THE INFLUENCES OF COMMITTED INTIMATE RELATIONSHIPS ON WORK OUTCOMES: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF RELATIONSHIP-TO-WORK PERMEABILITY

William Allen Aldridge II

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Psychology (Clinical).

Chapel Hill
2008

Approved by:

Donald H. Baucom, Ph.D. (Chair)

Joseph C. Lowman, Ph.D.

Deborah J. Jones, Ph.D.

Chester A. Insko, Ph.D.

Richard S. Blackburn, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

WILLIAM ALLEN ALDRIDGE II: The Influences of Committed Intimate Relationships on Work Outcomes: Examining the Role of Relationship-to-Work Permeability
(Under the direction of Donald H. Baucom, Ph.D.)

Current research regarding the influences of committed intimate relationships on work is sparse and lacks a comprehensive evaluation of the intimate relationship domain in relation to work. Therefore, using a large sample of workers from diverse occupations and organizational positions, the current study examined the influences of a broad set of intimate relationship experiences on several work outcomes that have traditionally been of interest to organizations and organizational behaviorists. Moreover, the current literature is largely reflective of the assumption that intimate relationships influence work in the same way for all people, which may not be the case. Therefore, the current investigation evaluated the roles of (a) relationship-to-work permeability (e.g., Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000), and (b) relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2000), in moderating the influences of committed intimate relationships on work outcomes. Results suggested that relationship-to-work permeability does play a significant role in determining the nature and strength of influences of committed intimate relationships on work, whereas intimate partner role identification, at least in combination with relationship-to-work permeability, may not be as important. Specifically, among those individuals who more frequently psychologically or behaviorally engaged with their intimate relationship while at work (i.e., higher relationship-to-work permeability), (a) higher frequency of negative intimate relationship behaviors predicted less favorable work outcomes

and (b) trends suggested that higher frequency of positive intimate relationship behaviors predicted more favorable work outcomes. Alternatively, among those individuals who *less* frequently psychologically or behaviorally engaged with their intimate relationship while at work (i.e., lower relationship-to-work permeability), (a) higher frequency of negative intimate relationship behaviors predicted *more* favorable work outcomes, whereas (b) trends suggested that the frequency of positive intimate relationship behaviors and work outcomes were not associated. The current investigation also found support for a new measure of relationship-to-work permeability, the Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale. This is a relatively brief measure that assesses relationship-to-work permeability among four different factors: Think/Feel, Communication, Representations, and Physical Presence. The role and nature of relationship-to-work permeability are discussed, along with implications for future research and for understanding couple functioning and organizational behavior larger contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first and foremost like to thank my advisor, Professor Don Baucom, for his guidance, input, and encouragement throughout this study. His support has been instrumental during this project and his suggestions greatly contributed to the quality of this manuscript. I have been blessed to work with a man of such character, success, and psychological insight. I would also like to thank my committee members, Professors Joe Lowman, Deborah Jones, Chet Insko, and Dick Blackburn, for their suggestions and encouragement throughout this study. Each of these individuals brought unique insights that greatly contributed to the quality of this project. Furthermore, this research effort would never have gotten off the ground without the support of the organizations partnering with this project. To those individuals that provided and supported access to the recruitment of research participants from their organizations, I give great thanks. In addition, Chris Wiesen, a statistical consultant at the Odum Institute at UNC-Chapel Hill, provided his time, effort, and thoughtfulness in helping me to complete the statistical work of this project with accuracy and confidence. I greatly enjoyed working with Chris and my appreciation for his patience with my constant statistical questions cannot be understated.

I would also like to thank my family for their unfailing support, both emotionally and practically, as I completed the last major milestone in my graduate career. Aside from providing consistent support, my parents have been a source of guidance and inspiration for my life and career. If I were to equal their character of person and approach their success in family and career, I would be among the most privileged men in the world. In addition, my

brother and sister, both older in years, have provided examples of how to create both professional success and happiness in committed intimate relationships.

To those persons in Chapel Hill who have believed in me and encouraged me throughout the past five years, I also give my greatest thanks. Foremost among these are my colleagues in the UNC Couple Studies Lab and my housemates at 7 Davie Circle. Their humor, encouragement, advice, and friendship have been the foundation of my life in Chapel Hill since starting graduate school. The support and patience provided me in the past year by Martha Goldfinch has also played an important role in the completion of this dissertation project. In addition, the members of the University Presbyterian Church community have been a grounding force both in faith and in friendship over the past five years. Many of them have shared their lives and passions with me and listened when I brought my work into our conversations.

Finally, I would like to thank Boone, my black Labrador Retriever and best companion, for his unconditional love, humor, and attention. He has been an unwavering source of emotional support and made sure I got plenty of sustaining healthy activity, wanted or not, each day during the process of this dissertation project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Love and work are the cornerstones of our humanness.
~Sigmund Freud (1856-1939)

For many individuals living in modern societies, committed intimate relationships and work are two of the most fundamental features of the human experience. In fact, both men and women generally rate being a spouse or lover and being a worker as central to their self-concepts (Thoits, 1992). Furthermore, with the broadening scope of work in the global economy, the broadening reach of work into personal life due to new technologies that enable continuous communication and information exchange, and changing societal expectations about gender roles and family, there is an increasing importance for individuals to become adept at simultaneously managing their jobs and their personal relationships. Labor force data collected during 2006 by the U.S. Department of Labor indicated that approximately 59% of men and 52% of women working in nonagricultural industries were married and living with their partners (U.S. Department of Labor, n.d.a). The inclusion of unmarried workers cohabitating with an intimate partner and married workers living without their partners likely would have made these statistics even more robust. In addition, the 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce indicated that the number of dual-earner couples in the United States rose from 66% in 1997 to 78% in 2002 (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2003). Thus, many individuals not only have to manage their own work, but that of their partners as well. Such concerns may be leading young adults to approach their early

career and marital trajectories with more consideration of the impacts of each domain on the other and their partners (e.g., Barnett, Gareis, James, & Steele, 2003; Peake & Harris, 2002).

Awareness of the need to balance intimate relationships and work is evolving at the same time that we are gaining a clearer understanding of how intimate relationships impact individuals, their partners, and their children. For instance, marital discord has been linked to higher rates of depression, relationship aggression, and poorer physical health; children from maritally distressed families are at greater risk for development of conduct problems (Halford, Kelly, & Markman, 1997; Markman & Jones-Leonard, 1985; O'Leary, Barling, Arias, Rosenbaum, Malone, & Tyree, 1989). Considering that 40% to 50% of first marriages are projected to dissolve in the United States, Australia, and Great Britain (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001; McDonald, 1995; United States Census Bureau, 2002), a large portion of the current population is expected to experience relationship distress during their lifetime. On the other hand, a considerable portion of those projected to remain together may be expected to retain positive marital quality. Current research suggests that partners satisfied with their marriage generally have lower instances of psychological distress, higher rated life happiness, better physical health, and greater resistance to the potentially damaging effects of negative life events (Bradbury, 1998; Gore, 1978; Gove, Hughes, & Style, 1983; Halford, 2001; Halford et al., 1997). Unfortunately, while much is known about the individual-, couple-, and family-level impacts of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction, still relatively little is known about the impacts of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on experiences in extra-familial environments, such as work. This is not to say, however, that the external environment has gone unnoticed in couple theory. For instance, Epstein and Baucom (2002) proposed that consideration of a couple's environment, both the

manner by which the environment impacts the couple and the manner by which intimate partners interact with their environment, is an essential part of conceptualizing relationship functioning and adaptation over time.

The current study was conducted to broaden existing research on the impact of committed intimate relationships on work through a comprehensive examination of the intimate relationship domain in relation to several traditional work outcomes. Close examination of these associations not only expands our perspective on and contextual understanding of intimate relationships, but also contributes to our knowledge about optimal work functioning and satisfaction. In addition, investigation of these associations provides insight into how well individuals are managing the demands to balance their intimate relationships and work responsibilities. Moreover, a main focus of the current investigation was to move beyond main effects models of the associations between work and intimate relationships. A review of the current literature reveals inconsistent patterns of influence between intimate relationships and work, suggesting that a number of individual and/or dyadic differences may exist in the experience of the intimate relationship-work interface (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Lambert, 1990). Therefore, the current study examined the roles of (a) relationship-to-work permeability (i.e., the degree to which an individual becomes psychologically and/or behaviorally involved with his or her intimate relationship while at work; e.g., Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000), and (b), relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification (i.e., the degree to which an individual defines himself or herself in terms of being an intimate partner; e.g., Ashforth et al., 2000), in moderating the influences of committed intimate relationships on work outcomes.

The Associations between Work and Committed Intimate Relationships

To date, the associations between work and intimate relationships have been examined from two related methodological perspectives. First, researchers have modeled the effects of experiences and attitudes in one domain on experiences and attitudes in the other domain. For instance, much research has focused on the impact of unfavorable work experiences, such as managing heavy workloads or generally being dissatisfied with one's job, on marital interaction patterns and overall relationship satisfaction (e.g., Barling & Macewen, 1992; Hughes & Galinsky, 1994). A small amount of research similarly has examined the positive processes between work and intimate relationships (e.g., Rogers & May, 2003) but less is currently known about these associations.

Second, researchers have examined the associations between work and marriage using a set of work-family constructs that, in-and-of themselves, represent the influence of one domain on the other. Research regarding three of these constructs will be discussed while reviewing the current literature on the associations between work and intimate relationships. First, *work-family conflict* represents interrole conflicts in which pressures from the work and family domains are incompatible in some regard (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Greenhaus and Beutell proposed that work-family conflict was often a result of time and energy conflicts, but also may occur when the behaviors required by one role are in conflict with the behaviors needed in the second role. For instance, work-family conflict is evident in the individual whose competitive behaviors are essential for advancement at work but inhibit building marital intimacy. Second, *work-family facilitation* represents the extent to which participation in one role is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed in the other role (Frone, 2003). For example, an individual might experience work-family facilitation through problem solving difficult work

situations with his or her intimate partner. Closely related to these two constructs is *work-family spillover* (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Work-family spillover more generally represents the transfer of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors from one role to the other. Carrying anger or fatigue from difficult interpersonal interactions at work into the home is representative of the work-family spillover process. As is apparent from these examples, work-family conflict, facilitation, and spillover are widely recognized as bi-directional constructs (e.g., Frone, 2003; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Thus, an individual may experience work-to-family conflict (or negative spillover), family-to-work conflict (or negative spillover), work-to-family facilitation (or positive spillover), and/or family-to-work facilitation (or positive spillover).

A review of the current literature regarding the associations between work and committed intimate relationships reveals evidence for both the impact of work on intimate relationships and the impact of intimate relationships on work (e.g., Barling & Macewen, 1992; Rogers & May, 2003). Although the current investigation focuses specifically on the influences of intimate relationships on work, a brief review of the evidence supporting the impact of work on intimate relationships is important both for acknowledging the bi-directional influences between work and intimate relationships and in demonstrating the qualitative nature of these associations; work experiences can lead to either favorable or unfavorable intimate relationship outcomes.

The Impact of Work on Intimate Relationships

The majority of published research examining the associations between work and intimate relationships has focused on the influences of work on marriage (e.g., Barling &

Macewen, 1992; Hughes & Galinsky, 1994). Moreover, of particular interest to researchers has been the impact of *unfavorable* work experiences on marital relationships. Whereas a detailed review of this literature is beyond the scope and purpose of the current review, two general patterns have emerged from this research. First, evidence suggests that a number of different work experiences and attitudes may adversely affect marital functioning and satisfaction. More specifically, work demands related to the experience of interpersonal difficulties at work, heavy occupational workload, and job and financial insecurity have been associated with increased marital anger, marital tension, and negative mood after work (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1989; Hughes & Galinsky, 1994; Hughes, Galinsky, & Morris, 1992; Repetti, 1989; Story & Repetti, 2006); greater occurrence of marital problems and marital arguments (Barling & Macewen, 1992; Bolger et al., 1989; Larson, Wilson, & Beley, 1994); increased marital withdrawal (Story & Repetti, 2006); and decreased marital satisfaction and stability (Barling & Macewen, 1992; Einhorn, Markman, & Stanley, 2006; Poortman, 2005; Sears & Galambos, 1992). The experiences of high work stress and fatigue have been associated with increased occurrences of negative marital interactions and expression of marital anger (Crouter, Perry-Jenkins, Hurston, & Crawford, 1989; Schulz, Cowan, Cowan, & Brennan, 2004), increased marital withdrawal (Roberts & Levenson, 2001; Schulz et al., 2004), and decreased positive emotion and increased negative emotion during marital interactions (Chan & Margolin, 1994; Roberts & Levenson, 2001). Additionally, the experiences of job dissatisfaction and work role conflict or ambiguity have been found to indirectly predict decreased marital satisfaction, decreased sexual satisfaction, and increased psychological aggression in marriage (Barling & Macewen, 1992). Finally, the experience of high amounts of work-related separation of intimate partners has been

associated with greater occurrence of negative mood at home (Hughes & Galinsky, 1994; Hughes et al., 1992), greater marital tension (Hughes & Galinsky, 1994; Hughes et al., 1992), and increased risk for divorce (Poortman, 2005).

Second, evidence supports that the presence of work-family conflict may adversely affect marital functioning and satisfaction. Aycan and Eskin, (2005), Leiter and Durup (1996), Netemeyer et al., (1996), and Suchet and Barling, (1986) all found that greater work-family conflict was associated with decreased marital satisfaction, although Suchet and Barling reported that the strength of this association was attenuated with increased spouse support. Similarly, Matthews, Conger, and Wickrama (1996), found that higher work-family conflict was indirectly associated with lower overall marital quality and stability by means of increased individual psychological distress and more hostile and less warm marital interactions. Therefore, the conflicts that result from managing competing work and family demands may contribute to poorer marital functioning and satisfaction.

Also of interest to researchers has been the impact of *favorable* work experiences on marital relationships. Although far less research has been conducted on these associations, evidence supports that several work experiences and attitudes may be beneficial to marital functioning and satisfaction. First, the experience of low work stress has been associated with increased occurrence of kissing, hugging, and communication during same-day marital interaction (Doumas, Margolin, & John, 2003). Second, the experiences of higher job satisfaction and personal accomplishment at work have each been associated with increased marital satisfaction (Heller & Watson, 2005; Leiter & Durup, 1996; Rogers & May, 2003). Finally, the experiences of high skill discretion, high decision authority, and high supervisor task competence at work have been associated with less marital tension and greater marital

companionship and support (Hughes & Galinsky, 1994; Hughes et al., 1992). In general, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) and Voydanoff (2004) proposed that enrichment processes between the work and family domains are associated with the benefits of resources generated in one domain on performance in the other domain. However, there is clearly a need for more research on these sorts of associations between work and intimate relationships.

The Impact of Intimate Relationships on Work

Relatively less has been published regarding the influences of intimate relationships on work. Similar to research on the impact of work on intimate relationships, the entirety of this research is specific to marital relationships. The current review focuses on two different areas within this literature: (a) how marital status affects work outcomes and (b) how marital satisfaction and the quality of marital interactions affect work experiences and attitudes.

The impact of marital status on work outcomes. Marital status consistently has been associated with measures of job success. Judge and Bretz (1994) reported that being married predicted both greater extrinsic career success (salary, job level, and number of promotions) and intrinsic career success (job and life satisfaction). However, some investigations have found the financial benefits of marriage to be limited to men (Jacobs, 1992; Melamed, 1996; Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). In fact, Jacobs reported that being married predicted lower income among women. Interestingly, a number of studies have found that, among men, having a working wife seems to negatively impact the men's income (Landau & Arthur, 1992; Pfeffer & Ross, 1982; Schneer & Reitman, 1993). Schneer and Reitman calculated that married men with children and an unemployed spouse earned 20% more than married men with children and an employed spouse. Landau and Author reported the same positive effect for married women employed in a Fortune 500 company and whose partners did not have careers. This

latter finding suggests that in some contexts, such as businesses traditionally dominated by men, women may be treated similarly to men regarding marital status, partner's employment, and income. Schneer and Reitman's finding that married women with employed spouses earned approximately 12% more than single women in a sample of M.B.A. graduates, another business field traditionally dominated by men, additionally supports this interpretation.

One study has reported an association between marital status and work-family spillover. Specifically, Grzywacz and Marks (2000) found that being married predicted greater positive spillover from family to work. However, being married was not significantly associated with greater *negative* spillover from family-to-work. This suggests that the benefits afforded by family roles may more readily be transferred to work by the majority of married individuals, perhaps due to specific benefits created within the marital relationship itself. On the other hand, all individuals may naturally limit the negative spillover process between family and work roles.

The impact of marital satisfaction and the quality of marital interactions on work outcomes. Research investigating the effects of global marital satisfaction and the quality of marital interactions on work is sparse at present. Regardless, two patterns have emerged in the literature and are especially relevant to the current investigation. First, current evidence suggests that overall marital satisfaction indeed may play a role in determining the nature of work experiences. More specifically, higher marital satisfaction has been found to predict both higher day-to-day and higher long-term job satisfaction (Heller & Watson, 2005; Rogers & May, 2003). On the other hand, greater marital discord or distress has been found to predict lower longitudinal job satisfaction (Rogers & May, 2003), higher self-reported work

loss among men in their first 10 years of marriage (Forthofer, Markman, Cox, Stanley, & Kessler, 1996), and, in a sample of women, increased entrance into the work force and higher income eight years later (Rogers, 1999). Rogers interpreted this last finding to be indicative of wives' efforts either to prepare themselves for the loss of their marriage and their partner's income or to attain rewards from domains outside of their marriage. Several studies also have investigated the influence of marital satisfaction on family-to-work conflict, although findings have been inconsistent to-date (e.g., Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Leiter & Durup, 1996; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Whereas much of the research on marital satisfaction and work outcomes has benefited from the use of large, nationally representative samples (i.e., Forthofer et al., 1996; Rogers, 1999; Rogers & May, 2003), this has generally come at a price of using minimal, nonstandard measures of marital satisfaction. Therefore, the use of more well established measures of marital satisfaction continues to be a methodological need in this area of intimate relationship-work research. Also of note is that Rogers and May's results suggested stronger, more consistent influences of marital satisfaction and marital discord on job satisfaction than the influence of job satisfaction on marital satisfaction and marital discord. Thus, while far fewer studies have been conducted on the influences of intimate relationships on work, these associations may be just as potent as associations in the reverse direction.

Second, current evidence suggests that the ways that partners interact with each other may affect their work experiences. Research in this area has not proceeded in a systematic fashion, instead investigating a diverse array of intimate relationship-work associations in varied populations; therefore, a review of the literature in this area reveals rather sundry findings. To start, Bolger et al. (1989) found that, among men, marital arguments predicted

arguments with supervisors, coworkers, and work subordinates the following day. Rothman and Perry (2004), investigating the occupational patterns of convicted male spouse abusers, reported that abusers often attributed lost work time, difficulty concentrating at work, and abuse of workplace resources such as phone, email, and company vehicles directly to their perpetration of intimate partner abuse. Next, Appelberg, Romanov, Heikkila, Honkasalo, and Koskenvuo (1996), in a large sample of Finnish employees, found an elevated risk of early retirement on medical grounds among married women reporting interpersonal conflict both with their intimate partner and at work. Additionally, Doumas et al. (2003), in a sample of Los Angeles area couples, found small but significant effects for *both* partners spending more time at work following days on which husbands reported lower occurrence of kissing, hugging, and communication in the marital relationship.

