From “Work-Family” to “Work-Life”:

Broadening our Conceptualization and Measurement
Abstract

Despite frequent reference to “work-life” issues in the organizational literature (e.g., Cascio & Aguinis, 2008), little theoretical or empirical attention has been paid to nonwork areas beyond family. The purpose of the research described here is to broaden the conceptualization and measurement of work interference with life outside of work (WIL). The authors report on a study of 1,811 university alumni from multiple organizations and diverse occupations. WIL was measured across eight nonwork domains and was represented by two forms of interference (strain- and time-based). Work interference with domains (other than family) explained unique variance in job satisfaction, turnover intentions, life satisfaction, physical symptoms, and mental health. Additionally, employees with high levels of WIL cited work demands as a contributor to their lack of involvement in one or more life domains. The importance, time spent, and level of work interference with domains varied according to demographic characteristics. Individuals who segmented work from nonwork tended to experience less WIL overall. Future research directions and practical implications for organizations are discussed.
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My job causes me to cancel dates with friends, work late, miss my kids’ activities, not be able to work out, not schedule doctor appointments. It affects all areas of my life because I’m either working long hours or too stressed to participate. Sometimes I try to prioritize one area that becomes important for a period of time…but it always seems to result in a backlog at work—which results in more stress, so I don’t really enjoy the activity that is supposed to be rewarding.

Over the past several decades, organizational researchers interested in the intersection between employees’ work and personal lives have primarily focused on the work and family domains (e.g., Byron, 2005; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). Attention to the work-family interface has been fueled by the changing nature of workplace demographics (i.e., more women are fully employed than ever before) and greater participation by men in the family domain. While reducing work-family interference remains a valid and important concern, the literature could benefit from a recognition of the diversity that exists in employees’ pursuits outside of work. The above quote from one of our study participants suggests the potential for work interference with other life areas (e.g., health, friendships) to be as prevalent as work interference with family.

There is a practical basis for examining work interference with life (WIL) as opposed to work interference with family specifically. Human resource practitioners have expressed concern over the equitable consideration of the intersection of work with all types of life roles, not just family roles (Wells, 2007). Respect for a variety of employee needs is crucial in an increasingly diverse workforce. Childlessness among employees has been increasing, especially among female managers (Wood & Newton, 2006). The U.S. Census Bureau reported that in 2006, a record 45% of women between the ages of 15 and 44 were childless (Dye, 2008). Similarly, a large portion of employees are single and live alone with some U.S. reports providing estimates as high as 40% (Casper, Weltman, & Kwesiga, 2007). Instituting human resource policies that
potentially neglect or even disadvantage demographic groups creates the risk of lowered perceptions of organizational support, increased counterproductive behaviors and other forms of backlash, and higher intentions to turnover (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007; Nord, Fox, Phoenix, & Viano, 2002; Ryan & Kossek, 2008).

In addition to establishing an inclusive workplace, one reason that organizations might care about the entirety of employees’ lives outside of work is to enhance their well-being. Quality of life in a variety of areas is positively related to life satisfaction (Rice, Near, & Hunt, 1980), which is, in turn, strongly positively related to job satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Heller, Watson, & Ilies, 2004). Aspects of employees’ lives outside of work play a larger role than previously thought in affecting work attitudes and behavior (Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Hart, 1999). Furthermore, ensuring that employees are able to engage in personal pursuits increases the possibility that they will gain skills that can be applied to the workplace (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

It is not surprising, then, that many of the companies identified by Fortune magazine’s “100 Best Companies to Work For” have embraced a broader perspective in policies and programs as work-life focused. Not only has the definition of “family” for leave policies become more flexible, but practices such as allowing employees paid volunteer time or open-use sabbaticals are becoming more commonplace (Schramm, 2009). Despite the presence of these forward practices, however, the organizational research literature, while beginning to adopt the term of “work-life,” actually rarely expounds on and measures this broader conceptualization (Crooker, Smith, & Tabak, 2002). This disconnect between research and practice leaves HR professionals with less guidance on how to most effectively design, implement, and evaluate inclusive policies and programs.
In the present paper, we respond to numerous calls by organizational scholars to broaden the notion of work-family conflict to account for nonwork areas beyond family (Bellavia & Frone, 2005; Carlson & Kacmar, 2000; Crooker et al., 2002; Sturges & Guest, 2004). Research on social identity suggests that there is a hierarchy of identities possessed by any individual (e.g., worker, parent, friend, volunteer), with some more important than others (McCall & Simmons, 1978). The present study is less presumptive than traditional work-family studies about what the most important identities for individuals are, and allows for an examination of the total hierarchy. The intended result is the examination of a richer construct that is more representative of employees’ experiences at the intersection of work and life outside of work.

We focus on only one direction of interference (work to life) as that has been found to be stronger (Frone, 2003), as well as more feasibly influenced by organizations. Based on previous definitions of work-family conflict offered by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), we define WIL as difficulty participating in nonwork domains by virtue of participation in the work domain. The construct includes family as only one of several life domains in which individuals may be involved.

We adopt the Conservation of Resources Model, which serves as a means of integrating role theory and spillover theory (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999), as an organizing theoretical framework. This model operates on the scarcity assumption, i.e., at any point in time individuals have limited resources to expend. Applied to the work-life context, it posits that participation in work and nonwork activities consumes time and energy. For our purposes, we contend that work has the ability to tax an individual’s resources interfering with one’s ability to perform in other areas of life. This model also assumes that individuals are sensitive to resource loss due to WIL.
The process of reacting to and dealing with WIL consumes resources in and of itself and can lead to adverse consequences for personal well-being (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999).

The present study contributes to the applied psychology literature by challenging the dominant theoretical standpoint which assumes that work and family are the only competitors for an individual’s time and energy. We present empirical evidence for the validity and utility of a broadened conceptualization and measurement of WIL. The remainder of the introduction will be organized as follows. We begin with a brief historical overview of how the work-family and work-life concepts have evolved, followed by a description of our conceptual perspective based on multiple life domains. A review of prior measurement of WIL (as distinct from work interference with family) will be provided. We will describe the measurement approach that we take in the present paper in further detail. Finally, we will present tests of the relationships between WIL and personal and work-related outcomes, as well as examine two ways in which individuals may attempt to reduce WIL.

