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Abstract

In the light of major changes affecting the workplace, the present research investigates the interaction of life domains. Specifically, the studies included in this research comprehensively integrate conceptual advancements in the literature on the interaction of life domains. These advancements refer to the scope of the life domains considered, the different directions of interactions between the work and the private life domain, the inclusion of a positive perspective on the interplay, and the adoption of multi-time and multi-level research methodology. At the same time, the present research adopts new perspectives by investigating life domain conflict and enrichment from an international perspective, by integrating boundary management tactics and by considering the role of emotions at the workplace. Four different studies based on different international and domestic samples were conducted. The results of the first study demonstrate that life domain enrichment plays an important role for international assignees and contributes to the prediction of important outcomes beyond what is contributed by life domain conflict. Using a large international sample, the second study underlines the need to take cultural value dimensions into account when examining the interplay of life domains. This study indicates that Individualism/Collectivism moderate the relationship between life domain conflict and satisfaction outcomes, such that the relationship is stronger in cultures high on Individualism. In the third study, the impact of boundary management tactics for the interplay of different life domains is shown for a sample of expatriates. Specifically, the third study demonstrates that permeability and flexibility of life domains are associated with life domain conflict and enrichment. Finally, the fourth study adopts a longitudinal research design using a weekly diary approach. This study indicates that daily affective events and mood predict life domain conflict and enrichment over time. Taken together, the present studies demonstrate that the integration of conceptual advancements with recent trends at the workplace substantially contribute to our knowledge on life domain interactions and open promising avenues for future research. At the same time, this integration provides several implications for organizations and individuals for the successful management of the interplay of life domains in a modern workplace.
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1. Introduction

Changes in society have altered the traditional views of work roles and roles in the private life domain (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). For example, changing gender roles (Barnett, Marshall, Raudenbush, & Brennan, 1993; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991), developments in women’s labor force participation (Hayghe, 1997), and technological developments (Duxbury, Higgins, & Mills, 1992) have changed the perception of the interplay of different life domains. Generally speaking, work can now be easily intertwined with the private life domain and vice versa, meaning that issues at work affect private life and issues in the private life domain affect work life (Clark, 2000; O’Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath, 2006). Often, this intertwined relation between life domains is perceived as a role conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). While different reasons for the growing importance of difficulties in combining different life domains have emerged, scholars agree on the fact that important factors underlying conflicts between life domains are the increase in dual-earner households, single parent families and increasing duties in elder care (Eby et al., 2005; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). At the same time, advancements such as telecommuting options (Duxbury et al., 1992; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006), the adoption of flexible and compressed workweek schedules (Baltensperger, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Neuman, 1999), and the wider use of mobile communication (Yun, Kettinger, & Lee, 2012) also affect the interplay of life domains.

It has to be noted that conflicts between life domains play an important role for both individuals and organizations (e.g. Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). For example, research has shown that conflicts between life domains are associated with various harmful individual outcomes such as stress or health-related problems (Berkman et al., 2015), decreased organizational commitment (Li, Lu, & Zhang, 2013), and decreased job satisfaction and family satisfaction (Allen, Herst, David, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000). In addition, conflicts between life domains are also related to various organizational outcomes such as absenteeism (Boyar, Maertz, & Pearson, 2005), job-related performance (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011), and customer purchase intent (Netemeyer, Maxham III, & Pullig, 2005).

Consequently, a growing body of research is concerned with finding possible antecedents and factors attenuating the negative effects associated with conflicts between life domains. For example, a recent meta-analysis shows several work domain related stressors (such as work role conflict, work role overload or work role ambiguity), support factors (such as organizational, supervisor and coworker support), and personality
variables (e.g. locus of control) to be important antecedents of work-family conflict (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). At the same time, family related stressors (such as family role conflict, family role ambiguity, and family role overload), family and spousal support, and family climate are associated with family-work conflict.

However, despite growing interest in and knowledge on the interplay of different life domains, several open questions remain. From a conceptual perspective, research comprehensively integrating recent conceptual advancements affecting the understanding of the interaction of life domains is still scarce. These conceptual developments are accompanied by calls for methodological advancements such as integrating multi-time and multi-level research approaches when investigating the interplay of life domains (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007; Eby et al., 2005). From an applied perspective, several recent trends such as the internationalization of the workforce (e.g. Adler & Gundersen, 2008; Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007; Silverthorne, 2005; Tsui, Nifadkar, & Ou, 2007), the virtualization of work processes (e.g. Raghuram, Garud, Wiesenfeld, & Gupta, 2001) and the growing importance of emotions at the workplace (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Lord & Kanfer, 2002) are leading to major changes to organizations and individuals. At the same time, these trends also affect the interactions of life domains. Namely, the internationalization of the workforce makes an international and intercultural perspective on the interaction of life domains necessary (Powell, Francesco, & Ling, 2009). In addition, a growing virtualization of work and the related diversification of working modes suggest the importance of boundary management tactics for a successful handling of the interplay of different life domains (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). Furthermore, the increasing importance of emotions at the workplace (Muchinsky, 2000) calls for the consideration of affective components and their effect on life domain interactions. Overall, the studies included in the present research aim at contributing to the current debate on the interplay of life domains by integrating recent conceptual developments with predominant changes at the workplace such as globalization/internationalization, digitalization/virtualization and emotionalization.

In the following, different early constructs and definitions focusing on the interplay of life domains are summarized before more recent conceptual advancements in this context are presented. Subsequently, these conceptual developments will be discussed in the light of new challenges resulting from major work trends and predominant changes at the workplace. Finally, this integration results in the development of current research questions regarding the interplay of life domains, before elaborating the contribution of the present research in detail.
1.1 Origins of the research on life domain interactions

As in many fields of research in industrial and organizational psychology, the literature on the interaction of life domains shows a high number of different concepts and definitions (Eby et al., 2005). For example, scholars have used the concepts of spillover (Staines, 1980), interference (Byron, 2005) or conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) to describe negative interactions between life domains. Nevertheless, scholars widely agree on considering role theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978) as a conceptual basis for investigation of the interplay of life domains. Katz and Kahn (1978) describe role conflicts as different role expectations toward a given person that impose pressures leading to a psychological conflict. Within the work role, they identify three different types of role conflicts, namely an intra-sender conflict (incompatible role expectations of one person, e.g. the supervisor), an inter-sender conflict (different role expectations of different persons) and an inter-role conflict (role expectations from belonging to one group or organization are in conflict with role expectations from another group or organization). With the last type of role conflict, the authors also refer to the interaction of life domains: “Demands from role-senders on the job for overtime or take-home work may conflict with pressures from one’s wife to give undivided attention to family affairs during evening hours. The conflict arises between the role of the focal person as worker and his role as husband and father” (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 20). Building on this concept of inter-role conflicts, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985, p. 77) in their seminal work define work-family conflict as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect”. According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), work-family conflict can be differentiated into three forms: time-based conflict, strain-based conflict and behavior-based conflict. For example, when time dedicated to one role makes it difficult to participate in another role, the resulting conflict has been described as time-based. Strain-based conflict occurs when strain experienced in one role interferes with participation in another role, and behavior-based conflict occurs when behavioral expectations in one role are incompatible with behaviors in another role.

In addition to this differentiation of different forms of conflict by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), the relationship between work and non-work has also been described under the notions of spillover and compensation (Staines, 1980). While the former assumes a similarity between life domains, the latter emphasizes differences in the work and the private life domain. Based on this distinction, spillover means the transfer of experiences (e.g. mood) from one life role to another. Contrarily, compensation occurs when deficiencies (e.g. in need fulfillments) of one life role are compensated by experiences in the other role. Empirical evidence supports both processes under different conditions (Staines, 1980), although spillover seem to be more prevalent. In addition, the concept of
spillover has been frequently used in contrast to the concept of crossover effects (Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005). According to this distinction, negative spillover occurs when negative experiences in the work domain are transferred to the private life domain. Crossover effects refer to the dyadic transmission of experiences within the same domain. For example, crossover occurs if strain experienced by one person is transferred to his or her partner or other family members.

Another concept used in the literature on the interaction of life domains is work-family balance. Often, work-family balance been conceptualized as the absence of work-family conflict (Carlson, Grzywacz, & Zivnuska, 2009), as a global assessment that work resources meet family demands and family resources meet work demands (Voydanoff, 2005) or as the appraisal of effectiveness and satisfaction with the work and the private life domain (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007). Based on role theory, Grzywacz and Carlson (2007, p. 258) define work-family balance as “the accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his or her role-related partners in the work and family domains”. However, as this short overview shows, there is a wide range of different understandings of the work-family balance construct, potentially leading to conceptual ambiguity and confusion.

Often, the concepts of work-family conflict, a lack of work-family balance and negative spillover are used interchangeably (Eby et al., 2005). Nevertheless, the concepts of spillover and balance can be criticized for several reasons. First, regarding spillover, the notion of similarity between the life domains postulated by the definition of spillover has been questioned (Clark, 2000; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003). Moreover, the concept of spillover between life domains does not specify the valence of the experiences transferred from one role to another (Lambert, 1990). Second, the concept of work-family balance has been contested. For example, the balance metaphor suggests that there is an ideal status of equality between the life domains – which does not necessarily exist in real life (Roberts, 2008). In addition, the use of the work-family or work life balance concepts may lead to the misunderstanding that the two life domains are in opposition to each other (Ulich & Wiese, 2011). Furthermore, as mentioned above, work-family balance remains conceptually unclear and underspecified (Guest, 2002). Consequently, to be more explicit and unambiguous, the present research speaks of conflict or interference between life domains to describe a negative or problematic relation between the work domain and other life domains.

1.2 Conceptual advancement in research on the interplay of life domains

As mentioned above, several conceptual advancements on the interaction of life domains have emerged in recent times. These advancements affect the scope of the life
domains considered, the different directions of interactions between life domains, the emphasis of a positive perspective on the interplay of life domains and the call for more multi-time and multi-level oriented research approaches.

First, given the growing number of alternatives to the typical family model, and increasing variability of leisure activities and interests, research on the interplay between different life domains has tended to supplement and, in some cases, replace the concept of ‘family’ with the concept of ‘private life’ (Tetrick & Buffardi, 2006). Although ‘family’ is an important part of ‘private life’, the two concepts are not interchangeable. For instance, private life includes time dedicated to one’s family as well as time shared with friends, time for leisure activities and time devoted to voluntary work (Roberts, 2008). Moreover, activities in the private life domain also comprise unpaid work (such as care work or child rearing; Fenzl & Resch, 2005). Additionally, broadening the research to include other non-work activities beyond family enables more people to identify with the subject (e.g. people living in single-person households). This perspective consequently reflects a more inclusive way of conceptualizing life domain issues (Lewis, Rapoport, & Gambles, 2003). Consequently, this research is based on the concept of ‘private life’ as a more comprehensive conceptualization and measurement of the interplay of different life domains.

Second, in addition to the original notion conceptualizing conflict between life domains as unidirectional construct, more recent studies agree on the fact that the interplay of life domains has to be conceptualized and measured as a bi-directional construct (Carlson et al., 2000; Eby et al., 2005; Gutek et al., 1991). On the one hand, experiences in the work domain can affect the private life domain (e.g. working long hours reduces the ability to participate in activities in the private life domain). On the other hand, experiences in the private life domain can affect the work domain (e.g. taking care of a sick child hinders participation in work meetings). As previous research has shown, the distinction between the different directions of conflict is important because different processes may underlie the influences from the work to the private life domain and vice versa (Eby et al., 2005).

Third, an important conceptual advancement in the literature on life domain interactions refers to the integration of a positive perspective on the interplay of different life domains. Often, this positive perspective is based on earlier theories, such as the role accumulation theory (Sieber, 1974), and the expansionist approach (Marks, 1977). As these theories underline, people profit by participating in multiple roles due to greater role privileges, buffering effects, greater status enhancement and personality enrichment (e.g. flexibility; Sieber, 1974). Moreover, one role may produce positive effects by increasing the energy for the other role and thus generating new resources available in different roles.
(Marks, 1977). Overall, this positive perspective on the interplay of life domains has received far less attention than the negative perspective (Maertz & Boyar, 2011). However, similarly to the different constructs describing negative interactions between life domains, a variety of different constructs describing the positive interplay of life domains exist. For example, the positive perspective on the interplay between different life domains has been described as facilitation (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007), positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) or enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Certainly, all these definitions shed light on important aspects of the positive interplay of life domains. However, it has been argued that enrichment represents the broadest, the most theoretically developed and best organizing construct and is therefore recommended for research analyzing the positive interplay of life domains (Maertz & Boyar, 2011).

According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006, p.72), enrichment is defined as ‘the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role’. In their conceptual model, the authors define two different paths through which enrichment occurs. On the one hand, resources generated in one role (such as skills, social-capital resources and material resources) may be transferred to another role by an instrumental path leading to high performance in the other role. On the other hand, the authors define an affective path where resources of one role lead to positive affect and then to high performance in the other role. Figure 1 shows the different path according to the model by Greenhaus and Powell (2006).
Analogously to life domain conflict, research found life domain enrichment to be a bi-directional construct with two different directions: work-private life enrichment and private life-work enrichment. Moreover, research has found that three aspects of enrichment have to be distinguished within each direction. Specifically, work-private life enrichment encompasses development, affect and psychosocial capital (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). First, work-private life development includes resource gains in terms of skills, knowledge or behaviors. Second, work-private life affect means the transfer of positive mood and attitudes. Third, work-private life psychosocial capital refers to the promotion and transfer of psychosocial resources (such as security or confidence).

Looking at the other direction of influence, private life-work enrichment can be differentiated into development, affect and efficiency. Whereas private life-work development and affect are analogous to work-private life development and affect, private life-work efficiency refers to a sense of focus or urgency developed in the private life domain, which helps the person to be a better worker. As recent research shows, the directions and sub-dimensions of enrichment are distinguishable and contribute uniquely to various outcomes (Masuda, McNall, Allen, & Nicklin, 2012). In addition, a meta-analysis has shown that work-private life enrichment and private life-work enrichment are...
associated with important outcome variables such as job satisfaction, affective commitment and family satisfaction (McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010).

Fourth, recent conceptual advancements also affect the adequate methodology to fully understand the interaction of life domains (Casper et al., 2007; Tetrick & Buffardi, 2006). One important aspect in this debate concerns the use of multi-time or longitudinal research methods. Specifically, research on the interaction of life domains has often been criticized for its frequent use of cross-sectional research designs (e.g. Casper et al., 2007; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999). Indeed, a review of the research methods used to study the interaction of life domains revealed that 89% of the studies included in the review used cross-sectional rather than longitudinal research designs (Casper et al., 2007). Consequently, more longitudinal research designs are necessary for several reasons. First, longitudinal research designs enable researchers to derive causal conclusions from their work, further clarifying the relationship between life domain conflict and enrichment and their antecedents and outcomes. Second, longitudinal research methods have the potential to better capture the dynamic character of the interplay of life domains (Butler, Grzywacz, Bass, & Linney, 2005; Resch & Bamberg, 2005; Rothbard, 2001). Third, a longitudinal design enables researchers to relate the perception and the attribution of life domain conflict and enrichment to concrete experiences in daily life (Maertz & Boyar, 2011). Among other longitudinal research techniques, the use of diary study methodology offers fruitful insights into the study of life domain conflict and enrichment (Casper et al., 2007). In particular, diary methods have the advantage of collecting data in a natural, spontaneous context and of reducing the retrospection bias (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003; Ohly, Sonnentag, Niessen, & Zapf, 2015). Although there are a few studies examining the interplay of life domains with diary research methodology (Martinez-Corts, Demerouti, Bakker, & Boz, 2015; Wiese, 2004), this area of research has further potential to flourish.

In addition to multi-time approaches in research on the interplay of life domains, previous studies also call for more research taking a multi-level perspective into account (Casper et al., 2007; Eby et al., 2005). So far, the vast majority of studies on the interplay of life domains was conducted at the individual level of analysis (89%; Casper et al., 2007). However, the interplay of life domains can largely be influenced by others and by the membership of different groups (e.g. through team or supervisor support). In addition, stressors and resources for work and private life may occur at different levels of analysis (country, organization, work team, family, individual). For example, flexible work arrangements in a team can affect the perception of life domain conflict at the individual level. Consequently, research adopting a multi-level perspective has the potential to
reveal these cross-level effects. The use of hierarchical linear modeling is especially recommended to identify multi-level effects.

Taken together, the present research tends to systematically integrate these conceptual advancements by considering the private life domain instead of family only, by conceptualizing the interaction of life domains as bi-directional constructs and by including life domain enrichment as a positive perspective on the interplay of life domains. In addition, multi-time and multi-level research approaches are implemented. The current research consequently applies these conceptual developments in the investigation of the interplay of life domains and integrates them with recent predominant developments and trends in a changing workplace.

1.3 The interplay of life domains in a changing workplace

Several recent societal trends and developments deeply affect the workplace. For example, the Capgemini 2012 Change Management Report identifies four meta-trends affecting organizational life: digital transformations, boundary-less organizations/globalization, demographic change and a new balance between productivity and social needs (e.g. work life balance). In addition, the report also highlights the importance of emotions during change processes. Moreover, from a research perspective, the dependence on technology, working in global networks, multiple forms of alliances, reliance on intellectual capital and retaining talent are described as major challenges affecting the modern workplace (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). Furthermore, scholars underline the need for emotional empathy and curiosity as important competencies in the 21st century workforce (Morelli, Illingworth, & Handler, 2015). Consequently, the present research builds on these major trends and analyzes conceptual advancements on the interplay of life domains in the light of current developments in a changing workplace. Specifically, the globalization of the workforce, the virtualization of work processes and the growing importance of emotions at the workplace are taken into account.

1.3.1 The globalization and internationalization of the workforce and the relevance of cultural dimensions for the interplay of life domains

As mentioned above, it is widely recognized that the globalization of work is a major trend posing various challenges to organizations and employees (Adler & Gundersen, 2008; Gelfand et al, 2007; Silverthorne, 2005; Tsui et al., 2007). For example, the internationalization of the workforce requires individuals to interact with international partners from different countries and cultures, to work in multicultural teams, to negotiate internationally, and to be prepared to move abroad to work in a foreign country (Adler & Gundersen, 2008). Two major challenges arise from this situation for research on life domain conflict and enrichment. First, there is a need to explicitly take international
assignments into account when studying the interplay of life domains (Caligiuri, Hyland, Joshi, & Bross, 1998; Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001; Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluk, 2002). Second, the internationalization also requires integrating an intercultural perspective on life domain conflict and life domain enrichment (Powell et al., 2009; Spector et al., 2007).

Regarding the internationally mobile workforce as a first challenge, it has to be noted that international assignments are an increasingly important part of business careers and the demand for internationally mobile employees is growing rapidly (KPMG, 2013; Takeuchi & Chen, 2013). Basically, the main motives for international assignments are to occupy positions that cannot be staffed locally, to support organizational development and to enable personal development by making international experiences possible (Edström & Galbraith, 1977). In the context of expatriation, the adjustment to the foreign culture, the adjustment to the interaction with host country nationals, and the adjustment to the work situation is of particular importance (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991). At the same time, role-related factors deeply affect a successful adjustment of expatriates (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). As the majority of expatriates is accompanied by a partner or a family (Shaffer & Harrison, 2001), the interaction of life domain is another major challenge affecting a successful adjustment. Consequently, research on the interaction of life domain should include an international perspective and explicitly take expatriates into account.

As a second challenge, the internationalization of the workforce requires adopting an intercultural perspective on the interaction of life domains (Powell et al., 2009). This is especially important because the understanding of work and private life is closely linked to cultural beliefs, values and norms (Carlson & Kacmar, 2000; Powell et al., 2009; Schein, 1984). For example, culture relates to the meaning and enactment of work and the private life domain which in turn influences the strengths of the relationship between these life domains (Ashforth et al., 2000). In addition, research has shown that national differences in orientations to self and family affect the amount of time allocated to work and family life (Schein, 1984) which leads to differences in how the work and family domains are deemed compatible (Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999). Overall, different cultures place an emphasis on different aspects of work and private life (Lu et al., 2009; Spector et al., 2004; Spector et al., 2007; Yang et al., 2012). Consequently, culture can also affect the perception of conflict and enrichment between life domains. In their review on intercultural perspective on the interplay of life domains, Powell et al. (2009) conclude that the influence of culture is best studied under a culture-as-dimension notion. This means that the influence of culture on the interplay of life domains should be based on existing cultural dimensions, for example the cultural dimensions described by Hofstede (2001) or
by the GLOBE research project (Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, 2013). Therefore, taking the influence of cultural dimensions on the interaction of life domains into account is a promising area of future research.

1.3.2 Digitalization/Virtualization and the relevance of boundary management tactics for the interplay of life domains

Another major trend affecting the working situation for both organizations and employees are technological changes and new communication technologies leading to a virtualization of work (Cascio, 2000; Raghuram et al., 2001). For example, the use of e-mail, cell phones and common data-bases accessible through the internet enable employees to work physically and independently from a given office space. Moreover, these technologies enable employees to work at times that differ from the regular office hours (McCloskey & Igbaria, 1998). It is widely recognized that new technologies increase the permeability between the life domains; however, scholars disagree whether the permeability has positive or negative effects for employees (Duxbury, Higgins, Smart, & Stevenson, 2014; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). While some authors argue that an increased permeability between life domains helps employees in regulating and synchronizing the demands of the different life domains (Kirchmeyer, 1995), others underline that permeable boundaries let one life domain intrude another life domain, potentially leading to work-private life conflict (Standen, Daniels, & Lamond, 1999).

Permeability between life domains is one of the several facets analyzed by research on boundary management tactics (Ashforth et al., 2000; Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007; Clark, 2000; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006). Specifically, in addition to the study of inter-role conflicts between the work and the private life domain, a growing amount of work is concerned with investigating role transitions between life domains (Ashforth et al., 2000). For example, in their seminal work, Ashforth et al. (2000) argue that people develop boundaries around their life domain and that these boundaries can be described on a continuum of segmentation and integration. While the segmentation of life domains includes inflexible and impermeable boundaries and makes boundary crossing more difficult, the integration of life domains includes flexible and permeable boundaries and increases role blurring. For example, a segmentation of the life domains implies that work affairs should not interrupt time dedicated to members of the private life domain and vice versa. Contrarily, if an individual is contacted by members of the private life domain via e-mails and phone calls while at work, integration of life domains occurs. In a similar vein, Clark (2000) in her work-family border theory argues that people are “border crossers” between life domains and that borders between life domains vary in strengths, permeability, flexibility and blending. In addition, research has shown that there are
individual preferences for different boundary management styles (e.g. Bulger et al., 2007; Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012). For example, while some employees prefer to be contacted by work-related partners at every time of the day, others may want to reserve times dedicated to friends or the family. Overall, boundary management tactics have the potential to explain differences in life domain conflict (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006) and enrichment (Bulger et al., 2007). Consequently, in the light of the growing virtualization of the workplace, the analysis of boundary management tactics offers a fruitful avenue in research on life domain interaction.

