation Between Enrichment and Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen &amp; Kirchmeyer (1995)</td>
<td>Resource enrichment</td>
<td>Nonwork to work</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>Nonwork to work</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz (2000)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Bass (2003)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Marks (2000a)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Marks (2000b)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Family to work</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>Family to work</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmeyer (1992a)</td>
<td>Resource enrichment</td>
<td>Parenting to work</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Family to work</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmeyer (1992b)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Parenting to work</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Parenting to work</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmeyer (1993)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Parenting to work</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Parenting to work</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmeyer (1995)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Nonwork to work</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Nonwork to work</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderman et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Personal to professional work</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>Work to caregiver</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens et al. (1997)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Work to caregiver</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>Caregiver to work</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumer &amp; Knight (2001)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
<td>Work to home</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>Work to home</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiedje et al. (1990)</td>
<td>Role enhancement</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompson &amp; Werner (1997)</td>
<td>Conflict/facilitation</td>
<td>Not differentiated</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Work to family</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To make comparisons across studies, the means on enrichment and conflict from Cohen and Kirchmeyer (1995), Kirchmeyer (1992a,b, 1993, 1995), Stephens et al. (1997), and Sumer and Knight (2001) were converted to a 5-point scale; the means from Hill (2005) were combined across men and women; the means from Hanson et al. (2003: Table 1) were aggregated across instrumental and affective items; and the means and correlations from Hammer et al. (2002; Tables 1 and 2) were averaged across Waves 1 and 2.
TABLE 2
Sample Work-Family Enrichment Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Work-Family Enrichment Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Grzywacz & Marks (2000a), Wayne et al. (2004) | Positive spillover from work to family  
The things you do at work help you deal with personal and practical issues at home.  
Positive spillover from family to work  
The love and respect you get at home make you feel confident about yourself at work. |
| Hammer et al. (2002)                       | Positive spillover from work to family  
Having a successful day at work puts me in a good mood to handle my family responsibilities.  
Positive spillover from family to work  
No sample item given |
| Hanson et al. (2003)                       | Positive spillover from work to family  
Abilities developed at work help me in my family life.  
Positive spillover from family to work  
Behaviors required in my family life lead to behaviors that assist me at work. |
| Hill (2005)                                | Work-to-family facilitation  
In the past three months, how often have you had more energy to do things with your family or other important people in your life because of your job?  
Family-to-work facilitation  
In the past three months, how often have you had more energy to do your job because of your family or personal life? |
| Kirchmeyer (1992b), Sumer & Knight (2001)  | Being a parent (being involved in the community, being involved in recreation/hobby groups):  
• results in rewards that would be difficult to achieve elsewhere (role privileges);  
• makes disappointments on the job seem easier to take (overall status security);  
• gives me access to certain facts and information that can be used at work (status enhancement); and  
• helps me understand the people at work better (personality enhancement). |
| Stephens et al. (1997)                     | Positive spillover from employment role to caregiver role  
Having a successful day at work puts you in a good mood to assist your parent.  
Positive spillover from caregiver roles to employment role  
You have had greater confidence in yourself at work because you have been able to handle caregiving responsibilities well. |
| Tiedje et al. (1990)                       | Role enhancement from work to family  
Having a career helps me to better appreciate the time I spend with my children. |

ment and conflict, the average enrichment score was at least as high as the average conflict score, and generally was substantially higher. At a minimum, this finding suggests that employees perceive that their work and family roles do enrich one another. Also, correlations between work-family enrichment and work-family conflict generally were small. Only eight of the twenty-one correlations reported were statistically significant (three positive and five negative), and the mean value of these twenty-one correlations was \(-.02\). Overall, these correlations suggest that work-family enrichment and work-family conflict are unrelated and independent constructs (Frone, 2003).

Regarding the directionality of enrichment, nine of the eleven studies that assessed both directions of enrichment found that family-to-work enrichment was substantially stronger than work-to-family enrichment. Self-report
studies suggest that many individuals experience work-family enrichment, but they do not necessarily indicate the types of role experiences that produce positive experiences and outcomes in the other role. Although several of the studies explored antecedents of work-family enrichment, such as organization support, psychosocial involvement in work, and personality or interpersonal style (Cohen & Kirchmeyer, 1995; Grzywacz et al., 2002; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b; Kirchmeyer, 1992b, 1993, 1995; Stephens et al., 1997; Sumer & Knight, 2001; Tiedje et al., 1990; Wayne et al., 2004), the findings do not provide much theoretical insight into the process by which a full range of variables can produce work-family enrichment.