The “Coming to Being” of “Work-Life” Interference

There was some breadth in the initial conceptualization of work interference with employees’ personal lives during the 1960s and 1970s when research on work and what was termed “leisure” was prominent (Near, Rice, & Hunt, 1980). Definitions of leisure varied but most emphasized the nature of free time, or discretionary time spent voluntarily outside of work on nonmaintenance activities (Owen, 1970). For example, scholars did not see leisure as including required activities like personal hygiene or household duties, but did see it as including participation in voluntary organizations, sports, social activities, and personal relationships between husband and wife (Burke, Weir, & DuWors, 1979; Meissner, 1971). Many, but not all, of these studies restricted their investigations to the leisure experiences of male employees.
In contrast, a rather distinct literature took hold in the 1980s concerned exclusively with the intersection between the work and family roles (Kanter, 1977). Role theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964) has been the dominant framework used to explain interference between work and family. Work-family conflict is commonly viewed as a “women’s issue” (Casper, Weltman, & Kwesiga, 2007; Gerkovich, 2006) as women who enter the workforce often still bear the primary responsibility of childcare (Meissner, Humphreys, Meis, & Scheu, 1975; Perrone, Webb, & Blalock, 2005; Robinson, 1977). Nevertheless, as men become more active in the role of parenting, researchers are finding that reported levels of work-family conflict are more comparable across genders (Galinsky, Aumann, & Bond, 2009). Furthermore, whereas women’s nonwork roles were historically defined by family responsibilities, women are also involved more proportionately in other nonwork areas of life (e.g., fitness, community, education) compared to earlier decades (Kraus, 2001). Thus, there is a trend toward decreasing gender division of “ownership” over certain life domains. The fact that both men and women are involved in a larger number of domains emphasizes the timeliness for broadening our measurement of work-life interference.

A Life Domains Perspective

One difference between the approach we take and that of past work-family research is that we expand the typical notion of role to encapsulate life domains, or the spheres of activity that make up a person’s identity. The traditional association of the term role with a social position unnecessarily restricts one’s conception of the aspects of life with which work may interfere (Biddle, 1986). Whereas work-family research has easily identified roles within social systems (“parent,” “spouse,” “employee”), individuals have expectations regarding other life domains they occupy, which may not fit as easily into the rubric of social positions (e.g., leisure).
Our approach derives from the life domains orientation espoused by Swindle and Moos (1992) whose theory is rooted in the quality of life literature (Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976) and multiple identity perspective (Thoits, 1983), as well as from Super’s (1980) life-space theory of career development, which also takes a broad view of roles (e.g., “leisurite”). These bodies of research provide support for a key underlying assumption of our approach (one that we will test)—that individuals are involved in domains other than family and work and that they find these domains to be important.

The process by which WIL perceptions are formed is assumed to be similar in nature to how perceptions of work interference with family are formed. Interference results from competing expectations from the work and nonwork spheres (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Social partners are an obvious source of expectations and are readily identifiable in the work domain (e.g., boss) and some contexts outside of work (e.g., family members, friends). For several life domains, however, expectations may be mostly or entirely internally derived. That is, in addition to social pressures, individuals also create their own expectations within domains based on personal beliefs and preferences (Greenhaus & Beutell; Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). Failure to meet externally or internally derived expectations set in any personally valued life domain (e.g., raising a family, volunteering in the community, maintaining physical fitness) because of work demands should lead to perceptions of work interference with that domain.

The perceived direction of interference depends on the domain with the strongest expectation, or the domain from which the stronger pressure originates (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). Researchers have suggested that it is for this reason that interference has often been found to be stronger in the direction of work to family (Milliken & Dunn-Jensen, 2005). Family members are thought to be more forgiving than are managers.
and, therefore, given lower priority when there is competition for resources resulting in higher work to family interference. The consequences for failing to meet standards in other domains outside of work may be even less severe (e.g., individuals are less likely to be held accountable by others for activities like hobbies, exercise, or volunteering), rendering their boundaries even more permeable. Because of relatively weaker punishments for failing to attend to these domains, we reasoned that they would be equally if not more susceptible to intrusions from work demands compared to the family domain.

Prior Measurement of WIL

We conducted a literature review for existing scales of WIL using PsycInfo and the following search terms: work-life, work/nonwork, work-home, and work-personal life (each with conflict, balance\(^1\), interaction, interference, integration). Existing measures we found generally fell into one of three categories: (a) measures with issues of construct validity, (b) global measures, and (c) measures assessing some subset of life domains.

Construct validity issues. Our search identified a tendency for the terms work-life and work-family to be used interchangeably in literature reviews (e.g., Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992), as well as in measurement. For example, some scales labeled work/nonwork or work-home conflict, actually consisted of items specific to family (e.g., Beutell & O’Hare, 1987; Peeters, de Jonge, Janssen, & van der Linden, 2004) and some work-family scales contained items referring to “personal interests” (e.g., Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). While inconsistency in the measurement of conflict between work and different foci (e.g., leisure, home life in general, social life) has been interpreted as muddiness in the operationalization of work-family conflict (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000), these variations constitute valid research ground.

\(^1\) We included ‘balance’ in our search because the term is often used loosely (i.e., some scholars consider it the absence of conflict or use it in place of conflict), but we do not review measures of balance that include aspects of facilitation or overall balance perceptions, as they are not the focus of this paper.
in need of purposeful clarification. Imprecise measurement and labeling is problematic because it can lead to inaccurate summaries of research.

**Global measurement.** Some scales have measured perceptions of work demands interfering with personal life in general (e.g., Bonebright, Clay, & Ankenmann, 2000; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992; Siegel, Post, Brockner, Fishman, & Garden, 2005). The global perceptions approach may be desirable under some circumstances (e.g., for sake of brevity), but the existing global measures have some limitations. For example, they lack a consideration of the nature of interference (e.g., time-based, strain-based), which has been found to be important in the measurement of work-family conflict (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). Related to the above point of construct validity, the most frequently used measures of global WIL differ minimally from measures of work-family conflict, for example, by the addition of “/friends” after “family” (Bonebright et al.; Huffman, Youngcourt, Payne, & Castro, 2008; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006). Thus, family is still a dominant theme in these measures. Moreover, global measurement does not assess the same construct as would be measured by asking about specific life domains (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Individuals may experience interference of work with one aspect of life (e.g., education) but when making a global judgment with respect to life outside of work may not report high levels of WIL.

**Subset of domains.** Several studies have chosen some subset of domains as a key focus. For example, Small and Riley (1990) examined work interference with marriage, parenthood, leisure, and home management. Premeaux, Adkins, and Mossholder (2007) examined work interference with the spouse, parent, elder care, home care, and leisure roles. While both studies employed a definition of leisure as all free time, other studies have defined leisure as distinct
from other uses of discretionary time outside of work (e.g., friends; Ginn & Fast, 2006; community service, study; Perrone et al., 2005). However, these latter studies focused on the discrepancy between preferred and actual time use. In addition to the use of discrepancy scores being potentially problematic (see Humphreys, 1996, for a discussion of this issue), these studies also did not consider strain-based interference.

Thus, despite professed interest by organizational researchers in WIL, the measures that are currently employed fall short of a comprehensive assessment of the construct. A new multidimensional measure is needed that accurately assesses the interface between work and a full range of other domains in which individuals are commonly involved. Next we describe the measurement approach that we propose in order to fulfill this need.