1.3.3 Emotions at the workplace and the relevance of affective events and mood for the interplay of life domains

In recent times, the impact of emotions at the workplace has rapidly grown in importance and emotions have been increasingly discussed as a hot topic for management (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Lord & Kanfer, 2002). In part, this increasing interest in the study of emotions at the workplace is due to the popularity of concepts such as emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1996) or the rapid development of the service sector requiring emotional labor (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Moreover, emotions have become popular in industrial and organizational psychology because of their mediating role between environment features and behavioral output (Lord & Kanfer, 2002; Scherer, 1994). A milestone in research on the impact of emotions at the workplace is the affective events theory (AET) by Weiss and Cropanzano (1996). In contrast to primarily cognitive oriented approaches, this theory describes attitudinal and behavioral outcomes at work not only as being influenced by stable work environment features but also and most importantly as the result of dynamic affective experiences at work. The AET has been replicated by various empirical studies (e.g. Fisher, 2002; Ilies & Judge, 2002; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2004; Wegge, van Dick, Fisher, West, & Dawson, 2006) and consequently it offers a strong basis for the investigation of affects at the workplace. As previous research has shown, emotions also play a focal role when examining the interaction of life domains (e.g. Carlson, Kacmar, Zivnuska, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2011; MacDermid, Seery, & Weiss, 2002; Rothbard, 2001). In particular, the transfer of mood and its effect on the perception of life domain conflict has been investigated by previous studies (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Williams & Alliger, 1994). However, research regarding emotions that addresses life domain interactions as bi-directional processes and considers both life domain conflict and enrichment is still missing.

To sum up, the studies included in the present research contribute to research and practice of life domain interactions in various ways. From a conceptual perspective, the
The present research integrates recent conceptual advancements in the literature on life domain interactions. As described above, these advancements affect the scope of the life domains considered, the bi-directional nature of the constructs, the inclusion of a positive perspective on life domains and the adoption of a multi-time and multi-level research methodology. From an applied perspective, the present studies integrate these conceptual advancements with challenges affecting the modern workplace. Consequently, they investigate the interaction of life domains in the light of recent work trends, namely the globalization and the virtualization of work as well as the growing importance of emotions at the workplace. Hence, the present research adopts an international and intercultural perspective and includes findings from the boundary management and the emotion literature. In the following section, the studies included in this research are presented in more detail.

2. The present research

2.1 Overview

Following the argumentation described above, the present research aims at contributing to the literature and practice of the interplay of life domain in various ways. The studies included in this research investigate the interplay of life domains both as dependent and independent variables. While two studies investigate the role that life domain conflict and enrichment play for various important outcomes (study 1 and study 2), two studies elaborate potential antecedents of life domain conflict and enrichment (study 3 and study 4). Figure 2 summarizes the focus of the different studies.
In the light of the globalization and the internationalization of the workforce, the first study presented here investigates life domain conflict and enrichment among a sample of expatriates. The aim of this study is to broaden the perspective on the interplay of life domains during international assignments by considering the effects of life domain conflict and enrichment on job satisfaction, turnover intentions and the accomplishment of role-related expectations among expatriate workers. This study contributes to the literature by integrating recent conceptual developments in the literature on the interaction of life domains in an expatriate context. Moreover, it is the first study investigating the impact of life domain enrichment for expatriates. Consequently, it sheds new light on the unique working experience of international assignees.

Given the growing importance of intercultural influences at the workplace described above, the second study presented within this research investigates the impact of culture on the relation of life domain conflict and satisfaction outcomes. More specifically, the cultural dimensions Individualism and Collectivism are investigated as moderators of the relationship between life domain conflict and job satisfaction, family satisfaction and life satisfaction. This study contributes to the knowledge on the interaction of life domains by analyzing the relationships between bi-directional life domain conflict and various satisfaction outcomes in a large international sample. Furthermore, the study clarifies
potential underlying mechanisms by considering cultural values as moderators. Finally, this study answers the call for multi-level research on the interaction of life domain by taking Individualism/Collectivism at country level into account.

In view of the virtualization and digitalization of the workplace and its effects on the permeability of life domains, the third study investigates the impact of boundary management tactics on life domain conflict and enrichment in a sample of expatriate workers. The aim of this study is to investigate how boundary permeability and flexibility relate to life domain conflict and enrichment and to build clusters of different boundary management styles for employees on international assignments. This is the first paper empirically investigating boundary management of expatriates. In addition, this paper contributes to the literature by integrating conceptual advancements in the interaction of life domains and combining them with differentiated forms of boundary management tactics. Furthermore, the identification of expatriates' boundary management profiles helps customize life domain interventions for international assignees.

Finally, the fourth study picks up the trend of the growing importance of emotions at the workplace. Building on the AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) as theoretical basis, this study adopts a longitudinal perspective on the interaction of life domains and addresses the impact of affective components on the interplay of life domains. Specifically, this study aims at investigating the effect of daily affective life events and mood on life domain conflict and enrichment by using a weekly diary approach. This study contributes to our knowledge by integrating conceptual advancements on life domain interactions and affective components using an established theoretical basis. Moreover, it adopts a multi-time approach and analyzes the dynamics of life domain conflict and enrichment from a longitudinal perspective.

In the following, the four articles are presented. Subsequently, the findings of the different studies are summarized and general implications for research and practice are derived. Finally, an outlook on possible future research on the interaction of life domains is presented.
2.2 Beyond Conflict: The role of life domain enrichment for expatriates (Study 1)
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ABSTRACT

The employment of expatriates has become an increasingly important part of professional business careers, and thus factors that influence the success of international assignments have increased in importance. Among these factors, the interaction of life domains plays an important role. This study applied recent advancements in the domestic literature on the interplay between different life domains to the expatriates' situation. These advancements affect the scope of the life domains considered, the different directions of interactions between life domains, and the inclusion of a positive perspective on the interplay. Among a sample of expatriates in the development cooperation sector on four continents, this study investigated the impact of life-domain enrichment on expatriates' assignments. Results showed that life-domain enrichment accounted for variance in job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role-related expectations, beyond what was accounted for by life-domain conflict. These findings underscore the need to consider life-domain variables and processes when examining expatriate adjustment. Implications for training and support of expatriates are discussed.
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Globalization of business activities causes a changing of work and its settings. In this context, intercultural exchange of knowledge and experiences is crucial to the success of organizations (e.g. Adler & Gundersen, 2008). Accordingly, international assignments are becoming an increasingly important part of professional business careers and a basic instrument for international organizations (e.g. Takeuchi & Chen, 2013). As recent studies show, the demand for expatriates is growing rapidly (Brown, 2008; KPMG, 2013), especially in the public sector including military, diplomatic, and social services (Fenner & Selmer, 2008). In general, principal motives for international assignments are to fill positions that cannot be staffed locally, to support organizational development, and to enable management development by making international experiences possible (Edström & Galbraith, 1977). The employment of expatriates is thus increasingly common in human resources management (e.g. Adler & Gundersen, 2008; Stahl, Miller, & Tung, 2002; Takeuchi, 2010).

However, expatriation is a challenge for individuals because of changes in both their work and private lives. At the same time, it means a risk for the assigning organizations due to high costs of failed expatriation. For example, premature cancelation of assignments, under-performance during assignments, and adjustment problems during assignments and after repatriation are among the most common examples of failed expatriation (Harzing & Christensen, 2004). This is particularly important because financial and nonfinancial costs (e.g. loss of knowledge, disrupted relations to host nationals) associated with expatriation are high (e.g. Black & Stephens, 1989; McNulty, De Cieri, & Hutchings, 2009; Zeira & Banai, 1985). Therefore, research on factors influencing the success of assignments is important for the understanding of expatriates’ experiences. Depending on the stage of an expatriation and on the perspective taken, a successful expatriation can manifest in a successful transfer of expertise, networking and relationship building, and the retention of the expatriate (Cerdin & Le Pargneux, 2009).

In general, the success of expatriation is often explained by adaptation processes (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005). According to Takeuchi (2010), adjustment is defined as ‘the degree of fit or psychological comfort and familiarity that individuals feel with different aspects of foreign culture’ (p. 1041). For example, successful adaptation to the host country reduces the risk of premature turnover and influences the job satisfaction of expatriates. Among the factors influencing the adaptation process, role conflict is particularly important (Lii & Wong, 2008). In particular, work–family conflict has been found to have strong negative effects on expatriates’ adjustment (Grant-Vallone & Ensler, 2001).

At the same time, domestic research on the interplay between different life domains (e.g. work–family conflict; work–life balance) is changing. These changes affect the scope
of the life domains considered, the different directions of interactions between life domains, and the perspective on the interplay. First, there are attempts to replace the term family by private life, broadening the perspective on the interplay between different life domains (Tetrick & Buffardi, 2006). Second, different directions of interactions, namely work–private life and private life–work are taken into account (Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). Third, domestic research is expanding its focus from a conflict perspective to an enrichment perspective (Wiese, Seiger, Schmid, & Freund, 2010). In addition to research looking at the interface between life domains in terms of strain (e.g. negative spillover, work–family conflict), recently scholars have broadened the view on synergies and positive relations between different life domains (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

These developments in domestic research have not yet been integrated in research on the factors that contribute to successful expatriation. However, doing so has the potential to enrich our perspective and knowledge about the unique experiences of expatriate workers. Thus, the purpose of this study is to adopt these developments on the interplay between different life domains and investigate relationships between enrichment of life domains, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and the accomplishment of role-related expectations among expatriate workers. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing literature on expatriates’ adjustment by adapting a broader scope on life domains, examining different directions of influence between work and private life, and integrating a positive perspective on the interplay between life domains, among expatriate workers. To this end, measures integrating these developments were used in a sample of expatriates from the development cooperation sector to assess the impact of the interplay of life domains on important outcome variables such as job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and the accomplishment of role-related expectations.

Expatriation: challenges and factors influencing the success of international assignments

As previous research has shown, the employment of expatriates is common in different sectors, namely the private or business sector as well as the public sector (Fenner & Selmer, 2008). Moreover, developing countries are becoming increasingly important for expatriation (Bader & Berg, 2014; Yeung, Warner, & Rowley 2008). In the present study, the focus is on public sector expatriates in developing countries, namely expatriates working in the area of development cooperation. Although this specific group of expatriates may differ from private sector expatriates in terms of working conditions (e.g. bureaucracy or hierarchy; Fenner & Selmer, 2008), the tasks performed by expatriates in development cooperation are often very similar to those in the public sector, as they serve as experts in advisory activities, as consultants for governmental agencies or as educational experts. Additionally, a study on public sector expatriates and their
adaptation processes concluded that the factors influencing the success of an international assignment among public sector expatriates are comparable to those described for private sector expatriates (Fenner & Selmer, 2008). Parallel to the experiences of private sector expatriates, role-related aspects are especially important for this target group (Fenner & Selmer, 2008).

Overall, despite the growing importance of expatriation in various sectors, it is also seen as a ‘double-edged sword’ (Stahl, Chua, Caligiuri, Cerdin, & Taniguchi, 2009). Problems such as high turnover rates and increased psychosocial stress arise frequently. Naumann (2007), for example, speaks of premature return rates of expatriates’ assignments ranging from 20% to 50%. In their longitudinal study, Anderzén and Arnetz (1999) found that expatriates show higher psychosocial stress compared to a nonmoving group. This is particularly problematic because costs of failed expatriation are high, especially if costs of damaged relations to business partners are taken into consideration (Zeira & Banai, 1985).

Previous studies have focused on psychological or sociocultural adjustment as one important construct underlying the rewards, costs, and risks of expatriate experiences to individuals, as well as their families and sending organizations (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). In particular, adjustment can be described in terms of various factors influencing the success of the expatriation. For example, Aycan (1997) considers work and nonwork factors, describing adaptation as changes in a direction of reduced conflict and increased fit between the expatriates and the new work and non-work environment in the host country. Based on the model proposed by Black, Mendenhall and Oddou (1991), recent meta-analyses show that adjustment consists of three aspects: adjustment to the general living environment in the foreign culture, adjustment to work expectations and roles, and adjustment to interactional situations and norms (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Hechanova, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2003). Moreover, in a recent review, Takeuchi (2010) argued for a broader perspective on adjustment processes including multiple stakeholders, namely stakeholders from the host country national domain, the parent company domain, and the family domain.

More specifically, as mentioned above, role-related concepts such as role overload, role ambiguity, and work–family issues have been suggested to be crucial factors that influence the adaptation process and thus the success of expatriation (e.g. Takeuchi, Yun & Tesluk, 2002). Among the role-related constructs, family concerns are seen as especially important (Takeuchi, 2010). In fact, the majority of expatriates are accompanied by a partner or a family (Shaffer & Harrison, 2001). Thus, an expatriation affects not only the work domain, but also the private-life domain. For example, Caligiuri, Hyland, Joshi, and Bross (1998) found spouse adjustment and family adjustment to have important
effects on expatriates’ adjustment to the host country. According to van der Zee, Ali and Salomé (2005), ‘working on overseas assignments involves adjusting to a new work situation as well as finding a balance in roles that have to be performed at home’ (p. 240). The importance of family concerns is often based on the specific situation in the host country. For instance, families on global assignments are separated from their social networks and therefore obligated to reorganize family tasks and duties (Caligiuri et al., 1998). While the expatriate has routines and networks within the assigning organization, nonworking family members are often challenged by the need for more cross-cultural adjustment than the expatriate worker. Thus, it has been suggested that global relocation often has a greater impact on the family than on the expatriate (Caligiuri, Hyland, & Joshi, 1998). An excellent overview of studies that incorporate the private-life domain in expatriates’ research is presented by Takeuchi (2010). The author described several studies that take the family members’ perspective into account and concluded that they have a great deal of influence on expatriates and their adjustment.

On the whole, spouse and family issues are often explicitly considered in research on expatriates; however, the interactions of work and personal life are usually not considered (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2001). Research is lacking that distinguishes between the different directions of influence (work–private life and private life–work), that takes a broader perspective on the different life domains, and that adopts a positive perspective on the interplay between life domains. The present research addresses this gap, and thereby sheds new light on the processes underlying expatriate adjustment.

Life-Domain Issues: Interaction between work and private life

Recent domestic research on the interplay between work and private life is based on role theory (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Initially, research focused on inter-role conflicts describing work–family conflict as ‘a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect’ (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), work–family conflict can be differentiated into three facets: time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict. For example, when time dedicated to one role makes it difficult to participate in another role, the resulting conflict has been described as time-based. Strain-based conflict occurs when strain experienced in one role interferes with participation in another role, and behavior-based conflict occurs when behaviors required in one role are incompatible with behaviors in another role.

Recently, several developments have emerged in the investigation of the interaction between work and private life. First, given the growing number of alternatives to the typical family model, and increasing variability of leisure activities, research on the interplay
between different life domains has tended to supplement and, in some cases, replace the term ‘family’ by the term ‘private life’ (Tetrick & Buffardi, 2006). Although ‘family’ is considered a subset of ‘private life’, the two terms are not interchangeable. For instance, unpaid work (such as care work or child rearing) has to be considered as an important activity in the private-life domain (Fenzl & Resch, 2005). Additionally, expanding the research to include other nonwork activities beyond family can broaden the perspective on the interplay between different life domains for people living in lone households. Private life includes time dedicated to one’s family as well as time shared with friends, time for leisure activities, and time devoted to voluntary work (Roberts, 2008). This perspective reflects a more inclusive way of conceptualizing life-domain issues, enabling more people to identify with the subject (Lewis, Rapoport, & Gambles, 2003). Consequently, the term ‘private life’ is used in this study.

Second, as Gutek et al. (1991) argue, two different directions of work–private life conflict have to be distinguished. On the one hand, work may interfere with private life resulting in work–private life conflict (e.g. long hours in paid work reduce the participation in activities at home). On the other hand, private life may interfere with work provoking a private life–work conflict (e.g. a relative’s illness prevents attendance at work). Moreover, different directions of interference have to be distinguished because of varying characteristics of the life domains. For instance, activities in the private-life domain are often considered to be more elastic than activities in the work domain. Thus, conflicts arising from the private-life domain operate differently from conflicts arising from the work domain. When these two directions and the three forms of conflict mentioned above are combined, six dimensions of life-domain conflict result. Table 1 shows the different forms of conflict between life domains examined in this research and provides example items representing each of the different subdimensions.

A third important change in the domestic life-domain literature is a shift from a perspective on conflict to a positive perspective of the interplay between different life domains (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). This shift is based on earlier theories, such as the role accumulation theory (Sieber, 1974), and the expansionist approach (Marks, 1977). Often people profit by participating in multiple roles due to greater role privileges, buffering effects, greater status enhancement, and personality enrichment (e.g. flexibility; Sieber, 1974). Moreover, one role may produce positive effects by increasing the energy for the other role and thus generating new resources available in different roles (Marks, 1977).

This positive perspective on the interplay between different life domains has been described as facilitation (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007), enhancement (Wiese et al., 2010) or enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) propose a detailed theoretical model of positive relations between life domains
using the term ‘enrichment’. They define work–family enrichment as ‘the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role’ (p. 72). Analogously to life-domain conflict, research found life-domain enrichment to be a multidimensional construct consisting of two different directions: work–private life enrichment and private life–work enrichment. Within each direction, three aspects of enrichment have to be distinguished. Specifically, work–private life enrichment consists of development, affect, and psychosocial capital (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). While resource gains in terms of skills, knowledge or behaviors are described as work–private life development, work–private life affect means the transfer of positive mood and attitudes. Work–private life psychosocial capital refers to the promotion and transfer of psychosocial resources (such as security or confidence). Private life–work enrichment can be differentiated into development, affect, and efficiency. Whereas private life–work development and affect are analogous to work–private life development and affect, private life–work efficiency refers to sense of focus or urgency, which helps the person to be a better worker. Analogously to the life-domain conflict dimensions, six life-domain enrichment dimensions result. As recent research shows, the directions and subdimensions of enrichment are distinguishable and contribute uniquely to outcomes such as job satisfaction (Masuda, McNall, Allen, & Nicklin, 2012). Table 2 shows the different subdimensions of enrichment between different life domains used in this study and provides example items representing each of the different subdimensions.

Although some studies address the interaction between life roles for expatriates, few of them distinguish clearly between the different role-related constructs (life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment, including their different directions and aspects) described above. High levels of work–family conflict are reported for expatriates on international assignments due to loss of social networks (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2001), isolation (Takeuchi et al., 2002) or increased responsibilities (Shaffer & Harrison, 2001). However, Lazarova, Westman and Shaffer (2010) developed an integrative model of expatriate work and family performance that also takes positive influences between work and family into account. Although they consider positive crossover effects, family/work role engagement and possible resources, their model does not integrate a broader perspective on life domains, reducing the private-life domain to family processes. Moreover, their model does not include life-domain enrichment in the way it is described by role theory.

Because the success of expatriation depends so substantially on successfully managing work and private life concerns, future research in the context of expatriation would benefit from considering recent developments in our understanding of life-domain conflict and enrichment. However, the nature of life-domain conflict for expatriates can
differ from employees on domestic assignments. As life-domain conflict is a form of inter-role conflict and caused by incompatibility of role pressures, unique roles played by expatriates have to be taken into account. For example, an expatriate is a representative from the parent company, a local resident, a citizen in both countries, an expert, and a family member (Rahim, 1983). Due to ambiguities and incompatibilities within these complex roles (Lii & Wong, 2008), it is likely that role pressures and role benefits have a different nature for expatriates than for domestic employees. Moreover, Harris (2004) argues that the cultural norms of the host country affect the role pressures, role expectancies, and the perception of the interplay of life domains for expatriates. Moreover, Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) state that blurred boundaries between life domains is a key feature of the expatriate’s situation. For instance, expatriates report a lack of refuge in one life domain from the stressors of another life domain (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). Despite these potential differences in the expatriates’ working situation, other research suggests that a distinction between conflict and enrichment and their subdimensions may be generalizable to the context of expatriation. For example, Dierdorff and Kemp Ellington (2008) identified time-, strain-, and behavior-based sources of life-domain conflict across different occupations, while the sub-constructs of life-domain enrichment were confirmed in various samples (Masuda et al., 2012; Odle-Dusseau, Britt, & Greene-Shortridge, 2012; Stoddard & Madsen, 2007). Thus, an integration of constructs from life-domain research has the potential to shed new light on the unique experiences of expatriates, but it may also contribute new insights about life-domain conflict and enrichment.

Thus, overall, we expect a clear differentiation between work–private life enrichment, private life–work enrichment, work–private life conflict, and private life–work conflict in the context of expatriation. Additionally, based on the domestic findings on the substructure of the concepts (Carlson et al., 2000, 2006), we expect the four components to consist of the three subdimensions described above. Specifically, it is predicted that

**Hypothesis 1.** Work-private life enrichment and private life-work enrichment of expatriates are independent from work-private life conflict and private life-work conflict of expatriates. In the context of expatriation, sub-dimensions of the constructs (time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict, enrichment through development, affect and capital/efficiency) are distinguishable.

Recent research has shown that different kinds of resources play an important role in the success of expatriation (Lazarova et al., 2010). For example, being adjusted well to work provides expatriates with resources that facilitate adjustment to the general environment (Takeuchi et al., 2002). Likewise, good adjustment to the host environment has been shown to relate to better work performance (Lee & Sukoco, 2008). Life-domain
enrichment, defined as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role, includes this transfer of resources (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Given the importance of resources for the expatriate’s experience, life-domain enrichment should have the potential to contribute substantially to the success of an international assignment.

Successful international assignments are characterized by several features, including successful completion of the assignment, satisfaction with the assignment and accomplishment of role-related expectations during the assignment. According to Galarza (2000), turnover intentions and job satisfaction are two of the most important indicators of expatriates' adjustment. As Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) state, poor adjustment manifests itself in intentions to quit the assignment as well as in job dissatisfaction. Moreover, Caligiuri et al. (1998) refer to the completion of the foreign assignment as the most important criterion for determining success on global assignments.

In the context of expatriation, the accomplishment of role-related expectations is another important factor. According to Hechanova et al. (2003), the absence of role ambiguity and high levels of role discretion are associated with successful interactional adjustment. Moreover, the accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an expatriate and his or her role-related partners can be seen as an indicator of a successful adjustment to the host country. The accomplishment of role-related expectations is an important indicator of success because it refers both to work expectations and roles (Black et al., 1991), and also adjustment to role expectations in ones private life.

Studies of domestic workers have found positive interactions between life domains to be an important predictor of turnover intentions (Haar & Bardoel, 2008) and job satisfaction (Carlson et al., 2006). Moreover, Carlson, Grzywacz and Zivnuska (2009) found a strong relationship between work–private life enrichment, private life–work enrichment, and the accomplishment of role-related expectations in domestic settings. Based on these domestic findings, we expect life-domain enrichment to play an important role in explaining job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and the accomplishment of role-related expectations of expatriates. According to the literature on adjustment processes (e.g. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005), turnover intentions and job satisfaction are key variables associated with expatriate adjustment success. Additionally, the accomplishment of role-related expectations is considered to be an important indicator of the adjustment to work expectations and roles.

Specifically, it is predicted that

*Hypothesis 2a. Life-domain enrichment of expatriates will correlate positively with job satisfaction.*
Hypothesis 2b. Life-domain enrichment of expatriates will correlate negatively with turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 2c. Life-domain enrichment will correlate positively with accomplishment of role-related expectations.