With regard to marital interaction patterns predicting work-family conflict and spillover, Grzywacz and Marks (2000) reported that fewer disagreements between spouses predicted decreased negative spillover from family to work among both genders and increased family-to-work positive spillover among men. Additionally, a number of studies have found that lower spousal support is associated with increased family-to-work conflict and negative spillover (Aycan & Eskin, 2005; Carlson & Perrewè, 1999; Frone et al., 1997; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) and decreased family-to-work positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

Because current evidence suggests that intimate relationship experiences predict family-to-work conflict and spillover, a brief overview of the work-related consequences of family-to-work conflict and spillover may enhance our understanding of how intimate relationship experiences influence work experiences. More specifically, increased family-to-

work conflict has been associated with several specific work experiences and attitudes, including job overload (Frone et al., 1997); increased job stress and distress (Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Frone et al., 1997; Netemeyer et al., 1996); less favorable interpersonal behaviors at work (Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, & Rosner, 2005); decreased work performance and productivity (Frone et al., 1997; Kossek & Ozeki, 1999; Netemeyer et al., 1996); decreased job satisfaction (Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002; Grandey, Cordeiro, & Crouter, 2005; Huang, Hammer, Neal, & Perrin, 2004; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Kossek & Ozeki, 1999; Netemeyer et al., 1996), increased job involvement (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999); decreased organizational commitment (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999); increased job withdrawal (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003); increased job turnover (Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Kossek & Ozeki, 1999; Netemeyer et al., 1996) and increased work-to-family conflict one year later (Huang et al., 2004). Although no published research has been conducted on the work-related outcomes of family-to-work *spillover*, Williams and Alliger (1994) did find evidence to support that distress and fatigue are commonly transferred from family roles to work roles during family-to-work transitions (such as leaving the family for work in the morning), which is indicative of family-to-work negative spillover. Likewise, Williams and Alliger found evidence to support that positive emotions, such as excitement, enthusiasm, happiness, and satisfaction, are commonly transferred from family roles to work roles during family-to-work transitions, which is indicative of family-to-work positive spillover.

Despite these patterns of how intimate relationships influence work, the strength of these associations has been relatively modest and inconsistent. For example, among literature exploring the influences of intimate relationships on work outcomes, measures of global marital quality have been associated with self-reported work loss (i.e., days that

workers report they were unable to carry out their normal responsibilities) at $r = .06$ (Forthofer et al., 1996), job satisfaction at $r = -.02$ to $r = .2$ (Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Heller & Watson, 2005; Rogers & May, 2003), and family-to-work conflict at $r = -.2$ (Netemeyer et al., 1996) and $R^2 = -.129$ (Leiter & Durup, 1996). Additionally, spousal support has been associated with family-to-work conflict at $r = -.14$ to $r = -.38$ (Aycan & Eskin, 2005; Frone et al., 1997). These generally modest and variable correlations might be suggestive of individual differences in how family influences work. In other words, instead of assuming that intimate relations influence work outcomes in the same way for all people, a more likely assumption is that individuals and/or couples differ in how they experience the transfer of intimate relationship experiences to work.

Individual Differences in Intimate Relationship-Work Associations

In reviews of the associations between work and family (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Lambert, 1990), three fundamental patterns of association have been proposed: spillover, segmentation, and compensation. Applied specifically to the associations between intimate relationships and work, *spillover* generally characterizes individuals whose intimate relationship experiences exert a parallel influence on their functioning at work (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). For example, an individual who performs worse at his or her job because he or she is demoralized by the frequent criticism of his or her intimate partner is said to experience spillover from marriage to work. As Lambert noted, this has been the most dominant view of the influences between work and family and has been the basis of the majority of work-family research to date. *Segmentation*, on the other hand, refers to the lack of influence between work and intimate relationship experiences (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). For example, segmentation characterizes the individual who can block out the

criticisms of his or her intimate partner in order to maintain performance at work; in essence, the two domains are kept separate or segmented. Finally, *compensation* refers to a situation in which poor well-being or low functioning in the intimate relationship is associated with *increased* involvement and reward-seeking at work, or vice versa; that is, the person compensates for a poor intimate relationship by performing more positively at work (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Rogers' (1999) suggestion that women in his sample were entering the workforce to seek extra-marital rewards when they experienced rising discord in their marriages is consistent with the notion of compensation.

Although these three possible outcomes have been proposed, there is a lack of knowledge about why one individual might experience spillover, another segmentation, and still another compensation. One variable that might help to explain such differences is gender. Pleck (1977) originally proposed that women, because they traditionally assume greater responsibilities at home, have more spillover from family to work. However, support for this assumption has been largely inconsistent; whereas a number of studies have suggested that the influences of family or marriage on work are more substantial for women (e.g., Appelberg et al., 1995; Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Grandey et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2004; Phillips-Miller, Campbell, & Morrison, 2000; Williams & Alliger, 1994), several studies conversely have reported that these associations are more substantial for men (e.g., Bolger et al., 1989; Forthofer et al., 1996; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Melamed, 1996), and still other studies have reported no substantial gender differences in the influences of family or marriage on work (e.g., Eagle, Miles, & Icenogle, 1997; Frone, 2003; Hammer et al., 2003; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Rogers & May, 2003).

Another possibility that remains relatively unexplored at present is that individuals may actually structure their work roles such that they are differently susceptible to the influences of intimate relationship experiences. For instance, workers may find that, to engage with and concentrate on their work responsibilities, they have to shut out or segment what is happening in their intimate relationships. Additionally, some individuals may believe that the intrusion of intimate relationship experiences into the workplace is inappropriate or unprofessional. These individuals likely would not experience much spillover between their intimate relationships and their work. In contrast, other individuals either may have difficultly blocking out intimate relationship experiences while at work or may more generally value having their intimate relationship experiences be a natural part of their work life. These individuals likely would experience higher amounts of spillover. Hall and Richter (1988) and Ashforth et al. (2000) proposed that role boundary permeability might help to explain the degree to which a given work-family role or domain may be open to the influence of a second work-family role or domain. More specifically, *role boundary permeability* represents "the degree to which a role allows one to be physically located in the role's domain but psychologically and/or behaviorally involved in another role" (Ashforth et al., 2000, p. 474). Similarly, Frone (2003) stated that theoretical models of role boundaries may help establish the conditions that minimize and maximize work-family balance. Based on these ideas, we should expect that individuals with low *relationship-to-work permeability* (i.e., the degree to which an individual becomes psychologically and/or behaviorally involved with his or her intimate relationship while at work) experience little spillover from their intimate relationships to their work, whereas individuals with high relationship-to-work permeability experience higher spillover from their intimate relationships to their work.

In addition, the degree to which an individual identifies as an intimate relationship partner might influence how relationship functioning influences work. Olson-Buchanan and Boswell (2006) proposed that individuals who highly value their intimate relationships and generally define themselves by their intimate partner roles may be more likely to engage in and express themselves in terms of their intimate relationships, even at work. In contrast, the authors note, individuals who place lower value on their intimate relationships may be less likely to express themselves in terms of their intimate relationships outside the relationship domain. However, there might be a caveat to this effect. If an individual largely defines him or herself in terms of his/her intimate relationship, but the individual's work life is *less permeable* to influence from the intimate partner role, then the intimate relationship is likely to have little influence at work. Therefore, we should expect that individuals who strongly identify with their intimate partner roles experience more spillover from their intimate relationships to their work when their occupational roles are permeable to the influence of their intimate relationships. However, individuals whose occupational roles are not very permeable to the influence of their intimate relationships should experience little spillover from their intimate relationships to their work (i.e., the roles are segmented), *regardless* of the degree to which they identify with their intimate partner roles.

The combined moderation of relationship-to-work permeability and intimate partner role identification also might help to explain the conditions under which *compensation* occurs. More specifically, there are likely to be three simultaneous conditions that may motivate an individual to compensate for his or her intimate relationship experiences within the work domain, that is, act oppositely at work compared to home. First, by definition, relationship-to-work compensation requires *poorer* functioning and satisfaction in the

intimate relationship. In other words, the individual must have something for which to compensate. Second, for an individual to feel comfortable detaching from his or her intimate relationship to compensate within another domain of life, the individual must relinquish some identification with the intimate partner role. Therefore, the compensating individual likely is characterized by *lower* intimate partner role identification. Individuals who sustain higher intimate partner role identification, in contrast, likely increase their involvement *within* the intimate relationship to address intimate relationship problems. Finally, Ashforth et al. (2000) suggested that compensating individuals seek to escape to highly segmented domains of life. In the case of compensation for poor intimate relationship experiences, this would prevent the continued experience of intimate relationships difficulties. Because low role permeability has been conceptualized as a fundamental characteristic of segmented roles (Ashforth et al., 2000), relationship to work compensation should require *low* relationship-to-work permeability. Thus, poor intimate relationship functioning in combination with low intimate partner role identification and low relationship-to-work permeability are proposed to set the stage for compensation at work.

The current study focused on the potential of (a) relationship-to-work permeability and (b) relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification to differentiate between the experiences of relationship-to-work spillover, segmentation, and compensation.

The Current Study

The main purpose of the current study was to examine the roles of (a) relationship-to-work permeability and (b) relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification in moderating the influences of intimate relationship experiences

on work outcomes in a large, diverse sample of workers. However, the current study also provided a more comprehensive examination of individuals' intimate relationships in relation to their work experiences than had previously been conducted.

In operationalizing the intimate relationship domain, the current investigation examined both global relationship satisfaction and four core factors of intimate relationship functioning, as recently identified by Doss and Christensen (2006). In a series of studies involving substantial sample sizes, Doss and Christensen reported that two factors of positive intimate partner behavior, Affection and Closeness, and two factors of negative intimate partner behavior, Demand and Violation, were identified consistently in several factor analyses across gender, relationship type (i.e., married, cohabitating, and dating), and sexual orientation. *Affection* refers to intimate partner behaviors that demonstrate verbal, physical, and sexual caring; *Closeness* refers to supportive intimate partner behaviors and joint activities; *Demand* refers to critical, abusive, or manipulative intimate partner behaviors; and *Violation* refers to intimate partner behaviors that test or breach relationship boundaries or standards (Doss & Christensen, 2006). The specific behaviors associated with each of these four factors are reported in Table 1. Because these four factors were identified consistently from a list of relationship behaviors thought to be comprehensive in nature, they may represent a comprehensive view of the most fundamental factors of intimate relationship functioning. The benefits of using these four factors of relationship functioning in the current study included their comprehensive nature, their empirical grounding across diverse groups and large samples, and their inclusion of both positive and negative intimate relationship functioning.

Table 1

Doss and Christensen's (2006) Four Factors of Intimate Partner Behaviors

Positive Behaviors
Affection
1. Being verbally affectionate with the partner
2. Being physically affectionate with the partner
3. Engaging in sexual activity with the partner
Closeness
1. Spending time with the partner
2. Confiding in the partner
3. Participating in financial decisions
4. Participating in child care
5. Participating in social activities with the partner
6. Being supportive of the partner
7. Discussing relationship problems with the partner
8. Participating in housework
Negative Behaviors
Demand
1. Criticizing the partner
2. Verbally abusing the partner
3. Being controlling and bossy of the partner
Violation
1. Flirting and engaging in affairs
2. Being dishonest with the partner
3. Engaging in addictive behaviors
4. Physically abusing the partner
5. Invading the partner's privacy
6. Breaking agreements with the partner

Global relationship satisfaction and Doss and Christensen's (2006) four factors of intimate relationship behavior were examined in relation to four work outcomes that traditionally have been of interest to organizations and organizational behaviorists: (a) job engagement [the degree to which an individual mentally, emotionally, and behaviorally engages with his or her job (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004)], (b) work stress, (c) limitations to productivity [a variation of work productivity that Lerner, Amick, Rogers, Malspeis, Bungay, and Cynn (2001) consider more sensitive to physical and mental health concerns], and (d) global job satisfaction. These four work outcomes provided broad coverage of the work domain by representing both behavioral and cognitive-affective experiences. Furthermore, the above review of the work-family and intimate relationship-work literatures suggested that these or similar work outcomes have demonstrated sensitivity to work-life issues in prior research, supporting their appropriateness as outcome variables in the current investigation.

While investigating the influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes in the current study, current models controlled for several potentially confounding variables either identified in the literature or based on theoretical judgment. First, the Big Five personality factors have demonstrated a significant role in the prediction of job satisfaction (e.g., Heller, Judge, & Watson, 2002; Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002), job performance criteria (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997), occupational stress (e.g., Grant & Langan-Fox, 2006), work involvement (Bozionelos, 2004), and work-family conflict and facilitation (Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). Therefore, the Big Five personality traits were controlled for when examining the influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes in the current study. Second, several demographic characteristics including social and economic factors (i.e., gender, age,

education, income, dual income status), work factors (i.e., number of years working at current position, average hours worked per week), and intimate relationship factors (i.e., intimate relationship status, number of years in relationship, status of children in and out of home) were thought to potentially confound the relationships between intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction and work outcomes. Therefore, models controlled for these variables in the current investigation as well. The primary effects examined in the current study were thus considered highly unique, free from the influence of common confounds.

The main effects of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes were of interest in the current investigation, as these associations provided a context for examining the roles of (a) relationship-to-work permeability and (b) relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification in the intimate relationship-work interface. Consistent with patterns in intimate relationship-work research to date, I expected that, overall, more favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction would predict more favorable work outcomes. Similarly, less favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction would predict less favorable work outcomes. In relation to operational definitions used in the current study, this meant that individuals who experienced higher levels of affection and closeness, lower levels of demand and violation, and were more generally satisfied in their intimate relationships were expected to have higher job engagement, lower work stress, less experience of limitations to productivity, and higher job satisfaction (Hypothesis 1).

Because the main effects of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes are simple associations, there was a need to provide some investigation into the directional nature of these effects (i.e., that they were, at least in part, relationship-to-work

directional effects). Therefore, the set of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction variables (affection, closeness, demand, violation, and global relationship satisfaction) was examined in relation to self-reported experiences of relationship-to-work spillover, a construct of directional explicitness. I expected that, if the relationship-to-work direction of the intimate relationship-work main effects was valid, overall, more favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction would predict more favorable self-reported relationship-to-work spillover patterns. Similarly, less favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction would predict less favorable self-reported relationship-to-work spillover patterns. In relation to operational definitions used in the current study, this meant that individuals who experienced higher levels of affection and closeness, lower levels of demand and violation, and were more generally satisfied in their intimate relationships would report higher relationship-to-work positive spillover and lower relationship-to-work negative spillover (Hypothesis 2). Although this test of the directionality of main effects could not be conclusive in and of itself, the purpose of the test was to provide at least some evidence of directionality in the absence of longitudinal data.

Moving beyond the main effects of intimate relationships on work and following Hall and Richter's (1988), Ashforth et al.'s (2000), and Frone's (2003) assertions that role boundary permeability may help account for individual differences in the experience of the work-family interface, I hypothesized that relationship-to-work permeability would moderate the influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes. Specifically, I expected that as individuals' occupational roles became more permeable to their intimate relationship roles (i.e., as relationship-to-work permeability increased), the strength of associations between their intimate relationship experiences and their work

outcomes would increase (Hypothesis 3). If supported, this hypothesis would help identify the necessary conditions for positive relationship-to-work spillover (i.e., more favorable intimate relationship experiences and high relationship-to-work permeability), negative relationship-to-work spillover (i.e., *less* favorable intimate relationship experiences and high relationship-to-work permeability), and intimate relationship-work segmentation (i.e., low relationship-to-work permeability).

Furthermore, the combined moderation of (a) relationship-to-work permeability and (b) intimate partner role identification was assessed. Following from the above discussion of the potential combined effects of these two variables, I generally expected that as relationship-to-work permeability increased, higher intimate partner role identification would increasingly strengthen the associations between intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction and work outcomes. Moreover, if this moderation effect was supported, three specific combinations of scores on the predictor variables relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and intimate relationship functioning or satisfaction, would help identify positive relationship-to-work spillover, negative relationship-to-work spillover, and relationship-to-work compensation patterns.

First, given support for the combined moderation of relationship-to-work permeability and intimate partner role identification, I hypothesized that, compared to all other groups of combinations on the three predictor variables, higher relationship-to-work permeability, higher intimate partner role identification, and more favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction (higher affection and closeness, lower demand and violation, and higher relationship satisfaction) would be associated with the most favorable work outcomes (higher job engagement, lower work stress, less experience of limitations to

productivity, and higher job satisfaction) (Hypothesis 4a). This pattern of associations is reflective of the positive relationship-to-work spillover process. Similarly, in capturing the negative relationship-to-work spillover process, I hypothesized that, compared to all other groups of combinations on the three predictor variables, higher relationship-to-work permeability, higher intimate partner role identification, and *less* favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction (lower affection and closeness, higher demand and violation, and lower relationship satisfaction) would be associated with the *least* favorable work outcomes (lower job engagement, higher work stress, more experience of limitations to productivity, and lower job satisfaction) (Hypothesis 4b).

Finally, to capture the relationship-to-work compensation process, I hypothesized that, compared to all other groups with *low* relationship-to-work permeability (which, as discussed above, may be thought to generally characterize groups who experience work and intimate relationships as segmented), the combination of lower relationship-to-work permeability, lower intimate partner role identification, and less favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction (lower affection and closeness, higher demand and violation, and lower relationship satisfaction) would generally be associated with the *most* favorable work outcomes (higher job engagement, less experience of limitations to productivity, and higher job satisfaction), except in the case of work stress (higher work stress) (Hypothesis 5). The exception that work stress would increase under these conditions acknowledges that the compensation process may place added stress on an individual to achieve more favorable work outcomes. Given the complexity of these predictions, a summary of all hypotheses in the current investigation is provided in Table 2.

Table 2

A Summary of Hypotheses in the Current Study

1. Individuals who experienced higher levels of affection and closeness, lower levels of demand and violation, and were more generally satisfied in their intimate relationships were expected to have higher job engagement, lower work stress, less experience of limitations to productivity, and higher job satisfaction.

2. Individuals who experienced higher levels of affection and closeness, lower levels of demand and violation, and were more generally satisfied in their intimate relationships would report higher relationship-to-work positive spillover and lower relationship-to-work negative spillover.

3. As individuals' occupational roles became more permeable to their intimate relationship roles (i.e., as relationship-to-work permeability increased), the strength of associations between their intimate relationship experiences and their work outcomes would increase.

4. (a) Compared to all other groups of combinations on the three predictor variables, higher relationship-to-work permeability, higher intimate partner role identification, and more favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction (higher affection and closeness, lower demand and violation, and higher relationship satisfaction) would be associated with the most favorable work outcomes (higher job engagement, lower work stress, less experience of limitations to productivity, and higher job satisfaction).

   (b) Compared to all other groups of combinations on the three predictor variables, higher relationship-to-work permeability, higher intimate partner role identification, and *less* favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction (lower affection and closeness, higher demand and violation, and lower relationship satisfaction) would be associated with the *least* favorable work outcomes (lower job engagement, higher work stress, more experience of limitations to productivity, and lower job satisfaction).

5. Compared to all other groups with *low* relationship-to-work permeability, the combination of lower relationship-to-work permeability, lower intimate partner role identification, and less favorable intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction (lower affection and closeness, higher demand and violation, and lower relationship satisfaction) would generally be associated with the *most* favorable work outcomes (higher job engagement, less experience of limitations to productivity, and higher job satisfaction), except in the case of work stress (higher work stress).

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Research Design

The current study examined committed intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction and work outcomes among a cross-sectional sample of workers in the Southeastern United States. Data for the current investigation were collected using web-based survey software as part of a larger longitudinal research effort to examine the impact of functioning and satisfaction in committed intimate relationships on work outcomes. Multivariate regression with follow-up univariate regression techniques were used to investigate the associations between the predictor variables – intimate relationship affection, closeness, demand, violation, and global satisfaction – and the outcome variables – job engagement, work stress, limitations to productivity, and global job satisfaction.