Proposed Measurement Approach

Domain-level measurement. In the present study, perceptions of WIL were collected at the domain level. This approach to conceptualizing and measuring WIL is consistent with facet-level approaches that have been taken with respect to other constructs (e.g., job satisfaction; Tett & Meyer, 1993; life satisfaction; Campbell et al., 1976). As alluded to earlier, the sum-of-facets approach is not equivalent to global measurement of a construct. That is, the same information cannot be assumed to be gleaned from one measurement approach versus the other. A primary advantage of a facet-level, as opposed to a global, approach is that the unique information associated with different facets (e.g., domains) can be diagnostic. A domain-based measure of WIL can provide information on the recipient domains of interference from work (i.e., an evaluation of which domains experience interference and to what extent). Similar to the manner in which clinical researchers have found the assessment of psychological health in terms of domains more useful for targeting areas for change (Frisch, Cornell, Villanueva, & Retzlaff,
1992; Lent, Singley, & Sheu, 2005), companies may find the assessment of domain-specific WIL helpful for developing initiatives (e.g., providing exercise facilities or community involvement programs).

Another advantage to a domain-based measurement approach is its flexibility. In addition to computing facet-level scores, it also makes sense to also conceptualize and operationalize an overarching construct that subsumes the constituent facets. Aggregating work interference across all life domains provides an index of the total extent to which work impacts participation in activities outside of work. This information can be useful if one wishes to design more general work-life initiatives or gauge the overall impact of WIL across domains on employee or organizational outcomes.

Types of interference. Work-family measures consistently demonstrate a factor structure including different types of interference (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). However, the distinction between time-based and strain-based interference has yet to be demonstrated for a measure of WIL. Premeaux et al. (2007) included items representative of strain- and time-based interference but failed to find distinction between the two types in an exploratory factor analysis. Small and Riley (1990) included items representative of these dimensions, but they were not equally distributed enough to form subscales by type and domain. Nevertheless, it makes sense conceptually to capture both as time and energy are the primary resources that are required for involvement in any life domain. Thus, we chose to measure both time-based and strain-based dimensions of WIL. We chose to not include behavior-based interference, because it did not meaningfully apply to all the life domains. Further, Carlson et al. (2000) found that only one out of 25 work-family studies included behavior-based items. Behavior-based scales have also
exhibited poor psychometrics in some cases. For example, Powell and Greenhaus (in press) found that a behavior-based work-family conflict subscale had low reliability ($\alpha = .51$).

**Hypothesized Relationships**

A faceted view of WIL allows for a more fine-grained analysis of its relation to personal well-being. Researchers argue that a complete view of employee well-being includes the consideration of satisfaction across multiple life domains (Ilies, Schwind, & Heller, 2007). Assessing satisfaction only in the work domain provides an unnecessarily restricted lens into employees’ lives. In line with this argument, we examined the relationship between WIL and domain-specific satisfaction outside of work.

The interference of work with other life domains is an unwelcomed experience. It is perceived as a discrepancy between one’s actual and ideal allocation of time and energy resources. Work interference with family is typically measured by phrases such as “my work takes up time that I would like to spend with my family.” Work interference with a domain affects quantity or quality of involvement within that domain. For example, work demands (and the resulting interference) has been linked to fewer social activities in the family domain (Ilies et al., 2007), negative reactions from relationship partners (Shimazu, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2009), poorer food choices in the health domain (Allen, Shockley, & Poteat, 2008), and lower performance in school (Butler, 2007).

To the extent that work interference with a domain prevents a person from meeting personal standards within that domain, he or she should experience lower domain satisfaction (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Past research has found that work interference with family and family satisfaction are negatively related ($p = -.17$; Allen et al., 2000) as are work interference with
leisure and leisure satisfaction ($r = -0.23$; Rice et al., 1992). We expected that a similar relationship would hold for other life domains.

\[ H1: \text{Work interference with a domain (WID) is negatively related to satisfaction in that domain.} \]

Whereas domain-level interference was hypothesized to relate to domain-level satisfaction, overall WIL should affect broader outcomes in both the work and personal domains. We expected WIL to have the same consequences as work interference with family considering that the former encapsulates the latter and based on the assumption that they operate in a similar manner. Work interference with family has been associated with lower job satisfaction and higher turnover intentions, as well as more general indicators of poor well-being including lower life satisfaction, increased physical symptoms of poor health, and increased depression (Allen et al., 2000). Some of these relationships with outcomes have been generalized to globally assessed WIL (anxiety, depression: Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2001; anxiety, physical symptoms: Small & Riley, 1990). On the basis of these previous findings, we hypothesized that employees who experience high average levels of work interference across multiple life domains should have less favorable attitudes toward their jobs and lower affective and physical well-being.

More importantly, we expected the WIL measure to exhibit incremental validity over work interference with family for the above criteria. We contend that WIL represents a broader construct space that is better suited to predicting job-related and well-being outcomes. The outcomes of psychological and physical health depend on the ability to meaningfully participate in all of one’s life domains including but not limited to family (Cantor & Sanderson, 2003).
Similarly, when one is forming a judgment of job satisfaction and deciding whether to turnover, work interference with family life may be one consideration, but one might also consider the available time and energy one’s current job leaves to exercise, pursue hobbies, or socialize with friends. If expanding the conceptualization of WIL to include nonwork domains other than family is useful, then we should be able to explain additional variance in outcomes.

**H2:** WIL (aggregated across domains) is negatively related to job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health and positively related to physical symptoms and turnover intentions.

**H3:** Work interference with domains other than family explains additional variance in job satisfaction, life satisfaction, mental health, physical symptoms, and turnover intentions above and beyond the variance explained by work interference with family.

Given that interference is an aversive state and is associated with negative consequences, individuals are likely to behave in ways to avoid or rectify high levels of WIL. For some individuals, levels of WIL may be so excessive as to preclude involvement in some life domains. While the topic of “opting out” of the workplace or downsizing one’s career in order to accommodate the demands of family has been popularized and debated (Belkin, 2003; Goldin, 2006), little consideration has been given to other areas of life from which individuals may be withdrawing. There are a few exceptions. For example, Fisher (2003) noted that many individuals do not have the option of not working and instead choose to delay or forego
parenthood. Similarly, scholars have speculated whether declines in civic engagement may have something to do with increased working hours (Putnam, 2000).

Disengagement from life domains is worth examining in order to gain a descriptive understanding of how individuals balance the multiple areas of their life. The juggling metaphor that is often used to describe work-life balance (see Halpern & Murphy, 2005, for a discussion) suggests that temporarily opting out or “dropping” certain domains may be adaptive in that it may help individuals to focus more intensely on areas when they require attention the most. Opting out of domains also has potentially negative consequences, however, as prolonged disengagement in life domains may preclude individuals from the benefits of role accumulation. Engaging in multiple roles or occupying multiple domains has been shown to provide individuals with social resources, personal growth, and ego gratification (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Sieber, 1974). Burke (1973) found that a larger discrepancy between the number of life domains in which an individual was involved and the number they desired was related to lower job satisfaction. By only studying work interference with domains in which individuals are currently involved, past research has not fully measured the effects of work demands on experiences outside of work. An initial question to be addressed regarding domain opt-out is whether it is related to interference levels. Given high WIL, we propose that individuals may cope by withdrawing from one or more life domains. According to Conservation of Resources Theory, the resource drain caused by the experience of WIL would prompt individuals to take protective measures (i.e., reduce activities that consume resources) in order to maintain their level of resources. Thus, we make the following prediction.

