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Abstract
This review examines the role that trait-based and state-based affect plays in understanding the intersection of work and family life. We start with the definition of key terms and concepts. This is followed by a historical overview of the two bodies of scholarship that are the focus of this review, the work-family interface and affect. Next, we provide a review and synthesis of 79 empirical studies examining affect in relation to work-family interaction, organized around three perspectives: the dispositional perspective, the state-based specific affective reactions perspective, and the state-based global affective reactions perspective. A methodological critique of these studies follows, providing a springboard for the discussion of recommended methodologies and data analytic approaches, along with directions for future research.
INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, research on the intersection of work and family life has burgeoned. Once viewed as separate domains, contemporary perspectives on work and family recognize the dynamic interplay between these two major life roles. Work and family life experiences are affect laden. Both major life events (e.g., childbirth, divorce, career change, promotion) and more mundane day-to-day experiences (e.g., helping a coworker, talking to one’s spouse) in both domains trigger affective reactions, which in turn influence behavior (Stanley & Burrows 2001). Likewise, affective dispositional traits such as trait-based positive and negative affect, neuroticism, and attachment style influence how individuals interpret and respond to work and family life (Ainsworth 1989, Watson & Clark 1984, Watson et al. 1988).

Based on the increasing interest in the intersection of work-family life, and the growing recognition that affective experiences are an essential component of daily life (Gray & Watson 2001, Stanley & Burrows 2001), in this article we provide a selective review of research examining affect in relation to the work-family interface. We begin by outlining conceptual and definitional issues of relevance to work, family, and affect. This is followed by a historical overview of the major perspectives used to understand the work-family interface and affect, emphasizing the study of affect in organizational settings. Then, we review empirical research on the role of affect in relation to the intersection of work and family life. Following this review, we discuss methodological issues associated with the study of affect in relation to work-family interaction and propose important directions for future research.

CONCEPTUAL AND DEFINITIONAL ISSUES

Defining the Domain of Work-Family Interaction

Broadly speaking, work-family interaction refers to experiences in the family (work) domain that impact experiences in the work (family) domain. Work is defined as instrumental activities that provide goods and services to support life (Piotrkowski et al. 1987) and generally refers to paid work (Burke & Greenglass 1987). There has been some debate
in the literature regarding similarities and differences between paid work and work that occurs in the family domain (see Kanter 1977, Zedeck 1992). We agree that work occurs in the family domain, yet consistent with much of the literature on work-family, we restrict our use of the term “work” to refer to paid work. Family consists of those individuals that one is related to as a function of biological ties, marriage, or adoption (Burke & Greenglass 1987, Piotrkowski et al. 1987). Unlike contributions to the work role, the instrumental purpose of family role activities is to keep the family unit intact and enhance the well-being of all members (Edwards & Rothbard 2000).

**Negative aspects of work-family interaction.** Traditionally, work-family interaction has been examined in terms of the conflict that can occur between work and family roles. This perspective is based on the scarcity hypothesis, which argues that individuals have limited resources (e.g., time, energy) and by devoting resources to one role, they are by depriving either tangible or intangible resources from the other role (Goode 1960). In their seminal work on the topic, Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) defined the construct of work-family conflict as a specific form of interrole conflict where the obligations associated with work and family roles are mutually incompatible and where participation in one role is made more difficult or stressful because of participation in the other role.

Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) defined three distinct types of work-family conflict. Time-based work-family conflict is created when time spent in one role (e.g., work) reduces the time available in the other role (e.g., family) or when pressures from one role (e.g., family) create a preoccupation with that role when one is trying to meet the demands of the other role (e.g., work). For example, a parent may have to miss a child’s dance recital because s/he needs to work late to meet a work-related deadline. Strain-based work-family conflict refers to role-generated strain symptoms (e.g., anxiety, fatigue, irritability) that are produced as a result of participation in one role (e.g., work) and hinder performance in the other role (e.g., family). As an illustration, anger and frustration experienced at home after fighting with one’s spouse may make it difficult to act upbeat and enthusiastic when interacting with clients at work. A final type of work-family conflict is behavior based. This occurs when behaviors that are required in one role (e.g., family) are incompatible with behaviors expected in the other role (e.g., work). For instance, a manager may be expected to act self-reliant, tough, and assertive at work, but at home family members may expect him/her to act nurturing, vulnerable, and empathetic.

Early research on the work-family interface conceptualized work-family conflict as a general phenomenon and did not differentiate the directionality of the experienced conflict. Research by Netemeyer and colleagues (1996) made an important contribution by recognizing the bidirectionality of work-family conflict. They argued that work can interfere with family (e.g., business travel may leave less time for family activities), and family can interfere with work (e.g., a sick child may cause one to miss an important meeting at work). This is an important distinction because these two aspects of work-family conflict are conceptually distinct and have some different antecedents (e.g., Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran 2005, Netemeyer et al. 1996).

**Positive aspects of work-family interaction.** Although most research has focused on negative aspects of work-family interaction (see Eby et al. 2005 for a review), scholars also recognize that there is a positive side of the work-family interface (Greenhaus & Powell 2006). Specifically, experiences in the family (work) role have the potential to enhance or even improve experiences in the work (family) life. The recognition of positive synergy between work and family roles provides a more balanced perspective on work-family interaction. Research is increasingly examining positive relationships between experiences in the work and the family domain (e.g., Hammer et al. 2003, Kirchmeyer 1992b, Rothbard 2001, Wayne et al. 2004).
with work-family conflict, the positive side of work-family interaction is bidirectional. That is, work can have a positive impact on family just as family can have a positive impact on work (Greenhaus & Powell 2006).

**Defining the Domain of Affect**

Affect refers to a mental state involving evaluative feelings (Parkinson et al. 1996). It is an umbrella term that includes a wide range of dispositions, moods, emotions, and generalized affective reactions to events, objects, and daily experiences. The construct domain of affect includes both stable, trait-based individual differences that influence how one characteristically views and interprets the world as well as state-based reactions that may range from somewhat transitory and specific states (e.g., moods, emotions) to more general affectively oriented evaluative judgments (e.g., job satisfaction, life satisfaction).

**Trait-based affect.** Individuals differ systematically in their tendency to respond to stimuli in a particular manner. Such individual differences in emotional reactivity and emotional self-regulation are reflective of trait-based affect (Davidson & Ekman 1994, Rothbart & Ahadi 1994). Trait-based affect includes both personality traits and temperament. A wide range of specific individual differences fall into the category of trait-based affect. This includes temperaments such as positive and negative affect, global personality traits (most notably neuroticism and extraversion; see Watson 2000), and more specific individual difference variables such as attachment style, emotional intelligence, and trait-based guilt.