Therefore, we turn to a second stream of research in which scholars have examined relationships between work-related variables and family-related variables. Although not all of the studies were designed to examine work-family enrichment, they often have shown positive relationships between experiences or outcomes in one role and experiences or outcomes in the other role. Tables 3 and 4 provide a representative sampling of these findings. In Table 3 work-related factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-Related Independent Variable</th>
<th>Family-Related Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Support for Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and flexible work environment</td>
<td>Time spent on home and children, quality of interaction with infants (men), performance, satisfaction, and well-being in family domain</td>
<td>Friedman &amp; Greenhaus (2000), Frone et al. (1997); Haas (1999), Parasuraman et al. (1996), Voydanoff (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking in the organization and acceptance by peers</td>
<td>Children's physical health and school performance (women), satisfaction with child care (women), family satisfaction</td>
<td>Friedman &amp; Greenhaus (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Performance as parent</td>
<td>Friedman &amp; Greenhaus (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td>Family engagement (men)</td>
<td>Rothbard (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
Studies Examining Relationships Between Family-Related Independent Variables and Work-Related Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family-Related Independent Variable</th>
<th>Work-Related Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Support for Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support from family</td>
<td>Income, positive work attitudes and satisfaction, job scope, career development activities, acceptance at work</td>
<td>Adams et al. (1996), Friedman &amp; Greenhaus (2000), Frone et al. (1997), Voydanoff (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family engagement</td>
<td>Work engagement (women)</td>
<td>Rothbard (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are presented as independent variables and family factors as dependent variables. In Table 4 family factors are presented as independent variables and work factors as dependent variables. Given the cross-sectional nature of much of this research, the specification of a variable as independent or dependent is somewhat speculative. Nevertheless, we organize the findings in this manner to illustrate the potential for experiences in one role to have a positive effect on experiences or outcomes in the other role.

As seen in Table 3, income derived from work has been found to be positively related to several indicators of marital quality and well-being (Barrett & Hyde, 2001; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Haas, 1999; Voydanoff, 2001). Moreover, a supportive and flexible work environment has been associated with positive behaviors and outcomes in the family domain (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Haas, 1999; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996; Voydanoff, 2001). Substantial evidence links job content (job scope, discretion, or complexity) with a positive home environment, marriage, child-rearing practices, and child outcomes (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Grimm-Thomas & Perry-Jenkins, 1994; Haas, 1999; Perry-Jenkins et al., 2000; Voydanoff, 2001). Networking activities and acceptance by peers have been related positively to child-related outcomes, especially for women (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). In one of the few studies designed explicitly to test an enrichment perspective, Rothbard (2001) found that psychological engagement (attention and absorption) in work was positively related to positive affect at work, which, in turn, was related to men’s psychological engagement in family life. The positive impact of work-related affect on family life also has been suggested by studies that have observed relationships of work satisfaction with family satisfaction, positive parenting, or positive child outcomes (Barling, 1986; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Stewart & Barling, 1996).

As seen in Table 4, positive relationships have been observed between social support received from a family member and career success, career development, or satisfaction at work (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Frone et al., 1997; Voydanoff, 2001). Also, marriage and the presence of children have been found to be positively related to three widely used indicators of career success—income, advancement, and satisfaction—but primarily for men (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Jacobs, 1992; Judge & Bretz, 1994; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Melamed, 1996; Pfeffer & Ross, 1982; Schneer & Reitman, 1993). In light of these findings, it is noteworthy that psychological engagement in family life has been associated with work engagement only for women (Rothbard, 2001).

Taken together, the studies assessing work-family enrichment with self-report scales and the studies observing positive relationships between work and family variables lend support to the notion that work experiences can enrich
family life and that family experiences can enrich work life. However suggestive these findings are, we still do not understand the process by which certain role experiences enhance experiences and outcomes in the other domain. For example, why is a complex, challenging job associated with positive parenting and marital quality? How does a supportive work or family environment enhance the quality of life in the other role? With few exceptions (e.g., Grimm-Thomas & Perry-Jenkins, 1994; Rothbard, 2001), researchers have not systematically examined the factors that might mediate or moderate positive cross-role relationships.

Accordingly, we have developed a theoretical model of the work-family enrichment process to offer a more complete understanding of positive work-family linkages, to place prior research in a larger context, and to guide future research in the area. This model builds on early writings on the subject (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974) and on the two streams of empirical research reviewed. The model goes beyond the prior literature by (1) identifying five types of work and family resources that have the capacity to promote work-family enrichment, (2) specifying two mechanisms or paths by which these resources can promote work-family enrichment, and (3) proposing several moderator variables that determine the conditions under which resources in one role are most likely to enrich the quality of life in the other role.

THEORETICAL MODEL OF WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

Figure 1 illustrates how experiences in Role A (work or family) can improve the quality of life in

FIGURE 1
Model of Work-Family Enrichment
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Role B (family or work). We consider quality of life as having two components: high performance and positive affect. We propose that the resources generated in Role A can promote high performance and positive affect in Role B and that the extent to which a resource heightens performance and positive affect is moderated by the salience of Role B, the perceived relevance of the resource to Role B, and the consistency of the resource with the requirements and norms of Role B.