*H4: WIL is positively related to opting out of domains.*
An alternative to managing the life domains in which one is involved is managing the boundaries between work and nonwork (Clark, 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996). Individuals differ from one another in the extent to which they use boundaries to integrate versus segment work and home, or where they lie on the integration-segmentation continuum (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Researchers have found that employees appreciate workplaces that support their integration-segmentation preferences (Kreiner, 2006; Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005). While boundaries are affected by organizational policies (e.g., flextime), they are also largely the product of individuals (Clark, 2000; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2005).

Clark explained that “if it is not possible or desirable for an organization to change their culture, then borders should be kept strong in both directions so that employees can maintain balance” (2000, p. 765). The strength of a boundary is a function of low flexibility (i.e., unable to contract or expand to accommodate demands of another domain), as well as low permeability (i.e., resistant to intrusions on one’s time and attention while physically present in the domain; Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Clark, 2000). Stronger boundaries surrounding both work and nonwork are the defining characteristics of high segmentation.

Although segmentation can make transitions from one life area to another more difficult, it also provides a number of advantages over integration including clearer psychological compartmentalization of life domains and reduced interruptions and distractions (Ashforth et al., 2000). Importantly, an individual who enacts strong boundaries between work and nonwork should be better able to leave work issues at work, both in the sense of not letting work time bleed over into personal time and psychologically detaching oneself from work when at home (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005). Indeed, perceived work-family segmentation is negatively related to
negative affective spillover from work to home (Ilies, Wilson, & Wagner, 2009) and to work interference with family (Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005; Powell & Greenhaus, in press). Thus, we hypothesize the following:

\[ H5: \text{Segmentation of work and nonwork domains is negatively related to WIL.} \]

Different segments of employees may be more likely to experience work interference with particular life domains due to their life circumstances, choices, or stages. Past research has found that employees with spouses and children report higher work-family conflict (Eby et al., 2005). The possibility remains, though, that single and childless employees may experience similar or higher levels of work interference concentrated in non-family areas (and consequently previously unreported). In the present study we investigate similarities and differences in work interference with life domains as a function of marital and parental status. We also examine gender differences in WIL by domains. It is possible that some of the inconsistencies in past findings (Eby et al.) are due to the fact that measures have been inconsistent in item references (e.g., home, personal life, family, nonwork). Because there is very little literature to guide hypotheses regarding demographic differences of work interference with specific life domains (i.e., other than family), in the present study we conducted an exploratory analysis of such differences.

Method

Sample

The sample for the main data collection was alumni of a large Midwestern university. As the focus of this paper is to develop and test a broader measure of WIL, it was important to have
single employees, as well as employees without children, in the sample (populations that are usually not well-represented in work-family conflict studies; Casper, Eby, et al., 2007). The sample was stratified on gender and marital status such that there were equal numbers of invitations sent to male versus female and married versus single participants. The sample was also stratified on age such that 15% of the invitations were sent to those below 24 years; 25% to 25-34 years; 35% to 35-44 years; 20% to 45-54 years and 15% to those above 55 years of age. While the invitation was sent via e-mail to 25,923 alumni, approximately 29% of the invitations bounced back and did not reach the intended participants, leaving a potential sample of 18,405. Out of those who viewed the invitation e-mail (22.5%; N = 4142), 60% (2485) accessed the survey and 46.7% (1935) filled out the survey. To be eligible to be part of the final sample the respondents had to have at least 30 hours or more per week of paid employment and had to be U.S. residents. Based on these criteria the responses of 54 participants were discarded. Listwise deletion was employed for 70 individuals who left the survey early and did not complete any of the work interference with life domains items (i.e., completed less than a quarter of the survey).

The final sample consisted of 1811 alumni who were compensated for participation with a $15 gift certificate to an online retailer. The mean age of participants was 38 years (SD = 11.25) and 46% were male. The marital status of the sample was as follows: 65.5% married, 31.5% single, and 3% in a domestic partnership. Forty-nine percent (49%) of the sample had spouses or partners who worked full-time. Fifty-six percent (56%) of the sample did not have any children living at home while 44% had one or more. Ten percent (10%) of the sample was single with one or more children living at home. The ethnic breakdown was as follows: 90% Caucasian, 3.7% African American, 3.2% Asian, and 1.1% Hispanic. On average, respondents
worked 46 hours per week (SD = 8.78). They held diverse job titles (e.g., attorney, art teacher, medical technologist) across a broad array of industries.

Measures

The measures described below were part of a larger survey. The presentation order of the domain-specific measures (e.g., satisfaction, involvement, interference) was counterbalanced across participants, such that roughly half received items pertaining to the eight domains in one order and the other half received them in the opposite order.

Work interference with life (WIL). A 48-item measure was constructed to measure participants’ perceived interference of work with life domains outside of work. We conducted a review to identify the different life domains in which individuals are commonly involved. Several taxonomies of life domains exist in the literature (e.g., Andrews & Withey, 1976; Blais, Vallerand, Briere Gagnon, & Pelletier, 1990; Swindle & Moos, 1992; Veroff, Kulka, & Douvan, 1981; Wadsworth & Ford, 1983). Eight domains outside of work were identified: education, health, leisure, friendships, romantic relationships, family, household management, religion and community involvement2. Descriptions were created for each to ensure that respondents understood the nature of activities that would qualify as participation in that domain (see Table 1).

<Insert Table 1 about here>

The items were generated by the authors based on a review of established scales (Bonebright et al., 2000; Burke et al., 1979; Carlson, et al., 2000; Glaser, Evandrou, & Tomassini, 2006; Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2001; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996; O’Driscoll et al., 1992; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell,

---

2 We also identified the domain of religion but subsequently eliminated this domain due to ambiguity of interpretation and low levels of interference indicated during pilot testing.
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2006; Reynolds, 2005; Rice et al., 1992; Siegel et al., 2005; Small & Riley, 1990; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Tompson & Werner, 1997; Wiley, 1987). The final 48 items were selected from a larger pool of 80 items through pilot testing and discussion among coauthors\(^3\). The items were adapted for each domain, resulting in three items to measure time-based interference and three items to measure strain-based interference for each domain. The item stems are provided in Table 2.

<Insert Table 2 about here>

The response scale ranged from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The alphas across domains ranged from .90 to .94. The aggregate measure of work interference with life across domains was formed by averaging interference scores across domains\(^4\) and had an alpha of .97. Further information concerning the internal structure and other validity evidence is presented in the Results section.