**State-based specific affective reactions.** State-based specific affect refers to subjectively experienced affective states, which reflect the current status of an individual in relation to his or her environment (Parkinson et al. 1996). This includes both moods and emotions, which are controlled by similar processes and contain similar components, yet represent distinct affective states (Parkinson et al. 1996). Moods are generalized feelings that are not associated with a particular object or event and are not characterized as intense enough to interrupt ongoing cognitive processes (Clark & Isen 1982, Thayer 1989). In contrast, emotions are associated with specific events or experiences and disrupt thought processes (Gray & Watson 2001). Another way to differentiate moods from emotions is in terms of their specificity and duration. Moods tend to be defined in terms of overall positivity or negativity (e.g., Watson 2000), whereas emotions are characterized by discrete affective reactions such as guilt, disgust, anger, fear, interest, rage, and joy (Plutchik 1994). Moods also tend to be of longer duration than emotions (Davidson 1994); moods can last hours or even days, whereas emotional reactions are typically intense and brief (Gray & Watson 2001, Izard 1991). Finally, moods are experienced more frequently and consistently than are emotions. Moods are almost always present since “waking consciousness is experienced as a continuous stream of affect, such that people are always experiencing some type of mood” (Watson & Clark 1994, p. 90). In contrast, emotions are high-intensity activation states that are not part of our daily life but have a major influence on us when they occur (Gray & Watson 2001). Emotions in particular are adaptive; they supply information, shift our attention, and alter our memory in ways that allow us to more effectively meet the challenges of everyday life (Clark & Watson 1994, Gray & Watson 2001).

**State-based global affective reactions.** State-based global affect refers to a wide range of summative evaluative constructs, which describe how one feels about objects, events, and life experiences. Life satisfaction is a general affective reaction and represents an important indicator of well-being since it captures one’s overall appraisal of the quality of life as a whole (Argyle 1987). Other global affective states that are indicators of well-being include the absence of depression and psychological withdrawal, as well as higher levels of state-based positive
affect and lower levels of state-based negative affect (Diener et al. 1985, Watson 2000). More distinct satisfactions represent general affective reactions to specific aspects of the work domain (e.g., job satisfaction, career satisfaction) and family domain (e.g., marital satisfaction, family satisfaction). These global affective states should not be confused with real emotions or moods, since each has unique causes and consequences. Emotions and moods also have physiological components that are not necessarily related to global evaluative reactions such as job satisfaction (Weiss 2002).

**HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF PERSPECTIVES USED TO UNDERSTAND WORK-FAMILY INTERACTION**

**Dominant Theoretical Perspectives**

Numerous perspectives have been used to understand the intersection of work and family life. Early research presumed that these two life domains were unrelated such that experiences in the work (family) domain had little or no effect on the family (work) domain. The notion of separate life spheres was the basis of segmentation theory (Evans & Bartolomé 1984, Piotrkowski 1978), and the idea is that the physical and psychological separation of these two life domains is adaptive, allowing individuals to compartmentalize their lives. The work domain is viewed as impersonal, competitive, and instrumental, whereas the family domain is associated with affectivity, intimacy, and significant relational experiences (Piotrkowski 1978). Although some individuals may experience work-family segmentation, subsequent research finds that this is more of a specific coping strategy than a behavioral pattern for most individuals (Lambert 1990).

The recognition that work and family experiences do affect one another led to the emergence of compensation theory (Champoux 1978, Staines 1980). This perspective presumes that individuals make differential investments in work and family life and that we make up for deficits in one domain by investing more in the other domain (Evans & Bartolomé 1984). For example, an individual in a dissatisfying job may invest more in the family role as a way to reap satisfaction that she or he is not obtaining from the work role. This perspective grew out of research on the experience of blue-collar workers who report working in unsatisfying work environments and indicate that their home life is a primary source of satisfaction that is missing from their occupational life (Piotrkowski 1979).

A third perspective on the work-family interface is spillover theory (Champoux 1978, Staines 1980). This is the dominant paradigm used to understand work-family interaction and suggests that experiences in the work (family) domain spillover and affect experiences in the family (work) domain. These spillover experiences include domain-specific affective experiences, skills, attitudes, and behaviors (Kando & Summers 1971). For example, the emotions generated at work can spillover into the family domain by influencing one’s mood at home after a frustrating day at work. Although work-family spillover has been historically viewed as negative, spillover can also be positive (Hanson et al. 2006, Kirchmeyer 1993, Small & Riley 1990). For instance, feelings of satisfaction and pride in one’s family can enhance job satisfaction and boost work-related self-efficacy.

Building on the notion that positive spillover can occur between work and family life, Greenhaus & Powell (2006) developed a theory of work-family enrichment, which proposes that experiences in the work (family) role improve performance and enhance affect in the family (work) role. This occurs through the transmission of positive affect and either tangible or intangible resources from one role to the other role. For instance, negotiation skills learned at work (a tangible resource) can be used in the family role to enhance marital quality or improve interactions with children. Work-family enrichment theory was informed by role enhancement theory (Marks 1977, Sieber 1974), which argues that engagement in multiple, high-quality roles provides both psychological and tangible resources for
individuals, which in turn enhance experiences in other roles. Indeed, research finds that role accumulation is positively related to well-being (Barnett & Hyde 2001). Moreover, research finds that satisfaction with work and satisfaction with family have additive effects on overall life satisfaction (Rice et al. 1985, 1992).

A growing body of scholarship has examined the positive synergy associated with work-family interaction, and numerous constructs have been identified to explain this phenomenon. Indicators of this positive synergy include work-family facilitation (e.g., Grzywacz & Bass 2003, Wayne et al. 2004), work-family enrichment (e.g., Kirchmeyer 1992a, Rothbard 2001), and as mentioned previously, positive spillover (e.g., Crouter 1984, Grzywacz 2000, Grzywacz et al. 2002, Hanson et al. 2006). As this literature base continues to grow, further construct refinement and theory development will undoubtedly occur.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF PERSPECTIVES USED TO UNDERSTAND AFFECT

Dominant Theoretical Perspectives

Various theories have been put forward to understand trait-based and state-based affect. These frameworks generally agree that affect has a two-dimensional structure consisting of positive affect and negative affect (Barrett & Russell 1998, Stanley & Burrows 2001, Watson & Tellegen 1985). Positive affect refers to the experience of pleasant psychological states such as cheerfulness, alertness, and confidence. Negative affect refers to the experience of unpleasant psychological states such as anger, sadness, and fear (Gray & Watson 2001). Both trait-based and state-based affect are conceptualized along these two dimensions, facilitating the integration of research on personality and temperament on one hand with moods, emotions, and satisfactions on the other hand (Gray & Watson 2001).