However, to broaden the understanding of factors influencing the success of expatriates’ assignments, it is important to analyze effects of life-domain enrichment in the context of other role-related constructs. For example, van Steenbergen, Ellemers and Mooijaart (2007) reported that life-domain enrichment contributed substantially and differentially to the prediction of work and nonwork outcomes (such as job performance, affective commitment, and work satisfaction) over and above the effects of work–private life conflict. Similarly, Wiese et al. (2010) showed that enhancement experiences (e.g. transfer of competencies, transfer of positive mood, compensation) predicted job satisfaction and satisfaction with partnership over and above work–family conflict. Following the motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), a low life-domain conflict should function as hygiene factor preventing negative outcomes (such as low job satisfaction), whereas life-domain enrichment as a motivation factor is able to predict positive outcomes substantially (van Steenbergen et al., 2007).

Consequently, it is predicted that

Hypothesis 3. Life-domain enrichment of expatriates will account for variation in (H3a) job satisfaction, (H3b) turnover intentions and (H3c) accomplishment of role-related expectations over and above what is accounted for by life-domain conflict.

METHOD

Participants and procedure:

The present study is based on a sample of German expatriates working in the area of development cooperation. They worked on different projects aiming to foster the independent development of developing countries, for example in poverty reduction, consulting of governmental agencies, education or public health projects. In most cases, they were technical experts in a specific working area and provided their knowledge to the local institutions in the host countries. In total, data from 112 employees from five different organizations were available. Participants were members of a variety of organizations, ranging from church and charity organizations to governmental agencies dealing with community development. All participants had a formal work contract based on German law for development aid. This assignment status requires a high level of technical expertise and several years of working experience in the respective field. All participants worked abroad based on their personal decision. Data were collected through web-based
self-reporting questionnaires during the spring of 2010. Links to the online questionnaires were distributed via email by the assigning organization.

The analyzed sample consisted of 50.0% women and 50.0% men. Of the expatriates, 52.7% worked in Africa, while 27.7% worked in Asia, 15.2% in Latin America and 3.6% in Eastern Europe. The majority (54.5%) lived in some sort of partnership with a significant other, and 26.8% had at least one child younger than 10 years. The job titles of the expatriates in the sample covered the field of development cooperation well. They ranged from peace building, consulting of governmental agencies, development of financial systems, to health care and HIV/AIDS.

Measures

Life-domain conflict was measured with the Work-Family Conflict-Scale (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). This measure consisted of nine items measuring work–private life conflict and nine items measuring private life–work conflict, resulting in a total of 18 items. The three subdimensions of work–private life conflict and private life–work conflict (time-, strain-, behavior-based conflict) were measured with three items each. Sample items included: ‘My work keeps me from my private life activities more than I would like’ (time-based work–private life conflict). The measure had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.89.

Life-domain enrichment was measured with the Work-Family Enrichment-Scale (Carlson et al., 2006). This measure consisted of nine items measuring work–private life enrichment and nine items measuring private life–work enrichment. The three subdimensions of work–private life enrichment (development, affect, and capital) and the subdimensions or private life–work enrichment (development, affect, and efficiency were measured with three items each. Sample items included: ‘My involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better member in my private time activities’ (work–private life enrichment through development). The measure had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.92 and consisted of 18 items in total. accomplishment of role-related expectations was measured with the Work-Family Balance-Scale (Carlson et al., 2009). Sample items included: ‘I am able to negotiate and accomplish what is expected of me at work and in my family’. This measure consisted of six items and had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91. All the life-domain scales were translated into German and broadened to work–private life by Pangert, Schiml and Schüpbach (in preparation). All items were coded 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree.

Job satisfaction and turnover intentions were measured with the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire, translated into German by Nübling, Stößel, Hasselhorn, Michaelis, and Hofmann (2007). Items on the job satisfaction scale were coded 1 = very satisfied, 4 = highly unsatisfied. For the analysis, items of this scale were recoded so that
higher scores mean higher levels of the construct. Sample items included: ‘How pleased are you with your work prospects?’ This measure consisted of seven items and had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.80. Turnover intentions were measured using the item ‘How often have you thought about leaving the international assignment during the last three months?’ with answers coded from never to every day. In addition to the demographic data described above (gender, children), we measured time on assignment and planned duration of assignment.

Analysis

Hypothesis 1 was tested with confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS (Arbuckle, 1997), testing the postulated four-factor model. This model distinguished between four higher order factors consisting of work–private life conflict, private life–work conflict, work–private life enrichment, and private life–work enrichment. Each of the nine items measuring these four factors was hypothesized to load on a respective first-order factor. Figure 1 shows the postulated model of life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment and their subdimensions. This model of life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment was tested against more parsimonious alternative models of the data. An alternative second model specified life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment to load on two factors, respectively (work-private life conflict, private life–work conflict, work–private life enrichment, private life-work enrichment) without distinguishing the sub-constructs. In a third model, the 18 items measuring enrichment were hypothesized to load on one factor and the 18 items measuring conflict to load on another factor. In a fourth model, the 18 items measuring the direction work–private life and the 18 items measuring the direction private life–work were hypothesized to load on one factor. Yet another model allowed the items of all constructs to load on one common latent factor.

To evaluate model fit, the chi-square test can be evaluated. However, several authors recommended the use of practical fit indices (Bollen, 1989; Bollen & Long, 1993; Kline, 1998). Therefore, we used the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the incremental fit index (IFI; Bentler & Bonett, 1980), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990) to examine model fit. Values of 0.90 or above for the CFI and IFI, and values of 0.08 or lower for the RMSEA, are usually taken as evidence of adequate model fit (e.g. Diefendorff, Silverman, & Greguras, 2005; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

To test Hypotheses 2a–2c, bivariate correlations were calculated between life-domain enrichment scores (work–private life enrichment and private life–work enrichment) and satisfaction scores, and between turnover intentions scores and the accomplishment of role-related expectations.
Hypotheses 3a–3c were tested with hierarchical regression analysis. In a first step, control variables were entered, including gender, continent, job title, time on assignment, presence of own children, partnership status, and planned duration of the assignment. In a second step, work–private life conflict and private life–work conflict scores were entered. Finally, work–private life enrichment and private life–work enrichment scores were entered in a separate step in the regression; a significant increase in $R^2$ after entering the work–private life enrichment and private–life work enrichment scores in this regression analysis indicates support for Hypothesis 3.

RESULTS

Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the study variables. As can be seen in Table 4, the postulated model, conceptualizing life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment as hierarchical factors distinguishing between the three different aspects of enrichment and conflict, and distinguishing on a higher level between the different directions (work–private life, private life–work), fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 852.520; \text{df} = 579; \text{CFI} = 0.903; \text{IFI} = 0.904; \text{RMSEA} = 0.065$). Fit indices for the alternative model with a common factor for conflict and enrichment ($\chi^2 = 3089.893; \text{df} = 595; \text{CFI} = 0.113; \text{IFI} = 0.124; \text{RMSEA} = 0.194$) indicated a poor fit to the data. Similarly, the two models distinguishing between the two directions work–private life and private life–work only ($\chi^2 = 2701.010; \text{df} = 594; \text{CFI} = 0.251; \text{IFI} = 0.260; \text{RMSEA} = 0.179$) and between conflict and enrichment ($\chi^2 = 2298.793; \text{df} = 594; \text{CFI} = 0.394; \text{IFI} = 0.401; \text{RMSEA} = 0.161$) indicated a poor data fit. The same is true for the four-factor model distinguishing work-private life conflict, work-private life enrichment, private life–work conflict and private life–work enrichment ($\chi^2 = 1705.290; \text{df} = 589; \text{CFI} = .603; \text{IFI} = .609; \text{RMSEA} = .131$). These results support Hypothesis 1.

As Table 3 reveals, all of the correlations for work-private life conflict, private life-work conflict, work-private life enrichment, and private life-work enrichment were significant and in the predicted direction, supporting Hypotheses 2a-2c. These hypotheses predicted that work-private life enrichment and private life-work enrichment will correlate substantially with job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role-related expectations. As can be seen in table 3, the correlations for the direction, work-private life, were higher than the correlations for the direction private life-work.

Table 5 shows the results of the hierarchical regressions that were conducted to test Hypotheses 3a-3c. As can be seen in the table, the control variables were not related to turnover intentions. In the prediction of accomplishment of role-related expectations, one control variable (continent) showed a significant relation to the dependent variable in the first step. In the prediction of job satisfaction, the control variable ‘planned duration of
assignment’ showed a significant relation to the dependent variable in the third step. Work-private life conflict and private life-work conflict scores significantly increased the prediction of job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = 0.10, p < 0.01$), the prediction of turnover intentions ($\Delta R^2 = 0.08, p < 0.05$) and the prediction of accomplishment of role-related expectations ($\Delta R^2 = 0.10, p < 0.01$). In the third step work-private life enrichment and private life-work enrichment scores increased the prediction significantly for job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = 0.26, p < 0.01$), for turnover intentions ($\Delta R^2 = 0.09, p < 0.05$) and for accomplishments of role-related expectations ($\Delta R^2 = 0.21, p < 0.01$) after controlling for gender, continent, time on assignment, presence of own children, partnership, planned duration of the assignment, work–private life conflict, and private life-work conflict. These results fully support Hypotheses 3a-3c. Additionally, in order to avoid potential misinterpretation due to the correlated predictors, the variance inflation factor (VIF) and the relative weight were calculated following the procedure recommended by Tonidandel and LeBreton (2011). VIF values between 1.08 and 3.52 were obtained, showing multicollinearity was not a problem, as high multicollinearity is represented by VIF values above 4 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). In the prediction of job satisfaction, work-private life conflict had a relative weight of 10.5%, private life-work conflict of 8.5%, work-private life enrichment of 30.0% and private life-work enrichment of 11.2%. The relative weights in the prediction of turnover intentions were 26.6% for work-private life conflict, 2.6% for private life-work conflict, 26.2% for work-private life enrichment, and 19.2% for private life-work enrichment. In the prediction of accomplishment of role-related expectations, work-private life conflict had a relative weight of 22.4%, private life-work conflict of 3.6%, work-private life enrichment of 32.6%, and private life-work enrichment of 26.1%.

DISCUSSION

Because understanding expatriates’ success is crucial for organizations and expatriates themselves, the purpose of this research was to contribute to the prediction of successful international assignments by incorporating recent theoretical developments and empirical findings in the area of life-domain conflict and enrichment. Prior research has demonstrated that role-related variables such as family role conflict or role ambiguities are important predictors of the success of international assignments (e.g. Takeuchi et al., 2002). In particular, life-domain-related issues play an important role predicting the success of an expatriation (Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001). However, research on the experiences of international expatriates has not yet integrated recent developments in life-domain research within the context of expatriation. In particular, recent life-domain research has expanded its focus to include nonwork domains other than the family, reflecting a more inclusive perspective on nonwork issues.
Moreover, research has emphasized different directions of influence, acknowledging influences from work to personal life and from personal life to work, thereby better capturing the processes operating between different life domains (Gutek et al., 1991). Finally, research on expatriates' experiences could benefit from incorporating recent perspectives that emphasize the potential for positive interactions between life domains (Wiese et al., 2010). Thus, the present study sought to broaden our understanding of expatriation by including these new developments in our application of life-domain constructs to the unique experiences of expatriate workers.

Based on research with domestic workers, our first hypothesis predicted that there would be a clear distinction between life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment among expatriate workers. Although there may be many similarities between the work and private life experiences of expatriate and domestic workers, there are also a number of important differences. In particular, as Harris (2004) noted, the cultural norms of an expatriate's host country may affect role perceptions and role pressures, and as Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) argued, expatriates often experience a greater blurring of life-domain boundaries than domestic workers. Thus, Hypothesis 1 tested whether distinctions identified in research with domestic workers also apply to the experiences of expatriate workers. As predicted, confirmatory factor analysis provided strong support for the hypothesized model. Four separate higher-order factors were supported, representing distinctions between life-domain conflict versus enrichment and distinctions between different directions of influence, namely work to private life and private life to work. The four higher order factors each summarized the hypothesized lower-order factors comprised of more specific dimensions, including time-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict, and development, affect, and capital enrichment. Alternative models that specified fewer factors, or eliminated the hierarchical structure, failed to fit the data nearly as well as the hypothesized four-factor hierarchical model, providing strong support for the expected distinctions between conflict and enrichment, between the two directions of influence, and among the lower order dimensions. Thus, life-domain enrichment is not the bipolar opposite of life-domain conflict in the context of expatriation. Additionally, different directions of influence (work–private life, private life–work) and different sub constructs of life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment are distinguishable for expatriates. Overall, these results suggest that the dimensions underlying life-domain interactions among domestic workers also apply to the experiences of expatriate workers living and working abroad.

Research on domestic workers also emphasizes the important role played by life-domain enrichment as a predictor of a variety of work adjustment outcomes, including job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role expectations (Carlson et al., 2003).
Thus, our second hypothesis sought to extend these findings to the domain of expatriate workers, adding new insights into the understanding of expatriate success. As predicted, each of the work domain enrichment measures correlated significantly with the three measures of work adjustment examined in this study, namely job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role-related expectations at work and in one’s private life. Overall, life-domain enrichment explained 10–17% of the variance in job satisfaction, 9–15% of the variance in turnover intentions and 27% of the variance in accomplishment of role-related expectations, representing medium to large effects. These effects are comparable to effects observed in research with domestic workers (van Steenbergen et al., 2007), extending the research on domestic life-domain processes to the experiences of expatriate workers.

Hypothesis 3 of the study predicted that the effects of life-domain enrichment, in both directions, would relate significantly with work adjustment outcomes after controlling for the effects of life-domain conflict. This was based on findings in domestic research that demonstrate that life-domain enrichment incrementally predicts important work-related outcomes (such as job satisfaction; van Steenbergen et al., 2007) after controlling for life domain conflict. Hierarchical regressions supported these incremental effects in our sample of expatriate workers, revealing unique effects of life-domain enrichment on job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role-related expectations, after controlling for life domain conflict and several covariates. Not surprisingly, life-domain conflict predicted the same outcomes as has been shown in previous research with domestic workers (e.g. job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role-related expectations; Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Carlson et al., 2009). In the present study, life-domain enrichment showed twice as much incremental variance in comparison with other predictors in the model, including control variables (such as gender, presence of own children, assignment, partnership, time on assignment), work–private life conflict, and private life–work conflict. This underscores the need to consider both life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment when considering the adjustment of expatriates to their foreign work assignments. A focus solely on life-domain conflict appears to present an incomplete picture. Moreover, as our results show, it is important to clearly distinguish between the different directions of influence (work–private life and private life–work), because the different directions had different relative weights in the prediction of the outcome variables. For example, the direction work–private life had a higher impact on the outcome variables for both conflict and enrichment than the effects of private life–work conflict and enrichment. These results are consistent with findings reported by Meissner (1971), who showed a high impact of factory work on employees’ experiences outside of work, calling this effect the ‘long arm of the job’. Thus, overall, the
findings of the present study underscore the value of incorporating recent theoretical and empirical developments in life-domain research in research on expatriate adjustment. Our findings support previous research on life-domain processes, and provide new insights into the understanding of the experiences of expatriate workers. Although the nature of expatriate work is substantially different from that of domestic employees, many of the same life-domain processes apply, and thereby shed new light on the complex processes that contribute to expatriate success.

There are also several important practical implications of the present research. First, correlations between life-domain conflict/life-domain enrichment and the adjustment success variables were higher for the direction work–private life than for the direction private life work. These findings underscore the importance of the work domain and the role of job design for expatriates. By actively improving experiences in the work domain (through work integration, training, socialization, etc.), expatriate workers may be better able to transfer resources toward managing the complexities surrounding the private life domain while abroad. Expatriate adjustment is challenging for both the expatriate himself/herself and his/her partner and family. By providing a supportive work environment, organizations can improve the degree to which the expatriate can manage complications arising outside of the work context. Second, the results underscore the value of focusing organizational resources on the interplay among different life domains when developing programs to facilitate expatriate preparation (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2001). In addition to special preparation programs offered to the expatriates’ spouses (e.g. Harvey, 1995), organizations might consider the promotion of life-domain enrichment and the transfer of resources from the work domain to the private domain, and vice versa. In particular, courses about adaptation could include exploration, information, advice, and practice about how to foster the enrichment of different life domains while being abroad. Furthermore, life-domain enrichment should be included in coaching or supervision programs during the expatriates’ assignment. Like programs that aim to reduce life-domain conflict for expatriates by raising their awareness of potential stressors in the different life domains (Brown, 2008), programs might be offered that focus on the positive side of life-domain processes, emphasizing the enrichment of work and private life that can occur during expatriation. For example, as Clark (2000) advises, sharing successes at work with members of the private-life domain and telling co-workers about positive private-life experiences may increase the awareness of resources available in the different life domains.

Limitations and future research
As in all studies, the present research has a few limitations that need to be considered. The most important limitation is the cross-sectional, rather than longitudinal, nature of the research. Thus, the possibility cannot be ruled out that causality runs from job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role-related expectations to life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment. Research is needed to tease apart the causal connections among the variables investigated in this study. Longitudinal data would also better capture the dynamic nature of the role-related constructs. Second, although we used an established measure of turnover intentions, it included a single item, precluding analysis of internal consistency reliability. Future research might be designed to replicate the core findings of the present study using alternative measures. Finally, our measure of accomplishment of role related expectations was self-report, raising the possibility that effects were somewhat inflated by the use of a common method.

As role-related constructs depend on expectations of role-related partners in the different life domains, future research should try to integrate the role-related partners’ perspective into the assessment of life-domain conflict and life-domain enrichment. Specifically, crossover effects between spouse and expatriate could be taken into account in future research (Takeuchi et al., 2002). Additionally, future research should combine different data sources such as objective data from assigning organizations concerning turnover of expatriates. Future research might also explore the unique antecedents and outcomes for each of the dimensions of conflict and enrichment. In this study, the main focus was on public sector expatriates. Due to an increasing number of international interventions in crisis regions and diplomatic activities, this group of expatriates is growing rapidly and becoming more important (Fenner & Selmer, 2008). However, describing differences in organizational conditions such as financial control, political determination, hierarchy, and centralization, Selmer and Fenner (2009) underscored the need to distinguish between public sector expatriates and expatriates in the private sector. As the organizational circumstances mentioned also affect the interplay between different life domains (Byron, 2005), research on private sector expatriates could reveal further insights into the interaction between different life domains of expatriates. Moreover, future research should focus on characteristics of the expatriates’ situation affecting the interplay between different life domains. For instance, differences in cultural values between the home and the host country play an important role in the interplay of work and private life of expatriates. Due to differences in the meaning of work and family, there may be differences in the interface between work and private life in different cultures (Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007). Likewise, resources (such as managerial support, coworker support or family support) may vary across cultures and thus affect possible enrichment processes between different life domains (Ford et al., 2007). As a
consequence, future research on life-domain enrichment and its consequences should take differences in cultural values into account, and explore how expatriation differs depending on the characteristics of the home and host cultures.

Overall, the present study clearly indicates that life-domain enrichment is an important variable in the context of international assignments. Furthermore, the present research enhances expatriate research by demonstrating incremental predictions of important outcomes that have been the focus of previous expatriate research. Given the findings of the present study, additional studies are needed to provide a clearer understanding of the processes underlying the interplay between different life domains for expatriates. Additionally, different perspectives on the interaction of work and personal life of expatriates should be considered. The present study is unique in demonstrating the value of incorporating recent developments in life-domain research in understanding the unique issues and experiences faced by expatriate workers. We hope that the present results encourage future theory-driven research that identifies constructs and processes that underlie successful expatriation.
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Table 1.

**Conceptualization of life-domain conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdimensions</th>
<th>Direction Work-Private Life</th>
<th>Direction Private Life-Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time-based</td>
<td>Time-based work-private life conflict</td>
<td>Time-based private life-work conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: ‘My work keeps me from my private activities more than I would like.’</td>
<td>Example: ‘The time I spend on private responsibilities often interfere with my work responsibilities.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-based</td>
<td>Strain-based work-private life conflict</td>
<td>Strain-based private life-work conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: ‘When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in private activities.’</td>
<td>Example: ‘Due to stress in my private life, I am often preoccupied with private matters at work.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-based</td>
<td>Behavior-based work-private life conflict</td>
<td>Behavior-based private life-work conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: ‘The problem-solving behaviors I use at work are not effective in resolving problems at home.’</td>
<td>Example: ‘The behaviors that work for me in my private life do not seem to be effective at work.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdimensions</td>
<td>Direction Work-Private Life</td>
<td>Direction Private Life-Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Work-private life enrichment through development&lt;br&gt;Example: ‘My involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me in my private life.’</td>
<td>Private life-work enrichment through development&lt;br&gt;Example: ‘My involvement in my private life helps me acquire skills and this helps me in my work.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>Work-private life enrichment through affect&lt;br&gt;Example: ‘My involvement in my work puts me in a good mood and this helps me in my private life.’</td>
<td>Private life-work enrichment through affect&lt;br&gt;Example: ‘My involvement in my private life makes me feel happy and this helps me in my work.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Efficiency</td>
<td>Work-private life enrichment through capital&lt;br&gt;Example: ‘My involvement in my work provides me with a sense of accomplishment and this helps me in my private life.’</td>
<td>Private life-work enrichment through efficiency&lt;br&gt;Example: ‘My involvement in my private life requires me to avoid wasting time at work and this helps me in my work.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.

**Correlations and descriptive statistics of the study variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life-domain conflict (both directions)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Life-domain enrichment (both directions)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-private life conflict</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Private life-work conflict</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work-private life enrichment</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Private life-work enrichment</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accomplishment of role-related expectations</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Turnover intentions</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Presence of own children</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gender</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Continent</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assignment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Partnership</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Time on assignment (months)</td>
<td>75.84</td>
<td>105.56</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Duration (months)</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>105.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** N = 112, *p<0.05, **p<0.01.
Table 4.