A resource is an asset that may be drawn on when needed to solve a problem or cope with a challenging situation. The generation of resources is a crucial driver of the enrichment process (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Grzywacz, 2002), and it is likely that role characteristics and personal characteristics determine the extent to which role participation produces resources. However, because our focus is on cross-role relationships, a discussion of the factors that generate resources is beyond the scope of the present article.

Figure 1 identifies five types of resources that can be generated in a role: skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources. As the name implies, skills and perspectives has two components. Skills refer to a broad set of task-related cognitive and interpersonal skills, coping skills, multitasking skills, and knowledge and wisdom derived from role experiences (Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998; Holman & Wall, 2002; McCauley, Ruderman, Ohlott, & Morrow, 1994; Ruderman et al., 2002). Perspectives involve ways of perceiving or handling situations, such as respecting individual differences (Ruderman et al., 2002), valuing differences in cultural background (Cox, 1993), being understanding of other people’s problems (Crouter, 1984b), and learning the value of trust (Crouter, 1984a); in short, work and family experiences can expand one’s “world view” (Kanter, 1977).

Psychological and physical resources include positive self-evaluations, such as self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Gist & Mitchell, 1992) and self-esteem (Brockner, 1988). These resources also include personal hardiness (Blaney & Ganellen, 1990; Kobasa, 1979), positive emotions about the future, such as optimism and hope (Seligman, 1991, 2002), and physical health.

Role experiences also provide resources through the acquisition of social capital: “the goodwill that is engendered by the fabric of social relations and that can be mobilized to facilitate action” (Adler & Kwon, 2002: 17). The two social-capital resources included in our model— influence and information—are derived from interpersonal relationships in work and family roles that may assist individuals in achieving their goals.

Flexibility in our model refers to discretion to determine the timing, pace, and location at which role requirements are met. This has been recognized frequently in the work-family literature as a potent resource (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Miller, 1997; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lynam, 1999).

Finally, material resources include money and gifts obtained from work and family roles.

It should be noted that many of the resources generated by role experiences are interdependent. For example, the availability of personal resources, such as skills and information, can enhance self-efficacy (Gist & Mitchell, 1992) and can facilitate the acquisition of social capital (Friedman & Krackhardt, 1997). Moreover, hardiness, a psychological resource, can promote effective coping skills (Kobasa, 1982) and physical health (Wiebe & McCallum, 1986). As a result of these interdependencies, the acquisition of one resource can trigger the acquisition of other resources.

The model specifies two mechanisms or paths by which a resource generated in Role A can promote high performance and positive affect in Role B. First, a resource can be transferred directly from Role A to Role B, thereby enhancing performance in Role B. Consistent with Hanson et al. (2003), we refer to this mechanism as the instrumental path, because the application of a resource has a direct instrumental effect on performance in another role. Second, a resource generated in Role A can promote positive affect within Role A, which, in turn, produces high performance and positive affect in Role B. Because this process operates through positive affect, we refer to this mechanism as the affective path (Hanson et al., 2003). In the following sections we discuss the instrumental path and the affective path, respectively.
The Instrumental Path to Work-Family Enrichment

In this path, different types of resources are directly transferred from Role A to Role B, improving performance in the latter role (arrow 1 in Figure 1). The literature suggests that skills and perspectives are transferred from one role to another (Crouter, 1984b; Kanter, 1977; Piotrowski, Rapoport, & Rapoport, 1987; Repetti, 1987), either directly or mediated by general knowledge structures (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Supporting empirical evidence comes from two sources: self-reports and cross-role relationships. Ruderman et al.’s (2002) female managers reported how a variety of qualities derived from their personal life (e.g., interpersonal skills, ability to multitask, respect for individual differences) enhanced their managerial effectiveness, a finding that is consistent with reports from McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison’s (1988) male executives. The use of active listening by one of Crouter’s (1984a) respondents cited earlier suggests that perspectives and skills nurtured at work can improve one’s parenting behavior.

Correlational findings, although potentially vulnerable to the threat of confounding variables, are also consistent with the transfer of skills and perspectives. For example, the positive relationship between job complexity and positive parenting (Haas, 1999; Perry-Jenkins et al., 2000) may reflect the impact of complex jobs on the development of leadership skills (McCaulley et al., 1994) that are applied, in turn, to parent-child interactions. Moreover, parents who hold jobs with opportunities for self-direction tend to value self-direction in their children (Haas, 1999), suggesting that a perspective (the importance of self-direction for personal development) can be transferred from the work domain to the family domain.