Participants

An estimated 10,000 working individuals of diverse demographic backgrounds (e.g., age, education, income) and from a variety of occupations and organizational roles were contacted about the current research project via direct email and online advertisements through the assistance of several community organizations. These individuals had to meet two eligibility criteria to participate in the current investigation. First, participants had to identify as permanent employees and working at least 20 hours per week at their places of employment. This excluded individuals whose occupational roles and settings were

transient, which may be associated with inconsistent experiences of the intimate relationship-work interface. Second, participants had to be involved concurrently in a committed intimate relationship. Individuals were able to meet this eligibility criterion by identifying as either (a) married and living together or (b) cohabitating with an intimate partner for longer than 12 months. Youssefnia and Berwald, in their review of 58 organizational surveys conducted over five years by two consulting firms, reported that special topic organizational surveys (for example, on work-life balance) were associated with an approximate 47% response rate (as cited in Rogelberg, 2006). In the current study, 644 total responses were received, representing an approximate 6.44% response rate. The response rate for the current project may have been lower than that reported by Youssefnia and Berwald due to (a) the inability of a number of individuals contacted about the project to meet both participation eligibility criteria, (b) the fact that the primary investigator was not involved in an administrative role in any of the organizations assisting with participant recruitment, and (c) having emailed rather than post mailed research invitations to potential participants; emails are much more easily ignored and discarded than posted mail.

The sample size used for analysis in the current investigation was reduced from the total 644 responses by a number of factors. Of the 644 initial responses, 182 participants did not fill out the survey to completion; 15 individuals did not report an average number of hours worked per week; 4 individuals reported less than 20 average hours worked per week; 3 individuals did not report an intimate relationship status; 4 individuals indicated that they were separated from their intimate partners; 5 individuals indicated that they were not married and had been living together less than a year; and 2 individuals indicated that they were not married and did not report how long they had been living with their intimate

partner. This reduced the available sample size to 429 participants. In addition, data from 14 individuals indicating a lesbian relationship, 6 individuals indicating a gay male relationship, and 2 individuals that did not indicate the sexual orientation of their current relationship were excluded from final analyses. This decision was made due to a combination of two factors. First, due to varying cultural acceptance of publically homosexual relationships, a strong possibility exists that individuals in homosexual relationships have psychologically different experiences of the intimate relationship-work interface than individuals in heterosexual relationships. Second, due to the small number of individuals in the current sample indicating a homosexual relationship orientation, current analyses were not able to test for statistical differences in the influences of intimate relationships on work outcomes among individuals indicating a homosexual relationship orientation as compared to those indicating a heterosexual relationship orientation. The final available sample size for analysis in the current investigation was thus $N = 407$. Additional demographic information for the final sample is reported in Table 3.

Measures

All participants completed a web-based survey designed to assess experiences in intimate relationships, experiences at work, and relevant biographical information. Measures included in the survey were as follows:

Biographical Measures

Biographical Data Form (BDF). Participants' biographical information was collected using the Biographical Data Form (BDF), a questionnaire created specifically for the purposes of the current investigation. The BDF consists of 19 items assessing social and economic information (e.g., age, gender, race, income), occupational information (e.g., identified occupation, organizational position, hours worked per week) and intimate

Table 3

Demographic Information for the Sample Used for Analysis in the Current Study

Characteristic	Descriptive Statistics *N*	*M*	*SD*
Age	407*	42.32	10.92
Education	407*	4.97	1.57
Annual income	407*	7.39	1.83
Years at current employer	402	8.37	8.48
Years at current position	407*	6.24	6.76
Average hours worked per week	407	44.71	9.16
Years married/cohabitating	407*	14.06	10.50

Characteristic	Frequency Statistics *N*	*Proportion*
Gender (*N* = 407*)		
Female	301	0.74
Male	106	0.26
Race (*N* = 407)		
White	385	0.95
Black	9	0.02
Asian	7	0.02

Note. Education was rated on an 8-point scale (1 = Less than a high school diploma, 2 = High school diploma or equivalent, 3 = Some college work, no degree, 4 = Associate degree, 5 = Bachelor's degree, 6 = Master's degree, 7 = Professional degree, 8 = Doctorate degree). Annual income was rated on a 12-point scale (1 = Under $5,000; 2 = $5,000 - $9,999; 3 = $10,000 - $14,999; 4 = $15,000 - $24,999; 5 = $25,000 - $34,999; 6 = $35,000 - $49,999; 7 = $50,000 - $74,999; 8 = $75,000 - $99,999; 9 = $100,000 - $149,999; 10 = $150,000 - $199,999; 11 = $200,000 - $249,999; 12 = $250,000 and over).
*These numbers include imputed values for missing data.

Table 3

Demographic Information for the Sample Used for Analysis in the Current Study (continued)

Characteristic	Frequency Statistics *N*	*Proportion*
Race (continued)		
Latin	5	0.01
Native American	5	0.01
Industry sector (*N* = 405)		
Public/government	260	0.64
Private/for-profit	133	0.33
Private/non-profit	12	0.03
Occupation/industry (*N* = 405)		
Legal	74	0.18
Office and Administrative Support	63	0.15
Life, Physical, and Social Science	56	0.14
Education, Training, and Library	52	0.13
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	52	0.13
Management	41	0.10
Computer and Mathematical	18	0.04
Business and Financial Operations	13	0.03
Community and Social Services	11	0.03
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	9	0.02

Table 3

Demographic Information for the Sample Used for Analysis in the Current Study (continued)

Characteristic	Frequency Statistics *N*	*Proportion*
Occupation/industry (continued)		
Architecture and Engineering	6	0.01
Healthcare Support	4	0.01
Sales and related	3	<0.01
Protective Service	1	<0.01
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	1	<0.01
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	1	<0.01
Position ($N = 405$)		
Executive, Managing Partner, Department Head, or Director of Professional Services Senior Position	29	0.07
Upper Management, Senior Partner, Senior Faculty, or Senior Provider of Professional Services	68	0.17
Middle Management, Junior Partner, Junior Faculty, or Junior Provider of Professional Services	167	0.41
Productions Associate, Services Associate, Sales Associate, or Paraprofessional Administrative	41	0.10
Administrative & Support Staff	100	0.25

Table 3

Demographic Information for the Sample Used for Analysis in the Current Study (continued)

Characteristic	Frequency Statistics *N*	*Proportion*
Intimate relationship status (*N* = 407)		
Married, living together	360	0.88
Unmarried, living together	47	0.12
Dual income status (*N* = 407*)		
Yes	348	0.86
No	59	0.14
Children at home (*N* = 407*)		
Yes	216	0.53
No	191	0.47
Children out of home (*N* = 407*)		
Yes	117	0.29
No	290	0.71

*These numbers include imputed values for missing data.

relationship information (e.g., intimate relationship status, intimate relationship orientation, number of children). Occupation/industry codes for the BDF were adopted from the U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics' Standard Occupational Classification system (U.S. Department of Labor, n.d.b). A copy of the BDF has been attached as Appendix A.

Intimate Relationship Domain Measures

Dyadic Adjustment Scale – 4 (DAS-4). Global relationship satisfaction was measured in the current investigation using Sabourin, Valois, and Lussier's (2005) four-item revision of Spanier's (1976) Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS). The DAS is one of the most widely used measures of marital adjustment. Sabourin et al. created the DAS-4 to serve as an abbreviated form of the original 32-item DAS and to measure global relationship satisfaction more specifically, as opposed to overall relationship adjustment. Development of the DAS-4 was conducted through a series of studies with total participation of 8,256 married or cohabitating couples. Sabourin et al. used nonparametric item response theory to generate the most efficient combination of DAS items and further selected items that specifically measured relationship satisfaction as opposed to related adjustment constructs. Sabourin et al. demonstrated that the DAS-4 was as informative at all levels of couple satisfaction, was as effective at predicting couple dissolution, and was significantly less contaminated by socially desirable responding when compared to the original 32-item DAS. The DAS-4 demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = .84$; Sabourin et al.). A sample item from the DAS-4 is "In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?" For this particular item, participants respond using a frequency scale ranging from 0 (Never) to 5 (All of the time).

Frequency and Acceptability of Partner Behavior Inventory (FAPBI). Evaluation of intimate relationship affection, closeness, demand, and violation was conducted using Doss and Christensen's (2006) Frequency and Acceptability of Partner Behavior Inventory (FAPBI). The FAPBI was developed to provide an assessment of both the frequency and acceptability of positive and negative intimate partner behaviors. The measure contains 20 items that provide frequency and acceptability subscale scores on each of the four intimate relationship variables of interest – affection, closeness, demand, and violation. To review, affection refers to behaviors that demonstrate verbal, physical, or sexual affection; closeness refers to supportive behaviors and joint activities; demand refers to critical, abusive, or manipulative behaviors; and violation refers to behaviors that test or breach relationship boundaries and standards. A full review of the specific behaviors associated with each of these four factors is provided in Table 1. An example of an Affection subscale item is "In the past month, my partner was physically affectionate (e.g., held my hand, kissed me, hugged me, put arm around me, responded when I initiated affection)." Respondents are asked to report the frequency of each behavior using their preferred timeframe (i.e., per day, per week, or per month) and then rate the acceptability of that behavior's frequency on a 9-point scale ranging from (0) totally unacceptable to (9) totally acceptable. Because acceptance scores for the frequency of each partner behavior were beyond the purposes of the current investigation, only frequency scores were used in analyses for the current study. In their examination of the Violation frequency subscale among 12,752 community individuals, Doss and Christensen reported slightly low, but sufficient, internal consistency among heterosexual respondents with children ($\alpha = .63$), heterosexual respondents without children ($\alpha = .67$), and cohabitating homosexual respondents ($\alpha = .68$). The other three frequency

subscales demonstrated good internal consistency across these three demographic groups (αs ranged from .73-.80). Doss and Christensen found each frequency subscale to overlap moderately with scores of global relationship satisfaction, suggesting the subscales are related, but not redundant, to global relationship satisfaction.

Partner Role Identification Scale (PRIS). Intimate partner role identification was measured using seven items adapted from Yogev and Brett's (1985) 11-item Family Involvement Scale. Items were selected and adapted to reflect identification specifically with the intimate partner role. For instance, the item "The most important things that happen to me are related to my family roles," was changed to "The most important things that happen to me are related to my role as a partner." All items were preceded by the statement, "In the next few questions, the term 'partner' should be understood in the context of your committed intimate relationship." Respondents rate each item on a 5-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Yogev and Brett reported good internal consistency for the original 11-item scale (α = .80). In the current study, the adapted 7-item scale also demonstrated good internal consistency (α = .83).

Personality Measures

Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI). Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann Jr.'s (2003) Ten-Item Personality Inventory was used to measure the Big Five Personality Factors among participants in the current investigation. The TIPI was developed as a measure of the Big Five Personality Factors for situations where a brief measurement of personality is needed and personality is not the main construct of interest (Gosling et al., 2003). The inventory consists of 10 word pairs, two word pairs per personality factor. Using a 7-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree, the respondent rates each word pair

according to the accuracy of the word pair in describing him or herself. An example of an item on the extraversion scale is "extraverted, enthusiastic." Gosling et al. found the TIPI to have strong convergent validity with more well established measures of the Big Five, adequate test-retest reliability (r = .72), and comparable patterns of predicted external correlates compared to more well established measure of the Big Five.

Relationship-to-Work Spillover Measures

Positive and Negative Spillover Scales (PANSS). Kirchmeyer's (1992) Positive and Negative Spillover Scales were used to measure relationship-to-work spillover in the current investigation. In the current study, all items in the scales were preceded with the phrase "Being a partner…," and the statement, "In the next few questions, the term 'partner' should be understood in the context of your committed intimate relationship." The positive spillover scale consists of 15 items designed to reflect privileges gained, status security, status enhancement, and personality enrichment in the occupational role as a function of spillover from a second role. An example of a positive spillover item is "Being a partner develops skills in me that are useful at work." The negative spillover scale consists of eight items designed to reflect time-, strain-, and behavior-based spillover from a second role to the occupational role. An example of a negative spillover item is "Being a partner tires me out so I feel drained at work." Respondents rate their agreement with each item using a 6-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (6) strongly agree. Kirchmeyer reported strong internal consistencies for both the positive spillover scale (αs ranged from .87 to .90) and the negative spillover scale (αs ranged from .79 to .88).

Work Domain Measures

Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS). Three items from Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh's Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (as cited in Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002) were used to assess global job satisfaction in the current investigation. The three items are "All in all I am satisfied with my job," "In general, I don't like my job," and "In general, I like working here." Respondents rate their agreement with each item using a 7-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. Both Cammann et al. (as cited in Bruck et al., 2002) and Bruck et al. reported good internal consistency for the scale ($\alpha = .77$ and $\alpha = .82$, respectively). In addition, Bruck et al. demonstrated that this measure of global job satisfaction was predicted by a measure of family-to-work conflict, suggesting adequate sensitivity to family-related constructs.

Job Engagement Scale (JES). Job engagement was measured in the current study with May, Gilson, and Harter's (2004) Job Engagement Scale. This scale consists of 13 items that were designed to reflect the three components of Kahn's psychological engagement – cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement (as cited in May et al., 2004) – as they relate to engagement with work. An example of an item is "Performing my job is so absorbing that I forget about everything else." Respondents rate their agreement with each item on a 7-point scale, ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. May et al. reported adequate internal consistency across the items ($\alpha = .77$). The scaled items have also demonstrated good construct validity in research on the predictors of employees' job engagement (May et al., 2004).

Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale (RtWPS). A new, 16-item measure of relationship-to-work permeability was created as part of the current investigation to provide a

more specific assessment of relationship-to-work permeability than otherwise exists (e.g., see similar measures of role boundary permeability in Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). Items were designed to assess the frequency with which an individual becomes psychologically and/or behaviorally involved with his or her intimate partner or their relationship while the individual is at work. Respondents rate each item on a 6-point scale, ranging from (0) never to (5) all of the time. Because this is a new measure, a copy of the full questionnaire has been attached as Appendix B. Scale construction techniques and results are discussed in Chapter 3.

Work Limitations Questionnaire – Output Demands (WLQ-OD). The Output Demands subscale of Lerner et al.'s (2001) 25-item Work Limitations Questionnaire was used to measure limitations to productivity. The WLQ was developed as a measure of work productivity impairment as related to physical and mental health concerns. The Output Demands subscale consists of five items that respondents rate on a scale ranging from (0) limited none of the time, to (100) limited all of the time. Responses represent the reported amount of time that respondents had job productivity limitations in the past month (in order to maintain consistency of time periods across instruments, the WLQ's time frame was adjusted from 2 weeks to 1 month for the current study; Lerner et al. suggested that using a 1 month time frame for the WLQ would not limit the scale's effectiveness). A sample item in the Output Demands subscale is "Do all you're capable of." Lerner et al. reported strong internal consistency for the Output Demands subscale ($\alpha = .88$), and scores on the WLQ-OD were found to be superior predictors of self-reported productivity loss compared to measures of work role impairment, work time lost due to mental or physical impairment, and work effectiveness during periods of physical or mental impairment. Lerner and Lee (2006)

reported that the Work Limitations Questionnaire is currently being used in employment, service provision, insurance, pharmaceutics, and academic research to measure self-perceived limitations in work productivity.

Work Stress Measure (WSM). Bun Chan, Lai, Chung Ko, and Weng Boey's (2000) revised Work Stress Measure was used to measure perceived work stress. The original WSM consisted of 37 items. However, a factor analysis conducted by Bun Chan et al. suggested that a revised 18-item measure would provide a more efficient and just as effective assessment of perceived work stress as related to the following six work events or situations: poor relations with supervisor, bureaucratic constraints, work-family conflicts, poor relations with colleagues, performance pressure, and poor job prospect. Respondents rate each item on an 8-point scale, ranging from (0) not a source of stress to (8) extreme stress. An example of a work event on the WSM is "Difficulty in maintaining relationship with superior." Bun Chan et al. reported excellent internal reliability of the original 37-item measure ($\alpha = .96$). In the current study, the adapted 18-item measure also demonstrated excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = .93$).

Procedure

The current study utilized cross-sectional survey data from the first measurement point of a larger longitudinal research study assessing the influences of intimate relationship experiences on work outcomes. Prior to recruitment of research participants, several commitments were secured among community business, professional, and government organizations based in the Southeastern United States to allow for recruitment from their memberships. These organizations consisted of individuals working in the fields of law, architectural design, medical supplies distribution, private psychology practice, management consulting, and the various occupations represented by state employees. Each participating

organization received, from the primary investigator, a research invitation addressed to organizational members (attached as Appendix C). This brief invitation, which included a description of the research project, organizational encouragement to participate, and an active web-link to the project's survey website, was tailored to appropriately reflect different organizational approaches to member participation. Individuals identified to assist with participant recruitment in each organizational site emailed this invitation directly to organizational members (e.g., using a listserv or member emails where available) and/or posted the invitation on the organization's intranet or web space (only one organization used this latter recruitment method and did so in lieu of direct emails). Participation reminder emails were sent to organizational members through contacts at organizational sites at each of three weekly intervals. The text of these three emails is attached as Appendix D.

Similarly, direct email was used to recruit participants from among the faculty and staff of a large public university located in the Southeastern United States. Each faculty and staff member at the university received directly from the primary investigator an initial research invitation and then reminder emails at each of three weekly intervals. These materials were similar to the research invitations and reminder emails sent to members of participating community organizations through contacts at each of those organizations (see Appendices E and F for copies of university faculty and staff recruitment letters). Regardless of the population from which participants were recruited, all recruitment efforts and collection of data occurred electronically.

The participation of members within each community organization or the university was on a voluntary basis. In addition, participation was completely confidential; community organizations and the university neither knew of an individual's participation nor had access,

in any way, to an individual's data. Participants were able to self-select into the current study by clicking on an active web link provided at the end of the initial research invitation or a participation reminder. This link directed participants to the project's survey website, where participants were able to complete all research questionnaires. Completion of the entire survey took on average 23 minutes. While participants were asked to self-report their preferred email address for follow-up data collection in the larger longitudinal project, no additional contact with participants was necessary for the purposes of the current investigation.

Web-based data collection for the current study was hosted by Qualtrics' secure web-based survey system, provided at no cost by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) to faculty and students conducting web-based survey research. The Qualtrics system maintains data behind a firewall, and all data are accessed only by the owner of the survey who must provide a password and user identification. All pieces of data are keyed to that owner identification and cannot be accessed by anyone other than the owner or, with the owner's request, technical assistance staff. Technical assistance staff includes server administrators at Qualtrics who respond to hardware or software failures, or Teresa Edwards, the UNC-CH administrator for the Qualtrics Software Agreement. The technical assistance staff was not requested to access data for the current investigation at any time. The Qualtrics system has been used by government agencies, hundreds of universities and in many dissertations involving human subjects and even disadvantaged and at risk populations, including government sponsored studies collecting data about physical and dependency abuse for adults and children.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale

Because the Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale (RtWPS) was a new measure and assessed the central construct (relationship-to-work permeability) in hypotheses about the moderation of influences of intimate relationships on work, there was a need to test the reliability and validity of the RtWPS prior to testing hypotheses in the current investigation. In addition, analyses of gender and occupational differences on the RtWPS were conducted to better understand the nature of the RtWPS and group differences in relationship-to-work permeability.

Reliability and Validity of the RtWPS

As discussed above, the RtWPS consists of 16 items that assess the frequency with which an individual becomes psychologically and/or behaviorally involved with his or her intimate partner or their relationship while the individual is at work. Respondents rate each item on a 6-point scale, ranging from (0) never to (5) all of the time. Descriptive statistics of each RtWPS item and the full scale, based on data collected for the current investigation, are reported in Table 4. Results suggested that the full 16 item scale had strong internal consistency. Furthermore, item means and standard deviations generally suggested adequate use of the full 6-point response scale for each item. Responses to items 8 ("My partner visits me while I am at work") and 14 ("During working hours, my partner interacts with the

Table 4

Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale Descriptives

Item	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*Skewness*	Scale α if item deleted
1. I initiate communication with my partner while at work (such as make phone calls to partner, send email to partner, send text/ instant messages to partner).	405	2.58	1.13	0.41	0.84
2. During the workday, I handle issues or responsibilities related to my partner or our relationship.	406	1.85	0.93	0.63	0.84
3. I find myself thinking about my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	405	2.19	0.98	0.52	0.84
4. I display photos of my partner at work.	406	3.27	1.95	-0.56	0.86
5. I talk about my partner or our relationship with the people I work with.	404	2.50	1.26	0.28	0.84
6. During the workday, I respond to concerns and good news related to my partner or our relationship.	405	2.81	1.24	0.28	0.83
7. I find myself thinking about problems with my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	406	1.55	1.02	0.97	0.85
8. My partner visits me while I am at work.	406	0.95	1.00	1.64	0.84
9. I bring my partner to work sponsored social events.	406	2.89	1.51	-0.30	0.85

Note. Response scale for each item is 0 (low) – 5 (high).