*Time spent on domains.* The participants were asked to report how much of their time in general they spent on domain-related activities compared to time spent on other life domains (1 = *None*; 2 = *Very little*; 3 = *Some*; 4 = *A great deal*).

*Domain involvement.* To assess whether participants were involved in each of the life domains, we referred to the time spent variable described above. Those who chose “none” were dummy coded as zero (no involvement); otherwise they were coded as being involved in the domain.

*Opt-out.* If participants indicated that they were not involved in a domain, they were asked the following question: “To what extent are work demands responsible for your lack of  

\(^3\) Characteristics of the pilot sample are available from the first author.

\(^4\) Our decision not to use weighted composites is based on arguments and empirical evidence in the satisfaction literature that suggest little benefit is to be gained by importance weighting (Rice, Gentile, & McFarlin, 1991; Staples & Higgins, 1998; Wu, Chen, & Tsai, 2009), because facet or domain satisfaction already contains information regarding importance.
involvement in _____-related activities” with the relevant domain substituted in the blank. The response options were 1 = *Not at all*, 2 = *One of a number of factors*, 3 = *Biggest factor*, and 4 = *Only factor*. Individuals who indicated that work demands were a factor (to any extent) in their lack of involvement were coded as having “opted-out” of a domain.

*Domain satisfaction.* Modified items from the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) developed by Diener et al. (1985) were used to measure satisfaction with life domains. The three items stems were as follows with domain names substituted for blanks: “I am satisfied with my ____.”; “If given the opportunity, I would change little about my ____.”; “My ____ is/are close to ideal.” The response scale ranged from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The alpha for domain satisfactions ranged from .89 to .93.

*Job satisfaction.* Participants provided self reports of job satisfaction using the same three adapted SWLS items described above. The alpha for job satisfaction was .88.

*Life satisfaction.* Overall life satisfaction was measured using the 3-item SWLS. A sample item is “I am satisfied with my life.” The response scale ranged from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The alpha for the scale was .82.

*Turnover intentions.* Participants completed a 3-item measure of turnover intentions adapted from a previous scale used by Colarelli (1984). The response scale ranged from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. A sample item is “I frequently think of quitting my job.” The alpha for the scale was .87.

*Domain importance.* The perceived importance of each domain was assessed with one item per domain (eight total): “How important is _____ to you?” The response scale ranged from 1 = *Not at all important* to 5 = *Very important.*
Work-life segmentation. Three items adapted from the Work-Family Integration-Blurring Scale were used to measure work-life segmentation (Desrochers et al., 2005). The response scale ranged from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. A sample item is “It is often difficult to tell where my work life ends and my nonwork life begins.” Items were reverse coded to represent segmentation. The alpha for the scale was .87.

Physical symptoms. Participants completed the Physical Symptoms Inventory (Spector & Jex, 1998), which asked them to indicate whether they had experienced any of a list of 18 physical ailments (e.g., upset stomach, headache) within the past 30 days and, if so, whether they had seen a doctor. The scale was formed by summing the number of physical ailments indicated weighted by doctor’s visits. The alpha for the scale was .74.

Mental health. Participants completed the 12-item General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1978). The participants were asked to rate the extent to which they had recently experienced a number of psychological symptoms. A sample item is “lost much sleep over worry”. Response options ranged from 1 = More so than usual to 4 = Much less than usual or from 1 = Not at all to 4 = Much more than usual depending on the item. The alpha for the scale was .88.

Results

Internal Structure Analyses

Second-order factor model. Consistent with the factor structure proposed by many sum-of-facets approaches (Wu & Yao, 2007), we expected WIL to exhibit a hierarchical structure, such that a higher-order factor of WIL underlies the lower-order factors of work interference with the constituent life domains. Thus, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis in which the eight life domain factors were nested under a second-order WIL factor (see Figure 1).
The goal of our analysis was to test the fit of a domain-based measurement model that also accounts for the unique variance associated with types of interference (time- or strain-based) to the data. To conduct this test, we formed time and strain item parcels for each domain and allowed the residuals of parcels of the same interference type to correlate (i.e., a correlated uniqueness model; Marsh, 1989). Forming item composites based on conceptual considerations is appropriate when there is theory to support the groupings (Landis, Beal, & Tesluk, 2000; Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002), as is the case for the time-based and strain-based interference distinction (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

The measurement model was tested for respondents involved in all of the life domains. Results indicated that the model fit the data rather well, $\chi^2 (32, N = 566) = 70.56, p < .05$, standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR) = .04, root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .05, comparative fit index (CFI) = 1.00.

**Alternative models.** We also sought to examine whether the above model fit equally well as a second-order model where the first-order factors were type of interference (and the item parcel residuals of the same life domain were allowed to correlate). This model would be consistent with the dominant theoretical conceptualization of work-life interference. This model also had adequate fit [$\chi^2 (44, N = 566) = 85.21, p < .05$, SRMR = .04, RMSEA = .04, CFI = 1.00], but not superior fit to the domain-focused model as evidenced by overlapping confidence intervals for the expected cross-validation index (CI$_{90}$ = .44, .53 versus CI$_{90}$ = .46, .54, respectively). It is also worth noting that a one-factor model had very poor fit, $\chi^2 (114, N = 566) = 4505.98, p < .01$, SRMR = .13, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .47.

**Demographic Differences**
Levels of involvement, as well as domain importance and WID means are reported in Table 3. Across all domains, participants reported high levels of involvement, with the lowest levels being for the domains of community involvement and education. Importance ratings tended to be above the midpoint of the scale, but did vary to some extent with the lowest rating being for community involvement and the highest being for family. Work interference ratings were similar across domains, tending to be around the midpoint of the scale.

<Insert Table 3 about here>

**Gender**

Men reported spending significantly more hours per week working than did women, *Cohen’s d* = .39. Men also reported spending significantly more time in the domain of leisure and significantly less time in the domains of health, family, household management, and friendships compared to women (see Table 4). Women reported higher WIL averaged across all domains than did men, *F*(1, 1511) = 26.13, *p* < .05. When looking at individual domains, women reported significantly higher work interference with health, household management, friendships, romantic relationships, community involvement, and leisure (see Table 4). Consistent with summary estimates in meta-analytic research (Byron, 2005), there was no significant gender difference in reported work interference with family.

<Insert Table 4 about here>

**Marital Status**

Individuals who were married or in a domestic partnership reported spending significantly more time working as compared to unmarried individuals. Additionally, they reported spending more time in the domains of family, household management, and community involvement and less time in the domains of health, friendships, education, and leisure as
compared to unmarried individuals (see Table 4). Individuals who were married or in a domestic partnership also reported higher levels of work interference with family than did unmarried individuals (see Table 4). Unmarried individuals reported that work interfered significantly more with the educational domain than did married individuals.