Psychological and physical resources developed or nurtured in one role can increase performance in another role, as suggested by a blend of self-report and correlational findings. It is likely that self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-confidence enhance performance in another role because they stimulate motivation, effort, persistence, and goal setting (DiPaula & Campbell, 2002; Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge & Bono, 2001; Murray, Holmes, & Griffin, 2000; Murray, Holmes, MacDonald, & Ellsworth, 1998; Wood & Bandura, 1989). For example, 23 percent of Ruderman et al.’s (2002) female managers reported that psychological benefits of their personal lives, such as self-esteem and confidence, enhanced their managerial effectiveness. Grimm-Thomas and Perry-Jenkins (1994) found that the effect of job complexity on positive parenting behavior was mediated by self-esteem, suggesting that self-esteem derived from experiences in one role can increase performance in another role. Because high performance enhances self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), the positive relationship observed between job performance and parental performance (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000) may reflect causal linkages among job performance, self-efficacy, and performance as a parent. Similarly, the positive relationship between spousal support and career success (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000) may be due to the self-esteem derived from emotional support (House, 1981).

The positive emotions of optimism and hope nurtured in Role A can promote effective performance in Role B by increasing persistence and resilience in the face of failure and challenge (Seligman, 1991, 2002). Hardiness has been associated with effective coping, which can promote positive outcomes (Blaney & Gannell, 1990). Physical health is likely to provide energy, mental sharpness, and stamina, promoting high role performance, whereas the costs of poor health are seen in lost time (e.g., work absenteeism) and diminished role performance (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997).

Individuals may apply information acquired as a result of social capital in one role to solve problems in another role. For example, information provided by a corporate-sponsored elder care resource service can help an employee solve problems related to the care of an elderly or ill relative. In a similar manner, information provided by an employee’s spouse may be usefully applied by the employee to his or her career (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Work contacts can exert influence to enhance one’s family life, such as when a powerful colleague uses his or her clout to help one’s child gain admission to a highly selective college. Conversely, family contacts can use their influence to help an individual compete successfully for a promotion, get a bank loan to open up a new business, or gain admission to a social club that provides exposure to potential sponsors of one’s career. The relationships of networking and ac-
ceptance at work with positive family outcomes (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000) and the relationship of family support with positive career outcomes (Adams et al., 1996; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Frone et al., 1997; Voydanoff, 2001) are also consistent with the notion that information and/or influence derived from social capital in one role can enhance performance in another role.

Flexibility within the work role enables an individual to devote more time to family responsibilities (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000), thereby enhancing the individual's performance in the family role. The negative relationships of flexible work arrangements, family-supportive organizational cultures, and supportive supervision with work-family conflict (Allen, 2001; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999) also suggest that workplace flexibility permits an individual to participate more fully in family life. Moreover, individuals who experience flexibility in their family responsibility because their spouses spend extended time on child care activities make fewer adjustments to their work schedule for family reasons and perform more effectively on the job (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000).

Material resources gathered in one role, work or family, can also promote performance in the other role. Money derived from employment can be used to enhance the quality of family life through the purchase of goods and services that make family life easier or more enjoyable (Miller, 1997). Income's positive relationship with marital stability and quality (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Haas, 1999; Voydanoff, 2001), along with children's health and the adequacy of their child care (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000), reflects the utilization of money to better one's family life. Similarly, financial resources acquired within the family role (e.g., gifts, no-interest loans, inheritance) can be used to start, promote, or upgrade a business venture; participate in activities that provide business contacts; or invest in career-enhancing education.

The findings cited in this section are consistent with an instrumental path toward work-family enrichment. Therefore, we offer the following proposition:

**Proposition 1:** Skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources generated in Role A directly promote high performance in Role B.

The Affective Path to Work-Family Enrichment

MacDermid, Seery, and Weiss (2002) have observed that most theoretical perspectives underplay the importance of emotion at the work-family interface. Their conclusion seems especially relevant to the positive interdependencies between work and family roles; an affective path as well as an instrumental path may promote work-family enrichment. Affect consists of moods—generalized affective states not associated with a specific stimulus—and emotions—more intense discrete states, such as anger or elation, that are linked to specific events (Brief & Weiss, 2002; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). In our model of work-family enrichment, we do not distinguish between these two components of affect. Instead, we view positive affect as including positive moods and positive emotions derived from role experiences.

We suggest that when individuals receive extensive resources from a role, their positive affect in that role is increased, which, in turn, facilitates their functioning in the other role. Therefore, there are two components of the affective path to enrichment: (1) the effect of resources on positive affect in a role and (2) the effect of positive affect in a role on functioning in the other role. We discuss these two components in turn.