Table 4

Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale Descriptives (continued)

Item	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*Skewness*	Scale α if item deleted
10. I experience emotions about my partner or our relationship while at work.	406	1.95	1.08	0.90	0.84
11. I plan out activities and/or responsibilities for my partner or our relationship while at work.	407	1.80	0.98	0.78	0.84
12. I find myself thinking about good times with my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	405	2.20	0.97	0.57	0.84
13. I keep personal gifts or mementos at work to remind me of my partner.	406	2.12	1.68	0.42	0.84
14. During working hours, my partner interacts with the people I work with.	407	0.74	1.14	2.23	0.85
15. I accept communications from my partner while at work (such as accept phone calls from partner, read emails from partner, receive text/instant messages from partner).	405	3.55	1.28	-0.47	0.84
16. I find myself thinking about decisions related to my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	407	1.89	1.04	0.64	0.84
					Full scale α
Full scale	407	2.18	0.68	0.31	0.85

Note. Response scale for each item is 0 (low) – 5 (high).

people I work with") were skewed towards the low end of the scale, suggesting that these items may represent permeability behaviors of lower frequency. The only item that if deleted would have raised the internal consistency of the full scale was item 4 ("I display photos of my partner at work"). However, as suggested by the mean and skewness of item 4 (i.e., mean above the scale midpoint; skewed towards the high end of the scale), this item represented one of the few permeability behaviors of higher frequency in the full scale. Considering the gains to internal consistency were minimal (difference in full scale $\alpha = .01$), the item was retained.

To provide additional evidence of validity for items in the RtWPS, an exploratory factor analysis of the full 16-item scale using principal axis factoring with varimax rotation was conducted. Four factors were extracted based on the identification of factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Together, these four factors were responsible for 63.10% of the full scale variance. Item factor loadings on these four factors are reported in Table 5. Results suggested that the first factor is reflective of an individual's cognitive or affective engagement with the intimate partner role while the individual is at work (Think/Feel; e.g., "I experience emotions about my partner or our relationship while at work"). The second factor is generally reflective of an individual's use of physical representations or verbal invocations of his or her intimate partner or their relationship while at work (Representations; e.g., "I display photos of my partner at work"). The third factor reflects an individual's engagement in communication behaviors with his or her intimate partner while at work [Communication; e.g., "I initiate communication with my partner while at work (such as make phone calls to partner, send email to partner, send text/instant messages to partner)"]. Finally, the fourth factor reflects an individual's actual physical

Table 5

Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale Item Factor Loadings

Item	Factor			
	1. Think/ Feel	2. Represen-tations	3. Communi-cation	4. Physical Presence
1. I initiate communication with my partner while at work (such as make phone calls to partner, send email to partner, send text/ instant messages to partner).	0.24	0.05	0.75[a]	0.17
2. During the workday, I handle issues or responsibilities related to my partner or our relationship.	0.49	0.08	0.49[a]	0.08
3. I find myself thinking about my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	0.65[a]	0.14	0.32	0.09
4. I display photos of my partner at work.	<-0.01	0.69[a]	- 0.01	-0.02
5. I talk about my partner or our relationship with the people I work with.	0.25	0.56[a]	0.20	0.12
6. During the workday, I respond to concerns and good news related to my partner or our relationship.	0.31	0.51[a]	0.43	0.20
7. I find myself thinking about problems with my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	0.69[a]	<-0.01	0.07	<-0.01
8. My partner visits me while I am at work.	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.85[a]
9. I bring my partner to work sponsored social events.	-0.07	0.34	0.24	0.40[a]

[a] Item factor classification.

Table 5

Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale Item Factor Loadings (continued)

Item	Factor			
	1. Think/ Feel	2. Represen-tations	3. Communi-cation	4. Physical Presence
10. I experience emotions about my partner or our relationship while at work.	0.70[a]	0.21	0.09	0.17
11. I plan out activities and/or responsibilities for my partner or our relationship while at work.	0.52[a]	0.25	0.39	0.05
12. I find myself thinking about good times with my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	0.46[a]	0.37	0.23	0.13
13. I keep personal gifts or mementos at work to remind me of my partner.	0.16	0.60[a]	0.06	0.13
14. During working hours, my partner interacts with the people I work with.	0.09	0.07	0.13	0.72[a]
15. I accept communications from my partner while at work (such as accept phone calls from partner, read emails from partner, receive text/instant messages from partner).	0.25	0.20	0.43[a]	0.19
16. I find myself thinking about decisions related to my partner or our relationship while I am at work.	0.83[a]	0.10	0.24	0.06

[a] Item factor classification.

inclusion of his or her intimate partner in the work domain (Physical Presence; e.g., "My partner visits me while I am at work"). Item 2 ("During the workday, I handle issues or responsibilities related to my partner or our relationship") loaded almost equally on Factor 1 (Think/Feel) and Factor 3 (Communication), not surprisingly suggesting that this permeability behavior includes both subjective psychological engagement with the intimate partner role and communication with the intimate partner. Item 6 ("During the workday, I respond to concerns and good news related to my partner or our relationship") loaded more on Factor 2 (Representations) than the more theoretically close Factor 3 (Communication), which was unanticipated. The reason for this factor loading is unclear. Regardless, all 16 items appeared statistically and theoretically relevant to the relationship-to-work permeability construct and suggested that there may be several different ways that individuals psychologically and behaviorally structure their work role to be permeable to their intimate relationship.

Although individuals indicating a homosexual orientation in their intimate relationships were excluded from analyses in the current study due to the possibility that these individuals have psychologically different experiences of the intimate relationship-work interface than individuals in heterosexual relationships, it was not expected that the construct of relationship-to-work permeability itself would operate differently among individuals in homosexual relationships. Therefore, RtWPS item analyses, reliability analyses, and factor analysis were repeated with the greater sample of study participants including individuals indicating a heterosexual intimate relationship, individuals indicating a homosexual intimate relationship, and those not reporting a relationship orientation (N = 429). In all aspects, results were virtually identical. Taken together, these analyses provide

support for the reliability and construct validity of the full 16 item RtWPS. Therefore, the full scale was retained for use in testing hypotheses in the current investigation.

Group Differences on the RtWPS

To better understand the Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale (RtWPS) and investigate important group differences in relationship-to-work permeability, gender and occupational differences on the RtWPS were explored. Results of an independent samples *t*-test supported a significant gender difference [t (186) = -2.08, $p < .05$]. As seen in Table 6, men in the current investigation reported slightly higher relationship-to-work permeability than women. A one-way ANOVA was used to test for overall mean differences on the RtWPS among all occupations represented in the current investigation with sample membership greater than $N = 1$. Results of the ANOVA were significant [F (12, 389) = 2.41, $p < .01$]. Follow-up contrasts of each occupation's RtWPS mean compared to the average of all other groups suggested that the legal occupation [t (97) = -4.28, $p < .01$] and the education, training, and library occupations [t (70) = -2.54, $p < .05$] were associated with higher than average relationship-to-work permeability, whereas the architecture and engineering occupations [t (7) = 3.20, $p < .05$] were associated with lower than average relationship-to-work permeability (see Table 6 for group means).

Descriptive Reports of Data Collected

Whereas missing data was not an issue for Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale analyses, there was a small amount of missing data among other scale scores that, if left unaddressed, may have reduced the number of observations in the multivariate data set that could be used to test hypotheses (see Appendix G for a report of missing data in the current investigation). Therefore, prior to conducting any analyses relevant to the hypotheses, a

Table 6

Group Means and Standard Deviations for Relationship-to-Work Permeability Group Contrasts

Group	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Gender ($N = 407$, $M = 2.18$, $SD = 0.68$)			
Female	301	2.13*	0.68
Male	106	2.29*	0.68
Occupation/Industry ($N = 402$, $M = 2.18$, $SD = 0.68$)			
Legal	74	2.49**	0.78
Office and Administrative Support	63	2.09	0.62
Life, Physical, and Social Science	56	2.11	0.64
Education, Training, and Library	52	2.34*	0.70
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	52	2.07	0.68
Management	41	2.06	0.59
Computer and Mathematical	18	2.13	0.72
Business and Financial Operations	13	1.97	0.61
Community and Social Services	11	2.05	0.68
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	9	2.01	0.56
Architecture and Engineering	6	1.72*	0.28
Healthcare Support	4	1.89	0.57
Sales and related	3	2.19	0.41

Note. Contrasts did not assume equal variances across groups.
* Significance of contrast against average of all other group means is $p < .05$.
** Significance of contrast against average of all other group means is $p < .01$.

maximum likelihood missing value imputation was performed to address this potential problem [see Schafer (1997) for a discussion of maximum likelihood missing value imputation in multivariate data sets]. All further results reported in the current investigation are based on the data set including imputed values for missing data as reported in Appendix G.

Ranges, means, and standard deviations for each scale employed in the current investigation are reported in Table 7. Results on the scales used to measure work outcome variables suggested that, overall, individuals in the current sample were satisfied and engaged with their jobs. However, results also suggested that individuals were experiencing limitations in their productivity levels 18.78% of the time. This is roughly equivalent to 1 hour and 45 minutes per day given a 9 hour work day. Participants in the current sample also reported mild to moderate work stress. With regards to self-reported relationship-to-work spillover, participants generally reported high levels of positive spillover and low levels of negative spillover. In terms of the Big Five personality traits, the sample was generally extraverted and largely agreeable, conscientious, emotionally stable, and open. Results on the scales used to measure intimate relationship variables suggested that, overall, individuals in the current sample were satisfied with their intimate relationship [based on the cutoff proposed by Sabourin et al. (2005) to identify dissatisfied couples using the DAS-4 (cutoff = 13)] and reported a substantially higher frequency of positive intimate partner behaviors (affection and closeness behaviors) than negative intimate partner behaviors (demand and violation behaviors). However, again using the cutoff proposed by Sabourin et al. (2005) to identify dissatisfied couples using the DAS-4, 47 of the 407 individuals in the current sample (11.5%) were classified as dissatisfied with their relationships. This rate of classification is

Table 7

Scale Ranges, Means, and Standard Deviations

Variable	Scale Range	*M*	*SD*
Outcome Variable Scales			
Global Job Satisfaction Scale	1 (low) – 7 (high)	5.66	1.38
Job Engagement Scale	1 (low) – 7 (high)	5.04	0.91
Work Limitations Questionnaire – Output Demands	0 (low) – 100 (high)	18.78	21.13
Work Stress Measure	0 (low) – 144 (high)	50.77	32.08
Positive and Negative Spillover Scales			
Positive spillover subscale	1 (low) – 6 (high)	4.06	0.85
Negative spillover subscale	1 (low) – 6 (high)	1.84	0.84
Personality Variables			
Ten Item Personality Inventory			
Extraversion subscale	1 (low) – 7 (high)	4.58	1.70
Agreeableness subscale	1 (low) – 7 (high)	5.34	1.18
Conscientiousness subscale	1 (low) – 7 (high)	6.00	0.99
Emotional stability subscale	1 (low) – 7 (high)	5.19	1.37
Openness subscale	1 (low) – 7 (high)	5.43	1.02
Intimate Relationship Variables			
Dyadic Adjustment Scale – 4	0 (low) – 21 (high)	16.43	3.15

Note. $N = 407$ for all scales.

Table 7

Scale Ranges, Means, and Standard Deviations (continued)

Variable	Scale Range	*M*	*SD*
Intimate Relationship Variables (continued)			
Frequency and Acceptability of Partner Behavior Inventory			
Affection (frequency subscale)	behaviors/month	179.02	194.23
Closeness (frequency subscale)	behaviors/month	162.09	142.25
Demand (frequency subscale)	behaviors/month	8.90	23.75
Violation (frequency subscale)	behaviors/month	9.45	41.89
Proposed Moderator Variables			
Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale	0 (low) – 5 (high)	2.18	0.68
Partner Role Identification Scale	1 (low) – 5 (high)	3.95	0.71

Note. $N = 407$ for all scales.

similar to rates reported in other community samples (e.g., Gallup, 1990; Hahlweg, 2004). Finally, results on the scales used to measure proposed moderator variables suggested that individuals in the current sample reported moderate relationship-to-work permeability and highly valued their roles as intimate relationship partners.

A table of bi-variate correlations among all 29 variables involved in testing the hypotheses is provided in Appendix H.

Hypothesis Testing

As discussed above, current hypotheses focused on the influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes (see Table 2 for a review). All hypotheses were initially tested using multivariate regression techniques. As discussed in Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003), multivariate regression makes possible an analysis of partial variance and significance tests in the context of multiple predictors and multiple outcomes. Furthermore, multivariate regression allows for the partialing of outcome variables in the same manner as predictors (Cohen et al., 2003), providing a more meaningful data analytic technique for examining the impact of a set of predictors on several outcome variables that may be best understood as representing different aspects of a larger domain. Although the multivariate regression model, as laid out above in the discussion of the current study, called for certain control and predictor variables, statistical model building steps that would assist in identifying the most statistically efficient, statistically valid, and theoretically relevant model to test hypotheses about the intimate relationship-work interface were not skipped.

Model Building

The first step in determining the most statistically efficient, theoretically relevant model to test the hypotheses about the intimate relationship-work interface was to employ a multivariate model that included the set of four work outcome variables (global job satisfaction, job engagement, limitations to productivity, work stress) and the following sets of predictors: (a) demographic control variables (gender, age, education, income, dual income status, years in current position, average hours worked per week, intimate relationship status, years in relationship, children at home status, children out of home status); (b) personality control variables (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, openness); (c) intimate relationship variables (intimate relationship satisfaction, frequency of partner affection behaviors, frequency of partner closeness behaviors, frequency of partner demand behaviors, frequency of partner violation behaviors); (d) proposed moderator variables (relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification); (e) all two-way interaction variables involving combinations of gender, relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables; (f) all three-way interaction variables involving combinations of gender, relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables; and (g) all four-way interaction variables involving combinations of gender, relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables. The two-, three-, and four-way interaction variables involving gender were added to this model to test for possible moderation effects of gender on the influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes, which have been suggested by previous family-work research

(e.g., Bolger et al., 1989; Grandey et al., 2005; Pleck, 1977). Next, a series of statistical contrasts were conducted to determine the significance of the contributions of these two-, three-, and four-way interaction variables involving gender to the overall prediction model.

The series of statistical contrasts sequentially eliminated all sets of gender interaction variables from the model. First, the set of four-way interactions involving combinations of gender, relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables (e.g., gender x relationship-to-work permeability x intimate partner role identification x relationship satisfaction) did not significantly contribute to the prediction model [$\lambda = 0.95$; F (20, 1132) = 0.89, $p = 0.60$]. Therefore, these variables were eliminated from the model and not included in any further analyses. Next, the contribution of all three-way interactions involving gender (e.g., gender x relationship-to-work permeability x relationship satisfaction) was tested. This set of three-way interactions did not significantly contribute to the prediction model [$\lambda = 0.87$; F (44, 1326) = 1.08, $p = 0.33$]. Therefore, these variables were eliminated from the model and not included in any further analyses. Finally, the contribution of all two-way interactions involving gender (e.g., gender x relationship satisfaction) was tested. This set of two-way interactions did not significantly contribute to the prediction model [$\lambda = 0.94$; F (28, 1289) = 0.77, $p = 0.80$]. Therefore, these variables were eliminated from the model and not included in any further analyses.

The remaining multivariate model included the set of four work outcome variables and the following sets of predictors: (a) demographic control variables; (b) personality control variables; (c) intimate relationship variables; (d) proposed moderator variables; (e) all two-way interaction variables involving combinations of relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables; and (f) all

three-way interaction variables involving combinations of relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables.

The next step was to test the statistical validity of the remaining model by assessing for potential multicollinearity among predictors, which has been known to inflate standard errors for regression coefficients (e.g., Neter, Kutner, Nachtsheim, and Wasserman, 1996; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). To assess for multicollinearity, variance inflation factors for all predictors were examined. As explained by Neter et al., variance inflation factors measure the degree to which the variances of the estimated regression coefficients are inflated compared to when predictors are not linearly related. Variance inflation factors for all predictors are reported in the first column of statistics in Appendix I (Full Model *VIF*). Neter et al. suggested that variance inflation factors greater than 10 may indicate an unacceptable level of collinearity in the model. The relationship-to-work permeability x intimate partner role identification x frequency of partner demand behaviors three-way interaction variable had a variance inflation factor greater than 10. However, before eliminating this variable from the model, an additional statistical contrast was performed to assess the independent contribution of this three-way interaction to the overall prediction model, above and beyond the contribution of all other predictors. This contrast was not significant [$\lambda = 1.00$; F (4, 364) = 0.44, $p = 0.78$]. Therefore, due to introducing an unacceptably high level of collinearity into the model in combination with evidence that the variable did not contribute significantly to the overall prediction model, the relationship-to-work permeability x intimate partner role identification x frequency of partner demand behaviors three-way interaction was eliminated and not included in any further analyses. Variance inflation factors for the reduced model

were re-examined and found to be at acceptable levels (see second column of statistics in Appendix I, "Reduced Model *VIF*").

At this point, the remaining multivariate model was viewed as the most statistically efficient, statistically valid, and theoretically relevant model for testing hypotheses about the influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes. To review, this model included the set of four work outcome variables and the following sets of predictors: (a) demographic control variables, (b) personality control variables, (c) intimate relationship variables, (d) proposed moderator variables, (e) all two-way interaction variables involving combinations of relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables; and (f) all three-way interaction variables involving combinations of relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables *except* the relationship-to-work permeability x intimate partner role identification x frequency of partner demand behaviors three-way interaction variable. All further results, unless otherwise noted, were a product of this multivariate regression model.

Hypotheses Tests

Each of the hypotheses was initially tested using a multivariate contrast. Specifically, the unique contribution of the set of variables relevant to the hypothesis was contrasted against the contribution of all predictors entered *earlier* in the multivariate regression model (e.g., for Hypothesis 1 regarding the main effects of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes, the unique contribution of the set of intimate relationship variables was contrasted against the contribution of the demographic and personality control variables, which were entered earlier in the multivariate regression model). To provide more

statistical power and provide greater methodological consistency across the several statistical contrasts performed, each of the contrasts employed the error term from the *full* work outcomes multivariate model (i.e., the error term of the model including all sets of predictors through the three-way interactions). The one exception to this was the single contrast used to test Hypothesis 2, which involved use of the unique multivariate model of self-reported positive and negative relationship-to-work spillover regressed on (a) demographic and personality control variables and (b) intimate relationship main effect variables. Appropriately, the error term specific to this unique model was used in this contrast. Interpretation of follow-up univariate results (i.e., the effects of predictors on each work outcome or self-reported relationship-to-work spillover variable) was guided by the results of these multivariate contrasts. When a multivariate contrast failed to provide support for a hypothesis, univariate results regarding the predictor variables specific to that hypothesis were *not* interpreted.

Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1 (see Table 2) provided a general expectation about the main effects of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes. The multivariate contrast used to investigate Hypothesis 1 tested the unique contribution of the set of intimate relationship main effects to the set of work outcomes above the contributions of the set of (a) demographic control variables and (b) personality control variables. Results from this contrast were not significant [$\Delta \boldsymbol{R}^2 < 0.01$; $\lambda = 0.94$; $F\ (20, 1212) = 1.21$, $p = 0.23$]. That is, intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction were not found to have a significant effect on work outcomes above and beyond demographic and personality controls. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported at the multivariate level. In accordance with planned analytical procedures, follow-up univariate results regarding the main effects of

intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on each of the four work outcomes were *not* interpreted.

Hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 2 (see Table 2) provided a prediction about the directional nature of the intimate relationship-work associations under investigation in the current study (i.e., that they were, at least in part, relationship-to-work directional effects). The multivariate contrast used to investigate Hypothesis 2 tested the unique contribution of the set of intimate relationship main effects to the set of *self-reported relationship-to-work spillover outcomes* (i.e., positive relationship-to-work spillover, negative relationship-to-work spillover) above the contributions of the set of (a) demographic control variables and (b) personality control variables. Results of this contrast were significant [$\Delta \boldsymbol{R}^2 = 0.26$; $\lambda = 0.52$; $F\ (10, 768) = 29.56$, $p < 0.01$]. That is, intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction *were* significantly associated with participants' self-report of the relationship-to-work spillover process above and beyond demographic and personality controls. Follow-up univariate results regarding these relationships are reported in Appendices J and K. As seen in Appendix J, univariate results suggested that positive relationship-to-work spillover increased as an individual's intimate relationship satisfaction increased or the frequency of partner closeness behaviors increased. As seen in Appendix K, univariate results suggested that negative relationship-to-work spillover increased as an individual's intimate relationship satisfaction *decreased* or the frequency of partner demand behaviors increased. Therefore, results largely supported Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 3 (see Table 2) proposed that relationship-to-work permeability would moderate the influences of intimate relationships on work outcomes. The multivariate contrast used to investigate Hypothesis 3 tested the unique contribution of

the set of two-way interactions involving combinations of relationship-to-work permeability and the set of intimate relationship variables to the set of work outcomes above the contributions of all other predictors entered earlier in the model. Results from this contrast were significant [$\Delta \boldsymbol{R}^2 = 0.02$; $\lambda = 0.90$; F (20, 1212) = 1.96, $p < 0.01$]. That is, the strength of influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes varied as a condition of participants' level of relationship-to-work permeability. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was supported at the multivariate level. A review of follow-up univariate results, which detail specific patterns underlying this multivariate moderation effect, are provided following review of the remaining multivariate tests of current hypotheses.

Hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 5. Hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 5 (see Table 2) provided a series of more complex predictions detailing the ways by which relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification would moderate the influences of intimate relationships on work outcomes. First, to provide general support for the combined moderation effects of relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification, a multivariate contrast was performed testing the unique contribution of the set of three-way interactions involving combinations of relationship-to-work permeability, intimate partner role identification, and the set of intimate relationship variables (*except* the relationship-to-work permeability x intimate partner role identification x frequency of partner demand behaviors interaction, which was earlier eliminated from the model) to the set of work outcomes above the contributions of all other predictors entered earlier in the model. Results from this contrast were not significant [$\Delta \boldsymbol{R}^2 = 0.01$; $\lambda = 0.94$; F (16, 1116) = 1.54, $p = 0.08$]. That is, the strength of influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes were not found to vary as a condition of

participants' level of relationship-to-work permeability combined with participants' level of intimate partner role identification, although there was a trend for this effect. Therefore, support was not provided at the multivariate level for testing Hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 5, which detailed specific patterns underlying this moderation effect. In accordance with planned analytic procedures, follow-up univariate results regarding the effects of these three-way interactions on each of the four work outcomes also were *not* interpreted.

To review, multivariate analyses suggested that the strength of influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes varied *only* as a condition of participants' level of relationship-to-work permeability. Multivariate results supported *neither* the main effects of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes *nor* moderation of these effects by way of relationship-to-work permeability in combination with intimate partner role identification, although there was a trend for this latter relationship. Therefore, in accordance with planned analytic procedures, when reviewing follow-up univariate results for the regression of each work outcome variable on all control and predictor variables, *only* the two-way interactions involving combinations of relationship-to-work permeability and the set of intimate relationship variables were interpreted. Follow-up univariate regression results for each work outcome variable regressed on all control and predictor variables are reported in Appendices L-O.

Follow-up univariate results for models predicting work outcomes. Only one significant finding regarding the interactions between relationship-to-work permeability and the set of intimate relationship variables emerged across follow-up univariate regression results. Specifically, results suggested that the interaction between relationship-to-work permeability and frequency of partner violation behaviors significantly predicted work stress.

When probed using one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean on relationship-to-work permeability, this interaction suggested that (a) among those with *higher* relationship-to-work permeability, work stress increased as the frequency of partner violation behaviors increased [*B* for frequency of partner violation behaviors = 0.38; *SE B* = 0.14; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = 2.70, $p < 0.01$] and (b) among those with *lower* relationship-to-work permeability, work stress *decreased* as the frequency of partner violation behaviors increased [*B* for frequency of partner violation behaviors = -0.32; *SE B* = 0.14; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = -2.29, $p < 0.05$].

Although they must be interpreted with appropriate caution given the number of analyses in the current investigation, three univariate *trends* did emerge regarding the interactions between relationship-to-work permeability and the set of intimate relationship variables. First, results revealed a trend suggesting that the interaction between relationship-to-work permeability and frequency of partner closeness behaviors predicted work stress. When probed using one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean on relationship-to-work permeability, this interaction suggested that (a) among those with *higher* relationship-to-work permeability, there was a trend suggesting that work stress decreased as the frequency of partner closeness behaviors increased [*B* for frequency of partner closeness behaviors = -0.03; *SE B* = 0.02; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = -1.68, $p = 0.09$] but (b) among those with *lower* relationship-to-work permeability, there was *no* relationship between work stress and the frequency of partner closeness behaviors [*B* for frequency of partner closeness behaviors = 0.02; *SE B* = 0.02; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = 0.84, $p = 0.40$].

Second, results revealed a trend suggesting that the interaction between relationship-to-work permeability and frequency of partner closeness behaviors predicted limitations to

productivity. When probed using one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean on relationship-to-work permeability, this interaction suggested that (a) among those with *higher* relationship-to-work permeability, there was a trend suggesting that limitations to productivity decreased as the frequency of partner closeness behaviors increased [*B* for frequency of partner closeness behaviors = -0.02; *SE B* = 0.01; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = -1.68, *p* = 0.09] but (b) among those with *lower* relationship-to-work permeability, there was *no* relationship between limitations to productivity and the frequency of partner closeness behaviors [*B* for frequency of partner closeness behaviors = 0.01; *SE B* = 0.01; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = 0.74, *p* = 0.46].

Finally, results revealed a trend suggesting that the interaction between relationship-to-work permeability and frequency of partner affection behaviors predicted work stress. When probed using one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean on relationship-to-work permeability, this interaction suggested that (a) among those with *higher* relationship-to-work permeability, there was *no* relationship between work stress and the frequency of partner affection behaviors [*B* for frequency of partner affection behaviors = 0.02; *SE B* = 0.02; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = 0.85, *p* = 0.40] but (b) among those with *lower* relationship-to-work permeability, work stress decreased as the frequency of partner affection behaviors increased [*B* for frequency of partner affection behaviors = -0.04; *SE B* = 0.02; *t* (null of *B* = 0) = -2.26, $p < 0.05$].

To review, only one significant finding regarding the interactions between relationship-to-work permeability and the set of intimate relationship variables emerged across follow-up univariate regression results. Specifically, relationship-to-work permeability was found to moderate the relationship between frequency of partner violation

behaviors and work stress. Higher relationship-to-work permeability was associated with a stronger positive association between frequency of partner violation behaviors and work stress. Alternatively, lower relationship-to-work permeability was associated with a stronger *negative* association between frequency of partner violation behaviors and work stress. Three trends were also indicated in follow-up univariate results, each involving a positive factor of intimate partner behavior. These trends suggested that higher relationship-to-work permeability was associated with (a) a stronger negative association between frequency of partner closeness behaviors and work stress, (b) a stronger negative association between frequency of partner closeness behaviors and limitations to productivity, but (c) no association between frequency of partner affection behaviors and work stress. On the other hand, the trends suggested that *lower* relationship-to-work permeability was associated with (a) no association between frequency of partner closeness behaviors and work stress, (b) no association between frequency of partner closeness behaviors and limitations to productivity, but (c) a stronger negative association between frequency of partner affection behaviors and work stress. Therefore, in addition to being supported at the multivariate level, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported at the univariate level.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Using a large community sample of workers from diverse occupations and organizational positions, the current investigation has provided an examination of the influences of intimate relationships on work, controlling for several common confounds. Moreover, special inquiry has been given to how these influences may be moderated by the permeability of individuals' work role boundaries and the importance the individual places on his or her role as an intimate relationship partner. Role boundary permeability and role identification have largely escaped work-family research to-date; yet, as discussed by Ashforth et al. (2000), Olson-Buchanan and Boswell (2006), and Frone (2003), these constructs may be principal moderators of work-family associations. A discussion of patterns emerging across the findings of the current investigation is followed by a general discussion of relationship-to-work permeability and, finally, concluding remarks about the current investigation.

Patterns of Influence from Intimate Relationships to Work

The results of the current investigation largely indicated that individuals do indeed structure their work roles to be more or less open to influences from their intimate relationships and that this may be the key factor in determining the nature and strength of influences of intimate relationships on work. That is, at the multivariate level, intimate relationship experiences in-and-of-themselves did not predict work outcomes in the current

investigation. Instead, the existence, strength, and nature of intimate relationship-to-work influences varied across individuals according to the permeability of their work-role boundaries. This finding was associated with a small effect size [$\Delta \boldsymbol{R}^2 = 0.02$; see Cohen (1992) for a discussion of effect size classification]. According to Cohen's conceptualization of small effect sizes, this suggests that while we may not be able to observe with naked eyes the differences in intimate relationship-to-work influences between groups of individuals with high and low relationship-to-work permeability, these group differences are not trivial.

The patterns that emerged across follow-up univariate results helped clarify this multivariate finding. Generally, higher relationship-to-work permeability was significantly associated with negative relationship-to-work spillover and marginally associated with positive relationship-to-work spillover. Specifically, among those with higher relationship-to-work permeability, as the frequency of intimate partner violation behaviors increased (e.g., flirting with members of the opposite sex, being dishonest with the intimate partner, invading the intimate partner's privacy; Doss & Christensen, 2006), work stress also increased. This finding was indicative of negative intimate relationship-to-work spillover. Additionally, although they must be interpreted with due caution, two trends suggested that, among those with higher relationship-to-work permeability, as the frequency of intimate partner closeness behaviors increased (i.e., emotional and practical support, problem solving, and interpersonal connectedness; Doss & Christensen, 2006), work stress and limitations to productivity at work each decreased. These findings were characteristic of positive relationship-to-work spillover. Therefore, the general expectation that relationship-to-work spillover is stronger among those individuals that are more frequently psychologically and behaviorally engaging with their role as an intimate relationship partner while at work was largely supported.

Alternatively, lower relationship-to-work permeability was significantly associated with relationship-to-work compensation and marginally associated with intimate relationship-work segmentation. Specifically, among those with *lower* relationship-to-work permeability, as the frequency of intimate partner violation behaviors increased, work stress *decreased*. This was indicative of relationship-to-work compensation, as less favorable intimate relationship experiences were predicting more favorable work outcomes. Initial expectations were that low intimate partner role identification would additionally be necessary to identify relationship-to-work compensation associations. Therefore, this finding could alternatively suggest that a high frequency of negative intimate relationship experiences and an adequately segmented work role alone may lead individuals to seek compensatory favorable experiences at work, regardless of whether or not they value their role as an intimate relationship partner. It is worth mentioning that in no cases did relationship-to-work compensation patterns emerge in the presence of a *low* frequency of *positive* relationship behaviors. Therefore, low frequencies of positive relationship behaviors and high frequencies of negative relationship behaviors may function differently in the intimate relationship-work interface. This might be an important consideration for future research.

Additionally, although they must be interpreted with due caution, two trends suggested that, among those with lower relationship-to-work permeability, the associations between (a) frequency of intimate partner closeness behaviors and (b) work stress and limitations to productivity did not hold. These findings were indicative of intimate relationship-work segmentation. Therefore, the general expectation that intimate relationship-work associations are not significant among those individuals that *less* often

psychologically or behaviorally engage with their role as an intimate relationship partner while at work was largely supported, at least as related to positive intimate relationship functioning. More generally, that all of these intimate relationship-to-work patterns and specific findings emerged above and beyond the predictive effects of major personality and several important demographic factors, such as hours worked per week and having children at home, was notable. The current findings both help identify the conditions under which individuals may differentially experience intimate relationship-to-work spillover, compensation, or segmentation, and demonstrate the uniqueness of intimate relationship-to-work influences.

An unexpected trend did emerge in the current results suggesting that among those with *lower* relationship-to-work permeability, as the frequency of intimate partner affection behaviors increased (i.e., verbal, physical, and sexual affection; Doss & Christensen, 2006), work stress decreased. This is indicative of positive relationship-to-work spillover. Alternatively, among those with *higher* relationship-to-work permeability, this association did not hold, indicating relationship-to-work segmentation. Generally, this finding is contrary to all other findings and the expectation that higher relationship-to-work permeability is associated with relationship-to-work spillover. On the one hand, the finding only reaches marginal significance and may be spurious. Alternatively, the trend could reflect a real psychological phenomenon suggesting that intimate partner affection behaviors influence work via an altogether different psychological process that necessitates lower levels of relationship-to-work permeability. However, conjectures about such a phenomenon are outside the bounds of current theory and, moreover, may be premature in the absence of

additional support for this unexpected finding. Future research should be mindful about replications or disconfirmations of this finding.

That only negative intimate partner relationship behaviors, and not positive intimate partner relationship behaviors, predicted individual work outcomes at a statistically significant level is consistent with much of the couple literature suggesting that the corrosive impact of negative intimate relationship behaviors is usually stronger than the constructive influence of positive intimate relationship behaviors (e.g., Weiss & Heyman, 1997). This is not to say that the constructive influences of positive relationship behaviors are not important, but rather to suggest that the effects of negative behaviors may be relatively stronger. However, these findings do counter the earlier suggestion, based on the findings of Grzywacz and Marks (2000), that the benefits afforded by family roles may be more readily transferred to work while negative spillover processes may be more naturally limited. Regardless, the relative impacts of positive and negative intimate relationship behaviors on work outcomes should be an important consideration as intimate relationship-work research moves forward. Additionally, provided this line of research eventually builds enough evidence for practitioners to begin deliberating how best to educate and intervene with individuals and couples through organizations of work, this will be an important pattern to clarify. Should current findings be replicated, added emphasis might be placed on lessening negative intimate relationship behaviors in relation to promoting positive relationship behaviors.

Furthermore, while there were at least some interpretable conditions under which *intimate partner relationship behaviors* influenced individual work outcomes in the current investigation, there was no evidence that *global relationship satisfaction* predicted any

particular work outcome under any condition. Similarly, as seen in Appendix L, intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction did not predict *global job satisfaction* under any condition with any level of statistical interest. Thus, while previous research has indicated that global satisfaction constructs may be important factors in the intimate relationship-work interface (e.g., Forthofer et al., 1996; Heller & Watson, 2005; Rogers, 1999; Rogers & May, 2003), current results suggested that these factors may not be important above and beyond the effects of more specific psychological and behavioral factors. Fortunately, from an intervention standpoint, specific behaviors are much more directly targetable than are global satisfaction factors.

Whereas results suggested that relationship-to-work permeability may be a key factor in determining the strength of intimate relationship-to-work influences, a similar role was *not* supported for intimate partner role identification, at least in combination with relationship-to-work permeability. When tested, the combination of intimate partner role identification and relationship-to-work permeability did not enhance, above and beyond relationship-to-work permeability alone, identification of intimate relationship-to-work spillover, segmentation, or compensation. This was contrary to initial expectation. Given that a statistical trend was found favoring the combined roles of intimate partner role identification and relationship-to-work permeability in moderating intimate relationship-to-work influences, results should be replicated before a substantive conclusion is drawn. Nevertheless, intimate partner role identification simply may not be as important in the relationship-to-work spillover process as was originally proposed. It may be that as work and home life are continuingly interspersed together by the demands and technologies of today's working world, individuals are relying less on the unique features of their work and home roles and more on the shared features. As

implied by Ashforth et al. (2000), relying on fewer unique role features may allow these individuals to more efficiently switch between work and home roles. With less reliance on unique role features, there is also less to *uniquely identify* with between work and home roles (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2000). Consequentially, because there is less unique role identification, intimate partner role identification in-and-of-itself may be less salient in influencing the intimate relationship-to-work spillover process.

Also of considerable interest was that gender was not supported as a key variable in determining the strength of intimate relationship-to-work influences, either alone or in combination with relationship-to-work permeability and/or intimate partner role identification. As discussed above, much of the prior research investigating work-family associations has focused on gender as a key moderator, yet with inconsistent results sometimes suggesting stronger work-family associations for females (e.g., Appelberg et al., 1995; Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Grandey et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2004; Phillips-Miller, Campbell, & Morrison, 2000; Williams & Alliger, 1994), sometimes suggesting stronger work-family associations for males (e.g., Bolger et al., 1989; Forthofer et al., 1996; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Melamed, 1996), and sometimes suggesting no gender differences (e.g., Eagle, Miles, & Icenogle, 1997; Frone, 2003; Hammer et al., 2003; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Rogers & May, 2003). Given these inconsistencies, along with current findings that gender did not, and relationship-to-work permeability did, help determine the strength of intimate relationship-to-work influences, future work-family research might place less emphasis on gender as a key moderator of work-family associations. In fact, considering that a small but significant gender difference was found in relationship-to-work permeability in the current investigation, it may be the case that gender has been serving as a weak, but statistically

important, proxy for work role permeability in previous work-family research. Depending on sampling methods, gender differences in work role permeability may have varied across samples examined in prior research. Future research should continue to investigate gender differences in work role permeability.

Finally, the current results suggested that intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction together were significant predictors of *self-reported relationship-to-work spillover*. This finding was associated with a medium-to-large effect size ($\Delta \boldsymbol{R}^2 = 0.26$). According to Cohen's conceptualization of such effect sizes, this suggests that we should be able to visibly observe the impact an individual's intimate relationship functioning on his or her self-report of the relationship-to-work spillover process. Anecdotally, we generally experience this phenomenon as true. Individuals are often quick to *report* that current intimate relationship difficulties are impeding their performance at work, regardless of whether this impedance is observable in work performance behaviors. Likewise, individuals are often quick to *report* that the benefits afforded them in their current intimate relationships facilitate their performance at work, regardless of whether these effects are actually noticeable at work. Whether or not self-reported relationship-to-work spillover is a valid measure of the actual degree of relationship-to-work spillover is questionable, and generally relationship domain-to-work domain effects may be more desirable to investigate than relationship domain-to-self-reported spillover effects. Regardless, the primary purpose of investigating this association in the current investigation was to help establish that the cross-sectional effects under investigation were, at least in part, relationship-to-work directional effects. This aim was achieved.

General Discussion of Relationship-to-Work Permeability

The findings of the current investigation provide clear evidence that relationship-to-work permeability may be the key moderator of intimate relationship-to-work associations. In addition, the results of the current investigation provided some insight into *how* individuals may create higher or lower levels of relationship-to-work permeability. Findings from an exploratory factor analysis of the Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale (RtWPS) suggested four factors of relationship-to-work permeability: Think/Feel, Communication, Representation, and Physical Presence. In other words, individuals may think about or experience emotion related to their intimate partner or their intimate relationship while at work (Think/Feel); choose to accept or initiate communications with their intimate partner while at work (Communication); keep photographs or other mementos of their intimate partner or their intimate relationship at work (Representation); and/or actually bring their intimate partner into the workplace or to work-related functions (Physical Presence). Whereas some individuals may experience relationship-to-work influences via all of these permeability factors, it could be the case that others experience permeability in only some of these ways. In addition, whether one of these permeability factors is of greater importance in the strength of influences from intimate relationships to work is not clear. For example, those individuals who rate high on the Physical Presence factor (e.g., if both intimate partners actually work in the same organization) may experience stronger relationship-to-work influences than those who rate equally high on the Representations factor. Additional research will be needed to investigate these possibilities.