The circumplex model (Russell 1980, Watson & Tellegen 1985) codified the two-dimensional structure of affect. Based on a secondary analysis of eight published studies on transient self-reported affect, Watson & Tellegen (1985) consistently identified two independent higher-order dimensions of affect representing high and low levels of positive affect and negative affect, respectively. High positive affect is represented by terms such as active, elated, enthusiastic, and strong, whereas low positive affect is defined by terms such as drowsy, dull, sleepy, and sluggish. In contrast, terms such as distressed, fearful, hostile, and jittery are indicators of high negative affect, whereas low negative affect is reflected in the terms calm, at rest, placid, and relaxed. Not all the moods included on the circumplex fall neatly into the positive or negative affect dimensions; some terms reflect a combination of these two core dimensions (Watson & Tellegen 1985). For instance, terms indicating pleasantness (e.g., content, happy, satisfied) represent a mixture of high positive affect and low negative affect. In contrast, terms indicative of unpleasantness (e.g., blue, lonely, unhappy) represent a mixture of low positive affect and high negative affect.

An extension of the circumplex model focuses on the more general biobehavioral systems that underlie positive and negative affect (Watson et al. 1999). Discussed within an evolutionary perspective, two general motivational systems are believed to exist, both of which facilitate adaptive behavior (Carver & White 1994, Tomarken & Keener 1998). The behavioral facilitation system represents approach motivation, and the behavioral inhibition system represents withdrawal motivation (Watson et al. 1999). The feeling states associated with positive affect motivate goal-directed behavior. In other words, positive affect mobilizes the behavioral facilitation system. The feeling states associated with negative affect facilitate apprehensiveness and caution such that negative affect drives the behavioral inhibition system.

The broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson 1998) also argues that positive and negative affective experiences operate vis-à-vis distinct pathways, yet emphasizes the
important role that positive emotions play in our everyday lives. Fredrickson (1998) argues that positive emotional experiences are not simply an indicator of “being happy” in the moment. Rather, over time the experience of positive emotions leads to psychological growth and flourishing. This is thought to occur because discrete positive emotional experiences such as pride, joy, interest, and love all have the ability to broaden individuals’ momentary thought-action repertoire and build physical, social, psychological, and intellectual resources (Fredrickson 2001, 2003). This stands in contrast to the specific action tendencies associated with negative emotions where an individual’s thought-action repertoire is narrowed and a very specific behavioral response is cued (e.g., flee in response to feeling threatened, attack in response to anger). The reason that positive emotions are believed to broaden and build rather than constrain individual behavior, is that positive emotions are not typically generated in adverse situations that require decisive action (Fredrickson 2001). Rather, positive emotions tend to occur as part of everyday life, and their experience encourages creativity and exploratory behavior (Csikszentmihalyi 1990, Fredrickson & Branigan 2005).

Several other perspectives focus more specifically on understanding affective experiences in the workplace. Affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) suggests that specific events at work (e.g., coworker interactions, promotions) create discrete emotional reactions, which in turn lead to spontaneous work behaviors and attitudes. This theory proposes that affective experiences at work have an immediate effect such that affect influences attitudes and behaviors when an individual is in a particular affective state. This emphasis on intraindividual differences in attitudes and behavior highlights the importance of studying affective events as they unfold over time.

Another perspective on the role of emotions in the workplace is Hochschild’s (1979, 1983) research on the phenomenon of emotional labor. In many work contexts, there are either implicit or explicit role expectations about the expression of feelings and emotions. In early research, emotional labor was defined as the emotions that employees are expected to display during service interactions (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993). From an organizational standpoint, it is presumed that requiring employees in the service industry to express positive emotions will increase organizational profits. However, this line of research found that there are mixed or even negative results associated with requiring employees to display certain service-oriented behaviors (Rafaeli & Sutton 1989). This is because the emotions required by service interactions may not be genuinely experienced by the role occupant, and faking these emotions can be emotionally draining. Although far less developed, the construct of emotional labor has also been discussed in relation to normative expectations regarding emotional expression in the family domain and the consequences associated with emotional labor generated in one’s nonwork life (Wharton & Erickson 1993, Yanchus et al. 2009).

THE ROLE OF AFFECT IN UNDERSTANDING THE INTERSECTION OF WORK AND FAMILY LIFE

Our review of empirical research on the role of affect in work-family interaction is organized around three perspectives: (a) the dispositional perspective, which examines trait-based affect in relation to work-family interaction; (b) the state-based specific affective reactions perspective, which examines mood and specific emotional reactions in relation to work and family life; and (c) the state-based global affective reactions perspective, which focuses on the association between overall summative global affective evaluations (e.g., job satisfaction, family satisfaction) and work-family interaction.

The Dispositional Perspective

Three affectively oriented Big 5 personality traits have been examined in relation to the
work-family interface: neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness. Neuroticism has received the most research attention. Individuals high on neuroticism are more likely to experience worry, apprehension, fear, sadness, and irritability. They also tend to cope less effectively with stress and tend to view events as threatening and troubling (Watson 2000). Given these characteristics, it is not surprising that neuroticism is positively related to both work-to-family conflict (Blanch & Aluja 2009, Bruck & Allen 2003, Horwitz et al. 2008, Hughes & Parkes 2007, Rantanen et al. 2008, Wayne et al. 2004) and family-to-work conflict (Blanch & Aluja 2009, Bruck & Allen 2003, Horwitz et al. 2008, Rantanen et al. 2008, Wayne et al. 2004). Furthermore, Bruck & Allen (2003) found significant positive zero-order correlations between neuroticism and all three types of work-family conflict (time-, strain-, and behavior-based), although no unique variance was explained by neuroticism when negative affect was included in the regression models. There is also evidence that neuroticism may reduce the likelihood that an individual experiences positive work-family interaction. Two studies found that as neuroticism increases, work-family facilitation decreases (Horwitz et al. 2008, Wayne et al. 2004). Another stream of research examined the moderating effect of neuroticism, arguing that emotional stability (the positive pole of neuroticism) may buffer individuals from work-family stressors. In support of this idea, the negative effects of work interfering with family on burnout (Kinnunen et al. 2003), depression (Kinnunen et al. 2003), and psychological distress (Rantanen et al. 2008, women only) were less pronounced among those with greater emotional stability.