There are two ways in which resources generated in Role A can produce positive affect in Role A. First, some of the resources in the model can have direct effects on positive affect in Role A (arrow 2). For example, psychological resources such as self-esteem, optimism, hope, and hardiness derived from a role can trigger a positive mood, positive emotions, or satisfaction with that role (Isen & Baron, 1991). Additionally, the accumulation of social resources at work is associated with positive feelings about one’s career (Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001), as is the degree of flexibility and support in the workplace (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Financial rewards from work are related to positive feelings about one’s career (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995), and total family income promotes marital stability (Haas, 1999).
Second, resources generated in Role A can promote high performance in Role A (arrow 3), which, in turn, enhances positive affect in that role (arrow 4). In our discussion of the instrumental path, we focused on how performance in one role can be enhanced through the transfer of resources generated in another role. These very same resources can also promote within-role performance. For example, work-derived self-esteem (Korman, 1976), skill development (McCall et al., 1988), and social resources (Seibert et al., 2001) can promote job performance or success; information acquired from a mentor can be used to make a significant contribution on a visible work assignment; and material resources obtained from an inheritance can be used to support family travel. In turn, since most individuals like to do something well rather than poorly, the consequences of performing well in a role are likely to be reflected in increased positive affect (Judge, Thoreson, Bono, & Patton, 2001).

In sum, resources derived from Role A can either have a direct effect on positive affect in that role or can have an indirect effect through high performance.

**Proposition 2:** Skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources generated in Role A produce positive affect in Role A.

The second component of the affective path represents the facilitating effect of positive affect in Role A on performance in Role B (arrow 5). In their discussion of mood spillover, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) propose that a positive mood in one role can enhance cognitive functioning, task and interpersonal activity, and persistence in another role, thereby increasing performance and rewards and promoting a positive mood in the second role.

Rothbard (2001) offers three explanations for the effect of positive affect in one role on engagement (attention and absorption) in another role, which can ultimately produce high performance in the latter role (Kahn, 1992). First, because positive affect is related to benevolence and helping behavior (Isen & Baron, 1991), it can increase one’s psychological availability to engage in another role. Second, positive affect is associated with an outward focus of attention, which is more likely to stimulate positive interactions than a more self-focused orientation, often associated with negative affect. Third, consistent with Marks (1977), positive affect can expand one’s level of energy, thereby increasing the likelihood of being highly engaged in another role. Rothbard (2001) provides partial support for her predictions, finding that positive affect at work triggers high attention in the family role (for men) and that positive affect within the family stimulates absorption with work (for women).

**Proposition 3:** Positive affect in Role A promotes high performance in Role B.

Propositions 2 and 3 collectively capture the affective path to work-family enrichment. An important distinction between the instrumental path and the affective path is the mechanism by which resources derived from one role enhance functioning in the other role. In the instrumental path, resources in Role A have direct effects on performance in Role B, whereas in the affective path, resources in Role A have indirect effects on performance in Role B through positive affect in Role A. It should be noted that both paths can ultimately promote positive affect in Role B because of the effect of performance in Role B on positive affect in that role (arrow 6).

**Moderators of the Instrumental Path**

The instrumental path requires that a resource generated in Role A be applied to Role B and that the application of the resource lead to high performance in Role B. With the exception of psychological and physical resources, we assume that the decision to apply a resource from one role to another is intentional (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). For example, the use of information from a coworker to solve a family problem, the use of an influential relative to gain advantage in a job search, the use of a bonus as a down payment on a summer home, the use of flexibility in the work schedule to spend more time with a spouse or children, and the use of a job-related skill to interact more effectively with family members are intentional decisions to invest resources acquired in one role in another role. The application of psychological and physical resources does not appear to be intentional, because individuals do not necessarily make a conscious decision to apply high self-esteem,
hardiness, optimism, or physical health to situational demands.

Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) can help explain the likelihood that an individual will transfer skills and perspectives, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources across roles. According to expectancy theory, an individual is most likely to engage in a behavior when the potential outcome of the behavior is highly valued and when engaging in the behavior is thought to lead to the attainment of the outcome. In the instrumental path, the behavior in question is the application of a resource to Role B, and the outcome is high performance in Role B.

We suggest that high performance in Role B is most valued when the role is highly salient to the individual. According to social identity theory, social roles form the basis of a person’s sense of self or identity (Burke, 1991; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1995; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Individuals who participate in different social roles have a variety of social identities that provide meaning and purpose in life. However, social identities are often organized in a hierarchy of salience or subjective importance such that some roles are more central than others in one’s self-concept (Thoits, 1991). Achieving high performance in a highly salient role is more likely to enhance well-being than achieving high performance in a less salient role, because salient role identities provide greater meaning and purpose (Thoits, 1991). The more salient a role is to an individual, the more time and emotion the individual invests in the role (Burke & Reitzes, 1991; Lobel, 1991; Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; Stryker & Serpe, 1994). Therefore, individuals intentionally apply resources to a salient role because they place a high value on performing well in a role that is central to their self-concept. Conversely, individuals make less deliberate effort to apply resources to a role that is not a significant source of self-identity.