Children

Individuals with children reported spending significantly fewer hours in the domains of health, friendships, education, romantic relationships, and leisure and more hours in the domains of family and household management compared to individuals without children (see Table 4). Individuals with children reported significantly higher levels of work interference with the domains of family and romantic relationships (see Table 4). A similar pattern emerged as above, wherein individuals without children reported higher levels of work interference with education than did individuals with children.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 5 presents descriptive statistics, intercorrelations, and alpha reliabilities for measures involved in this study. Table 6 displays the results of H1. As hypothesized, WID was found to be a significantly related to domain satisfaction for each of the eight domains. The pattern of correlations shows that work interference with a domain was more strongly related to satisfaction within that domain (average $r = .39$) than across other domains (average $r = .19$).

For each individual, the WIL score was calculated by averaging WID scores across the domains in which he or she was involved. Table 7 displays the results pertinent to H2. WIL was significantly related to all outcomes (job satisfaction, turnover intentions, life satisfaction, physical symptoms, and mental health) in the expected direction, supporting H2. Table 8
displays the results relevant to H3. In order to test for incremental prediction, we computed a composite variable of work interference with all domains excluding family. A hierarchical regression was conducted with work interference with family entered in Step 1 and this composite entered in Step 2. For all outcomes, the addition of work interference with life domains other than family provided a significant increment in variance explained, supporting H3. Because the predictor variables in Table 8 are highly correlated, the beta coefficients should be interpreted with caution. However, multicollinearity has little to no effect on the value of $R^2$ and, hence, the change in $R^2$ is still interpretable.

Table 9 reports descriptive opt-out data by domain. As indicated by the chi-square test, work was cited as a reason for lack of domain involvement more often than not for all domains except family and household management. To test H4, the opt-out variable was regressed on WIL. In support of H4, the results indicated that WIL was significantly positively related to opting-out of domains, $\beta = .44$, $F(1,1024) = 243.08$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .19$, where individuals reporting greater WIL also reported opting-out of more life domains due to work demands.

To test H5, a simple linear regression was performed with segmentation as the predictor and WIL as the outcome. Results indicated that segmentation was significantly negatively related to WIL, $\beta = -.39$, $F(1,1611) = 279.81$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .15$, supporting H5.

Discussion

Contributions

---

5 The same hypothesis was also tested using the seven work interference with domain scales in the second step rather than a composite, resulting in the same conclusions ($\Delta R^2$ ranged from 4 to 11%).
The present study answers calls by researchers to broaden the definition of the nonwork dimension. The results provide initial validation for and demonstrate the utility of a broadened measure of WIL. The participants of this study were involved in a variety of life domains outside of work that, on average, were perceived as moderately important. Investigating interference at the domain level revealed two key findings. First, whereas family has been the most frequently studied nonwork domain, we found work interference with other life domains to be equally prevalent. Second, by including additional domains beyond family we were able to improve our prediction of personal and work outcomes. These findings mean that work-family conflict scales are not appropriate gauges of WIL because there is unique and meaningful construct variance associated with other life domains.

As hypothesized, work interference with life domains was negatively related to satisfaction in those respective domains. Interestingly, the magnitude of the relationship between WID and domain satisfaction varied slightly across domains and was the weakest for family. These results highlight the importance of facet-level assessment, as this type of information would be lost in a global measurement approach. As organizational researchers form models of work-life interference it may be important to consider differential relationships across domains and their potential causes.

Whereas past research suggests that employees sometimes withdraw from an organization to reduce WIL, a novel contribution of this study was to illustrate the possibility that employees may also cope by disengaging from other areas of life. Specifically, we found that employees with higher WIL (averaged across the domains in which they were involved) were more likely to cite work as a contributing factor to their complete lack of involvement in one or more life domains. Work was most likely to be attributed as a cause for not being
involved in activities related to health, friendships, and leisure. This finding indicates that the impact of work demands on employees’ personal lives may have been previously underestimated. In addition to focusing on those domains in which an individual is currently involved, a consideration of the circumstances under which individuals choose to forego certain activities entirely because of an overly demanding job is important.

Opting out of life domains may be associated with the loss of valuable benefits. For example, friendships are one source of social support and research suggests that individuals with social support have better mental health, have lower incidence of disease, and live longer (House, Umberson, & Landis, 1988). Lack of health-related activities can lead to sedentary lifestyle or obesity, not only detrimental to individual health but also costing organizations an average of $8720 per employee per year (Caban et al., 2005). Employees who are involved in multiple roles outside of work are not only healthier but tend to have better managerial skills (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002). Of course, as we mentioned earlier it may be adaptive and necessary for employees to temporarily opt-out of domains to accommodate periods of heavy demands.

The results of this study complement previous efforts to understand the boundaries that employees construct between work and nonwork. Researchers have proposed that individuals strategically enact boundaries between life domains to reduce interference (Clark, 2000). In support of this notion, we found that reports of employees’ actual segmentation were negatively related to WIL. Although segmentation is not adaptive under all circumstances (e.g., it does not facilitate role transitions nor do all individuals prefer it), our results in combination with past findings (e.g., Desrochers et al., 2005) suggest that the advantages of perceived segmentation may outweigh its disadvantages, at least in terms of minimizing work-life interference. For
example, Edwards and Rothbard (1999) found that, counter to fit theory, employees who valued high work-family segmentation and whose organizations provided it had greater well-being than did those employees low in segmentation values and supplies. Although not hypothesized, in our study there was a negative relationship between segmentation and opting out of domains. This finding suggests additional benefits of segmentation (posthoc analyses suggested that the relationship was not mediated by WIL) and could be followed up in future research.

With respect to demographic differences, our data indicate that women perceived higher levels of work interference with the majority (six out of eight) of the life domains. At the same time, women reported spending more time in three of these domains and rated them as more important as compared to men (i.e., health, household, friendships). One potential explanation for gender differences, which is supported by our data, is the fact that women who work full-time still take on a disproportionate share of housework—what has been called “the second shift” (Hochschild & Machung, 1989)—leaving less time available for activities in other domains that may be of lower priority or less urgent (but nonetheless important to them). Leisure was an interesting case because women reported more interference with this domain but spent less time and considered it less important as compared to men. Importantly, these results suggest that gender is not only engrained in work-family issues, but also more broadly in the intersection of work with life outside of work.

*Strengths and Limitations*

Methodological strengths of this study include the use of a large field sample, respondents from diverse occupations, and the use of a measure assessing not only multiple life domains but also two forms of WIL (time-based and strain-based). Nevertheless, there are some limitations worth mentioning. First, we employed a cross-sectional survey to collect the data.
Because this methodology often carries with it concerns of common method variance, we undertook several precautionary measures. To minimize item priming effects, we ordered the survey such that all dependent variables (i.e., personal and work outcomes) were collected before independent variables and counterbalanced the order in which life domains were presented to participants (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). The physical symptoms checklist, though not a different source, represents a different method of survey response. Additionally, there is some evidence to suggest that domain-based measurement would be less conducive to respondent mood bias than global measurement (Schwarz & Strack, 2003). Respondents can use domain-level circumstances and criteria to form judgments and are less likely to take cognitive shortcuts tainted by current mood states. Finally, the fact that we were able to differentiate between domains and types of interference in confirmatory factor analysis reduce the likelihood that common method variance is an alternative explanation for the results.