While the current investigation provided some indication about *how* relationship-to-work permeability is experienced, the reasons *why* some individuals, more so than others,

psychologically and behaviorally engage with their intimate relationships while at work remain largely unclear. Individual factors may contribute to this, such as learned behaviors from parental, professional, or other social models. However, the current investigation also found significant gender and occupational differences in relationship-to-work permeability. Gender differences suggested that males may have a higher degree of relationship-to-work permeability than females, which is contrary to Pleck's (1977) original hypothesis that females may be more susceptible to family-to-work influences given that females traditionally assume more responsibilities at home. On the other hand, the current sample may be over-representative of males with higher relationship-to-work permeability. Participating in an intimate relationship-work research study offered through an individual's own organization of work may itself be characteristic of individuals with higher relationship-to-work permeability. Given that the current sample consisted of many fewer males than females, it could be the case only males with higher relationship-to-work permeability elected to participate in the current study. This might not have been the case with females if they are generally more open to psychologically engaging with their intimate relationship while at work. In other words, a larger and more representative sample of females may have been recruited. Therefore, while there is some indication in the current investigation of a gender difference in relationship-to-work permeability, the reality remains unclear.

Additionally, significant occupational differences in relationship-to-work permeability were found in the current investigation. The education, training, and library professions, collectively, and the legal profession were characterized by higher than average relationship-to-work permeability. The architecture and engineering professions, collectively, were characterized by lower than average relationship-to-work permeability. As

a word of caution, however, the architecture and engineering professions were represented by a small number of participants in the current study ($N = 6$). Regardless, these findings suggest that occupational differences may play a role in determining workers' degree of relationship-to-work permeability. At face value, the legal profession and education, training, and library professions are characterized by a higher frequency of novel interpersonal interactions and a higher need for interpersonal skill than architecture and engineering professions, which require a higher level of skill with physical objects and space. Therefore, it could be that relationship-to-work permeability is positively associated with the degree of novel interpersonal interaction and interpersonal skill required in a given occupation. In other words, individuals that are more consistently engaged in novel interpersonal interactions that require high interpersonal skills at work may naturally be more open to the influences of their intimate relationships at work. Again, this will be important for future research to explore more fully.

Another relatively unknown aspect of relationship-to-work permeability is whether it may serve both adaptive and maladaptive functions. In some cases, low relationship-to-work permeability may be adaptive. For instance, during times of particularly high relationship distress, compartmentalizing intimate relationship functioning and work functioning may be an adaptive way to prevent consequential negative outcomes at work. Additionally, this may allow for undivided focus when engaged with relationship problems. On the other hand, those who are not able or chose not to segment the work domain from a distressed intimate relationship may be setting the stage for additional adversity. In other cases, high relationship-to-work permeability may more adaptive. This might be particularly true in times of increased work demands and work stress. Resources available in the intimate

relationship, such as emotional and practical support, problem solving with a trusted partner, and having a sense of connectedness, may serve both direct and indirect purposes. Directly, these resources may provide means to more adaptively and capably manage work demands and resolve work stress. Indirectly, positive intimate relationship functioning may provide one with increased self-esteem and confidence, which may promote higher functioning while at work. Those who are not able or chose not to access the resources of their intimate relationship during times of increased work demands and stress may not be able to function to their highest potential while at work. Consequentially, this discussion raises questions about the flexibility of relationship-to-work permeability. In other words, we do not currently know if some individuals are able to regulate the permeability of their work roles to adapt to different situations, while work role permeability is relatively fixed for others. These are all questions that will be important as research on relationship-to-work permeability moves forward.

While many questions remain about the nature of relationship-to-work permeability, the current investigation has provided strong support for a new measure of relationship-to-work permeability, the Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale (RtWPS). The RtWPS is a brief scale that takes only a few minutes to complete, and results from the current investigation suggested that the scale has high internal consistency and may measure relationship-to-work permeability across a number of different relationship-to-work permeability factors. In the current investigation, RtWPS scores were able to discriminate between conditions of relationship-to-work spillover and relationship-to-work segmentation, and also assisted in identifying a relationship-to-work compensation association. Additionally, mean RtWPS scores were predicted by occupational group membership in a

theoretically meaningful way. Future research should continue refining the RtWPS, especially with regards to Think/Feel, Communication, Representation, and Physical Presence factors. For instance, we do not currently know whether these factors are statistically valid, reliable, and can be used in theoretically meaningful ways in their own right. Some item revision and/or item addition may be needed to strengthen and clarify these factors. Regardless, the RtWPS has the potential to be a useful tool in intimate relationship-to-work research.

Concluding Remarks about the Current Investigation

The findings of the current investigation must be understood within the context of several study limitations. First, the current sample is cross-sectional and, although some validation of the relationship-to-work directional nature of effects was provided, temporal precedence was not provided for intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction effects preceding work outcomes. Because the work-family literature has established that the associations between work and family variables are bi-directional (e.g., Frone, 2003; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996), the true directional nature of the current results are left in some question. This is a fundamental issue that may be addressed in future research by using longitudinal data and other means of statistical analysis that allow for analyzing the directional nature of effects.

Second, although the current investigation did benefit from well established measures of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction and work outcomes, data for the current study were attained entirely through the use of self-report survey questionnaires. Consequently, common method biases resulting from having a common rater and a common

item context across predictor and outcome variables may pose a threat to the validity of the current results [see Podsakoff, McKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff (2003) for a discussion of common method biases in behavioral research]. However, using alternative methods of data collection in the current investigation, such as observational assessment of relationship functioning or supervisor reports of work performance, would have created much greater time commitments and likely generated other prohibitive concerns among individual participants and community organizations allowing recruitment from their memberships. These concerns, in turn, would have threatened sample size, and therefore statistical power and the generalizability of findings. Given the current scarcity of literature on intimate relationship-to-work associations, achieving a sample size robust enough to meaningfully investigate intimate relationship-to-work associations was considered a priority. Regardless, future research should consider ways to balance participant and organizational commitment to intimate relationship-work research with more methodologically desirable assessments of relationship functioning and work outcomes.

Third, although the current sample drew from diverse occupations and organizational positions and included both married and long-term cohabitating individuals, the current sample was demographically skewed in several ways. Participants in the current investigation were largely white, well educated, and had middle to high level incomes. In addition, three quarters of the sample were females, and all participants included in current analyses indicated being in heterosexual relationships. Furthermore, complete demographic information about the population from which the current sample was drawn was not available, and, thus, the representativeness of the sample was indeterminable. These concerns may limit the generalizability of findings. Future research should consider

additional recruitment mechanisms, such as supplemental recruitment materials targeted at under-represented populations, to help ensure adequate diversity within recruited samples. The recruitment of homosexual individuals may be of particular importance given that they may have considerably different experiences of the intimate relationship-work interface than heterosexual individuals due to current cultural conditions regarding the acceptance of homosexual relationships in the workplace.

Of similar consequence, selection biases cannot be ruled out from the current study. As mentioned above, participation in an intimate relationship-work research study through one's own organization of work may be considered a relationship-to-work permeability behavior in-and-of-itself. Thus, the current sample may be skewed towards higher relationship-to-work permeability than the true population mean. Additionally, an argument may be made that community research on intimate relationships naturally draws samples skewed towards either more or less favorable intimate relationship functioning. On the one hand, those with more favorable intimate relationship functioning may be more willing to share their experiences than those with unfavorable intimate relationship functioning. On the other hand, it may be the case that individuals with more *un*favorable intimate relationship functioning view intimate relationship-work research as a channel, which would not otherwise exist in their organizations, to voice personal problems that may be affecting their work. Considering that the current sample was characterized by a similar rate of intimate relationship distress as found in other community samples, neither intimate relationship functioning selection bias was considered to be problematic in the current investigation.

Finally, although the current study benefited from a large sample size and numerous statistical controls, the number of predictors in current models may have considerably limited

the statistical power available for hypothesis tests. Several of the statistical trends reported in the current investigation may have reached statistical significance given a higher level of power. The clearest way to address this problem in future research is with a larger sample size. Alternatively, the results of the current investigation may assist future investigators by identifying which variables are of particular relevance in the intimate relationship-work interface, both as controls and predictors. Many of the controls, such as years spent in current organizational position, and even some of the predictors, such as global relationship satisfaction, did not significantly contribute to current models of the intimate relationship-work interface above and beyond other more meaningful controls and predictors. Therefore, the models used in the current investigation may be refined accordingly to allow for greater statistical power in future research.

Regardless of these limitations, the findings of the current study help put intimate relationship functioning within a broader societal context. Based on evidence from the current investigation, the influences of intimate relationship functioning seem to go beyond the individual partners and the couple itself, given appropriate levels of role boundary permeability. These effects may be measureable at work, which in certain contexts may have real implications for not only the individual's own work, but also for broader organizational effectiveness and success. For example, if a leader of an organization is experiencing high amounts of negative spillover from his or her intimate relationship to his or her work functioning, organizational management and decision making may eventually suffer. Likewise, the most effective and stable organizational leadership styles may naturally limit negative intimate relationship-to-work spillover and make use of positive intimate relationship-to-work spillover. Therefore, these findings not only suggest that intimate

relationship researchers and practitioners may need to broaden their perspective on the impacts of intimate relationship functioning, but also that organizational behaviorists may need to broaden their understanding of the factors that contribute to optimal work outcomes. In addition, considering that a large portion of the current population is expected to experience relationship distress during their lifetime (e.g., Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001; McDonald, 1995; United States Census Bureau, 2002) the current findings may have implications for future public and economic health research and practice.

Finally, provided that the current line of research continues to clarify the associations between intimate relationship and work functioning, couple practitioners and organizational behaviorists may be able to begin developing interventions that target workers and couples that are at risk for high negative spillover from intimate relationships to work. Similarly, education programs about the benefits of positive relationship-to-work spillover and the adaptive nature of intimate relationship-work segmentation during times of relationship distress may prove worthy ventures given added evidence of such intimate relationship-work associations. In general, such programs may be especially relevant as the demand to simultaneously manage work and intimate relationships continues to rise and as the rate of dual income couples continues to rise. However, at the current time, there is much more to be learned about the influences of intimate relationship functioning and satisfaction on work outcomes and the nature of relationship-to-work permeability. While the current investigation presents early information for prevention and intervention programs, much needs to be clarified before interventions can be reliably developed and effectively disseminated.

Appendix A:
Biographical Data Form (BDF)

1) Please indicate your gender: ___ Male ___ Female

2) Current Age (in years): ___

3) What is the highest level of education you have completed?

___ Less than a high school diploma
___ High school diploma or equivalent
___ Some college work, no degree
___ Associate degree
___ Bachelor's degree
___ Master's degree
___ Professional degree
___ Doctorate degree

4) Please indicate your identified racial background (you may check more than one, if applicable):

__ White
__ Black
__ Latin
__ Asian
__ Native American
__ Pacific Islander
Other: _____

5) Please indicate your identified ethnic background (you may check more than one, if applicable):

__ Northern European Descent
__ Western European Descent
__ Eastern European Descent
__ Southern European Descent
__ North African Descent
__ Middle Eastern Descent
__ Central Asian Descent
__ South African Descent
__ African Descent
__ African-Caribbean Descent
__ Latin-Caribbean Descent
__ Mexican Descent
__ Central American Descent
__ South American Descent
__ East Asian Descent
__ Southeast Asian Descent
__ South Asian Descent
__ American Indian Descent
__ Alaskan Native Descent
__ Native Hawaiian Descent
Other: _____

6) In which industry sector are you currently employed?

__ Public/Government __ Private/for-profit __ Private/not-for-profit

7) Which of the following occupations *best* categorizes your current work? (Choose one)

__ Management
__ Business and Financial Operations
__ Computer and Mathematical
__ Architecture and Engineering
__ Life, Physical, and Social Sciences
__ Community and Social Services
__ Legal
__ Education, Training, and Library
__ Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media
__ Healthcare Practitioners and Technical
__ Healthcare Support
__ Protective Service
__ Food Preparation and Serving
__ Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance
__ Personal Care and Service
__ Sales
__ Office and Administrative Support
__ Farming, Fishing, and Forestry

__ Construction and Extraction
__ Installation, Maintenance, and Repair
__ Production
__ Transportation and Material Moving
__ Military Specific

8) Which of the following *most closely* categorizes your current organizational position/title?
__ Executive, Managing Partner, Department Head, or Director of Professional Services
__ Upper Management, Senior Partner, Senior Faculty, or Senior Provider of Professional Services
__ Middle Management, Junior Partner, Junior Faculty, or Junior Provider of Professional Services
__ Productions Associate, Services Associate, Sales Associate, or Paraprofessional
__ Administrative & Support Staff

9) How many years have you been with your current employer? ___

10) How many years have you been at your current position? ___

11) On average, how many hours do you work per week? ___

12) What is your approximate <u>individual</u> yearly income?

__ Under $5,000	__ $25,000 - $34,999	__ $100,000 - $149,999
__ $5,000 - $9,999	__ $35,000 - $49,999	__ $150,000 - $199,999
__ $10,000 - $14,999	__ $50,000 - $74,999	__ $200,000 - $249,999
__ $15,000 - $24,999	__ $75,000 - $99,999	__ $250,000 and over

13) Does your intimate relationship partner contribute employment-generated income to your household?
__ Yes __ No

13a) If yes, what is your <u>partner's</u> approximate yearly income?

__ Under $5,000	__ $25,000 - $34,999	__ $100,000 - $149,999
__ $5,000 - $9,999	__ $35,000 - $49,999	__ $150,000 - $199,999
__ $10,000 - $14,999	__ $50,000 - $74,999	__ $200,000 - $249,999
__ $15,000 - $24,999	__ $75,000 - $99,999	__ $250,000 and over

14) Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?
__ Married, living together
__ Married, separated
__ Unmarried, living together

15) Please indicate the orientation of your current relationship:
__ Heterosexual __ Gay __ Lesbian

16) How many years have you and your current partner been married or living together? ___

17) How many times previously (prior to your current relationship) have you been married or in a relationship where you and a partner lived together longer than 12 months? ___

18) How many children do you have currently living in your household at least half time?
___

19) How many children do you have currently NOT living in your household? ___

Appendix B:
Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale (RtWPS)

In the next few questions, the term "partner" refers to your intimate relationship partner. Please rate the following 16 statements using the 6-point scale provided below:

Never (0)	Rarely (1)	Occasionally (2)	More often than not (3)	Most of the time (4)	All of the time (5)

1. I initiate communication with my partner while at work (such as make phone calls to partner, send email to partner, send text/instant messages to partner).
2. During the workday, I handle issues or responsibilities related to my partner or our relationship.
3. I find myself thinking about my partner or our relationship while I am at work.
4. I display photos of my partner at work.
5. I talk about my partner or our relationship with the people I work with.
6. During the workday, I respond to concerns and good news related to my partner or our relationship.
7. I find myself thinking about problems with my partner or our relationship while I am at work.
8. My partner visits me while I am at work.
9. I bring my partner to work sponsored social events.
10. I experience emotions about my partner or our relationship while at work.
11. I plan out activities and/or responsibilities for my partner or our relationship while at work.
12. I find myself thinking about good times with my partner or our relationship while I am at work.
13. I keep personal gifts or mementos at work to remind me of my partner.
14. During working hours, my partner interacts with the people I work with.
15. I accept communications from my partner while at work (such as accept phone calls from partner, read emails from partner, receive text/instant messages from partner).
16. I find myself thinking about decisions related to my partner or our relationship while I am at work.

Appendix C:
Research Invitation to Organizational Members

Subject Line: UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study
Dear [Colleagues or other preferred reference],

I am excited to inform you that [Name of organization] has agreed to assist with an ongoing research effort at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. As you know, [Name of organization] believes strongly in quality of life issues and is committed to fostering highly functioning and highly satisfied [employees and/or members]. By joining with a number of other business, professional, and government organizations in the Southeastern United States to participate in this research effort, we are delighted to be on the cutting edge of social and organizational science. Down the road, the knowledge gained from this research effort will be important as organizations, like [Name of organization], seek to promote both personal well-being and professional successes.

Participation is open to most levels and positions within [Name of organization]. To participate, the project requires that you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [Name of organization] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together). Although we would like to encourage your individual participation in this research effort, your involvement is completely voluntary. Please know that all information collected through this research effort will be held strictly confidential. In fact, [Name of organization] will neither know of your participation nor have access, in any way, to your individual information either now or in the future. All data collection is being conducted exclusively through secured channels at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In addition, the researchers at UNC-Chapel Hill in no way will identify you in any publication that results from this research effort.

Participation in the project will involve your filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires will take approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. [Please feel free to take time during your workday to complete the questionnaires. OR If you choose to participate, we would like to ask that you complete these questionnaires outside of your normal working hours at (Name of organization). OR Please fill out these questionnaires in accordance with the work-time policies of your specific workplace.]

To find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate, please click on the following web link:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks for your time and your investment in this important project!

[Preferred closing],
[Name]
[Title]
[Name of organization]

Appendix D:
Texts of Reminders to be Sent to Organizational Members

First Weekly Reminder

Subject Line: Reminder for UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study
Dear [Colleagues or other preferred reference],

Last week we sent out an invitation for each of you to participate in a research effort being conducted through the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. If you have already begun participation in this project, thanks! If not, we would again like to encourage you to do so.

Participation is open to most levels and positions within [Name of organization] and is completely voluntary. To meet the project's participation requirements, you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [Name of organization] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together). All information collected through this research effort will be held strictly confidential. Again, [Name of organization] will neither know of your participation nor have access, in any way, to your individual information either now or in the future; all data collection is being conducted exclusively through secured channels at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In addition, the researchers at UNC-Chapel Hill in no way will identify you in any publication that results from this research effort.

Participation involves your filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires will take approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. [Please feel free to take time during your workday to complete the questionnaires. OR If you choose to participate, we would like to ask that you complete these questionnaires outside of your normal working hours at (Name of organization). OR Please fill out these questionnaires in accordance with the work-time policies of your specific workplace.]

Please click on the following web link to find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks again for your time and your investment in this important project!

[Preferred closing],
[Name]
[Title]
[Name of organization]

Second Weekly Reminder

Subject Line: Reminder for UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study
Dear [Colleagues or other preferred reference],

We would again like to remind you about the research being conducted at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and with which [Name of organization] has agreed to assist. If you have already begun participation in this project, thanks! If you would like to participate and have not already done so, we would like to encourage you to consider participating at this time.

As a reminder, this research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. Participation in this project is completely voluntary and open to most levels and positions within [Name of organization]. To meet the project's participation requirements, you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [Name of organization] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together).

All information collected through this research effort will be held strictly confidential; [Name of organization] will neither know of your participation nor have access, in any way, to your individual information either now or in the future. In addition, the researchers at UNC-Chapel Hill in no way will identify you in any publications that results from this research effort.

Participation involves your filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires will take approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. [Please feel free to take time during your workday to complete the questionnaires. OR If you choose to participate, we would like to ask that you complete these questionnaires outside of your normal working hours at (Name of organization). OR Please fill out these questionnaires in accordance with the work-time policies of your specific workplace.]

Please click on the following web link to find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks again for your time and your investment in this important project!

[Preferred closing],
[Name]
[Title]
[Name of organization]

Third Weekly Reminder

Subject Line: Reminder for UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study
Dear [Colleagues or other preferred reference],

This is the final reminder about the research effort [Name of organization] has agreed to assist with at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Enrollment in the project will be closing within the next week. If you have already begun participation in this project, thanks! If you would like to participate and have not already done so, the next several days will be your last opportunity to sign up.

As a reminder, this research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other forms of committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. Participation is open to most levels and positions within [Name of organization]. To meet the project's participation requirements, you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [Name of organization] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together).

All information collected through this research effort is held strictly confidential and is not available to [Name of organization]'s access either now or in the future. Furthermore, the researchers at UNC-Chapel Hill in no way will identify you in any publications that result from this research effort.