Extraversion is also an affectively oriented disposition because higher levels of this trait are associated with positive emotionality. Individuals higher on extraversion tend to be more outgoing, energetic, lively, cheerful, confident, and assertive (Watson 2000). Research on the role of extraversion in work-family interaction is not conclusive. Some studies have found that as extraversion increases, work-family conflict decreases (Horwitz et al. 2008; Kinnunen et al. 2003, all-male sample), but other research has found no significant effects (Bruck & Allen 2003). Extraversion has also been examined as a predictor of the positive aspects of work-family interaction, with two studies supporting the notion that extraversion is positively related to work-family facilitation (Horwitz et al. 2008, Wayne et al. 2004).

A growing body of literature suggests that agreeableness can also be viewed as a temperamental trait (see Gray & Watson 2001). Individuals higher on this trait are less likely to experience irritability and jealousy. They also tend to be kind, trusting, cooperative, and mild mannered (Saucier 1994). Given these characteristics, it is presumed that as agreeableness increases, individuals should report fewer negative and more positive work-family interactions. Indeed, several studies have found that individuals higher on agreeableness (Bruck & Allen 2003, Rantanen et al. 2008, Wayne et al. 2004) or similar traits such as sociability (Blanch & Aluja 2009) reported less work-family conflict. Moreover, there is some evidence that agreeableness interacts with family-to-work conflict in predicting marital satisfaction among working fathers such that marital satisfaction was lowest when family-to-work conflict was reported to be high and agreeableness was low (Kinnunen et al. 2003).

Trait-based positive and negative affects have also been examined as predictors of work-family interaction. As discussed above, negative affect is characterized by feelings of distress, anger, contempt, nervousness, and unpleasurable engagement. In contrast, positive affect reflects feelings of enthusiasm, energy, concentration, and pleasurable engagement (Watson et al. 1988). Most studies have examined negative affect in relation to work-family conflict, typically finding a positive correlation (Bruck & Allen 2003, Carlson 1999, Karatepe & Uludag 2008, Little et al. 2007, Montgomery et al. 2006, Stoeva et al. 2002). Less research has focused on positive affect, but there is
some evidence that positive affect is negatively related to both work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict (Karatepe & Uludag 2008, Little et al. 2007).

Other more specific affectively oriented dispositions have been examined in the work-family literature. Burke and colleagues found that wives’ perceptions of their husbands’ Type A personality (characterized by aggressiveness, competitiveness, hostility, and impatience; Spence et al. 1987) were negatively related to their own marital satisfaction (Burke et al. 1980). There is also evidence that Type A personality is positively related to work-family conflict, although the specific pattern of effects is not consistent across types of work-family conflict (compare Bruck & Allen 2003 to Carlson 1999). Trait-based hostility is also positively related to work-family conflict (Blanch & Aluja 2009, Judge et al. 2006) and appears to exacerbate the positive relationship between the experience of work-to-family conflict and hostile emotional reactions. Judge and colleagues (2006) further found that trait-based guilt was positively associated with work-family conflict, and the positive relationship between work-family conflict and guilt-related emotional reactions was stronger among those reporting higher trait-based guilt (Judge et al. 2006).

Several additional affectively oriented dispositional variables have been examined in relation to the work-family interface. Sumer & Knight (2001) examined positive and negative work-family spillover in relation to attachment style, arguing that an individual’s working model of close relationships is likely to influence how he or she responds to work-family issues. They found that negative spillover from home to work was greater among individuals with a preoccupied attachment style (characterized by a negative image of self and positive image of other) compared with individuals with either a secure attachment style (characterized by a positive image of self and other) or dismissing attachment style (characterized by a positive image of self and negative image of other). In addition, positive spillover from home to work (and vice versa) was most pronounced among those with a secure attachment style. There is also some initial evidence that individuals who are higher in emotional intelligence report less family-to-work conflict, ostensibly because they are better able to recognize, regulate, and appropriately respond to emotional cues in both life domains (Carmeli 2003).

A final affectively oriented trait that has been examined in relation to work-family conflict is psychological hardiness. Individuals who are higher on this trait tend to be more resistant to strain reactions because of their tendency to view stressors as challenges that can be overcome rather than as circumstances over which they have little control (Kobasa 1979). As expected, Bernas & Major (2000) found that hardiness had an indirect effect on work-family conflict; hardiness predicted lower family stress, which in turn predicted less family interfering with work. Hardiness also predicted lower work stress, which in turn was associated with less work interfering with family. In a related study, Barling (1986) examined hardiness as a moderator of the relationship between work and nonwork conflict and marital adjustment among men. He found that when both interrole conflict and hardiness were high, marital adjustment was high. However, when interrole conflict was high and hardiness was low, marital adjustment was low. This suggests that like many of the other affectively oriented dispositional traits discussed in this section, hardiness may play a stress-buffering role in work-family interaction.

In summary, the dispositional perspective illustrates that certain traits predispose individuals to experience more intense emotional reactions to work-family interactions. The evidence is particularly strong for neuroticism, agreeableness, negative affect, and other traits associated with the tendency to experience anger (e.g., Type A personality, trait-based hostility). There is also some evidence that affective dispositions may buffer individuals from the negative effects of work or family stressors on strain reactions.
The State-Based Specific Affective Reactions Perspective

A second perspective focuses on the role of mood and emotion in the work-family interface. Consistent with the research reviewed above, state-based negative affective experiences (e.g., anxiety, tension, worry, frustration, guilt, distress, irritation) are positively related to both work-family conflict (Frone et al. 1997b, Geurts et al. 2003, Livingston & Judge 2008, Matthews et al. 2006) and greater juggling of work and family responsibilities (Williams & Alliger 1994, Williams et al. 1991). Moreover, as work and family role juggling increases, the positive mood state of calmness tends to decrease (Williams & Alliger 1994). The positive correlation between work-family conflict and negative mood states also appears to be stronger among those with a more traditional gender role orientation, and the nature of this effect varies by gender. Specifically, there is a stronger positive relationship between family-to-work conflict and the emotional reaction of guilt among men with traditional gender role orientations. In contrast, the positive association between family-to-work conflict and guilt is strongest among women who report a more egalitarian gender role orientation (Livingston & Judge 2008). In a more fine-grained examination of the manner in which mood states in one domain relate to outcomes in the other domain, Judge & Ilies (2004) found that daily experiences of fatigue and distress in the family predicted family-to-work interference. Interestingly, a parallel effect was not found for daily experiences of fatigue and distress at work on work-to-family interference.