Our study design allowed us to demonstrate the usefulness of a broader conceptualization of WIL and show that our newly developed measure functions as one would expect. However, there are many interesting questions that require longitudinal research. For example, at what point do individuals decide that they lack the resources to participate in certain life domains? Our results indicate that employees with high levels of interference are involved in fewer life domains. But one could also envision that excessive domain involvement is a precursor to the interference, which would then prompt domain opt-out—a meditational chain that could not be captured with the present data. With respect to managing the work-life boundary, do individuals enact boundaries proactively or reactively (i.e., after experiencing high WIL)? Qualitative research suggests that individuals do enact boundaries in response to high WIL but that a reciprocal relationship exists such that, in turn, boundary management reduces WIL (Kreiner,
Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2009). If decisions and actions taken to manage WIL unfold over time, then longitudinal studies, despite their rarity in the work-life literature, may be particularly appropriate research designs.

Although we attempted to maximize diversity in our sample along several demographic criteria (e.g., age, gender, marital status), we were not inclusive in all respects. For example, all participants were university alumni and full-time employees, the majority of which were Caucasian. As such, our results may not be generalizable to part-time, low-income, or minority employees.

Finally, we only examined the negative side of the work-life interface. While researchers have begun examining work-family enrichment (Carlson, Karacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006) and work-family facilitation (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007), the synergies of work and life, more generally, have yet to be studied and constitute a promising area for future research. A broader scope of activities outside of work implies more opportunity for gains from work to be applied elsewhere, and involvement in domains other than family should provide incremental gains to the work domain.

**Practical Implications**

Organizations interested in creating and sustaining an inclusive workplace may find the results of this study informative. Some support was provided for the thesis that “work-family” policies are less applicable and therefore less advantageous to certain demographic groups. Married individuals and those with children reported higher work interference with family compared to single and childless employees who, in turn, reported higher work interference with education. Post-hoc analyses reveal that the latter relationship can be explained by differences in age. While the rationale behind provision of work-family benefits is that employees with heavy
family demands have unique needs, the present results indicate that other groups of employees, at other life stages for instance, have their own sets of needs relating to their life pursuits (e.g., furthering one’s career through education). Instituting policies that appeal to a wider range of employees is likely to enhance perceived organizational support (Casper, Eby, et al., 2007).

The decision of where an organization should focus its resources may be aided by an assessment of domain-level interference levels overall and broken down by demographic groups. For instance, results such as those obtained in this study might emphasize the appropriateness of an educational assistance program and the importance of supervisor support of education for certain segments of employees. Specific solutions can be driven by follow-up qualitative assessments within an organization. Information regarding levels of domain opt-out can also be diagnostic. Ironically, the domains that individuals give up may be the ones that provide resiliency and opportunities to recover from work stress. In the present study conducted across multiple organizations, the domains of health, friendship, and leisure had the highest percentage of opt-out due at least partly to work. Health, in particular, not only had high levels of opt-out but also high levels of interference from work and was considered highly important. The present findings demonstrate the potential value to employees of health and wellness programs and, furthermore, suggest specific areas to target in addition to physical illness prevention (the activities constituting leisure and friendships, e.g., hobbies, relaxation, socialization, etc.).

While health initiatives are often justified by concerns of absenteeism and rising healthcare costs, the business case for the promotion of a wider variety of activities outside of work is more challenging but still conceivable. Many organizations already sponsor initiatives to promote community service among their employees. Some of the current reasons that organizations sponsor employee volunteer programs include developing leadership in their
employees (Friedman, 2008; Greenblatt, 2002), building community relationships in order to deal more effectively with neighbors and policymakers, and improving public relations through appearance as a “good citizen” (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998). Corporate citizenship can also help applicant recruiting. According to a 2007 survey conducted by Deloitte and Touche USA, nearly two-thirds of respondents from Generation Y (18-26 year olds) said that they prefer companies that give them opportunity to volunteer at nonprofit organizations. In the present research, work interference with community involvement ranked lowest out of the domains studied. However, women rated community involvement as more important and experienced more interference with this domain than did men. This is consistent with other research that finds women volunteer more (Institute for Women’s Policy Research, 2001) and reiterates the idea that establishing an inclusive workplace means considering diverse values.

Conclusions

The results of the present study demonstrate that the construct of WIL is larger than the construct of work interference with family and that the explanatory power afforded by expanding our measurement is not negligible. Our findings more generally suggest the value of a life domains approach to assessing WIL. The perspective offered by this paper opens up new questions for researchers to pursue regarding how employees manage their involvement at work and outside of work at the domain level.
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### Domain Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>All activities to maintain your physical and mental health, such as exercising, going to the doctor and dentist, eating a balanced diet, or meditation. May also include activities that you see as necessary to maintain a healthy appearance, such as getting a haircut or a manicure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>All activities with your family. This may include visiting/taking care of parents, spending time with a sibling, attending family functions, or caring for a child (feeding or dressing, driving to and from daycare or medical appointments, parent-teacher meetings, etc.). This <em>does not include</em> time spent alone with your significant other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure</strong></td>
<td>Both <em>active leisure</em>, such as hobbies (e.g., gardening, car shows, vacationing) or playing/watching sports, and <em>resting leisure</em>, such as reading or watching T.V. at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community involvement</strong></td>
<td>Activities like volunteering, participating in political campaigns or fundraisers, or attending meetings (e.g., town hall or city council) or community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romantic relationships</strong></td>
<td>Going on dates or spending personal time with a significant other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household management</strong></td>
<td>Activities to maintain a household, such as cleaning, grocery shopping, paying bills, making household repairs and improvements, or lawn care <em>or</em> arranging for these types of tasks to be performed by others. This <em>does not include</em> care for children or other dependents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendships</strong></td>
<td>Any activities engaged in with friends (nonfamily members) outside of work. This may include going to the movies, sharing a meal, talking, or providing support for a friend with a problem. It may also include time spent with a pet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Educational activities, such as reading job-related material not required by your work, completing class assignments for a degree program or certification, attending a seminar or conference, or taking courses for self-improvement. This <em>does not include</em> training or education provided by your employer on company time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Item Stems for the Work Interference with Life Domains Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain-based Interference</th>
<th>Time-based Interference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. After engaging in activities related to work, I am often too frazzled to spend time on *life domain*.
| 2. Due to all the pressures from work, sometimes I am too stressed to engage in activities related to *life domain*.
| 3. Stress from work makes it harder for me to be fully involved in *life domain*.
| 1. The time I spend on work cuts into the time I’d like to spend on *life domain*.
| 2. The amount of time my work takes up makes it difficult to find enough time for *life domain*.
| 3. My work keeps me from *life domain* more than I would like it to. |
Table 3