*Results of CFA Model Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>3089.893</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors (Work-Private Life, Private Life-Work)</td>
<td>2701.010</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors (Conflict, Enrichment)</td>
<td>2298.793</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Factors (Work-Private-Life Conflict, Work-Private-Life Enrichment, Private-Life Work Conflict, Private-Life Work Enrichment)</td>
<td>1705.290</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four hierarchical Factors (with sub-constructs)</td>
<td>852.520</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. CFI = Comparative fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation.*
Table 5.
Results of hierarchical regression analysis of job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and accomplishment of role-related expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Accomplishment of role-related expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continent</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on assignment</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned duration of the assignment</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-private life conflict</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life-work conflict</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-private life enrichment</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life-work enrichment</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. *p<0.05, **p<0.01.
Figure 1. Model of conflict and enrichment and their subdimensions.
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ABSTRACT

Due to the negative outcomes resulting from work family conflict (WFC), it is important to identify variables that influence the relationship between WFC and satisfaction outcomes. At the same time, globalized business activities and a culturally diverse workforce make a cross-cultural perspective on WFC and satisfaction outcomes necessary. Accordingly, this study used the Individualism/Collectivism value dimension identified by Hofstede (1980) to examine the moderating effects of culture on the relationship between WFC and job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Data were obtained from The International Social Survey Program (ISSP), including a sample of 20,850 participants from 30 countries. Results found significant negative relationships between WFC with all measures of satisfaction across cultures. Moreover, results of this study showed that relationships between WFC and satisfaction were stronger in nations that are more individualistic. Consequently, culture is an important variable when examining the relationship between WFC and satisfaction outcomes.
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Changes in society have altered our traditional views of work roles and the family structure (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Hayghe, 1997). Work can now be easily intertwined with family and vice versa, meaning that issues at work affect family life and issues with the family affect work life (O'Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath, 2006). When it becomes difficult to manage and keep work and family roles balanced, work-family conflict (WFC) occurs. Work-family conflict has been defined as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domain are mutually incompatible in some respect” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.77). Empirical evidence has shown that WFC is used as an umbrella term for a construct with two different sub-dimensions, with each having different antecedents and outcomes: work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW) (e.g. Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Frone, Russel, & Cooper, 1992; 1997; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). Thus, to completely capture the experience of conflict between work and family, it is necessary to consider both directions, family interfering with work and work interfering with family (Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). According to Allen, Herst, Bruck, and Sutton (2000), both WIF and FIW can result in costly effects on an individual's work life, home life, general well being, and physical and mental health. Due to the wide scope of effects resulting from WIF and FIW, it is important to understand the causes and the specific outcomes – especially negative consequences - associated with this type of conflict. Consequently, the present study investigates relationships between WIF and FIW and satisfaction with one's job, family, and life. The present research is particularly unique in providing a simultaneous investigation of both types of work family conflict, namely WIF and FIW, and their relationships with satisfaction in each of several domains, namely one's job, family, and overall life.

In addition, concepts of work and family are intertwined with cultural beliefs, values, and norms (Carlson & Kacmar, 2000; Powell, Francesco, & Ling, 2009; Schein, 1984). For example, national differences in orientations to self and family have been shown to affect the amount of time that is allocated to work and family life (Schein, 1984), which lead to differences in how the work and family domains are deemed compatible (Aryee et al., 1999). Because cultures are known to place an emphasis on different aspects of work and family life (Lu et al., 2009; Spector et al., 2004; 2007; Yang et al., 2012), the causes of conflict and the level of conflict felt are also likely to depend on cultural differences. At the same time, increasing globalization of business activities, and intercultural exchange of knowledge and experiences (Lee & Sukoco, 2010), have become commonplace in most large organizations, creating a need to understand and adapt to different working styles and working cultures (Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, & Stroh; 1999; Selmer, 2007). Thus, it is important to understand how culture affects the perception of WFC, and how cultural
differences may influence relationships between WFC and its consequences. Consequently, the purpose of the present research is to examine the effects of culture on the relationships between individual-level WFC and individual satisfaction with family, job, and one’s overall life.

Effects of WIF and FIW on Job Satisfaction, Family Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction

Overall, different theoretical perspectives on the relationship between WFC and its outcomes exist. While the domain specificity model argues that consequences of WIF/FIW primarily affect the receiving life domain (e.g. WIF reduces family satisfaction), the source attribution model posits that negative effects of WIF/FIW mainly affect the originating life domain (e.g. WIF reduces work satisfaction). In their meta-analysis, Shockley and Singla (2011) concluded that a majority of studies support predictions derived from the source attribution model. Specifically, this means that the relationship between WIF and job satisfaction is stronger than the relationship between WIF and satisfaction with the private life domain and vice versa, but negative effects on the receiving domain are nevertheless significant both statistically and practically.

Of the outcomes that have been linked with WFC, none has attracted more attention than job satisfaction (e.g., Allen et al., 2000; Boles, Howard, & Donofrio, 2001; Bruck et al. 2002; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; 1999; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). A meta-analysis by Kossek and Ozeki (1998) found that the relationships between job satisfaction and WFC (overall WFC, WIF and FIW) were negative; however, there was significant variation in the strength of the relationships across studies. In a similar vein, results of Allen et al.’s (2000) meta-analysis show an overall relation of WFC and job satisfaction of -.24. However, the authors also report significant variation in the findings across the different studies included in their analysis (Allen et al., 2000). Regardless of the direction of conflict (WIF or FIW), work family conflict represents an imbalance in one’s ability to meet work expectations (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), resulting in a decrease in job satisfaction (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984).

Nevertheless, compared to job satisfaction, relatively less is known about relationships between WFC and family satisfaction and life satisfaction. Allen et al. (2000) reported a negative relationship overall (-.17) between WFC and family satisfaction. However, effect sizes varied considerably between studies, suggesting the presence of moderator variables needing investigation. Other studies not included in the Allen et al. (2000) meta-analysis also reported conflicting results (e.g., Aryee, et al., 1999; Carlson & Kacmar, 2000; Frone et al., 1992; Hassan, Dollard, Winefield, 2010; Karatepe & Badder, 2006; Lapierre et al., 2008; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). Clearly, the relative dearth of research, and the lack of consistency in findings that have been reported
regarding the relationship between WFC and family satisfaction, suggests a need to investigate the relationship in different samples.

In addition to job satisfaction and family satisfaction, life satisfaction is an important outcome resulting from WIF and FIW (Allen et al., 2000). Previous research has established a negative relationship between WFC and life satisfaction, as would be expected given the connections between life satisfaction and job and family satisfaction (Allen et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). In the Allen et al.'s (2000) meta-analysis, a negative relation of -.28 between WFC and life satisfaction was found. However, looking at the specific directions of conflict, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) found negative relationships between life satisfaction and both WIF (-.35) and FIW (-.25).

Overall, previous research demonstrates relationships between work family conflict and job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction. As Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) point out, these negative relationships may be caused by the inability to meet contradictory role demands and expectations in the different life roles. Although these relationships appear to be moderated by various factors, including perhaps cultural differences, overall negative relationships between WIF and FIW with job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction are expected.

H1: There will be a negative relationship between both WIF and FIW and job satisfaction.
H2: There will be a negative relationship between both WIF and FIW and family satisfaction.
H3: There will be a negative relationship between both WIF and FIW and life satisfaction.

The Moderating Effects of National Culture on Relationships Involving WFC

Previous research has been able to identify antecedents and consequences of WFC; however there are inconsistencies in effect sizes across different studies (O'Driscoll et al., 2006). Moreover, meta-analyses have shown that effects are moderated by factors that have not yet been fully identified (Allen et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). At the same time, relatively fewer studies of potential moderators have been conducted compared to studies of main effects (O'Driscoll et al., 2006). Due to the degree of importance attached to work and family interfaces, more research is needed to understand what variables influence the relationships between WFC and other outcomes (Allen et al., 2000) such as job, family, and life satisfaction.

Work and family issues are closely related to cultural beliefs, values, and norms (Carlson & Kacmar, 2000; Powell et al., 2009; Schein, 1984). For example, pressures on work and family life are a reflection of social expectations and self-expectations that are influenced by values, beliefs, and role-related self-conceptions (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996). Additionally, the amount of time
dedicated to the work or the family domain differs between different cultures (Schein, 1984), leading to differences in how the work and family domains are perceived as being compatible or incompatible (Aryee et al., 1999). This difference in perceptions may in turn lead to differences in the relationship between WFC and its outcomes. Thus, cultural differences have the potential to affect the nature and strength of the relationship between experiences in the work and family domains (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Powell et al., 2009). For instance, cultures may differ in the extent to which work life is viewed separately from family life, or the view that work commitments have priority over family demands (Aryee et al., 1999; Schein, 1984). Because the meaning of work and family can vary for different individuals due to cultural and social factors (Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Poelmans, Chinchilla, & Cardona, 2003; Poelmans, O’Driscoll, & Beham, 2005), it is possible that the relationships between WIF/FIW and satisfaction outcomes are also affected by these differences. Moreover, cultures differ in their preferences for an integration or segmentation of different life domains (Powell et al., 2009). As empirical evidence has shown, differences in preference for integration and segmentation lead to mean differences in job satisfaction (Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005). Consequently, culture may moderate the relationships between WFC and satisfaction outcomes. In addition, cultures differ in the strength of ties between their members and, as a consequence, in the amount of support and help offered to individuals (Powell et al., 2009). At the same time, support and help have the potential to buffer the negative effects of WIF/FIW (Matsui, Ohsawa, & Onglatco, 1995), leading to potential cultural differences in relationships between FIW/WIF and satisfaction with various life domains.

Although there is an increasing body of studies investigating the interplay of life domains from an international perspective (e.g. Casper, Allen, & Poelmans, 2014), only few explicitly take cultural values into account. For example, Hill, Yang, Hawkins, and Ferris (2004) tested the generalizability of a model of the work-family interface in 46 countries and showed that their model of job characteristics, work-family conflict, and different outcomes fits the data across the different countries. Moreover, Steiber (2009) reports differences in time-based and strain-based work-family conflict in a study on 23 European countries. Shaffer, Joplin, and Hsu (2011) integrate findings from 219 studies on work-family questions conducted outside the USA. Based on the Job-Demands-Resources model, the authors propose a universal model of the work-family interface, its antecedents and outcomes. Although these studies adopt an international perspective, they do not explicitly consider cultural values and its impact on life domain conflict and relevant outcomes such as satisfaction.
Of the dimensions used to characterize cultural differences, none have attracted more attention than those described by Hofstede (1980; Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2006). Among these dimensions, Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) has become the most prominent cultural value dimension (Kirkman et al., 2006; Powell et al., 2009). Individualism signifies a culture’s emphasis on the goals and needs of the individual rather than the group (Hofstede, 1980). Members of individualistic cultures tend to give priority to self-interest, and value independence from others, whereas those with a more collectivist orientation tend to define the self in terms of group memberships (e.g. Erez and Earley, 1993; Hofstede, 1980). When there is a conflict of interest, individualists tend to put self-interests above collective interests, and collectivists tend to do the opposite (Chen, Meindl, & Hunt, 1997; Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995). Overall, I/C has been suggested as a cultural dimension that has the potential to have a large effect on the work-family interface (Francesco & Gold, 2005; Powell et al., 2009). For example, Powell et al. (2009) argued that members of collectivistic societies are more likely than members of individualist cultures to receive social support from family members when WIF or FIW occur, providing a buffering effect that members of individualist cultures are less likely to enjoy.

In an empirical study, Spector et al. (2007) contrasted four different country clusters and identified I/C as a moderator of the relationships between WFC and both job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Specifically, they showed that the relation between work demands and overall WIF was stronger in the Anglo-Individualist country cluster, compared to the Asian, the Latin American, and the Eastern Europe clusters. Moreover, country clusters moderated the relationships between strain-based WIF and turnover intentions, and strain-based WIF and job satisfaction, such that the magnitude of the relationship between WIF and job satisfaction and between WIF and turnover intentions was stronger in the Anglo-Individualist country cluster as compared with any of the collectivistic country clusters (Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe). However, in the case of time-based WIF and job satisfaction, a moderating effect of the country cluster was only found in the comparison of the Eastern Europe-Collectivist and the Anglo-Individualist cluster, but no moderating effects were found for the relationship between time-based WIF and turnover intentions. In a similar vein, Lu et al. (2009) examined the relationships between work and family demands, work and family resources, WFC and family satisfaction among Taiwanese and British employees and found that work resources seemed to have a stronger protective effect for Taiwanese than for British workers, whereas WIF resulted in greater role dissatisfaction among British workers. The authors noted that employees in individualistic countries perceive WIF as failure to meet
self-expectations in both life domains and are thus less satisfied with their work and non-work domains when WIF occurs.

Although previous studies of the moderating effects of national culture on relationships involving WFC (e.g. Lu et al., 2009; Spector et al., 2007) have provided a number of unique insights, they have, by and large, only considered one direction of WFC, namely WIF, neglecting the role of FIW in influencing individual outcomes related to job, family, and life satisfaction. Nevertheless, researchers have argued that to fully understand the interplay of the work domain and the family domain, it is necessary to assess both WIF and FIW (e.g. Carlson et al., 2000). Additionally, previous studies have also been limited to comparisons involving only two countries (Lu et al., 2009), or comparisons involving country clusters (Spector et al., 2007), meaning that additional variation among individual nations that differ in I/C has not been investigated as thoroughly. As previous research has shown, it is necessary to make a clear differentiation between nations that are considered to belong to the same country cluster (Murphy-Bermann & Bermann, 2002; Tsui, Nifadkar, & Ou, 2007); otherwise, differences in value patterns among these nations may easily be overlooked. Thus, extensions of the previous research, to include investigations of both directions of WFC, multiple satisfaction outcomes, and a wide variation of national culture contexts, would provide new and valuable insights. Accordingly, in the present study, WFC is conceptualized as a bidirectional construct, taking both WIF and FIW into account, as proposed by a number of authors (e.g. Carlson et al., 2000; Gutek et al., 1991). We also examine satisfaction with both the work and private life domains, in addition to overall life satisfaction. Finally, we include samples from 30 nations, representing a wide variation in I/C, providing a thorough investigation of the potential moderation of relationships involving WFC by nation-level differences in individualism.

In the case of WIF, it is expected that the negative effects of conflict on work, family, and life satisfaction will be stronger in individualistic countries. For example, Spector et al. (2007) observed that the relationship between strain-based WIF and job satisfaction was stronger among nations that were higher in individualism, and suggested that this was because employees in the individualistic country cluster are less loyal to their employers and more likely to react with dissatisfaction to adverse working conditions. Collectivism represents a culture’s emphasis on acting as a member of a group (Hofstede, 1980), with the most important in-group usually being the family (Triandis, 1995). Thus, for people in collectivistic cultures more than for people in individualistic cultures, work roles are likely to be seen as serving the needs of the family in-group rather than the individual (Spector et al., 2007). Members of collectivistic cultures perceive work and family as integrated domains (Yang, 2005; Yang et al., 2012), and see work as a means of supporting the
family (Spector et al., 2007). More specifically, work responsibilities are considered important to the success of the family group (Poelmans et al., 2003; Shenkar & Ronen, 1987). Employees in collectivistic countries are also more likely to receive social support from their family in-group (Powell et al., 2009), which could help buffer the negative effects of WIF on family and life satisfaction. Individualists, by contrast, prefer a clearer separation between the work and non-work domains (Powell et al., 2009), because it is assumed that one can function successfully in one domain without any influence from the other domain. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*H4a: Country will moderate the relationship between WIF and job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction such that the negative relationship will be stronger in individualistic countries.*

Along the same lines, FIW is expected to have a stronger effect on dissatisfaction with one’s life domains in individualistic than in collectivistic countries. Individualists tend to be more focused than collectivists on achieving personal goals (Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995), which are often tied to being successful at work. Thus, for individualists, FIW creates challenges for achieving personal work goals, which are less strongly linked to family goals than they are among collectivists. As a consequence, FIW has the potential to cause more significant problems for individualists because of the greater degree of separation between the goals in the life and work domains, as compared to collectivists. This implies that the relationships between FIW and work, family, and life satisfaction will be stronger in individualist cultures than in cultures that are more collectivist. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*H4b: Country will moderate the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction such that the negative relationship will be stronger in individualistic countries.*

**METHOD**

**Participants**

This study used data collected from the 2002 Family and Changing Gender Roles module of The International Social Survey Program (ISSP), conducted from September 2001 to February 2004. Participants from each country were a nationally representative random sample of the adult population 18 years old and older, with the exception of Austria and the Netherlands, where the sample consisted of respondents 16 years and older. Following previous study designs (e.g. Lu et al., 2008) and due to the nature of WFC (i.e. an imbalance between work life and family life), participants in this study were selected for analysis if they reported working for pay full time.
The ISSP data included participant responses from 35 country groupings. Participants from Germany-West and Germany-East were combined into one country, Germany. The same was done for Northern Ireland, which was combined with Great Britain and relabeled as Great Britain. As data for one of the variables used in this study were not available in the Slovenian sub-sample, this country (Slovenia) was removed from the dataset. Hofstede’s cultural value dimension ratings (2001) were used for testing the moderating effects of culture. Ratings were unavailable for Cyprus and Latvia, thus these countries were removed from the dataset. Table 1 shows within country sample sizes for the remaining 20,850 participants and 30 countries that were used in this study.

**Measures**

As mentioned earlier, research has shown that work family conflict should be investigated in terms of its two dimensions, work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW).

**Work Interfering with Family (WIF).** A two-item scale was created to measure work interfering with family: “I have come home from work too tired to do the chores which need to be done”, and “It has been difficult for me to fulfill my family responsibilities because of the amount of time I spent on my job”. Participants answered these questions using the following four point scale: Never, Once or twice, Several times a month, and Several times a week, with responses of, Does not apply, and, Don’t know, recoded as missing. Items were recoded before analysis so that higher numbers represented higher levels of the construct. Cronbach’s alpha of the measure ranged from .59 to .82 with an average of .70 across countries. Table 1 presents the internal consistencies and descriptive statistics of this scale.

**Family Interfering with Work (FIW).** Family interfering with work was measured using a two-item scale: “I have arrived at work too tired to function well because of the household work I had done”, and “I have found it difficult to concentrate at work because of my family responsibilities”. Participants responded to these questions using the same response scale as the measure of WIF. As can be seen in Table 1, the internal consistencies of this scale across countries ranged from .46 to .86 with an average of .69. We additionally controlled for differences in scale reliabilities across countries when examining the relationships between WIF/FIW and the satisfaction outcomes by covarying the country-level alphas in the analyses.

**Satisfaction:** The three dimensions of satisfaction, job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction, were each measured with a single item. In the case of this study, overall measures of job, family, and life satisfaction were of interest. Researchers (McDowell, 2010; Scarpello & Campbell, 1983) have found that single-item measures of
job satisfaction and life satisfaction are reliable forms of measurement, supporting their use in empirical research. Single-item measures are commonly used in cross-cultural research on job satisfaction (e.g. Oishi, Diener, Lucas, & Suh, 1999), and life satisfaction (e.g. Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis, 1998), and have provided useful insights that have contributed to our understanding of these constructs and their relationships with important outcomes. Because single-item measures of job and life satisfaction are considered appropriate for use in research (e.g. McDowell, 2010; Scarpello & Campbell, 1983; Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997), one can make the case that a single-item measure of this dimension should also yield meaningful results. Job satisfaction was measured by “All things considered, how satisfied are you with your (main) job”. Family satisfaction was measured using the following item, “All things considered, how satisfied are you with your family life”, and life satisfaction was measured with the following item “If you were to consider your life in general, how happy or unhappy would you say you are, on the whole”. Participants answered the questions using a seven-point scale ranging from Completely happy to Completely unhappy. For all three measures of satisfaction, higher scores represented lower levels of satisfaction; therefore, the items were reverse scored so that higher levels represented more satisfaction.

Individualism/Collectivism. Scores for I/C were obtained from Hofstede’s (2001) Values Survey Module. These scores are based on responses of IBM employees in 53 nations. The Hofstede (2001) measure is widely used as a value measure in cross-cultural studies (Tsui et al., 2007).

Control variables. To isolate the main effects of the study variables, other variables that are correlated with the dependent variables at the individual level of analysis were identified. As can be seen in Table 2, significant correlations were found between one or more of the study variables and the number of persons in a participant’s household, the number of hours worked weekly, the participant’s marital status, and the participant’s gender. Therefore, these four variables were included as covariates in the appropriate analyses. In addition, to rule out the possibility that the moderating effects of I/C are caused by wealth or economical factors, the Human Development Index (HDI; Human Development Report 2013) was included as a control variable in the moderation analysis.

Procedure and Measurement Equivalence

A common questionnaire was distributed to all respondents. Each national questionnaire was translated from a standard questionnaire originally written in British English, which was agreed upon by the ISSP Group. In cross-cultural research it is necessary to first determine measurement equivalence (ME) of the items used to measure the constructs before comparing scales across countries and making inferences about
observed differences. According to Vandenberg and Lance (2000), observed scores are not justified to be used in studying national differences unless psychometric equivalence is found first. In order to examine ME, we followed the recommendations by Riordan and Vandenberg (1994) in evaluating our two multi-item measures. Using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), an unconstrained model was estimated first where one loading for each factor (WIF and FIW) was set to 1.0 and all other parameters were freely estimated. A two factor model for WIF and FIW was tested that allowed a freely estimated covariance among the two factors, freely estimated loadings for the second item in each measure, and freely estimated item uniquenesses. Table 3 presents the results of the CFA models that were used to evaluate for ME. A CFI value of .998, IFI value of .998, and RMSEA value of .007 were obtained for the unconstrained, baseline model. All values met the established cutoff levels (CFI & IFI >.90 and RMSEA <.08) suggesting that the model fits across groups. A second model was then created where the loadings of WIF and FIW items were constrained to equality across groups. As can be seen in Table 3, the fixed model resulted in a non-significant decrease in the CFI of .007 and an increase in the RMSEA of only .002. These values met the established change criteria indicating non-significant differences between the item loadings across countries (<.01 for ΔCFI), suggesting that the relationships between items and factors were the same across groups and the scales used in this study were a good fit across all nations. These results imply that the measures were equally effective in measuring the latent WFC factors in the different countries, despite the fact that alpha reliabilities differed somewhat across countries. Because measurement equivalence was obtained, it can be assumed that the resulting differences across cultures on questionnaire items are due to cross cultural differences in measured constructs and therefore the observed scale scores were appropriate to compare across countries. Nevertheless, as noted above, our main analyses controlled for country differences in the scale alphas, as an added precaution against finding nation-level differences that are confounded with measurement differences.

Analysis

We used normal correlation/regression methods to test the main effects of WIF/FIW on the three satisfaction outcomes, and used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to test whether these relationships are moderated by nation-level differences in I/C. HLM provides an appropriate estimate of the multilevel interaction between cultural value dimensions and WIF and FIW in predicting measures of satisfaction. In the first step of the HLM analyses, job, family, and life satisfaction were regressed on the predictor variable (WIF or FIW), and then in a second step, the slope estimated at Level 1 was regressed on
I/C at Level 2. A significant change in the slope of the relationship between WIF or FIW and satisfaction across nations that differ in I/C indicates whether or not the value dimension moderates the relationships between WIF or FIW and measures of satisfaction. Following the recommendations of Enders and Tofighi (2007), variables at Level 1 were group mean centered and the variables at Level 2 were grand mean centered. To obtain a pure estimate of the cross-level interaction and partial out the effects of Level 1 variables at Level 2, aggregate WIF and FIW country scores, the Hofstede (2001) I/C country scores, and the interaction between these two were added to the Level 2 equation to predict the satisfaction outcomes. All analyses used a p-value of .05 to determine statistical significance. Resembling all regression tests, gender, marital status, number of hours worked weekly, number of persons in the household and the HDI were included as covariates in the Level 1 equations.

RESULTS

Pearson correlations among the main research variables were calculated to test Hypotheses 1-3. These correlations can be found in Table 2. Significant correlations (at the 0.01 level) were found between job satisfaction and both WIF \( (r = -0.067) \) and FIW \( (r = -0.102) \). Also, as predicted, significant negative correlations were found between family satisfaction and both WIF \( (r = -0.067) \) and FIW \( (r = -0.114) \). Additionally, it was predicted that life satisfaction is also negatively correlated with WIF and FIW. As expected, the relationships between life satisfaction and WIF \( (r = -0.074) \) and FIW \( (r = -0.128) \) are negative and significant. Overall, these results fully support Hypotheses 1-3. Not surprisingly, significant positive relationships were found between job satisfaction \( (r = 0.366) \) and life satisfaction as well as between family satisfaction \( (r = 0.625) \) and life satisfaction.