Proposition 4: Skills and perspectives, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources generated in Role A are more likely to directly promote high performance in Role B when Role B is highly salient than when it is not highly salient.

Consistent with expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), we also expect that an individual is most likely to apply a resource generated in Role A to Role B when he or she believes that application of the resource will have positive consequences. Just as individuals expend effort on a job when they believe that effort will result in high performance (Porter & Lawler, 1968), individuals also transfer a resource from one role to another when they believe that the resource can help them achieve high performance.

The factors that affect the perceived relevance of a resource are likely to vary across resources. The perceived relevance of a particular skill or perspective is likely to be stronger when there is a small contrast between work and family role identities (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). When work and family role identities are similar, individuals can express themselves in similar ways across roles and can see the connection between the skill or perspective acquired in one role and the requirements of the other role. For example, a parent who sees her work and family roles as settings in which to express nurturance (small role identity contrast) may be more likely to view a particular communication style learned at work as relevant to the family domain than a parent who sees herself as a nurturing manager and an authoritarian parent. The perceived relevance of information acquired in Role A to a situation in Role B is likely to be influenced by the credibility of the source. For example, a coworker’s information about available elder care options may be pursued more vigorously if that coworker has a track record of being knowledgeable and trustworthy. Similarly, a family member’s advice about a work project is more likely to be sought and applied to the project when he or she is perceived as more familiar with the nature of the particular work situation.

In the case of influence and money, perceived relevance is heightened when opportunities arise that require the investment of social contacts or money and when the influence or money is expected to enhance performance in the role. In contrast, when Role B does not provide potential opportunities (e.g., to expand a business or to enroll a child in a high-priced day care facility), or when a resource is seen as insufficient or inappropriate, an individual is unlikely to transfer money or influence from one role to another. Similarly, flexibility derived from Role A is most likely to be seen as relevant to Role B when there are strong expectations to participate in
Role B from other role members or from oneself (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964) and when the individual perceives that the additional role participation will enable him or her to meet role expectations. In other words, flexibility is most likely to be applied to another role when time commitment to the other role is expected and when it is believed that the time commitment will promote high performance.

Proposition 5: Skills and perspectives, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources generated in Role A are more likely to directly promote high performance in Role B when the resources are perceived to be relevant to Role B than when they are not perceived to be relevant to Role B.

Propositions 4 and 5 suggest that an individual is most likely to transfer a resource from Role A to Role B when Role B is highly salient and when the individual thinks the resource is relevant to Role B. However, the application of a resource does not guarantee it will promote high performance in another role. Attainment of high performance depends on whether the resource is compatible with the actual demands of Role B.

For example, a collaborative problem-solving skill or a team perspective fostered in the family domain could impede rather than improve job performance if an individual applies it to a work environment with an aggressive-defensive culture (Cooke & Szumal, 2000). Similarly, a directive decision-making style developed in an autocratic work environment could dampen performance in a family that values nurturance and self-direction. Yet collaborative or directive skills can enhance performance in a role in which task requirements and norms are compatible with these approaches.

Similarly, information applied to a role may either promote or dampen performance in the role, depending on its compatibility with the requirements of the role. A key determinant of the compatibility of information is its accuracy. Although some information that is applied to a role may be objective (e.g., tuition charged by a day care center), much of it is subjective (e.g., assessment of the quality of care the center provides), taking the form of advice (e.g., “This day care center would be an excellent choice for your children”). Therefore, a coworker’s suggestion to use a particular day care center may be unhelpful if the coworker underestimates tuition or if his or her high regard for the quality of the facility is unjustified. In either case, the information is inconsistent with the family’s requirement for high-quality and reasonably priced day care. As another example, a family member’s advice to seek a promotion through individual accomplishments and assertive self-nomination (Gould & Penley, 1984) may backfire in a company with a culture that encourages team performance and discourages self-aggrandizement.

The use of social influence to advance work or family outcomes may also be helpful or harmful to performance in Role B depending on the circumstances. For example, although a coworker’s attempt to influence the acceptance of one’s child into a prestigious private school could yield a positive outcome, it could fail should the school view the intervention as meddlesome. Similarly, a relative’s attempt to secure a job interview for an individual could help the individual but could also backfire should the hiring official resent the intrusion.

Even flexibility, with all of its advantages (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000), can have either a negative impact or no impact on performance in Role B if the additional time devoted to Role B is resisted by others within the role set or is not necessary to fulfill the requirements of the role. For example, flexibility at work that allows an employee to spend after-school time with a teenage child may not enhance the employee's performance as a parent if the child would rather be spending the same time in other ways.