Participation is completely voluntary and involves filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires takes approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. [Please feel free to take time during your workday to complete the questionnaires. OR If you choose to participate, we would like to ask that you complete these questionnaires outside of your normal working hours at (Name of organization). OR Please fill out these questionnaires in accordance with the work-time policies of your specific workplace.]

Please click on the following web link to find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks one last time for your consideration of this important project!

[Preferred closing],
[Name]
[Title]
[Name of organization]

Appendix E:
Research Invitation to University Faculty and Staff

Subject Line: UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study
Dear [University] Friends and Colleagues,

We are excited to inform you of a new web-based research effort through the UNC-Chapel Hill Department of Psychology. This research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. [University] is among a number of business, professional, and government organizations in the Southeastern United States to participate in this research effort. Down the road, the knowledge gained from this research effort will be important as organizations and institutions, like [University], seek to promote both personal well-being and professional successes for their employees.

The project is open to most levels and positions within [University]. In order to participate, you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [University] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together). Although we would like to encourage your individual participation in this research effort, your involvement is completely voluntary. Taking part in this research is not a part of your University duties, and refusing will not affect your job. You will not be offered or receive any special job-related consideration if you take part in this research.

Please know that all information collected through this research effort will be held strictly confidential. In fact, outside of the primary investigator, William Aldridge, and his faculty advisor, Donald Baucom, no one will know of your participation or have access, in any way, to your individual information either now or in the future. All data collection is being conducted exclusively through secured internet channels at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In addition, Mr. Aldridge and Dr. Baucom in no way will identify you in any publication that results from this research effort.

Participation in the project will involve your filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires will take approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. When choosing when and where to fill out these questionnaires, please observe the work-time policies of your specific workplace at [University].

To find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate, please click on the following web link:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks for your time and your investment in this important project!

William A. Aldridge II, M.A.
Graduate Student
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Donald H. Baucom, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Appendix F:
Texts of Reminders to be Sent to University Faculty and Staff

First Weekly Reminder

Subject Line: Reminder for UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study
Dear [University] Friends and Colleagues,

Last week we sent out an invitation for each of you to participate in a research effort being conducted at [University]. This research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. If you have already begun participation in this project, thanks! If not, we would again like to encourage you to do so.

Participation is open to most levels and positions at [University] and is completely voluntary. To meet the project's participation requirements, you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [University] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together). Taking part in this research is not a part of your University duties, and refusing will not affect your job. You will not be offered or receive any special job-related consideration if you take part in this research.

All information collected through this research effort will be held strictly confidential. Again, no one outside of the primary investigator, William Aldridge, or his faculty advisor, Donald Baucom, will know of your participation or have access, in any way, to your individual information either now or in the future. All data collection is being conducted exclusively through secured online channels at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In addition, Mr. Aldridge and Dr. Baucom in no way will identify you in any publication that results from this research effort.

Participation involves your filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires will take approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. When choosing when and where to fill out these questionnaires, please observe the work-time policies of your specific workplace at [University].

Please click on the following web link to find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks again for your time and your investment in this important project!

William A. Aldridge II, M.A.
Graduate Student
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Donald H. Baucom, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Second Weekly Reminder

Subject Line: Reminder for UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study
Dear [University] Friends and Colleagues,

We would again like to remind you about the Couples and Work Research Study being conducted through the UNC-Chapel Hill Department of Psychology. If you have already begun participation in this project, thanks! If you would like to participate and have not already done so, we would like to encourage you to consider participating at this time.

As a reminder, this research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. Participation in this project is completely voluntary and open to most levels and positions at [University]. To meet the project's participation requirements, you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [University] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together). Taking part in this research is not a part of your University duties, and refusing will not affect your job. You will not be offered or receive any special job-related consideration if you take part in this research.

All information collected through this research effort will be held strictly confidential; no one outside of the primary investigator, William Aldridge, or his faculty advisor, Donald Baucom, will know of your participation or have access, in any way, to your individual information either now or in the future. In addition, Mr. Aldridge and Dr. Baucom in no way will identify you in any publication that results from this research effort.

Participation involves your filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires will take approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. When choosing when and where to fill out these questionnaires, please observe the work-time policies of your specific workplace at [University].

Please click on the following web link to find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks again for your time and your investment in this important project!

William A. Aldridge II, M.A.
Graduate Student
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Donald H. Baucom, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Third Weekly Reminder

Subject Line: Reminder for UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Research Study

Dear [University] Friends and Colleagues,

This is the final reminder about the Couples and Work Research Study being conducted through the UNC-Chapel Hill Department of Psychology. Enrollment in the project will be closing within the next week. If you have already begun participation in this project, thanks! If you would like to participate and have not already done so, the next several days will be your last opportunity to sign up.

As a reminder, this research examines connections between how people experience their committed intimate relationships (such as marriage and other forms of committed partnerships) and their experiences at work. Participation is open to most levels and

positions at [University]. To meet the project's participation requirements, you must (1) be a permanent employee working 20 hours or more per week at [University] and (2) currently be involved in a committed intimate relationship (such as marriage or unmarried but living together).

All information collected through this research effort is held strictly confidential; no one outside of the primary investigator, William Aldridge, or his faculty advisor, Donald Baucom, will know of your participation or have access, in any way, to your individual information either now or in the future. Furthermore, Mr. Aldridge and Dr. Baucom in no way will identify you in any publications that result from this research effort.

Participation in this project is completely voluntary. Taking part in this research is not a part of your University duties, and refusing will not affect your job. You will not be offered or receive any special job-related consideration if you take part in this research. Your participation involves filling out a series of questionnaires at two different time points. Completion of these questionnaires takes approximately 20-30 minutes at each time point. When choosing when and where to fill out these questionnaires, please observe the work-time policies of your specific workplace at [University].

Please click on the following web link to find out more about this research effort and to sign up to participate:

[UNC-Chapel Hill Couples and Work Online Research Survey]

Thanks one last time for your consideration of this important project!

William A. Aldridge II, M.A.
Graduate Student
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Donald H. Baucom, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology
UNC-Chapel Hill

Appendix G:

Report of Missing Data Relevant to Hypotheses Tests

Variable	Valid *N*	*N* missing
Outcome Variables		
Global Job Satisfaction Scale mean score	407	0
Job Engagement Scale mean score	407	0
Work Limitations Questionnaire – Output Demands mean score	404	3
Work Stress Measure total score	407	0
Positive and Negative Spillover Scales		
Positive spillover subscale mean score	407	0
Negative spillover subscale mean score	407	0
Demographic Data (from the Biographical Data Form)		
Gender	403	4
Age	402	5
Education	406	1
Income	406	1
Dual income status	405	2
Years in current position	401	6
Average hours worked per week	407	0
Intimate relationship status	407	0
Years in relationship	404	3
Children at home	402	5
Children out of home	400	7

Report of Missing Data Relevant to Hypotheses Tests (continued)

Variable	Valid *N*	*N* missing
Personality Variables (from the Ten Item Personality Inventory)		
Extraversion subscale mean score	407	0
Agreeableness subscale mean score	407	0
Conscientiousness subscale mean score	407	0
Emotional stability subscale mean score	407	0
Openness subscale mean score	407	0
Intimate Relationship Variables		
Dyadic Adjustment Scale – 4 total score	407	0
Frequency and Acceptability of Partner Behavior Inventory		
Affection frequency subscale mean score	407	0
Closeness frequency subscale mean score	407	0
Demand frequency subscale mean score	405	2
Violation frequency subscale mean score	405	2
Proposed Moderator Variables		
Relationship-to-Work Permeability Scale mean score	407	0
Partner Role Identification Scale mean score	407	0

Appendix H:

Bi-Variate Correlations among Variables Relevant to Hypotheses Tests

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. Global job satisfaction	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
2. Job engagement	0.48**	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
3. Limitations to productivity	-0.12*	-0.03	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
4. Work stress	-0.39**	-0.10*	0.15**	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
5. Self-reported positive relationship-to-work spillover	0.15**	0.14**	0.02	0.02	1.00	.	.	.	.	.
6. Self-reported negative relationship-to-work spillover	-0.22**	-0.10*	0.17**	0.17**	-0.32**	1.00	.	.	.	.
7. Gender	0.04	0.38	0.07	-0.10*	-0.04	0.09†	1.00	.	.	.
8. Age	0.21**	0.27**	0.01	-0.13**	-0.07	-0.14**	0.17**	1.00	.	.
9. Education	0.03	0.32**	0.08	-0.05	0.18**	0.03	0.23**	0.03	1.00	.
10. Income	0.14**	0.40**	0.07	-0.07	0.08†	0.10*	0.35**	0.24**	0.55**	1.00

Note. 7. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Bi-Variate Correlations among Variables Relevant to Hypotheses Tests (continued)

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
11. Dual income status	0.08	0.08†	0.04	-0.08	-0.18**	0.12*	0.15**	0.05	-0.01	0.22**
12. Years in current position	0.14**	0.14**	-0.05	-0.06	-0.04	-0.10*	0.06	0.52**	-0.05	0.14**
13. Average hours worked per week	<0.01	0.40**	0.16**	0.11*	0.08	0.15**	0.21**	0.06	0.44**	0.62**
14. Intimate relationship status	-0.13**	-0.13*	-0.05	0.10*	<-0.01	0.10†	-0.09†	-0.22**	-0.10*	-0.15**
15. Years in relationship	0.18**	0.27**	-0.02	-0.09†	-0.04	-0.10*	0.09†	0.75**	0.03	0.22**
16. Children at home	0.08†	0.04	0.02	-0.06	-0.10*	0.08†	0.14**	-0.04	0.17**	0.19**
17. Children out of home	0.17**	0.17**	0.02	-0.11*	-0.05	-0.11*	0.10*	0.64**	-0.09†	0.10*
18. Extraversion	0.24**	0.18**	-0.02	-0.11*	0.22**	-0.17**	-0.12*	0.04	0.06	0.08†
19. Agreeableness	0.17**	0.10†	-0.12*	-0.15**	0.02	-0.25**	-0.11*	0.19**	-0.07	-0.08†
20. Conscientiousness	0.19**	0.28**	-0.19**	-0.11*	0.05	-0.26**	-0.12*	0.13**	-0.05	0.04

Note. 7. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male). 11. Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). 14. Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). 16. Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). 17. Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Bi-Variate Correlations among Variables Relevant to Hypotheses Tests (continued)

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
21. Emotional stability	0.31**	0.07	-0.10*	-0.22**	0.03	-0.25**	0.15**	0.19**	-0.04	0.08
22. Openness	0.03	0.08	<-0.01	<-0.01	0.05	-0.05	-0.09†	-0.03	0.07	-0.04
23. Global relationship satisfaction	0.19**	0.05	-0.09†	-0.08	0.54**	-0.56**	-0.06	-0.08	0.13**	0.01
24. Relationship affection	0.03	-0.08	-0.04	-0.07	0.17**	-0.16**	-0.08	-0.16**	0.03	-0.15**
25. Relationship closeness	0.11*	0.08	-0.01	-0.10*	0.18**	-0.04	0.18**	-0.07	0.25**	0.17**
26. Relationship demand	-0.07	0.05	0.05	0.03	-0.21**	0.42**	0.06	0.01	<0.01	0.05
27. Relationship violation	<-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0.02	-0.14**	0.06	-0.04	0.02	-0.18**	-0.08†
28. Relationship-to-work permeability	0.03	-0.11*	<0.01	0.02	0.27**	0.08	0.10*	-0.14**	0.13**	0.19**
29. Intimate partner role identification	0.19**	0.08	-0.02	-0.05	0.60**	-0.47**	0.04	-0.03	0.11*	0.04

Note. 7. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Bi-Variate Correlations among Variables Relevant to Hypotheses Tests (continued)

Variable	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
11. Dual income status	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
12. Years in current position	<-0.01	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
13. Average hours worked per week	0.16**	0.05	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
14. Intimate relationship status	-0.02	-0.09†	0.01	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
15. Years in relationship	0.02	0.39**	0.03	-0.35**	1.00	.	.	.	.	.
16. Children at home	0.09†	-0.06	-0.02	-0.18**	0.04	1.00	.	.	.	.
17. Children out of home	0.08	0.29**	0.01	-0.09†	0.51**	-0.17**	1.00	.	.	.
18. Extraversion	-0.09†	0.08	0.01	-0.08	0.02	0.03	0.03	1.00	.	.
19. Agreeableness	-0.02	0.15**	-0.05	-0.12*	0.24**	<-0.01	0.09†	0.07	1.00	.
20. Conscientiousness	-0.05	0.10*	-0.01	-0.10*	0.12*	-0.05	0.10*	0.05	0.12*	1.00

Note. 11. Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). 14. Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). 16. Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). 17. Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Bi-Variate Correlations among Variables Relevant to Hypotheses Tests (continued)

Variable	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
21. Emotional stability	-0.02	0.10†	-0.03	-0.06	0.16**	0.06	0.18**	0.05	0.4**	0.17**
22. Openness	-0.02	-0.04	0.07	0.09†	-0.09†	-0.03	-0.04	0.19**	0.15**	-0.03
23. Global relationship satisfaction	-0.15**	-0.06	0.04	<0.01	-0.11*	-0.17**	0.03	0.18**	0.16**	0.11*
24. Relationship affection	-0.07	-0.07	-0.04	0.19**	-0.19**	-0.22**	-0.07	0.11*	0.05	0.09†
25. Relationship closeness	0.19**	-0.04	0.10*	-0.02	-0.12*	0.31**	-0.11*	0.05	<0.01	<0.01
26. Relationship demand	0.12*	0.03	0.03	-0.07	0.08†	0.14**	-0.02	-0.03	-0.06	-0.11*
27. Relationship violation	-0.02	<0.01	-0.06	0.09†	-0.01	-0.03	0.08	<-0.01	0.03	-0.02
28. Relationship-to-work permeability	<0.01	-0.09†	0.08†	<-0.01	-0.20**	0.05	-0.15**	0.19**	-0.10*	-0.01
29. Intimate partner role identification	-0.13**	-0.01	0.06	-0.07	-0.03	-0.12*	<0.01	0.19**	0.14**	0.05

Note. 11. Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). 14. Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). 16. Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). 17. Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Bi-Variate Correlations among Variables Relevant to Hypotheses Tests (continued)

Variable	21.	22.	23.	24.	25.	26.	27.	28.	29.
21. Emotional stability	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
22. Openness	0.06	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
23. Global relationship satisfaction	0.18**	0.08	1.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
24. Relationship affection	-0.02	0.17**	0.32**	1.00	.	.	.	.	.
25. Relationship closeness	<0.01	0.08†	0.20**	0.26**	1.00	.	.	.	.
26. Relationship demand	-0.10*	-0.03	-0.38**	-0.13**	0.09†	1.00	.	.	.
27. Relationship violation	0.02	-0.02	-0.13**	-0.06	-0.09†	0.13*	1.00	.	.
28. Relationship-to-work Permeability	-0.04	0.04	0.12*	0.16**	0.19**	<-0.01	<-0.01	1.00	.
29. Intimate partner role Identification	0.12*	0.02	0.69**	0.25**	0.22**	-0.30**	-0.14**	0.28**	1.00

†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Appendix I:

Variance Inflation Factors for Predictors in Full Model and Model Without Permeability x Partner Role Identification x Demand Behavior Three-Way Interaction

Predictor	Full Model *VIF*	Reduced Model *VIF*
Demographic Main Effects		
Gender	1.41	1.41
Age	3.71	3.69
Education	1.80	1.80
Income	2.75	2.75
Dual income status	1.27	1.27
Years in current position	1.52	1.52
Average hours worked per week	1.92	1.92
Intimate relationship status	1.40	1.40
Years in relationship	2.94	2.93
Children at home	1.51	1.51
Children out of home	2.10	2.08
Personality Main Effects		
Extraversion	1.25	1.24
Agreeableness	1.46	1.46
Conscientiousness	1.17	1.16
Emotional stability	1.46	1.46
Openness	1.21	1.20

Variance Inflation Factors for Predictors in Full Model and Model Without Permeability x Partner Role Identification x Demand Behavior Three-Way Interaction (continued)

Predictor	Full Model *VIF*	Reduced Model *VIF*
Intimate Relationship Main Effects		
Global relationship satisfaction	3.02	3.01
Affection behaviors	1.99	1.99
Closeness behaviors	1.90	1.88
Demand behaviors	3.90	3.48
Violation behaviors	1.56	1.55
Moderator Main Effects		
Relationship-to-work permeability	2.08	2.02
Partner role identification	2.75	2.72
Two-Way Interactions		
Permeability[a] x Global relationship satisfaction	3.05	2.97
Permeability x Affection behaviors	2.93	2.93
Permeability x Closeness behaviors	2.09	2.09
Permeability x Demand behaviors	5.27	3.34
Permeability x Violation behaviors	2.71	2.67
Partner Role Identification x Global relationship satisfaction	3.38	3.22
Partner Role Identification x Affection behaviors	2.03	2.02

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability

Variance Inflation Factors for Predictors in Full Model and Model Without Permeability x Partner Role Identification x Demand Behavior Three-Way Interaction (continued)

Predictor	Full Model *VIF*	Reduced Model *VIF*
Two-Way Interactions (continued)		
Partner Role Identification x Closeness behaviors	2.40	2.38
Partner Role Identification x Demand behaviors	8.79	6.29
Partner Role Identification x Violation behaviors	2.00	1.84
Permeability[a] x Partner Role Identification	2.58	2.56
Three-Way Interactions		
Permeability x PRI[b] x Global relationship satisfaction	4.12	3.63
Permeability x PRI x Affection behaviors	3.49	3.49
Permeability x PRI x Closeness behaviors	3.01	2.89
Permeability x PRI x Demand behaviors	10.97	---
Permeability x PRI x Violation behaviors	2.51	2.41

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
[b] PRI = Partner Role Identification

Appendix J:

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Positive Relationship-to-Work Spillover

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Demographic Main Effects		
Gender	-0.03	0.09
Age	<-0.01	<0.01
Education	0.03	0.03
Income	0.02	0.03
Dual income status	-0.28**	0.11
Years in current position	<-0.01	<0.01
Average hours worked per week	<0.01	<0.01
Intimate relationship status	0.05	0.12
Years in relationship	0.01†	<0.01
Children at home	-0.17*	0.08
Children out of home	-0.15	0.11
Personality Main Effects		
Extraversion	0.07**	0.02
Agreeableness	-0.04	0.03
Conscientiousness	<-0.01	0.04

Note. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male). Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Positive Relationship-to-Work Spillover (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Personality Main Effects (continued)		
Emotional stability	-0.02	0.03
Openness	<-0.01	0.04
Intimate Relationship Main Effects		
Global relationship satisfaction	0.13**	0.01
Affection behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Closeness behaviors	<0.01*	<0.01
Demand behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Violation behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Model Statistics		
N	407	
F (21, 385)	10.47**	
R^2	0.36	

†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Appendix K:

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Negative Relationship-to-Work Spillover

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Demographic Main Effects		
Gender	<-0.01	0.08
Age	<-0.01†	<0.01
Education	-0.01	0.03
Income	0.05†	0.03
Dual income status	-0.09	0.10
Years in current position	<-0.01	<0.01
Average hours worked per week	0.01*	<0.01
Intimate relationship status	0.12	0.11
Years in relationship	<-0.01	<0.01
Children at home	-0.07	0.07
Children out of home	0.10	0.09
Personality Main Effects		
Extraversion	-0.03†	0.02
Agreeableness	-0.04	0.03
Conscientiousness	-0.12**	0.03

Note. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male). Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Negative Relationship-to-Work Spillover (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Personality Main Effects (continued)		
Emotional stability	-0.04	0.03
Openness	<-0.01	0.03
Intimate Relationship Main Effects		
Global relationship satisfaction	-0.13**	0.01
Affection behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Closeness behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Demand behaviors	<0.01**	<0.01
Violation behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Model Statistics		
N	407	
F (21, 385)	17.39**	
R^2	0.49	