Other studies find negative mood spillover from home to work as well as positive mood spillover across domains (Ilies et al. 2007; Judge & Ilies 2004; Song et al. 2008; Williams & Alliger 1994, elation only from family to work; Williams et al. 1991). There is also some evidence that negative mood spillover may be greater for those higher in work orientation (Song et al. 2008). Workload appears to be a catalyst for this work-to-home spillover effect such that increased workload leads to negative work affect, which in turn creates a negative affective reaction in the family domain (Ilies et al. 2007). Other correlates of negative mood include dissatisfaction with the amount of time available for family based on one’s work schedule (Jackson et al. 1985), lack of feedback at work, training inadequacy, and work role ambiguity (Doby & Caplan 1995). Another indication of work-family spillover is the finding that momentary satisfaction experienced in the work domain is positively associated with marital satisfaction reported later the same day (and vice versa) (Heller & Watson 2005). Mood appears to be an important explanatory mechanism here because both positive and negative mood partially mediated the relationship between momentary work satisfaction and momentary marital satisfaction (Heller & Watson 2005). Evidence for affective spillover was also found in research by Ilies and colleagues (2009). These authors found that on days where employees report high daily job satisfaction, they also tend to report higher daily marital satisfaction, greater positive affect at home, and less negative affect at home.

There is some evidence of gender differences in mood spillover across domains. Specifically, Williams & Alliger (1994) found that spillover of negative mood across domains was stronger for women than men. Schulz et al. (2004) also found gender differences in the effect of negative emotions at work on one’s home life. Husbands (but not wives) were more withdrawn at night and reported fewer angry behaviors toward their wives after experiencing more negative emotional arousal at work. In contrast, wives reported more angry behaviors toward their husbands after a more negative emotionally arousing day at work. The amount of workload reported during the day also had differential effects on the emotional reactions of husbands and wives. Wives reported being more withdrawn and were perceived by their husbands as being more angry at home if they experienced a heavy workload during the day. No such effects were found for husbands. Schulz et al. (2004) further found that marital
satisfaction influenced how individuals respond to emotionally taxing experiences at work. Husbands in less satisfying marriages were less likely to report angry behavior at the end of more emotionally distressing workdays. Husbands in less satisfying marriages also reported that their wives engaged in less angry behavior toward them after a difficult day at work. These findings suggest that emotional expression or venting behavior may be inhibited among individuals in less satisfying marriages. It may also reflect differences in household responsibilities and family role salience between the sexes.

Crossover mood effects between partners have also been documented. Song et al. (2008) studied marital dyads and found a significant positive relationship between both positive and negative mood states as reported by spouses. These authors also demonstrated that mood crossover only occurred when husbands and wives reported spending time together, and the mood spillover that occurred tended to decrease as time spent apart increased. Ilies et al. (2009) reported similar crossover effects. Daily job satisfaction reported by the employee was positively related to spouse ratings of the employee’s positive affect at home, and this effect held only for employees who reported a high degree of work-family role integration. A similar pattern was found for the spouse’s ratings of employee’s negative affect. Children’s perceptions of the affective work reactions of adults who play a significant role in their life suggest that there may also be crossover effects from adult to child. Specifically, children reported more positive expectations regarding their own emotional reaction to work when they believed that significant adults in their life held more favorable affective reactions toward work (Porfeli et al. 2008).

A final area of research related to state-based affect involves the emotional demands associated with one’s home life. Similar to Hochschild’s (1979, 1983) conceptualization of emotional labor, emotion work is a form of domestic labor that involves providing emotional support and encouragement to others in an effort to create and sustain positive emotions in the family (Minnotte et al. 2007). Several studies find that emotion work at home is associated with work-family spillover. For men (but not women), as emotion work increased, so did spouses’ negative work-family spillover (Minnotte et al. 2007). Similar effects were documented by Demerouti and colleagues (2005). For both genders, job requirements (which included emotional demands) were positively related to employees’ work-to-family conflict as well as partners’ reports of work-to-family conflict. Furthermore, Stevens et al. (2007) found that for women, both satisfaction with emotion work at home and family cohesion (feelings of togetherness, harmony, and engagement) predicted less negative work-to-family spillover and more positive family-to-work spillover. For men, positive family-to-work spillover was predicted by satisfaction with emotion work at home and relationship satisfaction. Interestingly, satisfaction with emotion work at home was also associated with more negative work-to-family spillover for men. Other research finds that emotional cohesion within the family is positively associated with job satisfaction for women, suggesting another emotional spillover mechanism between the work and home domain (Stevens et al. 2002).

Several conclusions can be reached from research on state-based specific affective reactions. First, state-based moods and emotions are associated with the strains of balancing work and family obligations; as the demands of work and family life increase, individuals tend to experience more negative affective states and fewer positive affective states. Second, there is evidence of both positive and negative mood spillover across work and family domains, suggesting that work and family life likely have reciprocal effects on one another. Gender differences in mood spillover are also evident in research on state-based specific affective reactions, perhaps due to different gender role expectations regarding the expression of emotion in daily life. Third, there is mounting evidence of crossover effects between partners such that one individual’s mood influences the other partner’s mood and/or emotional reaction to work and family life.
The State-Based Global Affective Reactions Perspective