Finally, Hypothesis 4 predicted that the relationships between WIF and FIW with the three satisfaction outcomes would be moderated by I/C. Using HLM, predictors and covariates were entered at Level 1 and country level culture scores were entered at Level 2. Hypothesis 4a predicted that the relationship between WIF and the satisfaction outcomes was moderated by I/C. As seen in Table 4, WIF is significantly associated with job satisfaction \( (p = 0.000) \). Additionally, this relationship is moderated by I/C \( (p = 0.007) \). Furthermore, as Table 4 shows, WIF had a significant relationship with family satisfaction \( (p = 0.000) \), confirming Hypothesis 2. As can be seen in the table, this relationship was moderated by I/C \( (p = 0.001) \), as predicted by Hypothesis 4a. As Table 4 further shows, WIF had a significant relationship with life satisfaction, and this relation was moderated by I/C \( (p = 0.001) \), further supporting hypothesis 4a.

Hypothesis 4b predicted that the relationships between FIW and the satisfaction outcomes would be moderated by I/C. As can be seen in Table 4, the results show
significant relationships between FIW and job satisfaction (p = .000), between FIW and family satisfaction (p = .000), and between FIW and life satisfaction (p = .000), supporting Hypotheses 1-3. As can also be seen in the table, each of these relationships was moderated by I/C (job satisfaction p = .000; family satisfaction p = .000; life satisfaction p = .002). These results fully support hypothesis 4b. All significant results were in the expected direction such that the relationship between WIF/FIW was stronger in countries that are higher in individualism.

In addition, we performed simple slope analyses in order to better understand the significant moderating effects. Following common guidelines (e.g. Aiken & West, 1991; Cohen & Cohen, 1983), values one standard deviation (SD) below and one SD above the mean of the cultural moderator I/C were chosen for plotting. The analysis indicated that in the prediction of job satisfaction, simple slopes of WIF varied between -0.25 at one SD above the mean of I/C to -0.17 at one SD below the mean of I/C. For FIW, the simple slopes varied between -0.37 (one SD above the mean of I/C) and -0.19 (one SD below the mean of I/C). In the prediction of family satisfaction, simple slopes of WIF varied between -0.20 (one SD above the mean of I/C; for FIW -0.40) and -0.12 (one SD below the mean of I/C; for FIW -0.21). Finally, in the prediction of life satisfaction, the simple slopes varied between -0.21 (one SD above the mean of I/C; for FIW -0.39) and -0.13 (one SD below the mean of I/C; for FIW -0.21). All of the simple slopes for WIF/FIW between one SD above and below the average value of I/C were significant (p < .01). Figure 1 shows plots of the relationships between WIF/FIW and the three satisfaction outcomes, for countries that are one SD above and below the mean of I/C. As these plots indicate, the relationship between WIF/FIW and satisfaction outcomes is stronger in countries that are higher in Individualism (one SD above the mean of the I/C score, dotted line) than in countries with lower Individualism (one SD below the mean of the I/C score, solid line).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine whether nation-level differences in individualism/collectivism moderate relationships between WFC and satisfaction outcomes, while including both WIF and FIW as predictors of satisfaction with one's job, family, and overall life. Previous research has reported mixed results with respect to the relationships between WFC and satisfaction outcomes (e.g. Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), and thus, the present study expanded on past efforts and sought to further clarify the nature of these relationships. Moreover, in a world of globalized business activities, both employers and employees are confronted with the need to adjust to different cultural values (e.g. Black et al., 1999; Selmer, 2007). In addition, as noted, work life balance issues are strongly linked with cultural values, beliefs, and norms about the meaning of work and its
relationship with other life domains (e.g. Powell et al., 2009). Therefore, the present study looked at the relationships between WIF and FIW and various satisfaction outcomes, using a large sample of participants from 30 countries. Hofstede's I/C value dimension was investigated as a potential moderator of the relationships between WIF/FIW and satisfaction, in an effort to provide insight about the ways in which culture may influence relationships involving work-family conflict.

Hypotheses 1-3 predicted that there would be negative relationships between job, family, and life satisfaction and both WIF and FIW. Consistent with the majority of previous research (e.g. Allen et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), results showed that significant negative relationships exist for all variables. However, the correlations between WFC and the different satisfaction outcomes obtained in the present study are smaller than the correlations reported by recent meta-analyses (e.g. Shockley & Singla, 2011). This may be due to the fact that the present study is based on a large multinational dataset and a culturally diverse sample while most of the studies in the meta-analysis are based on samples from the United States or other Western countries. Finally, Hypothesis 4 predicted that Hofstede’s (1980) I/C value dimension will moderate the relationships between WIF and FIW and the satisfaction outcomes. As predicted, moderating effects of I/C were found for the relationship between WIF and the satisfaction outcomes, such that the relationship was stronger in nations that are higher in individualism (Hypothesis 4a). These results are consistent with the findings of Lu et al. (2009) who reported that country moderated the relationship between WFC and family satisfaction, and with the results reported by Spector et al. (2007) who found a significant moderation of country cluster for the relationship of strain-based WFC and job satisfaction. Additionally, I/C moderated the relationships between FIW and all three of the satisfaction outcomes (Hypothesis 4b). Specifically, the relationships between FIW and satisfaction were stronger among countries that are higher in individualism, as compared to countries that are lower in individualism (i.e. higher in collectivism). These results are consistent with the notion that members of collectivistic nations are more flexible in how they view work and family issues (Lu et al., 2009), and are more apt to see work and family life as domains that should intermingle with each other (Schein, 1984). The findings suggest that members of collectivistic societies are better able to handle the negative effects of FIW than members of individualistic societies, experiencing a smaller reduction in their satisfaction when FIW occurs. Additionally, members of collectivist societies have greater social support, which results in less WFC overall (Powell et al., 2009). These social networks can also be called upon to provide support in times of need and distress (Lu et al., 2009), buffering the negative effects of FIW on satisfaction.
**Implications of this study**

Building on previous studies that examined cultural differences in WFC (e.g. Lu et al., 2009; Spector et al., 2007), the present research shows that the effects of WFC differ by country and more specifically, these differences are predictable from nation-level variation in individualism/collectivism. The current study also observed that the moderating effects of culture also occur for the relationships between FIW and satisfaction, offering new information about the influences of culture on WFC. Additionally, the present study incorporated different satisfaction outcome variables and shed new light on the consequences of both WIF and FIW on life and family satisfaction.

An important practical implication of the current study is that multinational companies might need new or different strategies for handling work and family conflict depending on office locations. Understanding how people balance work and family life cross-culturally would allow organizations to better meet the needs of their employees, thus reducing the potential consequences associated with it. The results of the present study suggest that policies to reduce WFC might be more important in individualistic countries than in collectivistic countries as the negative effect of WIF/FIW is stronger in individualistic countries. In addition, policies and practices such as flexible work schedules and childcare assistance that work in individualistic countries may not be as effective in collectivist countries. As a result, policies and practices to reduce WFC should be adapted to the context and the cultural values of the respective country (Poelmans et al., 2003). For example, flexible work arrangement may be more effective in individualistic countries as they respond to the specific needs of employees with more individualistic values (Spector et al., 2007). The same is true for childcare assistance programs. While there is more social support in collectivistic countries (Powell et al., 2009), working parents in individualistic countries may be more in need of childcare assistance offered by their employer. Moreover, this study shows that across different countries, strategies for handling work and family conflict should include both directions of WFC, namely WIF and FIW.

Taken together, these findings suggest that while some cultural differences influence WFC it cannot be assumed that all cultural differences will. Future research is needed that replicates the current findings and examines other cultural dimensions. For example, cultural dimensions such as gender egalitarianism have the potential to further clarify the relationship between WFC and its outcomes. Based on the results of this study, culture appears to affect work and family domains. These differences were found to affect outcomes of WFC, but cultural differences are also likely to affect antecedents of WFC. A more inclusive model, such as one that incorporates antecedents of WIF and FIW, and
outcomes of WIF and FIW, should be evaluated in future research that examines culture as a moderator of relationships involving WFC.

Limitations

This study has contributed to expanding our knowledge of how WFC affects satisfaction outcomes among employees in different cultural contexts; however, as in all research, there are some limitations of the research that are worth noting. First, because data were collected at one specific point in time, causal relationships cannot be assumed. Longitudinal study designs should be used in future research to gain a better understanding of role of causality in the relationships between WFC and job, family, and life satisfaction. Second, effect sizes of the findings obtained in this study can be criticized as being rather small. Yet, they are important in illustrating effects that have largely been ignored in previous research, and certainly encourage future research that examines additional moderators of the important relationships between WFC and satisfaction with various life domains. Third, the measures used in this study were limited because of practical constraints in the numbers of items used to measure the focal constructs. Measures that include a greater number of items are preferred because they usually have higher internal reliability, and may allow for the measurement of sub-dimensions of the broader constructs. Nevertheless, the reliabilities of the two-item scales used to measure WIF and FIW were remarkably high in most countries, therefore providing appropriate justification to use these scales. Furthermore, CFA analyses provided excellent support for the hypothesized measurement model in this research, and results showed psychometric equivalence across countries. Previous research has found single-item measures to provide reliable assessments of the constructs investigated in this research, thus it was also appropriate to use them in this study. We also controlled for nation-level differences in the internal consistency reliabilities of the WIF and FIW scales, so that observed nation-level differences in relationships were relatively unconfounded by nation-level differences in the reliabilities of the scales that were used. Future research would benefit from replicating this study using alternative measures of WIF and FIW, as well as measures of satisfaction outcomes. Additionally, future studies could take differences in types of WIF and FIW (e.g. time-based, strain-based and behavior-based conflict; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) into account. Finally, scores for the Hofstede I/C dimensions were obtained from prior research (Hofstede, 2001), and represent an overall measure of individualism for the nation. However, a country identified as individualist does not mean that all people within the country are equally individualistic, or collectivist (e.g. McSweeney, 2002). Thus, within-country variation in I/C or other value dimensions may be worth investigating in future research.
Despite its limitations, the current study adds to the growing body of cross-cultural WFC research. This study provided new insight into the possible moderating effects involving WIF/FIW, however future research can build upon these results by investigating additional similarities or differences in the way individuals across cultures experience the antecedents, outcomes, and interface between work and family and by taking more different cultural value dimensions into account. We hope that the present research encourages additional studies of the role of culture in WFC research.
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Table 1.

**Alpha Reliabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations among Study Scales for Each Country**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIF Interface Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian Republic</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Chile</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. Total N = 20,850; N only includes full-time workers.*
Table 2.

Correlations among Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WIF</td>
<td>18306</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FIW</td>
<td>18372</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JS</td>
<td>19152</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.067**</td>
<td>-.102**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FS</td>
<td>20378</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.067**</td>
<td>-.114**</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LS</td>
<td>20579</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-.074**</td>
<td>-.128**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.625**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Persons</td>
<td>20682</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-.021**</td>
<td>.047**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.105**</td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Weekly hours</td>
<td>20850</td>
<td>44.61</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>.035**</td>
<td>.020**</td>
<td>.026**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.113**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Marital Status</td>
<td>20660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.020**</td>
<td>-.046**</td>
<td>-.158**</td>
<td>-.099**</td>
<td>-.237**</td>
<td>-.039**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gender</td>
<td>20836</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.062**</td>
<td>.068**</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.065**</td>
<td>-.049**</td>
<td>-.052**</td>
<td>-.208**</td>
<td>.039**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. **Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), *Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
JS = Job Satisfaction, FS = Family Satisfaction, LS = Life Satisfaction, Persons = number of persons in the household, Weekly hours = number of hours worked weekly, Marital Status 1 = married, 2 = not married; Gender 1 = male, 2 = female.
Table 3.

Summary of Fit Statistics for Scale Equivalence Tests (N = 19,979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconstrained</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63.914</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Loading</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>231.823</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. ΔCFI = .007; CFI = Comparative fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation; N=20,850.
Table 4.
HLM Analysis of Life Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction and Family Satisfaction predicted by WIF and FIW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Family satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Life satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.508** (0.524)</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>7.688** (0.601)</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>8.681** (0.821)</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIFAG</td>
<td>-0.433 (0.188)</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>-0.216 (0.217)</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.316 (0.273)</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I/C</td>
<td>0.049 (0.026)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.056 (0.030)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.073* (0.035)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIF x I/C</td>
<td>-0.019 (0.010)</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.012)</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-0.028* (0.014)</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.072** (0.019)</td>
<td>-3.74</td>
<td>0.055** (0.017)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.014 (0.020)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.125** (0.020)</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>-0.427** (0.018)</td>
<td>-23.87</td>
<td>-0.760** (0.016)</td>
<td>-13.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.008** (0.000)</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.002* (0.000)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.003* (0.001)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.001 (0.000)</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.043** (0.006)</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>0.027** (0.006)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.462 (0.801)</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>-0.437 (0.929)</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-1.381 (0.909)</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.819* (0.706)</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>-2.207* (0.817)</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>-3.619** (1.031)</td>
<td>-3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.203** (0.015)</td>
<td>-13.66</td>
<td>-0.159** (0.012)</td>
<td>-13.21</td>
<td>-0.175** (0.019)</td>
<td>-9.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I/C Cross-level Interaction</td>
<td>-0.002** (0.000)</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>-0.002** (0.001)</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>-0.002** (0.001)</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>Level 2 Intercept</td>
<td>6.396** (0.386)</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>6.616** (0.366)</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>7.358** (0.887)</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIWAG</td>
<td>-0.291 (0.268)</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-0.008 (0.251)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.074 (0.309)</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I/C</td>
<td>0.036* (0.016)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.031* (0.015)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.031 (0.018)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIW x I/C</td>
<td>-0.023* (0.009)</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>-0.021* (0.009)</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.011)</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.064** (0.019)</td>
<td>-3.34</td>
<td>0.052** (0.017)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.009 (0.019)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.114** (0.020)</td>
<td>-5.63</td>
<td>-0.417** (0.018)</td>
<td>-23.40</td>
<td>-0.250** (0.016)</td>
<td>-15.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.005** (0.000)</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.001 (0.000)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.006 (0.006)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.049** (0.006)</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>0.032** (0.006)</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.422 (0.867)</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>1.071 (0.805)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.663 (0.921)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.123* (0.535)</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>-1.429* (0.504)</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
<td>-2.628* (1.018)</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.269** (0.021)</td>
<td>-12.48</td>
<td>-0.292** (0.022)</td>
<td>-13.08</td>
<td>-0.290** (0.029)</td>
<td>-9.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I/C Cross-level Interaction</td>
<td>-0.005** (0.001)</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>-0.005** (0.001)</td>
<td>-4.67</td>
<td>-0.005** (0.001)</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p<.05, **p<.01; Standard errors in parentheses; Persons = number of persons in the household, Weekly hours = number of hours worked weekly, Marital Status 1 = married, 2 = not married; Gender 1 = male, 2 = female, N=17,242.
Figure 1. Moderating effect of I/C on the relationship of WIF/FIW and satisfaction outcomes. Unmarried persons served as reference group for this figure.
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In the context of international assignments, role-related constructs such as the interplay of life domains are of particular importance for the successful adjustment of expatriates (e.g. Takeuchi, 2010). At the same time, boundaries between life domains are often described as unclear and blurred raising questions about their influence on expatriates’ life domain interaction. Thus, the present study builds on domestic findings on boundary management, and investigates the relationship between the boundary management tactics and life domain conflict and enrichment of expatriates. In a sample of 202 expatriates in a higher education context, associations between the permeability and the flexibility of life domains and work–private life conflict, private life–work conflict, and work–private life enrichment were found. However, no significant results were obtained for the relation between boundary management and private life–work enrichment. In addition, boundary management profiles of expatriates were described. Taken together, the findings underscore the need to consider the role-related stakeholders of expatriates, especially in the private life domain. Implications for the support of expatriates are discussed.
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In times of globalized business activities, different forms of expatriation are becoming increasingly important (e.g. Andresen, Bergdolt, Margenfeld, & Dickmann, 2014; Hechanova, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2003; Shaffer, Kraimer, Chen, & Bolino, 2012). For expatriates, international assignments are associated with various changes in the work environment, the general environment or the living conditions (Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, 2004). Consequently, expatriation often represents a challenging situation for the expatriate himself and other important stakeholders such as individuals in the host country, parent firm members, and the expatriate's family (Takeuchi, 2010). At the same time, the risk of an early return or underperformance of expatriates is high, and failed expatriation could be costly for the sending organisation (e.g. Hechanova et al., 2003; McNulty, de Cieri, & Hutchings, 2009; Zeira & Banai, 1985). Consequently, the successful adjustment of expatriates plays a crucial role in international human resources management (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005, Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991). Among others, role-related constructs such as role overload, role ambiguity, and work–family related concepts are important factors influencing expatriates’ adjustment processes and expatriates’ success (Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluk, 2002). Especially, interaction with members of the private life domain such as family members or friends plays a crucial role in understanding the expatriates’ adjustment (Takeuchi, 2010). However, research on expatriate adjustment has been criticized as being narrowly focused on the expatriate, ignoring important stakeholders and how the expatriate interacts with his various partners in different settings (Takeuchi, 2010). In addition, while the importance of work–family conflict for expatriates has been shown by previous studies (e.g. Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2001; Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001), research on the interplay of life domains of expatriates could be expanded in various ways.

First, building on developments and findings in domestic research on life domain interaction, a broader perspective on the interplay of life domains should be adopted. This broader perspective implies also including the private life domain instead of focusing on the family domain only, because it includes alternatives to the classical family model (e.g. Tetrick & Buffardi, 2006). Moreover, the interplay of life domains should be regarded as a bidirectional construct (e.g. Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). Finally, instead of focusing on the negative interaction of life domains only, a broader perspective implies also taking positive relations between life domains into account. Based on role theory and role accumulation theory (Sieber, 1974), the present study thus considers work–private life enrichment and private life–work enrichment. More specifically, we refer to Greenhaus and Powell (2006) who define life domain enrichment as ‘the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role’ (p.72).
Second, while the effects of the interplay of life domains of expatriates have been shown by various studies, little is known about potential antecedents of work–private life conflict and work–private life enrichment among expatriates. In particular, research that explicitly addresses specific aspects of the expatriates' living situation for the interplay of their life domains is lacking. This is important because expatriates' work and private life conditions are different from domestic employees in various ways. For example, expatriates on global assignments are often separated from their social networks and have to reorganize private life concerns and duties. This may lead to stress arising from the new challenges in organizing the work–private life interface (Caligiuri, Hyland, Joshi, & Bross, 1998; Wurtz & Suutari, 2014). Moreover, cultural influences and norms of the host country affect the role expectations and role pressures that expatriates are confronted with. Specifically, changes in cultural expectations and role expectations may lead to challenges for the successful management of life domains and their interplay (Harris, 2004). In addition, work is described as being more disruptive on global assignments than in a domestic context (Wurtz & Suutari, 2014). This means that work concerns affect the private life domain more often and that the boundaries of the private life domain are often not respected. Finally, 'blurred boundaries' are a key feature of the expatriates’ living situation (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). This leads to a lack of refuge in one life domain from the stressors of another life domain. Taken together, research is needed that takes a broader perspective on the interaction of life domains of expatriates into account, and that explicitly considers the characteristics of the expatriates’ situation in order to strengthen our understanding of how to foster a healthy interplay of life domains among expatriates.

One important aspect in domestic research that has been gaining interest is boundary management tactics (e.g. Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007). In the light of the digitalization and the virtualization of the workplace, boundaries between life domains become more permeable (Duxbury, Higgins, Smart, & Stevenson, 2014; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007), leading to new challenges in life domain boundary management. Domestic research shows that individuals manage the boundaries between their life domains by either segmenting or integrating the different life domains (Bulger et al., 2007; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). Boundary management tactics, such as flexibility and permeability in the work or the private life domain, are negatively associated with interference between life domains (e.g. work interfering with the family), and positively associated with enhancements between the work domain and the private life domain (Bulger et al., 2007).

Taken together, the aim of the present study is to investigate the influence of boundary management strategies of expatriates on work–private life conflict and on work–private life enrichment. This paper contributes to existing literature in three important
ways. First, to our knowledge, it is the first paper that explicitly investigates differentiated forms of boundary management in an expatriate context, and how they influence expatriates' life domain conflict and life domain enrichment. Second, this paper adopts a broad perspective on the interplay of life domains by including the private life domain instead of the family domain, by explicitly considering the interplay of life domains as a bidirectional construct, and by taking positive interactions of life domains into account. Finally, this paper identifies different boundary management profiles that could be used to customize interventions that foster a positive interplay of life domains for expatriates.

The role of life domain interaction for expatriates

Psychological, or sociocultural, adjustment has been described as an important factor influencing the performance and satisfaction of expatriates (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Hechanova et al., 2003). As previous research has shown, role-related aspects are especially important for the adjustment of expatriates in their host country. For example, in their meta-analysis on expatriates' adjustment, Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) found that role clarity, role discretion, role novelty, and role conflict are antecedents of expatriates' work adjustment. In addition, non-work-related factors such as spouse adjustment are associated with work adjustment, interaction adjustment, and cultural adjustment. Moreover, previous studies underline that expatriation implies various changes and challenges for the expatriates' private situation and the whole family (Caligiuri et al., 1998; Harris, 2004; Shaffer, Westman, & Selmer, 2015). Given the fact that the majority of expatriates are accompanied by a partner or family (Shaffer & Harrison, 2001), previous studies also explicitly address the interplay of life domains of expatriates. For example, Grant-Vallone and Ensher (2001) showed that the work–personal life conflict of expatriates is positively related to expatriates' depression and anxiety, while personal life–work conflict is positively related to expatriates' concerns for their health. The authors concluded that it is important for sending organisations to focus on and differentiate both forms of life domain conflict (work–private life and private life–work) in order to retain high-quality employees. A study by Takeuchi et al. (2002) reported both crossover and spillover effects on expatriates' cross-cultural adjustment. This means that the experiences in one life domain interact with the experiences in another life domain (spillover effects) and that the expatriates' attitudes have an influence on their spouses' attitudes (crossover effects). In a similar vein, Van der Zee, Ali, and Salomé (2005) reported the negative effects of work–home interference and home–work interference on subjective well-being and crossover effects of stressors and emotional distress among expatriate couples. In their conceptual article, Lazarova, Westman, and Shaffer (2010) took a positive perspective on the interplay of life domains into account. Namely, they specified the interaction of work
and personal demands and resources from different life domains on expatriates’ engagement and performance in different life roles. Accordingly, in their qualitative study, Schütter and Boerner (2013) concluded that both negative interactions of life domains (work–family conflict) and positive interactions of life domains (work–family enrichment) occur in an expatriate context. While their participants mainly reported time-based and energy-based conflicts between their life domains, they also reported a positive transfer of skills and mood. In a quantitative study, Kempen, Pangert, Hattrup, Mueller, and Joens (2015) found that life domain enrichment accounted for the variance in expatriates’ job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and the accomplishment of role-related expectations beyond what was accounted for by life domain conflict.