The use of money to purchase goods or services can enhance or detract from performance in Role B, depending on whether the goods or services meet the requirements of the situation and are consistent with its norms. For example, the hiring of live-in assistance for children may detract from family life if it produces less frequent or less intimate interactions between parents and children. In addition, the investment of money derived from family sources to pursue an additional degree may not improve performance in a job with low-skill requirements or in an organization that does not value higher education.
Proposition 6: Skills and perspectives, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources generated in Role A are more likely to directly promote high performance in Role B when the resources are consistent with the requirements and norms of Role B than when they are inconsistent with the requirements and norms of Role B.

Moderator of the Affective Path

As noted earlier, the affective path has two components: (1) resources generated in Role A promote positive affect in Role A, and (2) positive affect in Role A increases performance in Role B. We believe that the second component of the affective path is moderated by the salience of Role B.

Recall Rothbard's (2001) three explanations for why positive affect may influence engagement, and ultimately performance, in another role: benevolence and helping behavior, an outward focus, and an expansion of energy. We suggest that the tendencies to be benevolent and to hold an outward focus derived from Role A are more likely to lead to positive interactions and psychological availability in Role B when the latter role is highly salient to the individual, because success and well-being are particularly meaningful in highly salient roles (Thoits, 1991). In other words, general tendencies to be available, engaged, and energetic in a role translate into attention and absorption in another role only when they provide a significant source of self-identity. Therefore, although positive affect derived from one's family (work) role may expand the tendencies to be helpful, available, and energized, these tendencies may not be applied to a work (family) domain that is peripheral rather than central to one's self-concept.

Proposition 7: Positive affect in Role A is more likely to promote high performance in Role B when Role B is highly salient than when it is not highly salient.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

We recommend that a comprehensive research program be conducted to test the validity of the model proposed in this article. This entails the development and validation of new measures and the use of a variety of methodologies. We believe that there is value in continuing to assess work-family enrichment through self-reports; just as we have learned a great deal about negative relationships between work and family from self-reports of work-family conflict, self-reports of enrichment should provide insights into positive relationships between work and family. However, consistent with our definition of enrichment, new measures are needed to assess the extent to which each resource included in our model (the instrumental path) and positive affect (the affective path) have beneficial effects on performance in the other role. Both directions of enrichment (work to family and family to work) should be assessed, and perceptions of enrichment should be gathered from the focal person and others in the individual's work and family environments. In addition, a measure of global work-family enrichment should be developed to determine which factors contribute most prominently to overall enrichment. Furthermore, measures of the proposed moderators (salience of each role, perceived relevance of a resource, consistency of each resource with the requirements and norms of each role) should be developed or modified from the existing literature.

After the necessary measures are developed and validated, empirical testing of the model in Figure 1 can proceed in two stages. First, the impact of resources on performance and positive affect in Role A should be determined. Second, relationships between resources and positive affect in Role A and performance in Role B, including moderating influences, should be investigated. Because the testing of each stage will require a longitudinal design, an examination of the entire model in the same study will call for data to be collected at several points in time.

An alternative approach to testing the model or portions of it would be to use a critical incident approach (Flanagan, 1954) to examine self-reported episodes of work-family enrichment. Individuals could be asked to think of a specific time in their lives when their experiences in either a work or family role enhanced their performance in the other role. They could then be asked questions about the factors they perceive as having contributed to the enrichment, includ-
ing the generation of resources and positive affect in Role A, the positive outcomes in Role B, and the proposed moderator variables. This approach could yield insights into the enrichment process by focusing on a specific enrichment episode as the unit of analysis.

However, the limitations of such an approach should not be underestimated. It would have the disadvantages common to all research methods that rely on retrospective accounts, particularly faulty memories (Golden, 1992; Schwenk, 1985). In addition, self-reports at best capture individuals’ perceptions of enrichment rather than enrichment per se. Because self-reports of enrichment may be biased and inaccurate, a parallel line of research examining relationships of experiences and outcomes in one role with experiences and outcomes in another role should be vigorously pursued. Although many scholars have followed this strategy (see Tables 3 and 4), most of their studies were not designed to test a model of work-family enrichment and most did not include mediating variables. The two most notable exceptions provide insight into the role of self-esteem (Grimm-Thomas & Perry-Jenkins, 1994) and positive affect (Rothbard, 2001) in work-family enrichment. Ideally, this line of research should include resources, performance, and positive affect in work and family roles, as well as moderator variables, to trace the causal linkages proposed in Figure 1.

Researchers should continue to examine the relationship between work-family enrichment and work-family conflict. Although, as noted earlier, in prior research scholars have observed weak and inconsistent relationships between enrichment and conflict, it is possible that enrichment derived from some of the resources in our model has a different relationship with conflict than enrichment derived from other resources. It is also possible that instrumental enrichment and affective enrichment have differential relationships with conflict. Moreover, although enrichment and conflict have been found to have different correlates (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b; Stephens et al., 1997), additional research is necessary to develop and test theory-driven predictions regarding these differences.