A final perspective on the role of affect in the work-family interface considers state-based global affective reactions, typically as consequences of work-family experiences. Numerous studies find that as work-family conflict increases, job satisfaction decreases (Adams et al. 1996; Allen 2001; Aryee et al. 1999a,b; Behson 2002; Burke & Greenglass 1999; Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Frone et al. 1994a,b; Grandey et al. 2003, women only; Hill 2005; Kinnunen et al. 2004, women only; Parasuraman et al. 1992; Shaffer et al. 2001; Steenbergen et al. 2007; Thomas & Ganster 1995; Wiese & Salmela-Aro 2008), life satisfaction (Adams et al. 1996; Aryee et al. 1999a,b; Hill 2005), and family/home/nonwork satisfaction (Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Frone et al. 1994a,b; Hill 2005; Hughes & Parkes 2007; Karatepe & Uludag 2008; Kinnunen et al. 2006; Shaffer et al. 2001; Steenbergen et al. 2007). This is consistent with research indicating that juggling work and family role responsibilities is associated with less task enjoyment, especially among those higher in extraversion (Williams et al. 1991). There is also ample evidence that work-family conflict is positively related to various indicators of psychological health such as less depression (Frone et al. 1997a,b; Major et al. 2002; Schwartzberg & Dytell 1996, fathers only; Thomas & Ganster 1995), fewer psychiatric disorders (Frone 2000), and lower psychological distress (Burke & Greenglass 1999; Frone et al. 1994a; Grandey & Cropanzano 1999; Harvey et al. 2003; Hughes & Parkes 2007; Kinnunen et al. 2004, women only; Kinnunen et al. 2006; LaPierre & Allen 2006; Mauno et al. 2005; O’Driscoll et al. 1992, 2003; Van der Zee et al. 2005). Work-family conflict is also negatively related to engagement at work (Innstrand et al. 2008, Wiese & Salmela-Aro 2008). Overall psychological adjustment to living overseas has also been linked to both job and nonwork satisfaction (Takeuchi et al. 2002). Finally, there is some evidence that well-being, job satisfaction, family satisfaction (Edwards & Rothbard 1999), and burnout (Barnett et al. 1999) are related to greater perceived fit between work and family life.

There are numerous studies examining the emotionally draining syndrome of burnout in relation to work-family interaction. This literature finds that greater work-family conflict is associated with higher levels of burnout (Bacharach et al. 1991, Burke & Greenglass 1999, Demerouti et al. 2005, Harvey et al. 2003, Innstrand et al. 2008, Kinnunen et al. 2006, Montgomery et al. 2006). There is also evidence of a reciprocal relationship such that greater burnout at time 1 predicts more work-family conflict at time 2 (Demerouti et al. 2004, Innstrand et al. 2008). Work-family interference serves as a partial explanation for why working long hours and experiencing emotional demands at work leads to burnout (Montgomery et al. 2006a,b). Burnout is also negatively related to other indicators of family functioning such as marital satisfaction and family climate (Kinnunen et al. 2003). Furthermore, Westman & Etzion (1995) found that burnout experienced by one spouse was associated with increased burnout as reported by the other spouse, suggesting crossover effects within marital dyads. Likewise, Demerouti et al. (2005) found that for women (but not men), partners’ ratings of work-to-family conflict predicted target employees’ burnout.

Another line of research on global affective reactions links one partner’s work-family conflict to the other partner’s psychological well-being. Hammer and colleagues (2005) found that husbands’ work-family conflict was positively correlated with wives’ reports of depression. Similar effects have been documented among expatriate families. Van der Zee et al. (2005) found that as expatriates perceived greater home-to-work interference, their spouses reported lower psychological well-being. Reciprocal crossover adjustment effects have also been documented such that one person’s reported psychological comfort with the host country is positively related to the other person’s cross-cultural adjustment.
Reciprocal relationships were also found between expatriate work adjustment and spouse cross-cultural adjustment (Takeuchi et al. 2002).

Evidence is beginning to accumulate that as individuals report more positive work-family experiences (e.g., positive spillover, facilitation, enrichment), they also tend to report greater satisfaction with their work lives (Hill 2005, Steenbergen et al. 2007, Wiese & Salmela-Aro 2008) and nonwork lives (Hill 2005, Steenbergen et al. 2007). Likewise, positive work-family experiences predict greater overall psychological health (Hammer et al. 2005, Kinnunen et al. 2006, Steenbergen et al. 2007, Van der Zee et al. 2005), partner satisfaction (Wiese & Salmela-Aro 2008), engagement with one’s partner (Innstrand et al. 2008, Wiese & Salmela-Aro 2008), and less burnout (Innstrand et al. 2008). Finally, a longitudinal study of dual-career couples revealed crossover effects for positive spillover such that husbands’ (wives’) positive spillover at time 1 was negatively related to wives’ (husbands’) depression at time 2 (Hammer et al. 2005).

Finally, crossover effects have been examined in relation to other work-family variables. Grandey et al. (2005) found that women’s job satisfaction (but not men’s job satisfaction) was predicted by their husbands’ perceptions of their wives’ work interfering with family. Grandey et al. speculate that when a husband perceives that his wife is violating the gender-prescribed family role by working, this creates resentment and conflict in the family. In turn, this reduces women’s job satisfaction because they attribute blame to their job. Similarly, Matthews et al. (2006) found a positive correlation between an individual’s perception of work-to-relationship conflict and his/her partner’s perception of the target individual’s work-to-relationship conflict. This suggests that if one person experiences work-to-relationship conflict, the other person is also likely to report feeling that his/her partner’s work is interfering with the relationship. Gender differences were also reported by Matthews et al. (2006). As expected, as women’s reports of work-to-relationship conflict increased, so did relationship tension as reported by their partner. However, the opposite effect was found for men; as men reported greater relationship conflict, their partners tended to report feeling less annoyed and irritated with them. This seemingly counterintuitive finding awaits replication before firm conclusions can be drawn.

Research on state-based global affective reactions consistently finds that the experience of work-family conflict predicts a whole host of negative affective reactions to work and family life, as well as impaired psychological well-being among employees. Work-family conflict is also consistently related to burnout, which in turn has negative repercussions for overall family functioning. Another mechanism by which state-based global reactions influence work-family interaction involves crossover effects among relational partners. This can come in the form of crossover burnout, work-to-relationship conflict, and work-family conflict. There is also some evidence that positive work-family experiences have the potential to facilitate more favorable reactions to both work and nonwork.

METHODODOLOGICAL ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH EXAMINING AFFECT IN WORK-FAMILY RESEARCH

Methodology is an important vantage point to use in synthesizing a body of scholarship and identifying future research directions because methodological choices influence the accumulation of knowledge over time (Sackett & Larson 1990, Schriesheim et al. 1993). For example, if an area of inquiry relies almost exclusively on cross-sectional survey data collected from a single individual, then concerns arise regarding internal validity due to lack of triangulation, mono-method bias, and the inability to isolate cause-and-effect relationships among study variables. On the other hand, if laboratory experiments dominate a body of scholarship,
then criticisms often focus on external validity because of the artificiality of the context and the use of samples that may not be representative of the population to whom one wants to ultimately generalize. To offset the inherent limitations of any single methodology, corroborating evidence from studies using different methodological characteristics is desirable. In this section, we summarize the methodological characteristics of the empirical studies reviewed above. This provides a platform for recommending specific methodologies and data analytic techniques that have utility for addressing critical unanswered questions about the role of affect in the work-family interface.