Taken together, the interplay of life domains is of crucial importance in an expatriate context. However, more research is needed that adopts a broad perspective on this interplay and that explicitly considers the possible antecedents of life domain conflict and enrichment. Moreover, given the fact that, in the case of expatriates, boundaries between life domains are often described as ‘blurred’ (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Shaffer et al., 2001), it is especially important to better understand how boundary management affects the interplay of the life domains of expatriates. As we will argue in the following, domestic research on boundary management has the potential to substantially contribute to expatriate research.

**Boundary management tactics**

Given the digitalization and virtualization of the workplace, boundaries between life domains are becoming more permeable (Duxbury, Higgins, Smart, & Stevenson, 2014; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). For example, the use of e-mail, cell phones and common data-bases accessible through the internet allow individuals to work independently from a given office space. Moreover, these technologies enable employees to work independently from given office hours (McCloskey & Igbaria, 1998). In domestic research, various authors show the importance of boundaries between the work and personal life domains, as well as the importance of individual tactics to actively manage boundaries in the context of the interplay between work and private life (Kossek & Lautsch, 2012). For example, Clark (2000) described people as ‘border crossers’ between different life domains. More specifically, she defined strength, permeability, flexibility and the blending of life domains as relevant features of borders between life domains. Similarly, Ashforth et al. (2000), in their seminal work, pointed out that roles between work, home or third places can be described on a continuum ranging from integration to segmentation. Overall, both theories agree that boundaries between life domains can be described by their permeability and their flexibility (Bulger et al., 2007; Kossek & Lautsch, 2012). Following
Ashforth et al. (2000), integration of life roles is characterized by flexible and permeable boundaries and low role contrast, while segmentation encompasses inflexible and impermeable boundaries and high role contrast. In addition, Hecht and Allen (2009) underlined the necessity to view boundaries between life domains as bidirectional constructs, meaning that the boundary strength at home has to be separated from the boundary strength at work. Consequently, work segmentation results in a ‘protection’ of the work domain by adopting low flexibility and permeability, while work integration means high flexibility and permeability in the work domain. Similarly, private life segmentation means the protection of the private domain showing low flexibility and permeability, while private life integration is characterized by high flexibility and permeability of the private life domain.

More recently, Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010), further refined the concept of boundary flexibility by differentiating ‘flexibility ability’ from ‘flexibility willingness’. Flexibility ability refers to the perception of personal or situational constraints affecting an individual’s boundary management, such as external factors preventing or enabling leaving a domain. For example, flexibility ability is high when there is no childcare responsibility preventing leaving the private life domain. Flexibility willingness describes an individual’s motivation to integrate or segment life domains. Combining these different aspects, six different boundary tactics result: work flexibility ability, work flexibility willingness, work permeability and private life flexibility ability, private life flexibility willingness and private life permeability (Bulger et al., 2007).

Based on the notion that resources to participate in different life roles are scarce (e.g. Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964), it has been argued that a decreased strength of life domain boundaries (integration) leads to the depletion of resources available to fulfil role expectations in the respective life roles (Hecht & Allen, 2009). For example, a weak boundary of the private life domain allows people to engage in work-related concerns while at home. As a consequence, this engagement depletes the resources available for the participation in the private life domain. For instance, Olson-Buchanan and Boswell (2006) showed that higher work- to non-work permeability is associated with higher work-private life conflict. Moreover, in their longitudinal study, Hecht and Allen (2009) showed that boundary strength at home predicts both work–family conflict and family–work conflict, while boundary strength at work only predicts family–work conflict. However, previous studies also show positive effects of boundary management tactics on life domain conflict, pointing to a buffering effect of permeability and flexibility. For example, taking the distinction between flexibility ability and flexibility willingness into account, Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010) found that family flexibility ability was negatively related to work–family conflict and family–work conflict, while work
flexibility ability was negatively related to work–family conflict. However, family permeability was positively related to family–work conflict and work permeability was negatively related to work–family conflict. In a different study, Bulger et al. (2007) found that work flexibility ability was negatively related to work–private life conflict, while private life permeability was positively associated with work–private life conflict. Moreover, Bulger et al. (2007) demonstrated that work flexibility willingness and private life flexibility ability were negatively related to private life–work conflict, while work permeability was positively related to private life–work conflict.

As outlined above, boundaries between life domains play a crucial role in the context of expatriation (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). Specifically, the notion of blurred boundaries of expatriates (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005) points to the necessity to actively manage boundaries in an expatriate assignment. Moreover, qualitative findings underline the importance of the integration of life domains in relation to work–private life conflict in an expatriate context (Schütter & Boerner, 2013). Based on domestic findings, it is thus assumed that boundary management tactics are associated with the conflict in life domains of expatriates. Due to the inconsistent findings in domestic research and the explorative character of this study in an expatriate context, we do not further specify the expected direction. Thus, we predict:

**Hypothesis 1**: Work flexibility ability, work flexibility willingness, work permeability, private life flexibility ability, private life flexibility willingness and private life permeability of expatriates are associated with work–private life conflict and private life–work conflict.

In addition to life domain conflict, life domain enrichment also plays an important role in the context of expatriation (Kempen et al., 2015; Schütter & Boerner, 2013). Consequently, it seems important to also address the influence of boundary management tactics on the positive interplay of life domains. Building on the enrichment theory developed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006), it could be argued that boundary management is important for the enrichment of life domains, because highly flexible and highly permeable boundaries allow resources from one domain to influence the quality of life in the other domain. Similarly, Kossek and Lautsch (2012) underlined the fact that permeable boundaries allow behaviours or emotions to spillover into another role. Consequently, in addition to assumed negative spillover effects (life domain conflict), permeable boundaries are also expected to be related to a positive spillover between life domains (life domain enrichment).

In a domestic context, Bulger et al. (2007) further analyzed the impact of boundary segmentation or integration on the interplay of life domains including both conflict and enrichment. Moreover, the authors described several consistent clusters of boundary
management practices. Namely, they found a cluster that they labelled ‘integrators’ (high flexibility ability, flexibility willingness and permeability in both domains), a cluster they labelled ‘work integrators/personal life segmenters’ (high work flexibility ability and willingness in the work domain but not in the private life domain) and two clusters that fall in the middle of the segmentation–integration continuum. In addition, they found that work flexibility ability and private life flexibility willingness were positively associated with work–private life enhancement, while work flexibility willingness was positively associated with private life–work enhancement. In an expatriate context, it is likely that boundary management tactics are particularly related to a positive interplay of life domains because of the unique living situation of expatriates. More specifically, the expatriates’ living situations require the formation of social ties in the private and the work domain in order to obtain information, and formal and informal support (Farh, Bartol, Shapiro, & Shin, 2010). In addition, cross-cultural motivation and openness play an important role in an expatriate context (Chen, Kirkman, Kim, Farh, & Tangirala, 2010). Thus, it could be expected that high permeability and high flexibility of the different life domains play a functional role in the context of expatriation and are consequently positively related to the positive transfer of resources between life domains. We thus predict:

Hypothesis 2: Work flexibility ability, work flexibility willingness, work permeability, private life flexibility ability, private life flexibility willingness and private life permeability of expatriates are positively associated with work–private life enrichment and private life–work enrichment.

METHOD
Participants and procedure

The present study is based on a sample of expatriates working as international researchers (doctorate or postdoctorate) at a university and at different research institutions in a large German city. The participants were contacted through a service centre at the university that assists the international researchers after their arrival. Data were collected through web-based self-report questionnaires during the summer of 2015. Links to the online questionnaire were distributed via email by the service centre. All participants were assured that they would not be identified and that only the researchers would have access to the data.

In total, data from 202 expatriates were available. The sample consisted of expatriates from 57 countries (46.7% women and 53.3% men). Of the expatriates, 11.0% are from countries of the Middle East, 30.9% from Europe, 30.9% from Asia, 10.5% from South America, 5.4% from North America, 5.2% from Africa, 4.7% from Russia and 1.0% from Australia. The majority (55.2%) lived in some sort of partnership with a significant
other, and 26.0% indicated they had at least one child. The age of the sample ranged from 24 years to 63 years, with a mean of 32.9 years. On average, the expatriates indicated they worked 45.83 hours per week, with a minimum of 20 hours and a maximum of 81 hours. Participants were selected if they reported working a minimum of 20 hours per week which equals the official working hours for most doctoral positions at German universities.

Measures

Boundary management was measured with eight items obtained from Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010). The measure consisted of four items measuring boundary management in the private life domain and four items measuring boundary management in the work domain. In addition, the sub-dimensions of boundary management ability and boundary management willingness were distinguished. Sample items included ‘While at work, I can stop what I am doing to meet responsibilities related to my family and my personal life’ (work flexibility ability), ‘I am willing to take time off from work to deal with my family and personal life responsibilities’ (work flexibility willingness), ‘If the need arose, I could work late without affecting my personal responsibility’ (private life flexibility ability) and ‘I am willing to change plans with my friends and family to deal with work-related responsibilities’ (private life flexibility willingness). Cronbach’s Alpha for the different sub-dimensions ranged from .73 to .91. All items were coded 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree.

Permeability was measured with four items obtained from Clark (2002). The measure included two items measuring permeability of the private life domain and two items measuring permeability of the work domain. Sample items included ‘My family or friends contact me while I am at work’ (work permeability) and ‘I hear from people related to my work while I am at home’ (private life permeability). The sub-dimensions of the measure had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .70 and .73 respectively. Items were coded 1= very seldomly, 5 = very often.

Life domain conflict was measured with six items of the Work–Family Conflict Scale (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000) with three items measuring work–private life conflict and three items measuring private life–work conflict. Sample items included ‘My work keeps me from my private life activities more than I would like’. The measure had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .75.

Life domain enrichment was measured with the short version of the work–family enrichment scale by Kacmar, Crawford, Carlson, Ferguson, and Whitten (2014). The scale consisted of six items with three items capturing work–private life enrichment and three items capturing private life–work enrichment. Sample items included ‘My
involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me in my private life' (work–private life enrichment). The measure had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .83. The wording of the life domain scales was changed to ‘private life’ instead of ‘family’. All items were coded 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree. The survey was administered in English language.

Analysis

To test the factorial structure of the boundary management measures in an expatriate context, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS (Arbuckle, 1997) was applied to test the postulated six-factor model. This model distinguished between the six interrelated first-order factors consisting of work flexibility ability, work flexibility willingness, work permeability, private life flexibility ability, private life flexibility willingness and private life permeability following the structure described by Bulger et al. (2007). Each of the two items measuring these six factors was hypothesized to load on a respective first-order factor. This model of the boundary management of expatriates was tested against alternative, more parsimonious models of the data. An alternative second model specified boundary management to load on four factors (boundary management work, boundary management private life, permeability work, permeability private life) without distinguishing between the sub-constructs of boundary management. A third model distinguished between boundary management ability, boundary management willingness and permeability. In a fourth model, the items measuring boundary management were hypothesized to load on one factor and the items measuring permeability to load on another factor.

To evaluate model fit, we used the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the Incremental Fit Index (IFI; Bentler & Bonett, 1980), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990). Values of .90 or above for the CFI and IFI, and values of .08 or lower for the RMSEA, are usually taken as evidence of adequate model fit (e.g. Diefendorff, Silverman, & Greguras, 2005; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested with hierarchical regression analysis. In a first step, control variables were entered, including working hours, age, gender, presence of own children, and partnership status. In a second step, work flexibility ability, work flexibility willingness, work permeability, private life flexibility ability, private life flexibility willingness, and private life permeability were entered. A significant increase in $R^2$ after entering the boundary management scores in this regression analysis indicates support for Hypothesis 1 and 2. In addition, significant β-weights indicate which specific aspects of boundary management are relevant for the prediction of life domain conflict and life domain enrichment.
RESULTS

Results of the CFA of the postulated boundary management model are displayed in Table 1. As the results show, the postulated model distinguishing between the six factors of work flexibility ability, work flexibility willingness, private life flexibility ability, private life flexibility willingness, work permeability, and private life permeability fits the data well ($\chi^2 = 62.372; \text{df} = 45; \text{CFI} = .978; \text{IFI} = .979; \text{RMSEA} = .044$). The fit indices for the alternative model with four factors for boundary management ($\chi^2 = 310.703; \text{df} = 49; \text{CFI} = .673; \text{IFI} = .685; \text{RMSEA} = .163$) indicated a poor data fit. Similarly, the two models distinguishing between three factors of boundary management ($\chi^2 = 563.268; \text{df} = 51; \text{CFI} = .361; \text{IFI} = .381; \text{RMSEA} = .224$) and between two factors of boundary management ($\chi^2 = 518.262; \text{df} = 53; \text{CFI} = .419; \text{IFI} = .437; \text{RMSEA} = .209$) indicated a poor data fit.

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations and intercorrelations of the study variables. Table 3 shows the results of the hierarchical regressions that were conducted to test Hypotheses 1 and 2. From the control variables, working hours were related to work–private life conflict, whereas the presence of children was related to private life–work conflict. In addition, age was related to work–private life enrichment. None of the control variables were related to private life–work enrichment. As Table 3 shows, significant regression coefficients of the boundary management tactics were obtained for work–private life conflict, private life–work conflict and work–private life enrichment. However, boundary management tactics did not predict private life–work enrichment. More specifically in regards to Hypothesis 1, private life flexibility ability ($\beta = -.28, p < 0.01$), private life flexibility willingness ($\beta = .15, p < 0.05$), and private life permeability ($\beta = .30, p < 0.01$) significantly predicted work–private life conflict. In addition, work permeability ($\beta = .18, p < 0.05$) and private life flexibility ability ($\beta = -.19, p < 0.05$) significantly predicted private life–work conflict. The additional variance explained by boundary management variables was 19% ($p < 0.01$) in the prediction of work–private life conflict and 10% ($p < 0.01$) in the prediction of private life–work conflict. These results mainly support Hypothesis 1. Moreover, in regards to Hypothesis 2, private life flexibility ability ($\beta = .24, p < 0.01$) significantly predicted work–private life enrichment and the additional variance explained by the boundary management variables was 7%. However, no significant results were obtained for the prediction of private life–work enrichment. These results partly support Hypothesis 2. As can be seen from Table 3, the boundary management tactics differently predicted life domain conflict and enrichment. While private life flexibility willingness and private life permeability were positively associated with work–private life conflict, private life flexibility ability was negatively associated with work–private life conflict. Similarly, work permeability was positively related to private life–work conflict,
whereas private life flexibility ability was negatively related to private life–work conflict. Moreover, private life flexibility ability was positively associated with work–private life enrichment. Figure 1 summarizes the results of the regression analysis.

In order to better understand the types of expatriate boundary management, we followed the procedure described by Bulger et al. (2007) and additionally ran a cluster analysis. As there were no theoretical reasons for a specification of the number of clusters in an expatriate context, we followed the steps described by Bulger et al. (2007). Thus, we used the TwoStep clustering procedure within SPSS. The six boundary measures were centred on the scale’s midpoint prior to cluster analysis (Bulger et al., 2007). Table 4 shows the centred variable means and the results of the one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs).

These ANOVAs indicate the differences between clusters on the specific dimensions. The results show a four-cluster solution, as described in a domestic context by Bulger et al. (2007). However, taking a closer look at the cluster solution, our results differ slightly from those found by Bulger et al. (2007). More specifically, expatriates in cluster 1 (n = 64) show high integration on the private life domain boundary tactics, while they show relatively low scores on the work domain boundary tactics. Individuals in cluster 2 (n = 54) tend to show an opposing boundary management style to individuals in cluster 1. While they show relatively high scores for the boundary management in the work domain (work flexibility ability, flexibility willingness, and permeability), they show relatively low scores for boundary management in the private life domain (especially private life flexibility ability). Moreover, individuals in cluster 3 (n = 42) show flexibility ability and willingness in both life domains, and especially in the private life domain, however, they show low scores for permeability in both life domains. Finally, expatriates in cluster 4 (n = 42) can clearly be placed on the integration side of the integration–segmentation continuum because they show high scores for flexibility and permeability in both life domains.

To better understand the different clusters, demographic variables for each cluster were investigated. The demographic information for the clusters is displayed in Table 5.

In addition to variables such as gender, partnership status, children and working hours, country scores for Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) on country level, obtained from Hofstede (2001), were included in this description. This was done because previous research has shown that I/C plays an important role in the context of the interaction of different life domains (Spector et al., 2007). As Table 5 shows, cluster 1 (private life integration/work segmentation) shows the lowest percentage of children and the second highest average working hours. Cluster 2 (work integration, private life segmentation) shows the highest percentage of partnered individuals. Individuals in cluster 2 also indicate the highest percentage of children. This group is also the youngest. Individuals in
cluster 3 (high flexibility, low permeability) show the lowest percentage of women, the lowest percentage of working hours and the lowest mean score for I/C which indicates a rather collectivistic orientation. Finally, individuals in cluster 4 (integrators) show the highest percentage of women, the highest average working hours and the highest mean score for I/C which indicates a rather individualistic orientation. This group is the oldest.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to examine the boundary management tactics of expatriates and how they relate to the interplay of different life domains in an expatriate context. Prior research has shown the importance of the interplay of different life domains while on an international assignment and its impact for life domain conflict and life domain enrichment (e.g. Caligiuri et al., 1998; Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2001). At the same time, previous studies have shown that boundaries between life domains of expatriates are often perceived as unclear and blurred (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). However, prior research has not yet addressed the question of how expatriates’ boundary tactics relate to their life domain conflict or life domain enrichment. Therefore, there is a need to link the findings from domestic research on boundary management tactics to the unique situation of expatriates. More specifically, there is a need to differentiate between boundary flexibility ability, boundary flexibility willingness and the permeability of life domains (Bulger et al., 2007) to obtain a precise picture of boundary management tactics and their influence of the interplay of life domains in an expatriate context. Such research answers the call for adopting a broader perspective on expatriate research by explicitly taking their relation to various stakeholders in the work and the private domain into account (Takeuchi, 2010). In addition, it expands the perspective on the interaction of life domains of expatriates by considering the private life domain instead of only the family, by conceptualising the interplay of life domains as a bidirectional construct, and by incorporating a positive perspective on the interplay of life domains.

Findings from this study demonstrated that boundary tactics are associated with the life domain conflict and life domain enrichment of expatriates and explain variance beyond several demographic variables such as working hours, children or partnership status. In particular, work–private life conflict was significantly predicted by private life flexibility ability and private life permeability; while private life–work conflict was significantly predicted by work permeability and private life flexibility ability. These results partly support our first hypothesis and are similar to the findings obtained in domestic research (Bulger et al., 2007; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). Our results further show that work–private life enrichment was only significantly predicted by private life flexibility ability, while none of the predictors significantly predicted private life–work enrichment. These
results partly support our second hypothesis but they differ from findings in domestic research where work–private life enrichment was significantly predicted by private life flexibility willingness and work flexibility ability. Overall, our results provide two major implications. First, as our results in an expatriate context show, boundary management tactics in the private life domain show a greater association with work–private life conflict, private life–work conflict and work–private life enrichment than boundary management tactics in the work domain. This means that the interaction of life domains in an expatriate context strongly depends on the boundary management tactics in the private life domain. Furthermore, these results emphasise the need to explicitly consider boundary strategies in the private life domain in future studies. Moreover, it underlines the urgent need to consider expatriates in their context and in interaction with their private life (Takeuchi, 2010). Second, private life flexibility ability seems to be a consistent key factor for life domain related issues during expatriation. More specifically, private life flexibility ability seems to have a buffering effect on conflict between life domains while, at the same time, it is positively associated with the enrichment between life domains. This means that by strengthening private life flexibility ability, life domain conflict could be attenuated while life domain enrichment could be strengthened in an expatriate context. In addition, our results show that the permeability of the work domain is positively associated with private life–work conflict while permeability of the private life domain is positively associated with work–private life conflict. This means that if the boundary of one domain is permeable or weak, greater conflict emerging from the other domain is experienced. With reference to the work–family border theory (Clark, 2000), this may be explained by the fact that the life domains are perceived as being different from one another. In the case of expatriates, it is likely that the private life domain differs in many respects from the work domain, for example in terms of language and culture. Consequently, in the case of expatriates, the reduction of the permeability or the protection of life domains may help international employees to better balance their life domains.

In addition to the regression analysis, we also performed cluster analysis to better understand boundary management profiles in an expatriate context. As in domestic research, the analysis resulted in four different clusters. Similar to findings from domestic research, the resulting clusters support domain-specific differences on the segmentation–integration continuum. For example, individuals in the first cluster tend to show relatively low scores for permeability and flexibility in the work domain while at the same time, they show flexibility and permeability in the private life domain. This work segmentation/private life integration pattern may in part be explained by different priorities given to the different life domains. For instance, these individuals protect their work domain by segmenting the borders of the work domain while they open the borders of their private life domain. This
cluster may thus be labelled as ‘work protectors’. Taking a closer look at the demographic characteristics, this cluster shows the lowest percentage of children and a relatively high amount of average working hours. Contrarily, individuals in cluster 2 tend to integrate their work domain while they show lower scores for permeability and flexibility in the private domain. Thus, they seem to protect their private life domain while they open up their work domains. This group is characterized by the highest percentage of children and the highest percentage of partnered individuals. Thus, the resulting pattern may be explained by the different needs emerging from the different life domains. For example, this group may have to react to demands from the family and the private life domains in a flexible way while they are at work. At the same time, individuals in this cluster want to preserve private time for their family or partner. This cluster may thus be labelled ‘family protectors’.

For individuals in cluster 3, differences between flexibility and permeability can be observed. These individuals show high scores for flexibility and low scores for permeability in both domains. This means that individuals in this cluster are able and willing to change plans in both domains, but they are seldom contacted by role-related partners while they are in the other domain. This cluster has the lowest percentage of women and the most collectivistic scores on the Hofstede I/C dimension. Interestingly, this group has the highest score for private life flexibility ability which indicates a tendency to change personal plans due to the requirements of work. Following Greenhaus and Kossek (2014), this pattern may be explained by the fact that more Confucian values are related to a greater obligation for employees to work more intensely due to reciprocity norms. Thus, individuals in this cluster may feel a greater obligation to fulfill their work tasks, even when it means changing family plans. This cluster may thus be labelled ‘work warriors’ (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012). Finally, individuals in cluster 4 can be clearly placed on the integration side of the segmentation–integration continuum and labelled ‘integrators’. This group has the highest percentage of women, the highest amount of working hours, and the highest scores on the Hofstede I/C rating indicating a rather individualistic orientation. Individuals in this group seemed to have a preference for the complete integration of their private life and their working life; the high amount of working hours indicates that they may also dedicate much of their lifetime to their work. However, the high I/C ratings are somehow counterintuitive, as a high integration of life domains in the more collectivistic group would be more likely according to previous studies (e.g. Powell, Francesco, & Ling, 2009). Thus, future research is needed that explicitly takes into account cultural orientations as a possible predictor of boundary tactics and the interplay of life domains. Overall, it can be concluded that in an expatriate context, there is no group that can clearly be placed on the segmentation side of the integration–segmentation continuum. This may be due to the fact that expatriates per se
have to integrate their private life into their working life as they completely change their living context when accepting an international assignment (Harrison et al., 2004). Figure 2 provides a summary of the resulting clusters in an expatriate context.