†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Appendix L:

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Global Job Satisfaction

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Demographic Main Effects		
Gender	-0.12	0.17
Age	<0.01	0.01
Education	<0.01	0.05
Income	0.04	0.06
Dual income status	0.32†	0.20
Years in current position	<0.01	0.01
Average hours worked per week	<-0.01	<0.01
Intimate relationship status	-0.12	0.23
Years in relationship	<0.01	<0.01
Children at home	0.18	0.15
Children out of home	0.14	0.20
Personality Main Effects		
Extraversion	0.14**	0.04
Agreeableness	-0.02	0.06
Conscientiousness	0.14*	0.07

Note. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male). Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Global Job Satisfaction (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Personality Main Effects (continued)		
Emotional stability	0.24**	0.05
Openness	-0.02	0.07
Intimate Relationship Main Effects		
Global relationship satisfaction	0.02	0.03
Affection behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Closeness behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Demand behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Violation behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Moderator Main Effects		
Relationship-to-work permeability	<0.01	0.13
Partner role identification	0.22	0.14
Two-Way Interactions		
Permeability[a] x Global relationship satisfaction	-0.04	0.05
Permeability x Affection behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Permeability x Closeness behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Permeability x Demand behaviors	<0.01	<0.01

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Global Job Satisfaction (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Two-Way Interactions (continued)		
Permeability[a] x Violation behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Global relationship satisfaction	-0.03	0.03
Partner Role Identification x Affection behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Closeness behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Demand behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Violation behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Permeability x Partner Role Identification	0.37†	0.19
Three-Way Interactions		
Permeability x PRI[b] x Global relationship satisfaction	-0.06	0.04
Permeability x PRI x Affection behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Permeability x PRI x Closeness behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Permeability x PRI x Violation behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Model Statistics		
N	407	
F (38, 368)	3.54**	
R^2	0.27	

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
[b] PRI = Partner Role Identification
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Appendix M:

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Job Engagement

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Demographic Main Effects		
Gender	-0.20*	0.10
Age	<0.01	<0.01
Education	0.11**	0.03
Income	0.05†	0.03
Dual income status	0.08	0.11
Years in current position	<-0.01	<0.01
Average hours worked per week	0.03**	<0.01
Intimate relationship status	0.05	0.13
Years in relationship	<0.01	<0.01
Children at home	-0.02	0.09
Children out of home	0.06	0.11
Personality Main Effects		
Extraversion	0.07**	0.02
Agreeableness	<0.01	0.04
Conscientiousness	0.24**	0.04

Note. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male). Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Job Engagement (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Personality Main Effects (continued)		
Emotional stability	<0.01	0.03
Openness	0.05	0.04
Intimate Relationship Main Effects		
Global relationship satisfaction	-0.02	0.02
Affection behaviors	<-0.01*	<0.01
Closeness behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Demand behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Violation behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Moderator Main Effects		
Relationship-to-work permeability	-0.21**	0.07
Partner role identification	0.19*	0.08
Two-Way Interactions		
Permeability[a] x Global relationship satisfaction	<0.01	0.03
Permeability x Affection behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Permeability x Closeness behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Permeability x Demand behaviors	<0.01	<0.01

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Job Engagement (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Two-Way Interactions (continued)		
Permeability[a] x Violation behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Global relationship satisfaction	-0.04*	0.02
Partner Role Identification x Affection behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Closeness behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Demand behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Partner Role Identification x Violation behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Permeability x Partner Role Identification	0.17	0.11
Three-Way Interactions		
Permeability x PRI[b] x Global relationship satisfaction	<0.01	0.02
Permeability x PRI x Affection behaviors	<0.01	<0.01
Permeability x PRI x Closeness behaviors	<-0.01†	<0.01
Permeability x PRI x Violation behaviors	<0.01*	<0.01
Model Statistics		
N	407	
F (38, 368)	7.79**	
R^2	0.45	

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
[b] PRI = Partner Role Identification
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Appendix N:

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Limitations to Productivity

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Demographic Main Effects		
Gender	-0.82	2.75
Age	0.25	0.18
Education	0.21	0.87
Income	-0.73	0.92
Dual income status	-0.61	3.25
Years in current position	-0.15	0.19
Average hours worked per week	0.42**	0.15
Intimate relationship status	-7.62*	3.77
Years in relationship	-0.21	0.17
Children at home	2.43	2.50
Children out of home	1.57	3.25
Personality Main Effects		
Extraversion	0.03	0.67
Agreeableness	-1.55	1.05
Conscientiousness	-3.98**	1.11

Note. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male). Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Limitations to Productivity (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Personality Main Effects (continued)		
Emotional stability	-0.87	0.90
Openness	-0.14	1.10
Intimate Relationship Main Effects		
Global relationship satisfaction	-0.41	0.56
Affection behaviors	0.01	<0.01
Closeness behaviors	<-0.01	<0.01
Demand behaviors	0.06	0.08
Violation behaviors	<0.01	0.03
Moderator Main Effects		
Relationship-to-work permeability	-1.25	2.12
Partner role identification	2.79	2.35
Two-Way Interactions		
Permeability[a] x Global relationship satisfaction	0.56	0.85
Permeability x Affection behaviors	<0.01	0.01
Permeability x Closeness behaviors	-0.02†	0.01
Permeability x Demand behaviors	0.17	0.11

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Limitations to Productivity (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Two-Way Interactions (continued)		
Permeability[a] x Violation behaviors	-0.16	0.13
Partner Role Identification x Global relationship satisfaction	0.87†	0.50
Partner Role Identification x Affection behaviors	-0.02	0.01
Partner Role Identification x Closeness behaviors	<-0.01	0.02
Partner Role Identification x Demand behaviors	<-0.01	0.07
Partner Role Identification x Violation behaviors	0.05†	0.03
Permeability x Partner Role Identification	-1.62	3.16
Three-Way Interactions		
Permeability x PRI[b] x Global relationship satisfaction	-0.79	0.68
Permeability x PRI x Affection behaviors	-0.02	0.02
Permeability x PRI x Closeness behaviors	0.04†	0.02
Permeability x PRI x Violation behaviors	-0.02	0.09
Model Statistics		
N	407	
F (38, 368)	1.61**	
R^2	0.14	

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
[b] PRI = Partner Role Identification
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Appendix O:

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Work Stress

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Demographic Main Effects		
Gender	-6.08	4.02
Age	-0.24	0.26
Education	-1.83	1.27
Income	-1.27	1.35
Dual income status	-5.30	4.75
Years in current position	-0.17	0.27
Average hours worked per week	0.80**	0.23
Intimate relationship status	5.56	5.50
Years in relationship	0.31	0.24
Children at home	-0.22	3.66
Children out of home	-1.80	4.74
Personality Main Effects		
Extraversion	-1.59	0.98
Agreeableness	-2.07	1.53
Conscientiousness	-2.51	1.62

Note. Gender (0, Female; 1, Male). Dual income status (0, Yes; 1, No). Intimate relationship status (0, Married, living together; 1, Unmarried, living together). Children at home (0, No; 1, Yes). Children out of home (0, No; 1, Yes).
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Work Stress (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Personality Main Effects (continued)		
Emotional stability	-3.97**	1.32
Openness	0.76	1.60
Intimate Relationship Main Effects		
Global relationship satisfaction	0.03	0.82
Affection behaviors	-0.01	0.01
Closeness behaviors	<-0.01	0.01
Demand behaviors	0.07	0.12
Violation behaviors	0.03	0.04
Moderator Main Effects		
Relationship-to-work permeability	4.17	3.10
Partner role identification	-1.28	3.44
Two-Way Interactions		
Permeability[a] x Global relationship satisfaction	0.65	1.24
Permeability x Affection behaviors	0.04†	0.02
Permeability x Closeness behaviors	-0.04†	0.02
Permeability x Demand behaviors	<0.01	0.15

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Univariate Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Predictor Variables on Work Stress (continued)

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*
Two-Way Interactions (continued)		
Permeability[a] x Violation behaviors	0.51**	0.19
Partner Role Identification x Global relationship satisfaction	0.45	0.73
Partner Role Identification x Affection behaviors	-0.02	0.02
Partner Role Identification x Closeness behaviors	<0.01	0.03
Partner Role Identification x Demand behaviors	0.06	0.11
Partner Role Identification x Violation behaviors	0.03	0.04
Permeability x Partner Role Identification	-7.78†	4.62
Three-Way Interactions		
Permeability x PRI[b] x Global relationship satisfaction	-0.09	1.00
Permeability x PRI x Affection behaviors	0.03	0.03
Permeability x PRI x Closeness behaviors	<-0.01	0.03
Permeability x PRI x Violation behaviors	0.24†	0.14
Model Statistics		
N	407	
F (38, 368)	2.53**	
R^2	0.21	

[a] Permeability = relationship-to-work permeability
[b] PRI = Partner Role Identification
†$p < .10$ (marginally significant). *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

REFERENCES

Appelberg, K., Romanov, K., Heikkila, K., Honkasalo, M. L., & Koskenvuo, M. (1996). Interpersonal conflict as a predictor of work disability: A follow-up study of 15,348 Finnish employees. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 40,* 157-167.

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro-role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 25,* 472-491.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2001). *Marriage and divorces, Australia.* Canberra, Australia: Author.

Aycan, Z., & Eskin, M. (2005). Relative contributions of childcare, spousal support, and organizational support in reducing work-family conflict for men and women: The case of Turkey. *Sex Roles, 53,* 453-471.

Barling, J., & Macewen, K. E. (1992). Linking work experiences to facets of marital functioning. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13,* 573-583.

Barnett, R. C., Gareis, K. C., James, J. B., & Steele, J. (2003). Planning ahead: College seniors' concerns about career-marriage conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62,* 305-319.

Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 1-26.

Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R. C., & Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51,* 175-183.

Bond, J. T., Thompson, C. A., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2003). *Highlights of the 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce.* New York: Families and Work Institute.

Bozionelos, N. (2004). The big five of personality and work involvement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19,* 69-81.

Bradbury, T.N. (Ed.). (1998). *The developmental course of marriage dysfunction.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bragger, J. D., Rodriguez-Srednicki, O., Kutcher, E. J., Indovino, L., & Rosner, E. (2005). Work-family conflict, work-family culture, and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 20,* 303-324.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2005). Impact of work-family interference on general well-being: A replication and extension. *International Journal of Stress Management, 12,* 203-221.

Bruck, C. S., Allen, T. D., & Spector, P. E. (2002). The relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A finer grained analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60,* 336-353.

Bun Chan, K., Lai, G., Chung Ko, Y., & Weng Boey, K. (2000). Work stress among six professional groups: The Singapore experience. *Social Science & Medicine, 50,* 1415-1432.

Carlson, D. S., & Perrewè, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management, 25,* 513-540.

Chan, C. J., & Margolin, G. (1994). The relationship between dual-earner couples' daily work mood and home affect. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11,* 573-586.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 155-159.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Crouter, A. C., Perry-Jenkins, M., Hurston, T. L., & Crawford, D. W. (1989). The influence of work-induced psychological states on behavior at home. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 10,* 273-292.

Doss, B. D., & Christensen, A. (2006). Acceptance in romantic relationships: The Frequency and Acceptability of Partner Behavior Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 18,* 289-302.

Doumas, D. M., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (2003). The relationship between daily marital interaction, work, and health-promoting behaviors in dual-earner couples: An extension of the work-family spillover model. *Journal of Family Issues, 24,* 3-20.

Eagle, B. W., Miles, E. W., & Icenogle, M. L. (1997). Interrole conflicts and the permeability of work and family domains: Are there gender differences? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50,* 168-184.

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,* 178-199.

Einhorn, L., Markman, H., & Stanley, S. (2006, November). *The impact of economic strain on marital satisfaction.* Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, Chicago, IL.

Epstein, N. B., & Baucom, D. H. (2002). *Enhanced cognitive-behavioral therapy for couples.* Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Forthofer, M. S., Markman, H. J., Cox, M., Stanley, S., & Kessler, R. C. (1996). Associations between marital distress and work loss in a national sample. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 597-605.

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

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 65-78.

Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50,* 145-167.

Gallup, G. Jr. (1990). *The Gallup poll: Public opinion 1990.* Wilmington, DE: Scholarly resources.

Gore, S. (1978). The effect of social support in moderating the health consequences of unemployment. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19,* 157-165.

Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann Jr., W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37,* 504-528.

Gove, W. R., Hughes, M., & Style, C. B. (1983). Does marriage have positive effects on the psychological well-being of the individual? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24,* 122-131.

Grandey, A. A., Cordeiro, B. L., & Crouter, A. C. (2005). A longitudinal and multi-source test of the work-family conflict and job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78,* 305-323.

Grant, S. & Langan-Fox, J. (2006). Occupational stress, coping, and strain: The combined/interactive effect of the Big Five traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41,* 719-732.

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

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31,* 72-92.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5,* 111-126.

Hahlweg, K. (2004). Strengthening partnerships and families. In P.L. Chase-Lindale, K. Kiernan & R.J. Friedman (Eds.), *Human development across lives and generations* (pp.204-238). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halford, W. K. (2001). *Brief couple therapy: Helping partners help themselves.* New York: Gilford Press.

Halford, W. K., Kelly, A., & Markman, H. J. (1997). The concept of a healthy marriage. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples intervention* (pp. 3-12). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *The Academy of Management EXECUTIVE, 11,* 213-223.

Hammer, L. B., Bauer, T. N., & Grandey, A. A. (2003). Work-family conflict and work-related withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17,* 419-436.

Heller, D., Judge, T. A., & Watson, D. (2002). The confounding role of personality and trait affectivity in the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 815-835.

Heller, D., & Watson, D. (2005). The dynamic spillover of satisfaction between work and marriage: The role of time and mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1273-1279.

Huang, Y.-H., Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., & Perrin, N. A. (2004). The relationship between work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 25,* 79-100.

Hughes, D., & Galinsky, E. (1994). Work experiences and marital interactions: Elaborating the complexity of work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15,* 423-438.

Hughes, D., Galinsky, E., & Morris, A. (1992). The effects of job characteristics on marital quality: Specifying linking mechanisms, *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 31-42.

Jacobs, J. A. (1992). Women's entry into management: Trends in earnings, authority, and values among salaried managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37,* 282-301.

Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1994). Political influence behavior and career success. *Journal of Management, 20,* 43-65.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 530-541.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1992). Perceptions of nonwork-to-work spillover: Challenging the common view of conflict-ridden domain relationships. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 13,* 231-249.

Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68,* 347-367.

Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 139-149.

Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1999). Bridging the work-family policy and productivity gap: a literature review. *Community, Work, & Family, 2,* 7-32.

Lambert, S. J. (1990). Processes linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda. *Human Relations, 43,* 239-257.

Landau, J., & Arthur, M. B. (1992). The relationship of marital status, spouse's career status, and gender to salary level. *Sex Roles, 27,* 665-681.

Larson, J. H., Wilson, S. M., & Beley, R. (1994). The impact of job insecurity on marital and family relationships. *Family Relations, 43,* 138-143.

Leiter, M. P., & Durup, M. J. (1996). Work, home, and in-between: A longitudinal study of spillover. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32,* 29-47.

Lerner, D., Amick, B. C., Rogers, W. H., Malspeis, S., Bungay, K., & Cynn, D. (2001). The Work Limitations Questionnaire. *Medical Care, 39,* 72-85.

Lerner, D. J., & Lee, J. (2006). Measuring health-related work productivity with self-reports. In R. C. Kessler & P. E. Stang (Eds.), *Health and work productivity* (66-87). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Markman, H. J., & Jones-Leonard, D. (1985). Marital discord and children at risk: Implications for research and prevention. In W. Frankenberg & R. Emde (Eds.), *Early identification of children at risk* (pp. 59-77). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Matthews, L. S., Conger, R. D., & Wickrama, K. A. S. (1996). Work-family conflict and marital quality: Mediating processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59,* 62-79.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77,* 11-37.

McDonald, P. (1995). *Families in Australia: A socio-demographic perspective.* Melbourne, Australia: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Melamed, T. (1996). Career success: An assessment of a gender-specific model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69,* 217-242.

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,* 400-410.

Neter, J., Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Wasserman, W. (1996). *Applied Linear Statistical Models* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: WCB/McGraw-Hill.

O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57,* 263-268.

Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & Boswell, W. R. (2006). Blurring boundaries: Correlates of integration and segmentation between work and nonwork. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68,* 432-445.

Peake, A., & Harris, K. L. (2002). Young adults' attitudes toward multiple role planning: The influence of gender, career traditionality, and marriage plans. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60,* 405-421.

Pfeffer, J., & Ross, J. (1982). The effects of marriage and a working wife on occupational and wage attainment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 27,* 66-88.

Phillips-Miller, D. L., Campbell, N. J., & Morrison, C. R. (2000). Work and family: Satisfaction, stress, and spousal support. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 37,* 16-30.

Pleck, J. H. (1977). The work-family role system. *Social Problems, 24,* 417-427.

Podsakoff, P. M., McKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 879-903.

Poortman, A. R. (2005). How work affects divorce. *Journal of Family Issues, 26,* 168-195.

Repetti, R. L. (1989). Effects of daily workload on subsequent behavior during marital interaction: The roes of social withdrawal and spouse support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57,* 651-659.

Roberts, N. A., & Levenson, R. W. (2001). The remains of the workday: Impact of job stress and exhaustion on marital interaction in police couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63,* 1052-1067.

Rogelberg, S. G. (2006). Understanding nonresponse and facilitating response to organizational surveys. In A. I. Kraut (Ed.), *Getting action from organizational surveys: New concepts, technologies, and applications* (312-325). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rogers, S. J. (1999). Wives' income and marital quality: Are there reciprocal effects? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61,* 123-132.

Rogers, S. J., & May, D. C. (2003). Spillover between marital quality and job satisfaction: Long-term patterns and gender differences. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65,* 482-495.

Rothman, E. F., & Perry, M. J. (2004). Intimate partner abuse perpetrated by employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9,* 238-246.

Sabourin, S., Valois, P., & Lussier, Y. (2005). Development and validation of a brief version of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale with a nonparametric item analysis model. *Psychological Assessment, 17,* 15-27.

Salgado, J. (1997). The five-factor model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 30-43.

Schafer, J. L. (1997). *Analysis of Incomplete Multivariate Data*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.

Schneer, J. A., & Reitman, F. (1993). Effects of alternate family structures on managerial career paths. *The Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 830-843.

Schulz, M. S., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., & Brennan, R. T. (2004). Coming home upset: Gender, marital satisfaction, and the daily spillover of workday experience into couple interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18,* 250-263.

Sears, H. A., & Galambos, N. L. (1992). Women's work conditions and marital adjustment in two-earner couples: A structural model. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 789-797.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38,* 15-28.

Story, L. B., & Repetti, R. (2006). Daily occupational stressors and marital behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20,* 690-700.

Suchet, M., & Barling, J. (1986). Employed mothers: Interrole conflict, spouse support, and marital functioning. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 7,* 167-178.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Thoits, P. A. (1992). Identity structures and psychological well-being: Gender and marital status comparisons. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 55,* 236-256.

United States Census Bureau. (2002). *Number, timing, and duration of marriages and divorces: 1996*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Labor. (n.d.a). Persons at work in nonagricultural industries by age, sex, race, Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, marital status, and usual full- or part-time status. Retrieved February 26, 2007 from http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat22.pdf.

U.S. Department of Labor. (n.d.b). SOC major groups. Retrieved February 20, 2007 from http://www.bls.gov/soc/soc_majo.htm.

Voydanoff, P. (2004). Implications of work and community demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9,* 275-285.

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,* 108-130.

Weiss, R. L., & Heyman, R. E. (1997). A clinical-research overview of couples interactions. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples interventions* (pp. 39-41). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Williams, K. J., & Alliger, G. M. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *The Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 837-868.

Yogev, S., & Brett, J. (1985). Patterns of work and family involvement among single- and dual-earner couples. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70,* 754-768.