Typical Methodological Approaches

Seventy-nine individual studies published in 78 empirical articles were included in this review (one article presented data from two independent studies). Sixteen of these articles represented the dispositional perspective, 20 articles focused on the state-based specific affective reactions perspective, and the remaining 43 articles corresponded to the state-based global affective reactions perspective. Drawing from Casper et al.’s (2007) review, the following methodological features were examined: time horizon (cross-sectional versus longitudinal), research design (within-subjects, between-subjects, and both within- and between-subjects design), and level of analysis. This last category is conceptualized in terms of the “level of theory” (Klein et al. 1994, p. 198) and included individual, crossover (e.g., spouse burnout predicting employee work-family conflict), dyad (e.g., employee-child dyad as the unit of analysis), and both individual and crossover. For all of these methodological features, the coding was mutually exclusive such that a given study was classified into only one category. The data collection method (survey, archival, diary focus group or observation, other) was also recorded for each study, and the coding here was exhaustive since a given study could use more than one data collection method (e.g., survey and focus group). We focused on these particular methodological features because scholars have criticized work-family research in general as relying too heavily on individual-level, survey-based, cross-sectional methodologies (Casper et al. 2007). We added the methodological feature of research design because of the ephemeral nature of state-based affect and the tendency for organizational scholars to focus on differences between individuals rather than intraindividual variability.

Table 1 illustrates the methodological characteristics of the studies included in the present review, organized in terms of the three perspectives used in this review. Research adopting the dispositional perspective relies almost exclusively on cross-sectional, individual-level, survey-based methodologies and tends to focus on interindividual differences. Perhaps owing to the stable nature of dispositions, longitudinal research from the dispositional perspective is uncommon as is research examining intraindividual differences. The dispositional perspective is also the least diverse in terms of data collection methods, utilizing surveys to the virtual exclusion of other data collection methods. The state-based global affective reactions perspective also tends to rely on cross-sectional, between-subjects research designs and to focus on research questions at the individual level of analysis. These findings align with the conclusions reached about the general work-family literature. As such, the same criticisms apply to the dispositional and state-based global affective reactions perspectives.

In contrast, the state-based specific affective reactions perspective relies on both cross-sectional and longitudinal approaches and focuses attention on both intraindividual and interindividual differences in the affective experiences of work-family interaction. With the emphasis on transient affective states, this perspective frequently uses the diary method for data collection, typically in conjunction with surveys. The state-based specific affective reactions perspective is also more likely to address research questions from both the individual and crossover levels of analysis.
Table 1 Methodological characteristics of studies examining affect in relation to work-family interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dispositional perspective</th>
<th>State-based specific affective reactions perspective</th>
<th>State-based global affective reactions perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time horizon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-subjects</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between-subjects</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both within- and between-subjects</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossover</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both individual and crossover</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection method</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., interview)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coding for all of methodological features except data collection method is mutually exclusive. Coding for data collection method is exhaustive.*

**Recommended Methodologies**

As illustrated throughout this review, trait-based affect and state-based affect play a prominent role in the intersection of work and family life. Disentangling the complex interplay between affect and work-family interaction requires careful attention to research methodology and creative approaches to the design of research studies. We believe that there are a variety of underutilized methodologies and analytical techniques that hold promise in terms of broadening and deepening our understanding of the role of affect in work-family interaction. In fact, given the widespread use of cross-sectional, individual-level approaches, particularly among studies taking the dispositional and global affective reactions perspectives, our knowledge of the work-family interface in these areas may be somewhat method bound. In the sections that follow, we provide specific methodological and statistical recommendations to advance theory and research in this area.

**Longitudinal research.** Of particular importance for understanding the role of affect in work-family interaction is the consideration of temporal changes over time, which requires a longitudinal perspective. The call for more longitudinal research in the work-family literature is not new (Casper et al. 2007), and we recognize the many barriers to conducting such research including subject attrition over time, tenure criteria that encourages and rewards quantity of publications, and the highly competitive nature of extramural funding, which makes longitudinal research more feasible. Nonetheless, the nature of affective experiences makes longitudinal research particularly important. For example, the temporal-based additive quality of positive emotions proposed by Fredrickson’s (1998) broaden-and-build theory suggests a
cumulative effect of affective experiences over time. This might include additive effects associated with recurring positive emotional experiences in the work domain (e.g., successive positive job experiences), the family domain (e.g., a long-term fulfilling marriage), or a combination of the two.

Another reason that longitudinal research is so important is that family dynamics and priorities shift across the course of one’s life. During the early career (age 25 to 40), individuals often make important life decisions regarding marriage, children, and career (Greenhaus et al. 2000). These decisions have the potential to engender major affective reactions that can spill over into the work (family) domain. For instance, preparing for marriage or the birth of a child is typically anxiety inducing as well as exciting. These family-generated emotional experiences may have particularly potent spillover effects into the work domain in the early career years. Similarly, accepting one’s first “real job” can create feelings of pride and personal fulfillment or lead to a sense of regret and disappointment that in turn affects one’s family experience. For some individuals, middle career (age 40 to 55) is associated with career stagnation due to fewer opportunities for professional growth or skill atrophy. This can engender negative emotional reactions (e.g., apathy, depressed mood, anger), which in turn creates tension at home. For others, the middle career period is associated with positive affective experiences, as individuals reflect on work accomplishments and prepare for new career challenges (Greenhaus et al. 2000). The late career (age 55 to retirement) also represents an important transition for working individuals, particularly if one’s sense of self-worth is closely tied to the work role (Greenhaus et al. 2000). As retirement approaches, individuals may experience positive and/or negative emotional reactions to this life transition, and these affective experiences undoubtedly influence family life.