With respect to practical implications, it can be concluded that employers should make particular efforts to engage in the support of the expatriates’ private life situation, as the flexibility ability of the private life domain is the central protecting factor for the successful interplay of life domains on an international assignment. Results indicate that it is particularly important for employers and expatriates to strengthen the expatriates’ private life flexibility ability. This could be done by providing different forms of support for the private life domain such as childcare assistance, a living space close to the workplace or mobility support. Moreover, the results clearly indicate that spouses and families of expatriates should be explicitly considered in the preparation for and the supervision of an international assignment. Moreover, our results suggest that in the context of expatriation, employers should respect the protection of the life domain by reducing contact attempts, emails and phone calls because the permeability of a life domain may be a risk factor for conflict between life domains. In addition, more tailored support packages for expatriates are needed that specifically address the different boundary management patterns in the context of an expatriates’ overall living situation. For example, while expatriates showing a high willingness to integrate life domains (e.g. the integrators) are likely to benefit from measures that help them to integrate their working life in their private life and vice versa (for example through mobile communication solutions and flexible time arrangements), expatriates that show less willingness to integrate their life domains (e.g. the family protectors) would benefit from policies that help them to protect their life domains (for example during specific times that stipulate reduced communication and contact attempts).

As with all research, there are of course some limitations worth mentioning. Most importantly, our data is cross-sectional and cannot prove a causal relation between the variables observed. In the case of boundary management, a reverse causality from conflict or enrichment of life domains to the boundary management tactics cannot be ruled out. Future research should thus apply longitudinal research methodology to better investigate the influence of boundary management over time. In addition, although this study addressed the experiences of expatriates in context as suggested by Takeuchi (2010), the study relies on single source and self-report data. Future research should adopt a broader perspective and explicitly consider the perspectives of role-related partners of expatriates in the private life domain or in the work domain. Moreover, as the sample consisted of expatriates in a higher education setting, generalizability to expatriates working in private organisations is reduced. This is especially important
considering that the expatriates in this context were mainly working on doctoral or postdoctoral projects likely to be associated with a major personal interest. Thus, the sample may have unique boundary management tactics not comparable with expatriates in other domains.

Overall, future research could build on our findings and simultaneously investigate the influence of organizational policies (e.g. the use of communication technology during leisure time, flexitime arrangements, home office policies, or childcare assistance) and individual boundary tactics on life domain enrichment and conflict on international assignments. With regard to the enrichment between life domains, more research is needed that examines possible antecedents of life domain enrichment. Expanding on our argumentation described above, boundary management tactics may primarily have a moderating effect on the influence of other content factors on life domain conflict and enrichment. Thus, future research is needed that explicitly analyzes content factors leading to life domain enrichment in an expatriate’s context. Moreover, as mentioned above, expanding on previous research that has shown the influence of cultural values on the interplay of different life domains (Powell et al., 2009; Spector et al., 2007), it would be fruitful to also take the influence of cultural value dimensions on boundary management tactics into account.

Taken together, the present study clearly shows associations between specific boundary management tactics such as flexibility and permeability in both life domains in the context of an international assignment. The main findings underline the importance of boundary management tactics in the private life domain and more specifically, the role of private life flexibility ability as a protecting factor for life domain conflict and an antecedent of life domain enrichment. In addition, this study also presents possible boundary management profiles of expatriates. Building on the present study, more research is needed to provide a better understanding of the longitudinal influences of the boundary management tactics of expatriates. We hope that the present study stimulates future research that helps us to better understand how the boundary management of expatriates contributes to the success of an international assignment.
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Table 1.

*Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis model comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six hierarchical factors (with sub-constructs)</td>
<td>62.372</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four factors (boundary management work, boundary management private life, permeability work, permeability private life)</td>
<td>310.703</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three factors (boundary management ability, boundary management willingness, permeability)</td>
<td>563.268</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two factors (boundary management and permeability)</td>
<td>518.262</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* CFI = Comparative fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation.
Table 2.
Correlations and descriptive statistics of the study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work flexibility ability</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work flexibility willingness</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work permeability</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life flexibility ability</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life flexibility willingness</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life permeability</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work–private life conflict</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life–work conflict</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work–private life enrichment</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life–work enrichment</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = 202, *p<.05, **p<.01.
Table 3.

Results of hierarchical regression analysis of work–private life conflict, private life–work conflict, work–private life enrichment and private life–work enrichment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work flexibility ability</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work flexibility willingness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work permeability</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life flexibility ability</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life flexibility willingness</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life permeability</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N=202, *p<.05, **p<.01. Missing Cases were deleted listwise.
Table 4.

*Cluster membership means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work flexibility ability</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work flexibility willingness</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work permeability</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life flexibility ability</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life flexibility willingness</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life permeability</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

Cluster membership demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 60)</td>
<td>(N = 52)</td>
<td>(N = 42)</td>
<td>(N = 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of woman</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage partnered</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with children</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
<td>33.41 (8.41)</td>
<td>32.15 (6.25)</td>
<td>32.22 (5.04)</td>
<td>33.60 (6.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average working hours</td>
<td>47.38 (10.33)</td>
<td>43.80 (9.49)</td>
<td>43.40 (7.36)</td>
<td>48.46 (8.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Hofstede I/C score</td>
<td>44.73 (21.91)</td>
<td>43.69 (22.51)</td>
<td>36.88 (19.18)</td>
<td>53.12 (24.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Means are uncentered. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses where appropriate.
Figure 1. Summary of the regression analysis results. Private life domain related processes/variables in dotted line, work domain related variables in solid line. FA = Flexibility Ability, FW = Flexibility Willingness, P = Permeability, - = negative effects, + positive effects.
Figure 2. Resulting boundary management cluster in an expatriate context.
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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effects of daily affective events and mood on the interaction of life domains. Specifically, based on affective events theory (AET, Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), it hypothesizes that daily hassles/uplifts and mood predict life domain conflict and life domain enrichment over time. A sample of 229 participants completed questionnaires measuring daily affective events, mood, and life domain conflict and enrichment once per week over the course of four weeks (yielding 677 data points). The results of hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) analysis showed that positive affective events predicted life domain enrichment for the work domain and the private life domain. However, negative affective events failed to predict life domain conflict. Moreover, positive mood predicted life domain enrichment, and negative mood predicted life domain conflict for both life domains. This study contributes to the existing literature by adopting a longitudinal perspective on the interaction of life domains, by clearly distinguishing different directions of influence between the work and the private life domain, and by explicitly taking affective events and mood into account as potential antecedents of life domain conflict and enrichment. Practical implications for fostering a positive interplay of life domains are discussed.
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The interplay between different life domains represents a fundamental aspect of daily life for individuals and their organizations. For example, previous research has shown that negative interactions between life domains, such as negative spillover and work-private life conflict, are associated with decreased job satisfaction (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000), decreased organizational commitment (Li, Lu, & Zhang, 2013), and increases in stress and health-related problems (Berkman et al., 2015). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) define work-family conflict as ‘a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect’ (p. 77). Other authors emphasize positive interactions between the work and private life domains, focusing on life domain facilitation (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007), or enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Positive interactions between life domains are associated with higher job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and satisfaction with one’s family (McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) define life domain enrichment as ‘the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role’ (p. 72).

Thus, positive and negative interactions take place between differing life domains, leading to a variety of positive and negative outcomes for individuals and organizations. It has been argued that the interaction of life domains has to be conceptualized as bi-directional construct, with effects from the working life on the private life and vice versa (e.g. Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). Moreover, it has been suggested to apply the concept of ‘private life domain’ instead of ‘family’ to enable more individuals to identify with the construct and to be more inclusive (Kempen, Pangert, Hattrup, Mueller, & Joens, 2015; Tetrick & Buffardi, 2006). Not surprisingly, a number of studies have sought to examine potential antecedents of life domain conflict and enrichment. For example, a recent meta-analysis showed that several work domain related stressors (such as work role conflict, work role overload, and work role ambiguity), support factors (such as organizational, supervisor, and coworker support), and personality variables (e.g. locus of control) were associated with self-reported work-family conflict (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). At the same time, stressors in the private life domain such as family role conflict, family role ambiguity, and family role overload, family and spousal support, and family climate were associated with family-work conflict.

Much less is known, however, about the antecedents of life domain enrichment. Moreover, although several studies reported strong spillover of mood and affect occurring between life domains (e.g. Hackett, Bycio, & Guion, 1989; Repetti, 1987; Rothbard, 2001; Stone, 1987), the role of affective events and mood have not been thoroughly investigated as potential antecedents of either life domain enrichment or life domain conflict (Carlson, Kacmar, Zivnuska, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2011; MacDermid, Seery, & Weiss, 2002). Thus,
the present study applies Weiss and Cropanzano’s (1996) affective events theory (AET) to examine the effects of daily affective experiences and mood at work and in the private life domain on the experience of conflict and enrichment arising from the interplay of the two domains. According to AET, reactions to one’s job depend on both the stable characteristics of the job, and on the dynamic affectively laden events that occur, representing daily hassles or daily uplifts. The AET describes affective events as affective experiences acting as proximal causes of affective reactions. In addition, it defines mood as an affective state that is less intense than emotions, of longer duration and not specific to an event or an object. We predict that these affective events, occurring in the work domain and in the private life domain, along with more generalized mood, will influence life domain conflict and life domain enrichment over time in a longitudinal analysis of responses from working adults. As Maertz and Boyar (2011) argue, research is needed that adopts an episodic approach to understanding life domain interactions, given that life domain conflict and enrichment occur as episodes and are stored in memory as episodes.

Taken together, the present study contributes to the literature in four important ways. First, it conceptualizes the interaction of life domain as bi-directional processes consisting of both conflict and enrichment. Second, it deepens the understanding of possible antecedents of life domain conflict and enrichment by taking affective aspects such as daily affective events and mood into account. Third, building on the AET, it provides a sound theoretical basis for the analysis of life domain interactions and affective components. Finally, this study uses a weekly diary study design to analyze the dynamics of life domain conflict and life domain enrichment from a longitudinal perspective.

The importance of affect in the context of life domain interaction

Several disparate theoretical processes may underlie the effects of affective experiences in one life domain on conflict or enrichment with respect to another life domain. For instance, it is known that emotional spillover occurs, whereby experiences and emotions in one life domain carry over into the other life domain (Staines, 1980). At the same time, compensation can sometimes occur, whereby deficiencies in one life domain may be compensated for with experiences in another life domain. Moreover, research on boundary management suggests that micro role transitions occur frequently in daily life, including boundary-crossing activities between the work and non-work domain (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). Examples include phone calls from work or home while in the other setting, or mental preoccupation with events in one domain while in another domain (e.g. Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). Boundaries between life domains are characterized by a certain degree of permeability and flexibility (Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007). Thus, role transitions and permeable domain
boundaries enable daily affective events and mood to influence perceived life domain conflict and life domain enrichment.

Several early studies underline the importance of affect in the context of life domain interactions (see MacDermid et al., 2002 for an overview). Focusing on the negative interplay of life domains, Wharton and Erickson (1993) described how the structure and role expectations of the work and the private life domain lead to specific patterns of emotions and emotion management, which in turn have the potential to cause individual consequences such as work-family role overload and work-family role conflict. Individuals who manage multiple roles face disparate emotional management requirements in the different roles, leading to higher role overload and role conflict. Moreover, it has been argued that negative mood in one domain inhibits role performance and rewards in other life domains, leading to negative mood in those domains (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Thus, in an empirical study of employed adults, Williams and Alliger (1994) showed that spillover of unpleasant mood was reported leading both from work to family, and from family to work, based on diaries kept by the participants. The authors found that interference of family with the work role on a given day led to distress in the family role. However, the authors examined only negative interactions between life domains, neglecting potential positive interactions between the work and the private life domain.

In addition, several studies also consider the role of mood on positive interactions between life domains. For example, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) argue that positive mood can enhance cognitive functioning, task activity, and positive interactions with others, leading to positive affect that crosses domain boundaries. Clark, Michel, Stevens, Howell, and Scruggs (2014) found that positive emotions like joviality, attentiveness, and self-assurance, mediated the relationship between work engagement and work-private life enrichment.

As these studies show, mood plays a potentially important role in the context of life domain interactions. However, few empirical investigations of the role of daily affective experiences in the life domain interplay have been reported. Of the studies that have examined affective events in life domain research, few have considered the bi-directional nature of life domain conflict and enrichment. Moreover, research has tended to reduce the ‘private life’ domain to the ‘family’ domain, which neglects the full range of experiences that individuals may have outside of work. Thus, the present study relies on AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) to derive hypotheses about the influences of daily affective events and mood on the interplay of life domains while at the same time integrating the conceptual advancements in the field of life domain interaction.

Affective Events Theory as Theoretical Framework
According to AET, work environment features contribute to the occurrence of negative or positive events in the workplace, which in a cumulative way lead to negative or positive affective reactions. These affective reactions have attitudinal and behavioral consequences. In particular, affective reactions are directly related to work attitudes such as job satisfaction, but they also lead to affect driven behaviors. According to the theory, two different mechanisms contribute to these affective reactions, namely endogenous factors, which include affective dispositions and experienced mood, and exogenous factors, which include specific work-related or non-work-related affective events. Overall, the basic predictions of the model have been confirmed in number of studies (e.g. Fisher, 2002; Ilies & Judge, 2002; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2004; Wegge, van Dick, Fisher, West, & Dawson, 2006).

The affectively laden events that underlie affective reactions include both major life events, like divorce, separation, accidents, and injuries, and daily hassles and uplifts. Hassles are ‘the irritating, frustrating, distressing demands that to some degree characterize everyday transactions with the environment’ (Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981; p. 3.). Uplifts, by contrast, are daily experiences that are favorable to an individual’s well-being (Ivancevich, 1986). For both daily hassles and uplifts, the frequency of events can be distinguished from their intensity (Reich, Parella, & Filstead, 1988). According to Basch and Fisher (2004), intensity captures the subjective, internal responses to events, reflecting individual differences in reactivity to such life events. Thus, in the present study, we focus on the intensity of hassles and uplifts experienced over the course of several weeks.

Previous research demonstrates that daily hassles are a better predictor of stress than other life events (Kanner et al., 1981), and that daily hassles predict psychological well-being and mental health dimensions better than other life events (Chamberlain & Zika, 1990). Moreover, daily hassles and uplifts influence job performance and absenteeism (Ivancevich, 1986). Although daily life events thus play an important role in explaining several outcomes, research on the interaction of life domains has not yet fully integrated this perspective. In the present paper it is argued that daily affective events, as exogenous variables, influence both life domain conflict and life domain enrichment. Building on the basic definition of life domain conflict, it is assumed that conflicts between life domains may be time-based, strain-based or behavior-based (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). At the same time, daily hassles may be time-consuming (Kanner et al., 1981), produce strain or result in behavioral challenges (Chamberlain & Zika, 1990). Thus, it is expected that daily hassles have the potential to produce the perception of life domain conflict. In a similar vein, daily uplifts may produce resources such as social support or psychological resources (Basch & Fisher, 2004) that can be transferred from one role to another (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Moreover, as previous research has shown, endogenous variables, such as mood, also play a role for life domain interactions, influencing life domain conflict and enrichment independently of affective
events. Consequently, it is argued that both affective events (exogenous factors) and mood (endogenous factors) are able to predict the perception of life domain conflict and life domain enrichment over time. Figure 1 shows the predicted relationships between affective events/mood, and life domain conflict and enrichment.

In two cross-sectional studies, Carlson et al. (2011) found support for a model that predicted mediating effects of mood on the relationships between work-family enrichment and job satisfaction. However, the cross-sectional character of the data makes it difficult to ascertain whether life domain enrichment was a cause or a consequence of higher mood levels. In the present research, we predict that affective events and mood act as exogenous and endogenous predictors, respectively, of life domain conflict and enrichment. This is based on the assumptions of AET and also follows the conceptual model of life domain enrichment described by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) in which positive affect transmits resources from one domain to other domains. Thus, affective reactions to resources generated in one role are antecedents of perceived enrichment between life domains. As noted, the present research employs a longitudinal diary study approach to permit more trustworthy inferences about the causal processes underlying relationships between daily affective events, mood, and life domain conflict and enrichment.

**Study Hypotheses**

Diary studies have the potential to capture the dynamics of the interplay of life domains over time (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003; Ohly, Sonnentag, Niessen, & Zapf, 2010). For example, diary studies have found that daily personal resources (Martinez-Corts, Demerouti, Bakker, & Boz, 2015), daily smartphone use (Derks, Duin, Tims, & Bakker, 2015), and subjective involvement in the professional domain (Wiese, 2004), predicted eventual life domain conflict. Butler, Grzywacz, Bass, and Linney (2005) reported that daily job demands were negatively related to work-family facilitation over a 14-day period, whereas daily control and skill utilization were positively related to work-family facilitation during the same period. Butler et al. (2005) did not examine the effects of non-work experiences on outcomes in the work domain, however. Thus, the present study extends previous research by analyzing the effects of daily affective events and mood in the work and non-work domains on experienced conflict and enrichment in each domain. We also conceptualize the non-work domain broadly to include one’s entire ‘private life’, rather than just the ‘family life’. This is important because previous research has shown that the effects of life events and mood show different patterns in different life domains (e.g. Holm & Holroyd, 1992). Thus, we propose separate hypotheses for effects of mood and affective events in the work and private life domains. In particular, it is hypothesized that daily affective events in one life domain predict conflict and enrichment of that domain with other domains. More specifically, we hypothesize that:
Hypothesis 1:

a) Positive events at work predict work-private life enrichment.

b) Positive events in the private life domain predict private life-work enrichment.

c) Negative events at work predict work-private life conflict.

d) Negative events in the private life domain predict private life-work conflict.

Similarly, it is hypothesized that mood in one life domain predicts conflict and enrichment of that domain with the other domain. More specifically, it is predicted that:

Hypothesis 2:

a) Positive mood at work predicts work-private life enrichment.

b) Positive mood in the private life domain predicts private life-work enrichment.

c) Negative mood at work predicts work-private life conflict.

d) Negative mood in the private life domain predicts private life-work conflict.

METHODS

Participants

Participants in this study were recruited via personal contacts, online platforms, and social networks using snowball technique, and asked to complete a short survey at four separate intervals during the spring of 2015. Overall, the sample consisted of a total of 229 participants who were recruited to participate in the study. Of this number, 207 participated in the first week, 181 participated in the second week, 151 participated in the third week, and 139 participated in the fourth week of the study. This equals a drop-out rate of 33.65%. In total, 677 data points were available. Of the total number of participants, 59.9% were female and 40.1% were male. Nearly a quarter (24.6%) indicated that they were living with a significant other and had children, 34.8% were living with a significant other but did not have children, 23.2% were single and living alone, 6.8% were single and living in a shared house or apartment, and 10.6% indicated that they were single and living in some other situation. The mean age of the participants was 34.54 years ($SD = 11.12$), and participants worked an average of 36.30 hours per week ($SD = 12.70$).

Procedure

In the present study, a weekly diary approach was chosen to analyze the relationships between daily affective events, mood, and life domain interaction over time. A weekly interval was chosen in an effort to capture changes in life domain conflict, life domain enrichment, mood, and affective events (Bolger et al., 2003). Larsen and Kasimatis (1990) showed that changes in mood varied in weekly cycles. Thus, Sonnentag, Mojza, Binnewies, and Scholl
(2008) used a weekly diary method in their study of interactions between affective experiences in different life domains. Daily changes are likely to be less reliable, and hence, we asked participants to complete our measures once per week over the course of four weeks. In particular, participants received a personalized invitation via e-mail and a personalized link to the online questionnaire with the instruction to fill out the questionnaire on Thursday or Friday evening after work for each of the four weeks of the study. Each link to the questionnaire could only be used once. Following the recommendations by Ohly et al. (2010), the questionnaire was kept as short as possible to encourage participation throughout the course of the study. Overall, participants could complete the survey each week within about five to seven minutes. As an incentive to participate in the study, participants were invited to take part in a raffle after completing the survey on the fourth measurement occasions. They were also offered an individual profile containing descriptive feedback regarding their own levels of life domain conflict and enrichment.

MEASURES

Each of the measures was administered during each of the four survey occasions. Participants were asked to think about their experiences during the past week and respond to survey items according to their experiences during the week. Thus, items were written in the past tense, and began with the phrase ‘during the last week’.

Affective Events: Affective events at work were measured using the hassles and uplifts at work scale by Basch and Fisher (2004), which was adapted to German by Mueller and Biebricher (2010). We wanted to reduce the number of items administered on each occasion to a manageable number. Hence, we asked three experts in the area of life domain research to examine items in the scale and rate each in terms of its relevance for interactions between life domains. This resulted in a set of ten positive and ten negative events that were presented to the research participants. Sample items include, “I was given more responsibility” (positive affective event at work) and “Somebody wasted my time” (negative affective event at work). In addition, participants could indicate that another positive or negative event not mentioned in the list occurred during the past week. Thus, a total number of 22 events were assessed on each occasion. If the participants indicated that an event occurred, they were asked to rate the intensity of this event using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = “very bad” to 7 = “very good” with a midpoint of 4 = “neutral”. Cronbach’s Alpha for these scales ranged from .56 to .88 for the different measurement intervals. The average Alpha was .80 across the four time periods.

Affective events in the private life domain were assessed using the daily life events scale originally developed by Seidlitz and Diener (1993), and revised by Oishi, Diener, Choi, Kim-Prieto, and Choi (2007). As with the work-related events, we asked researchers to judge the
relevance of the items to life domain interactions, leading to a final set of ten positive and ten negative events and two additional events (positive and negative). As for the affective events in the workplace, a total number of 22 possible events were assessed. Sample items include “I impressed my friends” (positive affective event), and “I was stood up” (negative affective event). The items were translated into German using back translation method. Similar to affective events at work, the intensity of the events was rated using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = “very bad” to 7 = “very good” with a midpoint of 4 = “neutral”, if the participants indicated that an event occurred. Cronbach’s Alpha for these scales ranged from .72 to .96 for the different measurement points, with an average Alpha of .84 across the four time periods.

Following the procedure described by Basch & Fisher (2004), the items measuring intensity of positive and negative events were recoded as follows. If hassles items were rated as positive or neutral, they received a score of 0, as the hassle had no negative intensity. Moreover, “somewhat bad” was recoded as 1, “bad” as 2 and “very bad” as 3 resulting in a higher score meaning more unpleasantness. Similarly, uplifts at work and in the private life domain were recoded 0 if the event was rated neutral or negatively. In addition, “somewhat good” was recoded as 1, “good” as 2 and “very good” as 3 (see Basch & Fisher, 2004).

**Mood:** Weekly mood was assessed using the Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), which was translated to German by Krohne, Egloff, Kohlmann, and Tausch (1996). From this scale, five items were selected to measure positive mood in the workplace, five items for negative mood in the workplace, five items for positive mood in the private life domain, and five items for negative mood in the private life domain. Sample items included, “During the last week, I felt interested at work” (positive mood at work). Participants used a five-point Likert rating scale anchored 1 = “not at all”, to 5 = “to a large extent”. Cronbach’s Alpha for these scales ranged from .69 to .86 for the different measurement points, with an average Alpha of .79.