Also, beyond simply having main effects on role-related and global outcomes, enrichment and conflict may interact to predict outcomes. Enrichment, like social support (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1994), could serve a buffering role that protects an individual from the negative consequences of a stressor (work-family conflict). Further, accumulating roles (employee, spouse, parent, community volunteer) may have both advantages and disadvantages for individuals (Sieber, 1974). That is, role accumulation can provide more extensive resources to be applied to other roles that promote enrichment, as well as time constraints and stressors that produce conflict. Therefore, in future research scholars should examine the conditions under which role accumulation promotes enrichment to a greater versus lesser extent than it promotes conflict.

We also recommend further investigation of the role of gender in the work-family enrichment process. Because men and women historically have experienced quite different connections between work and family lives (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999), they may experience the enrichment process differently. The limited research on gender differences in work-to-family enrichment (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000b; Rothbard, 2001) and family-to-work enrichment (Kirkmeyer, 1993; Rothbard, 2001) has produced inconsistent results. Although these inconsistencies may be due to differences in conceptualizations of enrichment and research methodologies, they highlight the need to understand whether (and, if so, why) men and women experience different levels of enrichment.

In future research scholars should also examine the impact of role characteristics and personal characteristics on resource generation. For example, the structure of a role and the presence of supportive interpersonal relationships in a role are likely to influence the generation of resources within the role (McCauley et al., 1994; Morrison, 1992; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Similarly, personal characteristics, such as demographic background (Ibarra, 1993), may determine the extent to which the individual has access to certain resources.

Indeed, it would be fruitful to examine the impact of an individual’s dispositional characteristics on several linkages in the work-family enrichment model. For example, a proactive personality (Seibert, Gant, & Kraimer, 1999) may be an important prerequisite for work-family enrichment, because individuals who are proactive in their relationships may be particularly likely to develop skills, receive information and
social support, seek flexibility in the time they are expected to commit to role activities, and apply resources generated in one role to another. In addition, trait affectivity may play a prominent role in work-family enrichment, not only because it determines one's satisfaction or mood (Schaubroeck, Ganster, & Kemmerer, 1996; Shaw, Duffy, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1999) but also because it determines how constructively one reacts to stressful challenges in the environment (Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002). In a similar vein, an individual's relationship attachment style (Sumer & Knight, 2001) warrants research attention because the acquisition and application of resources often involve effective relationships with other people.

A boundary-crossing perspective may be fruitfully applied to the study of work-family enrichment. Nippert-Eng (1995) identifies two forms of "boundary work": (1) boundary placement, by which one erects and maintains boundaries between home and work, and (2) boundary transcendence, by which one moves back and forth between the two roles. Ashforth et al. (2000) and Nippert-Eng (1995) propose a continuum of role relationships, ranging from integration to segmentation. Two roles are integrated when the role boundaries are flexible and permeable and when an individual's role identities are similar for the two roles, whereas two roles are segmented when the role boundaries are inflexible and impermeable and when there is a high contrast between role identities for the two roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). In future research scholars should examine whether individuals take less of themselves in specific resources and positive affect across rigid boundaries associated with highly segmented roles than across flexible boundaries associated with highly integrated roles.

The impact of organizational, family, and community interventions on work-family enrichment also deserves research attention. Because many work-family linkages are the result of conscious intention (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), problem-solving instruction, marital counseling, and peer support groups may help individuals see the virtues of enrichment and develop the general skills and perspectives (e.g., self-awareness, proactivity, understanding the requirements and norms of a particular role) that can make enrichment more likely to occur. It would be worthwhile to examine the ultimate effect of such interventions on individuals' approaches to the enrichment process, as well as their success at it.

The work-family interface is influenced by the larger social, economic, and political context (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999). Because countries can vary significantly in cultural norms and values, gender-role ideology, and public policy regarding work-family issues (Lewis, 1997), comparative studies would be helpful in assessing the effect of culture on enrichment. For example, Ashforth et al. (2000) propose that collectivist, feminine, low uncertainty avoidant, and/or low power distance cultures promote more role integration than individualistic, masculine, high uncertainty avoidant, and/or high power distance cultures; researchers should examine whether individuals in the former cultures experience more work-family enrichment than individuals in the latter cultures.

Finally, the concept of work-family enrichment may be extended to include "work-life" enrichment, just as work-family issues more broadly may be viewed as a subset of work-life issues (Lewis & Dyer, 2002). We recommend research on the ways in which experiences in roles outside work and family (e.g., community volunteer) enrich or are enriched by experiences in work and family roles.

In conclusion, prior thought and research on the interface between work and family suggest that participation in one role may enrich the quality of life in the other role. However, an overriding theoretical model of the process by which enrichment takes place has been lacking. This article proposes such a model, which may be used as a guide for future research incorporating different types of methodologies. Such research is recommended to increase our understanding of the conditions under which work and family are allies rather than enemies.
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