Multiple levels of analysis. Work-family research involves the simultaneous consideration of work and family life as well as different viewpoints (e.g., employee-spouse, employee-supervisor, employee-child). In other words, work’s influence on family (and vice versa) cannot be completely understood without accounting for both life domains and the entire set of role occupants in each domain. Given these characteristics, work-family interaction can naturally be viewed from multiple levels of analysis. Consistent with general criticisms of the work-family literature (Casper et al. 2007), much of the existing research on affect and work-family has examined individual-level effects (although in this review, crossover effects were more frequently examined than in the general work-family literature) and relied on individual-level theories rather than theories that consider dyadic, familial, or system-level effects. When crossover effects have been examined, the focus has typically been on married or cohabitating partners. Absent in the literature on affect and work-family is research examining other types of crossover effects. This is somewhat surprising given the emotional contagion process whereby one individual’s affective state either consciously or unconsciously influences the emotions or behaviors of another person or group (Barsade 2002). Emotional contagion seems likely among various dyads in the family unit. For instance, a child’s positive mood may influence employee mood either on or off the job. Likewise, a sibling who is experiencing anxiety or depression as a result of a difficult life experience (e.g., divorce, medical problems) may engender similar negative emotional states in an employee, either at home or at work. Other possible emotional crossover effects include interactions between employee and coworker, employee and customer, and employee and supervisor.

Our review revealed that no research to date has taken a dyadic perspective in understanding the role of affect in work-family interaction. This is surprising given the considerable crossover research in this area and the consistent finding that employee (partner) affect relates to partner (employee) affect. Dyadic research examining similarity in trait-based or state-based affect among partners may provide
unique insight into how individuals respond to work-family conflict or experience work-family enrichment. Likewise, shared perceptions of work-family conflict among partners may be an important predictor of family attitudes as well as work outcomes. Finally, an important variant of multilevel approaches to the study of affect and work-family is research that simultaneously examines intraindividual and interindividual variability in affective experiences. This type of research is most frequently seen in the study of state-based specific affective reactions due to the transient nature of emotions and moods. This research consistently demonstrates that there is meaningful within-person variability in affective experiences and that this variability is predictive of individual outcomes (e.g., Ilies et al. 2009).

To better understand such complex associations between affective responses in the work and family domain, Allen (2009) recently called for more multilevel work-family research. Although we agree that multilevel research is needed, such designs must take into account possible linkages through both bottom-up processes (e.g., from the employee to the employee-spouse couple) and top-down processes (e.g., from the work team to the employee). Furthermore, measures designed to capture higher-level constructs such as family affect or family emotional contagion should be developed. Moreover, multilevel designs should draw samples from multiple dyad combinations, multiple families, multiple organizations, and across multiple time horizons (short term, long term). Multiple short-term measurements, preferably in real time (i.e., experience sampling), seem particularly important to account for the aforementioned ephemeral nature of state-based affect.

Nonlinear change. Specific events (e.g., graduation, first employment, job loss, home ownership, health crises) or major role changes (e.g., getting married or divorced, becoming a parent, being promoted to a supervisory role) in either domain can have profound nonlinear effects on individuals, influencing attitudes and behaviors after that point as well as subsequent interactions with those around them. Research on these triggers, or turning points, indicates that completely new behavior systems may develop in response to the opportunities and demands resulting from turning points (Cohen 2008). As an illustration, it may be that the birth of an individual's first child has a major effect on work role identity or job satisfaction, whereas the birth of subsequent children has little or no effect. Likewise, an event in the work domain, such as receiving a scathing performance review, could set off an extreme emotional reaction that irrevocably alters one's attitudes toward work or one's employer. These represent a few of the many potential avenues for understanding affective turning points in work-family research. Finding and employing rigorous empirical methods able to address causal processes unfolding over time (turning points) are critical steps to furthering the accumulation of scientific knowledge in this area.

**Recommended Data Analytic Strategies**

Given the appropriate research design, there is a broad array of innovative data analytic techniques that may contribute to our understanding of the role of affect in work-family interaction. First, latent growth curve models, or random effects models, extend the common structural equation modeling (SEM) framework to provide a flexible statistical tool for testing the significance of change across time and predictors/outcomes of such change (McArdle 1988). Latent growth curve models are beneficial because besides incorporating the accepted benefits of SEM (i.e., accounting for measurement error, inclusion of multiple independent and dependent variables), they also can estimate linear (longitudinal) and nonlinear (turning points) effects.

Second, there is a whole set of statistical approaches dedicated to dyadic effects, some of which incorporate multiple levels of analyses simultaneously and others that only take into account the dyadic nature of the data while...
maintaining an individual level of analysis (see Kenny et al. 2006). Illustrating the latter, path analysis with dyadic data could be used to examine the effect of employee job satisfaction on employee work-family conflict while controlling for the correlation between spouse and employee job satisfaction as well as the non-independence between employee and spouse work-family conflict. Examples of analytical strategies that allow for incorporation of effects at more than one level (i.e., individual-dyad, individual-group) simultaneously include hierarchical linear modeling (Raudenbush & Bryk 2002) and multilevel SEM (Heck & Thomas 2000). Finally, there are occasions where the primary research question focuses on how the similarity (dissimilarity) between dyad members on the same construct affects other variables of interest. For instance, is the similarity in job satisfaction between husband and wife a stronger predictor of marital satisfaction than their dyadic mean-level job satisfaction? Two analytical techniques that provide the ability to examine such similarity, in addition to dyadic mean-level effects, include polynomial regression (Edwards 2007) and the latent congruence model for SEM (Cheung 2009).

Unique situations also exist where examining affect in the work-family interaction may necessitate accounting for a large spectrum of relationships among group members. Two particular types of analyses that incorporate the entirety of social relationships are social network analysis and social relations models. Social network analysis (Scott 1991) identifies the breadth and quality of ties, connections, or links between persons in a group using various types of network measures. Some network measures focus on the individual (e.g., centrality), others on dyads (e.g., reciprocity), others on triads (e.g., transitivity), while others focus on the entire network as a whole (e.g., density). Those indices can then be used as predictors or outcomes of other variables of interest (e.g., positive affect as a predictor of network density at work and/or outside of work). Social relations models (Kenny 1994) also attempt to answer group-level relationship-oriented research questions and require just as intensive data collection, but they usually rely on interval-level data, whereas in social network research the data are typically at the nominal level.

CONCLUSION
Research on work-family interaction continues to accumulate, and there is increasing recognition that affective experiences in both work and family life are important to consider in work-family scholarship. This article provides a historical overview of these two bodies of scholarship, reviews the dominant paradigms adopted in these areas of inquiry, synthesizes existing empirical research on affect and work-family interaction, and provides an original methodological critique of this body of research. From this critique, important avenues for future research are identified, which should both broaden and deepen our understanding of the complex interplay between affective experiences in these two important life domains.
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