*Domain Involvement, Domain Importance, and Work Interference with Life across Domains*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Importance M (SD)</th>
<th>WID M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>4.26 (.78)</td>
<td>3.25 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.67 (.67)</td>
<td>3.00 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3.43 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.97 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4.02 (.92)</td>
<td>3.00 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.89 (1.08)</td>
<td>2.82 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4.52 (.76)</td>
<td>3.08 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3.01 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.90 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3.87 (.90)</td>
<td>3.14 (.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. WID = Work interference with domain. Involvement is reported as percentage of sample who reported being involved in a domain at least one hour per week. Importance and WID ratings (ranging from 1 to 5) were provided only by individuals involved in the domain.*
Table 4

**Effect Sizes for Demographic Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marital</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>1.32*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.63*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.83*</td>
<td>-0.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>-0.59*</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Leisure Time spent</td>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>- .21*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time spent</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Effect sizes are reported as Cohen’s *d* values. Positive *d* values indicate a higher mean for males, married individuals, and individuals with children. Interference = Work Interference with Domain.

*p < .05.*
### Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Study Variables

| Variable          | M   | SD  | N   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | 23  | 24  |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Segmentation      | 2.90| .12 | 1615| .87 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Life sat          | 3.05| .99 | 1808| .20 | .82 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Job sat           | 3.60| .93 | 1786| .05 | .38 | .88 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Turnover Int      | 2.62| .11 | 1808| .02 | .28 | .73 | .87 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Physical sym.     | 1.29| .19 | 1612| -.30| -.24| .20 | .74 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Mental health     | 3.02| .46 | 1612| .27 | .48 | .45 | .35 | .47 | .88 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Opt out           | 1.01| .78 | 1037| -.25| -.28| -.14| .14 | .22 | -.27|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| WIL               | 3.05| .73 | 1785| -.38| -.38| -.34| .30 | .43 | -.50| .43 | .97 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Health            | 3.25| .92 | 1706| -.31| -.29| -.27| .24 | .39 | -.42| .35 | .82 | .91 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Family            | 3.02| .90 | 1570| -.32| -.32| -.26| .20 | .32 | -.36| .33 | .81 | .60 | .91 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Household         | 2.97| .92 | 1704| -.77| -.77| -.24| .19 | .33 | -.35| .31 | .78 | .60 | .54 | .92 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Friendships       | 3.00| .90 | 1656| -.34| -.31| -.26| .24 | .35 | -.41| .35 | .84 | .62 | .66 | .58 | .91 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Education         | 2.82| .92 | 1289| -.17| -.27| -.33| .30 | .28 | -.35| .24 | .69 | .49 | .43 | .47 | .46 | .94 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Romantic          | 3.08| .92 | 1512| -.36| -.35| -.27| .23 | .37 | -.43| .39 | .82 | .60 | .66 | .56 | .68 | .44 | .91 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Community         | 2.90| .86 | 1144| -.26| -.22| -.28| .27 | .32 | -.36| .33 | .76 | .53 | .51 | .55 | .61 | .49 | .53 | .91 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Leisure           | 3.14| .92 | 1724| -.35| -.34| -.30| .25 | .38 | -.43| .38 | .83 | .61 | .62 | .57 | .67 | .49 | .66 | .58 | .90 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Health            | 2.80| .99 | 1768| .20 | .39 | .16 | -.09| -.31| .29 | -.17 | -.36| -.46| -.27 | -.26| -.24| -.20 | -.29 | -.22 | -.29 | .89 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Family            | 3.42| 1.00| 1639| .39 | .40 | .16 | -.13 | -.17 | .21 | -.15 | -.23 | -.14 | -.27 | -.13 | -.18 | -.14 | -.21 | -.15 | -.23 | .91 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Household         | 3.04| .98 | 1777| .16 | .33 | .15 | -.10 | -.22 | .24 | -.22 | -.34 | -.26 | -.24 | -.50 | -.24 | -.17 | -.26 | -.20 | -.23 | .31 | .16 | .93 |     |     |     |     |
| Friendships       | 2.96| 1.02| 1733| .13 | .35 | .14 | -.10 | -.14 | .23 | -.15 | -.26 | -.20 | -.23 | -.14 | -.32 | -.12 | -.22 | -.11 | -.21 | .27 | .25 | .18 | .93 |     |     |     |
| Education         | 3.45| .96 | 1349| .03 | .28 | .25 | -.18 | -.12 | .18 | -.09 | -.23 | -.15 | -.14 | -.12 | -.12 | -.46 | -.13 | -.14 | -.14 | .21 | .22 | .14 | .20 | .90 |     |     |
| Romantic          | 2.99| 1.16| 1585| .11 | .42 | .15 | -.11 | -.13 | .22 | -.17 | -.20 | -.11 | -.24 | -.11 | -.12 | -.07 | -.31 | .06 | .20 | .23 | .28 | .19 | .25 | .13 | .93 |     |
| Community         | 2.95| .95 | 1187| .00 | .14 | .11 | -.13 | -.04 | .11 | -.10 | -.19 | -.11 | -.16 | -.15 | -.12 | -.12 | -.36 | -.10 | .09 | .15 | .10 | .17 | .17 | .09 | .91 |     |
| Leisure           | 2.91| .99 | 1785| .25 | .46 | .21 | -.14 | -.25 | .34 | -.31 | -.43 | -.32 | -.39 | -.30 | -.34 | -.21 | -.36 | -.25 | -.46 | .35 | .27 | .33 | .35 | .21 | .32 | .13 | .90 |

*Note.* WIL = Work interference with life, aggregated across domains. WID = Work interference with domain. Alpha reliability coefficients are listed on the diagonal. *p < .05
Table 6

*Domain Satisfaction Regressed on Work Interference with Domain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>415.87</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>516.90</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>181.15</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>348.29</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>154.81</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>183.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>461.60</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*Regression of Work- and Personal-Related Outcomes on Work Interference with Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-15.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>23.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-17.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical symptoms</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>19.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-22.90*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Standardized regression coefficients are shown.

N = 1609 to 1785.

*p < .05*
Table 8

Hierarchical Regression of Work- and Personal-Related Variables on Work Interference with Family and Work Interference with Other Nonwork Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Physical Symptoms</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIDf</strong></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIDo</strong></td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔR²</strong></td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall R²</strong></td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Standardized coefficients from the full model are shown. WID_f = work interference with the family domain. WID_o = work interference with domains other than family. *p < .05
Table 9

*Number of Individuals Opting out of a Domain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>35.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>145.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reason denotes the reason given by the person for lack of involvement. NW = had nothing to do with work; W = at least partly due to work.

*p < .05
Figure Captions

Figure 1. *Second-order measurement model of work interference with life*
Note. T represents parcels of time items. S represents parcels of strain items. Domains are abbreviated using the first two letters of the domain name. WIL = Work interference with life.