**Life domain enrichment:** Life domain enrichment was assessed with the short version of the work–family enrichment scale developed by Kacmar, Crawford, Carlson, Ferguson, and Whitten, (2014), and translated to German by Pangert, Schiml, and Schüpbach (2015). The scale included six items in all, with three items capturing work–private life enrichment and three items capturing private life–work enrichment. Sample items included, ‘My involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me in my private life’ (work–private life enrichment). All items were rated using a Likert scale anchored 1 = “strongly disagree”, to 5 = “strongly agree”. Cronbach’s Alpha for these scales ranged from .69 to .80 for the different measurement points, with an average Alpha of .75.

**Life domain conflict:** Life domain conflict was measured with six items from the Work–Family Conflict Scale (Carlson et al., 2000), which were translated to German by Pangert et
al. (2015). Three of the items measured work–private life conflict and three items measured
private life–work conflict. Sample items included ‘My work keeps me from my private life
activities more than I would like’. The wording of the life domain scales was changed to
‘private life’ instead of ‘family’, and all of the items were written in the past tense, as noted
above. Cronbach’s Alpha for these scales ranged from .53 to .74 for the different
measurement points, with an average Alpha of .63 across the four periods. Table 1 shows
the reliability estimates for each scale and each measurement occasion.

RESULTS
Following the recommendations by Huang, Curran, Keeney, Poposki, and DeShon,
(2012), we began by evaluating the response data to detect potential insufficient effort
responding. In particular, we calculated response time for each item during each
measurement period. None of the participants had a response time below 2 seconds per
item, and hence, none of the participants was removed because of insufficient effort
responding. Table 2 shows the correlations for the relevant variables aggregated to person
level and to the week level. As can be seen from the table, the demographic variables
gender, working hours, and age were related to the dependent variables, and as a
consequence, were covaried in subsequent analyses. To test the main hypotheses, we
followed the procedure for the analysis of diary-style data recommended by Nezlek (2012)
and Ohly et al. (2010). Specifically, in the case of a diary study, days (Level 1 variables) are
nested within persons (Level 2 variables) making a multilevel modeling approach necessary,
which we implemented with stata (Version 12.1).

Before testing relationships between daily affective events/mood and life domain conflict
and enrichment, we evaluated the amount of variation of life domain conflict and life domain
enrichment that was attributable to within-person factors and to between-person factors,

using a null-model that included only an intercept. An Intra-Class Correlation (ICC) can be
calculated for the null-model and tested with a likelihood ratio test, by dividing the variance
explained by the intercept in the null-model by the total variance explained. As Table 3
shows, the amount of variance attributable to the individual level (between measurement
points) ranges from 44.5% to 55.9% and is thus sufficient to conduct further analyses.

Following the recommendations by Nezlek, (2012) and Ohly et al. (2010), data were person-
centered (group-mean centered) prior to the multilevel analysis.

With regard to the influence of positive events, Hypothesis 1a predicted that positive
events at work are related to work-private life enrichment over time. As can be seen from
Table 4, this hypothesis was confirmed ($b = .305$, $p < .00$). Moreover, Hypothesis 1b
predicted that positive events in the private life domain influence private life-work enrichment
over time. This hypothesis was also confirmed ($b = .419$, $p < .00$). With regards to negative
events, Hypothesis 1c predicted that negative events at work relate to work-private life conflict. This hypothesis was not supported ($b = .004, p = .963$). Finally, Hypothesis 1d predicted that negative events in the private life domain influence private life-work conflict. As can be seen in Table 4, this hypothesis was not supported ($b = .027, p = .717$). Taken together, Hypothesis 1 received partial support in this study; positive affective events predicted life domain enrichment, but negative events failed to predict life domain conflict.

Hypothesis 2a predicted that positive mood at work influences work-private life enrichment. This hypothesis was confirmed ($b = .418, p < .00$). Moreover, Hypothesis 2b predicted that positive mood in the private life domain influences private life-work enrichment. This hypothesis was also supported in the present research ($b = .280, p < .00$). With regards to negative mood, Hypothesis 2c predicted that negative mood at work relates to work-private life conflict. This Hypothesis was confirmed ($b = .428, p < .00$). Finally, Hypothesis 2d predicted that negative mood in the private life domain relates to private life-work conflict. This Hypothesis was also confirmed ($b = .231, p < .01$). Thus, overall, Hypothesis 2 was fully supported in the present research; both positive and negative mood in one life domain influence life domain conflict and enrichment.

DISCUSSION

Using AET as theoretical framework, the present study investigated the effects of daily affective events and mood on the perception of life domain conflict and enrichment over time. Thus, the present study contributes to research on possible antecedents of life domain conflict and enrichment, and provides new insights that may help organizations and individuals to attenuate the negative effects of life domain conflict and to foster instead the enrichment of life domains. Following the differentiation of the AET between exogenous and endogenous affective factors leading to organizational attitudes and behavior, the first hypothesis of the study predicted that positive and negative affective events (daily hassles and uplifts) influence the perception of life domain conflict and enrichment over time. More specifically, it was expected that positive events at work affect work-private life enrichment (H1a), that positive events in the private life domain affect private life-work enrichment (H1b), that negative events at work predict work-private life conflict (H1c) and that negative events in the private life domain affect private life-work conflict (H1d). Results of the hierarchical linear modeling showed that, in the case of life domain enrichment, both work-private life enrichment and private life-work enrichment were predicted by positive events in the work and in the private life domain, fully supporting Hypotheses 1a and 1b. However, contrary to Hypotheses 1c and 1d, negative events in the workplace and in the private life domain did not predict perceptions of life domain conflict.
Several implications can be drawn from these results. First, the present results underscore the need to consider conflict and enrichment separately from each other, to conceptualize them as bi-directional constructs, and to clearly specify the direction of influence between the life domains. Second, affective events appear to have different effects on life domain conflict and life domain enrichment. While in the case of life domain enrichment, daily positive affective events do have an impact; daily negative affective events are not a causal factor predicting life domain conflict. Consequently, different processes may underlie these relationships. For example, Rothbard (2001) argued that positively-laden affective experiences lead to an outward focus of attention, which in turn is associated with openness and engagement in different roles. Negatively-laden events, by contrast, lead to an inward focus, which reduces engagement with others. In addition, another possible explanation may lie within different cognitive coping styles that may have been applied here. For example, previous research has shown that emotion focused coping mechanisms such as positive thinking buffer the negative effects of work-family conflicts (Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999). Consequently, similar cognitive coping strategies may also reduce the influence of negative affective events on the perception of the interplay of life domains. Third, regarding the conceptual frameworks spillover and compensation explained above, it could also be argued that spillover may primarily underlie the effect of positive events on life domain enrichment, while in the case of negative events, both spillover and compensation occur. Specifically, in the case of negative events, employees may seek to compensate for those events and consequently, they do not have an equally strong impact on the perception of life domain conflict. In a similar vein, Rothbard (2001) argues that individuals may cope with negative emotions in one life domain using compensation to avoid the transfer of the negative emotion to the other life domain.

The second hypothesis of the study predicted that mood in the different life domains affect the perception of life domain conflict and enrichment over time. Specifically, it was predicted that positive mood in the work domain influences work-private life enrichment (H2a), that positive mood in the private life domain influences private life-work enrichment (H2b), that negative mood in the work domain influences work-private life conflict (H2c) and that negative mood in the private life domain influences private life-work conflict over time (H2d). Results of the hierarchical linear modeling analysis fully supported each of these hypotheses. Thus, positive and negative mood in the different life differentially predicts life domain conflict and enrichment over time. This implies that mood is an important factor to be considered when analyzing the interplay of life domains. For instance, mood in one life domain may act as a resource that is transferred to the other life domain, enhancing the perception of the second life domain. Moreover, as suggested by Greenhaus and Powell (2006), mood may act as a vehicle that enables other resources to be transferred from one
life domain to the other. In the case of life domain conflict, it can be concluded that in the sense of a scarcity hypothesis, negative mood in one life domain may reduce resources available in the other life domain. This lack of resources may in turn influence the perception of the conflict between the life domains.

From an applied perspective at the organizational level, the findings imply that employers pay attention to the affective atmosphere at the workplace, foster favorable working conditions, and seek to enhance the mood of employees. As the present results suggest, a focus should be placed on the relatively ‘small’ events at the workplace. Specifically, daily uplifts at work (like friendliness, positive feedback and responsibility) have the potential to foster the transfer of resources between life domains. Moreover, following the argumentation by Rothbard (2001), the present findings may also be transferred to the dynamics of different roles within an organization. Specifically, an affective event at work can equally affect the perception of the interplay of different roles within the organizational context. For example, a frustrating experience with a client may affect perceptions of a subsequent team meeting, which could lead to a perception of conflict between the different task roles. Organizations might thus benefit from providing seminars and training programs that address emotion management questions and strategies.

At the individual level, the results suggest that potential advantages may be derived through coaching activities for employees that focus on emotion regulation and management. For example, trying to actively put oneself in a positive mood may be a powerful way to enhance one's perceived interaction between life domains. Moreover, applying cognitive strategies to interpret daily hassles and uplifts in a more positive and constructive way might help employees experience more positive interactions between the work and private life domains. Coping strategies such as positive thinking, help seeking, and direct action coping styles (Rotondo, Carlson, & Kincaid, 2003), may help to attenuate the negative effects of daily hassles in the work and private life domains.

Research is needed to further identify factors that moderate the effects observed in this study, for example, by finding variables that enhance the positive effects of daily uplifts or that ameliorate the negative effects of daily hassles. For example, daily affective events should be investigated together with rather stable work environment features. Similarly, variables attenuating the negative effects from mood on life domain interaction would be important to find. Based on the AET, possible moderators at the organizational level may include characteristics of the workplace environment, whereas, at the individual level, individual dispositions and personality factors may play a role. Moreover, boundary management tactics may have an influence on the relationships between daily hassles, daily uplifts, and mood on perceptions of life domain conflict and enrichment. For example, in the case of negative events, a boundary strategy that focuses on separating life domains may
help in preventing negative events from one domain to influence the conflict between life domains (Standen, 1999). Similarly, Lambert (1990) suggested that segmentation of life domains may work as an active strategy that can help employees in dealing with negative experiences in a particular life role. By contrast, an integrating boundary strategy might help to foster a positive transfer of resources between domains, leading to enrichment between life domains.

As in all research, some limitations of this study should be noted. First, we used shortened versions of established measures in the present research, to reduce the length of the survey overall and encourage continued participation throughout the length of the study. This caused somewhat lower reliability for some of the measures on some occasions. This was especially the case for the items measuring life domain conflict. Nevertheless, overall, reliabilities in the present study were acceptable, and we encourage future research that uses similar measures. We also used a structured rating approach to measure weekly events, rather than conducting a qualitative analysis of participants' open-ended recollections of salient affective events. Thus, it is possible that salient events occurred that were not assessed in the present study. The use of structured event ratings, however, helps participants recall events that may have occurred, which is a common problem in using retrospective assessment (Tourangeau, Rips, & Rasinski, 2000). To obtain a broader picture of relevant daily affective events, future studies could use a free recall technique to identify relevant events in the context of life domain conflict and enrichment. Finally, we used a relatively short time interval between the first and the last measurement periods in the present study. Thus, future research should follow up on the present findings by examining effects that play out over a longer period of time.

Overall, this present study makes an important contribution to the literature on life domain interactions by investigating the role of daily affective events and mood as antecedents of life domain conflict and enrichment. The longitudinal character of this study allows for a more insightful analysis of causal relationships among variables. Future research is needed that builds on the findings reported in the present study and explores the effects of daily affective events and mood in a broader context, specifying the underlying processes and moderators, such as coping processes, boundary management tactics, and organizational factors affecting the influence of daily affective events and mood on life domain conflict and enrichment. Overall, the present study represents a unique attempt to integrate theory about affective events and life domain conflict and enrichment in a longitudinal investigation. We hope the results of the present study encourage additional research of these important effects.
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### TABLES

Table 1.

**Reliability Indicators for Scales Depending on Measurement Point**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affective Events at Work</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affective Events at Work</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affective Events Private Life</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affective Events Private Life</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Work Positive)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Work Negative)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Private Life Positive)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Private Life Negative)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Private Life Enrichment</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Life-Work Enrichment</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Private Life Conflict</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Life Work Conflict</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Indicators are Cronbach’s Alpha values. Each of the four columns represents the corresponding measurement point (weekly intervals). PANAS = Positive Affects Negative Affects Scale.
Table 2.

Pearson's r Correlations Between All Variables Aggregated to the Person Level and to the Week Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Affective Events at Work</th>
<th>Negative Affective Events at Work</th>
<th>Positive Affective Events Private Life</th>
<th>Negative Affective Events Private Life</th>
<th>PANAS (Work Positive)</th>
<th>PANAS (Work Negative)</th>
<th>PANAS (Private Life Positive)</th>
<th>PANAS (Private Life Negative)</th>
<th>Work-Private Life Conflict</th>
<th>Private Life-Work Conflict</th>
<th>Work-Private Life Enrichment</th>
<th>Private Life-Work Enrichment</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Working hours</th>
<th>Living situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affective Events at Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.145**</td>
<td>.628**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>-.150**</td>
<td>-.250**</td>
<td>-.106**</td>
<td>-.094*</td>
<td>-.205**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>.130**</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affective Events at Work</td>
<td>.206*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>-.082**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.159**</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.153**</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affective Events Private Life</td>
<td>.744*</td>
<td>.248*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.267**</td>
<td>-.140**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>-.169**</td>
<td>-.129**</td>
<td>-.126**</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>-.091*</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affective Events Private Life</td>
<td>.262*</td>
<td>.676*</td>
<td>.305*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.098*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.128**</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Work Positive)</td>
<td>.458*</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.262*</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.116**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>-.104**</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.146**</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.079*</td>
<td>.159**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Work Negative)</td>
<td>-.163*</td>
<td>.449*</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>.216*</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.126**</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>-.155**</td>
<td>-.108**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.082*</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Private Life Positive)</td>
<td>.294*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.415*</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.479*</td>
<td>-.170**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.270**</td>
<td>-.184**</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.103**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.106**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS (Private Life Negative)</td>
<td>.159*</td>
<td>.264*</td>
<td>-.235**</td>
<td>.324*</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.546**</td>
<td>-.265**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.110**</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td>-.105**</td>
<td>-.227**</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.092*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Private Life Conflict</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.230*</td>
<td>-.152**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.475*</td>
<td>-.170**</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.119**</td>
<td>-.087*</td>
<td>.078*</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Life-Work Conflict</td>
<td>-.279*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.191*</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.183**</td>
<td>.375*</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.390*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.089*</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.091*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Private Life Enrichment</td>
<td>.359*</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.568*</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.307*</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Life-Work Enrichment</td>
<td>.235*</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.328*</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.264*</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.433*</td>
<td>-.209*</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.629*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.143**</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.035**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.289**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.247**</td>
<td>-.179*</td>
<td>-.207**</td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.345**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.082*</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.166**</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.327**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Situation</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.498**</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Missing cases are excluded pairwise. Values below the diagonal are based on responses aggregated to the person level (N = 152 - 177). Values above the diagonal are based on responses aggregated to the week level (N = 552 - 666).
* p < .05, ** p < .01.
Table 3.
Percentage of Variance Attributable to Within-Person Factors and Between-Person Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>Within Variance</th>
<th>Between Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-Private Life Enrichment</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Life-Work Enrichment</td>
<td>.460**</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Private Life Conflict</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>.54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Life Work Conflict</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** p < .01.*
3. General Discussion

The purpose of the present research was to contribute to our understanding and insights into the interaction of life domains in various important ways. From a conceptual perspective, the studies presented here aimed at integrating recent conceptual advancements in the literature on life domain interactions. More specifically, these advancements refer to the scope and conceptualization of the life domains considered, the bi-directional nature of the constructs and the inclusion of a positive perspective on life domains by taking life domain enrichment into account. In addition, these conceptual advancements also go along with the call for more multi-time and multi-level oriented research. Overall, this is important because it helps clarify the relationship between life domain interaction and both antecedents and outcomes. In summary, the questions studied in the present research underline the need to consider the interaction of life domains in employees’ and organizational life and may help in fostering a positive interplay of the work and the private life domains.

### Table 4.

**Results of the Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive events at work (\rightarrow) WPI F</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>3.83*</td>
<td>Positive events in private life (\rightarrow) PL WF</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>4.83*</td>
<td>Negative events at work (\rightarrow) WPI F</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>7.62*</td>
<td>2.568</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>9.28*</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>7.51*</td>
<td>2.324</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>11.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>2.94*</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive mood at work (\rightarrow) WPI F</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>7.22*</td>
<td>Positive mood in private life (\rightarrow) PI WF</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>5.18*</td>
<td>Negative mood at work (\rightarrow) WPI F</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>5.56*</td>
<td>Negative mood in private life (\rightarrow) PI WF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>4.86*</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>6.04*</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>7.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>3.47*</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-2.14*</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-2.13*</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. WPLE = Work-Private Life Enrichment, PLWE = Private Life-Work Enrichment, WPLC = Work-Private Life Conflict, PLWC = Private Life Work Conflict. * \(p < 0.05\), ** \(p < 0.01\).
3.1 Summary of Results

The first study included in this research examined the role of life domain conflict and enrichment for international assignments. Based on a sample of 112 expatriates in the development cooperation sector, the results showed that life domain enrichment contributes to the prediction of job satisfaction, turnover intentions and the accomplishment of role-related expectations beyond what was contributed by life domain conflict. This is the first study empirically studying life domain enrichment among expatriates. From a research perspective, the findings of this study underline the need to integrate recent conceptual advancements on the interplay of life domains in the expatriates' literature by adopting a broader perspective and considering both life domain conflict and enrichment as bi-directional constructs with unique effects. For example, the study demonstrates that the direction work-private life had a higher impact on the outcome variables than the effects of private life-work conflict and enrichment. Furthermore, this study demonstrates the unique value of life domain enrichment for expatriate workers and its incremental prediction of job satisfaction, turnover intentions and the accomplishment of role-related expectations. From an applied perspective, the study provides suggestions how to integrate both life domain conflict and enrichment in the preparation and the supervision of international assignees and their partners in the different life domains.

The second study included in this research adopted an intercultural perspective on the interplay of life domains and investigated the moderating effects of Individualism/Collectivism as cultural dimensions on the relationship of work-family conflict and family-work conflict on various satisfaction outcomes. Based on a sample of 20,850 individuals from 30 countries, hierarchical linear modeling analysis showed that Individualism/Collectivism moderate the negative relationship between life domain conflict and job satisfaction, family satisfaction and life satisfaction such that the relationship is stronger in countries with a more individualistic attitude. These findings suggest that members of collectivistic societies are better able to handle the negative effects associated with life domain conflict than employees in individualistic societies. From a theoretical perspective, the present findings demonstrate the generalizability of the relationships between life domain conflict and satisfaction in a large international sample. Furthermore, this study shows the appropriateness of multi-level research methodology for research on the interaction of life domains. Moreover, these results imply that cultural dimensions affect the relationship of life domain conflict and satisfaction outcomes and that culture should thus be taken into account when analyzing the effect of life domain conflict on various outcomes. From an applied point of view, results of the second study suggest that life domain interventions may not be equally successful in different countries.
Thus, organizations should customize life domain interventions to the values of the culture they are operating in.

The third study built on the boundary management literature and aimed at investigating the role of boundary management tactics of expatriates. Based on a sample of 202 expatriates in the higher education context, the results showed that the permeability and the flexibility of life domains are associated with work-private life conflict, private life-work conflict and work-private life enrichment, but not with private life-work enrichment. Moreover, results of a cluster analysis revealed the existence of four different boundary management clusters among expatriates labeled as “work warriors”, “integrators”, “work protectors” and “family protectors”. This study is unique in investigating differentiated forms of boundary management tactics in an expatriate context. For theory and research, the findings of the third study imply that differentiated forms of boundary management (permeability, flexibility ability and flexibility willingness) identified in domestic research are distinguishable in an international context. In addition, these boundary management tactics differentially contribute to the prediction of life domain conflict and enrichment beyond several control variables. Moreover, the results indicate that boundary strategies in the private life should be regarded separately from boundary strategies in the work domain as they have differentiated effects on life domain conflict and enrichment. Especially, private life flexibility ability has a strong effect on life domain interactions and may act as a buffer for life domain conflict. For practitioners and sending organizations, the present findings thus underline the need to strengthen private life flexibility ability of expatriates by providing structural support systems (such as childcare assistance, a living space close to the workplace or mobility support) aiming at fostering the private flexibility in the host countries. Furthermore, the resulting cluster can be used to offer tailored intervention programs for the different boundary management groups.

Finally, the fourth study included in this research adopted a longitudinal perspective on the interaction of life domains and aimed at investigating the impact of daily life events and mood on life domain conflict and enrichment. Using a weekly diary approach, this study was based on a sample of 229 participants and 677 data points. The results of the hierarchical linear modeling analysis showed that daily life events predict life domain enrichment, but not life domain conflict and that mood predicts both life domain conflict and enrichment. This study is unique in building on the AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) as established theoretical basis and in investigating exogenous and endogenous affective components as predictors of life domain conflict and enrichment. From a theoretical perspective, the results imply that daily life events and mood have different effects on life domain conflict and enrichment. While positive daily affective events predict life domain
enrichment, negative daily affective events do not predict life domain conflict. Thus, different processes (such as variation in attention focus or coping) may underlie these relationships. Moreover, the results of the last study demonstrate that a longitudinal diary study design helps in clarifying the dynamics of life domain interactions and the relation to its antecedents. From an applied perspective, the results indicate that employers should pay more attention to the affective atmosphere at the workplace as it significantly contributes to the perception of the interplay of life domains. For individuals, the results suggest that the adoption of cognitive coping strategies may help in attenuating the effect of negative mood and fostering the positive transfer or resources between life domains.

3.2 General Implications for Research and Practice

Overall, the results of the present research provide several important implications for research and practice. First, from a conceptual and research perspective, the results underline the necessity to conceptualize life domain conflict and enrichment as bidirectional constructs with separate directions of influence. As all the four studies included in this research demonstrate, the different directions of influence from work to the private life domain and vice versa are distinguishable. Moreover, the different directions show differential relations to antecedents and outcomes of work-private life conflict, private life-work conflict, work-private life enrichment and private life-work enrichment. Hence, it is important to clearly differentiate between influences from the work domain on the private life domain and vice versa in future research. Additionally, the results of the present studies provide support for the notion of varying characteristics of the different life domains. For example, as study 3 shows, the work domain and the private life domain differ in their permeability and flexibility and their respective effects on life domain conflict and enrichment. Especially, flexibility ability, flexibility willingness and permeability of the private life domain are associated with life domain conflict and work-private life enrichment. Similarly, the results of the first study show that influences from the work domain on the private life domain showed a higher impact on the outcome variables for both conflict and enrichment than the effects originated in the private life domain.

Second, the results indicate that in addition to life domain conflict, a positive perspective on the interplay of life domains offers new insights into the interplay of life domains. Specifically, life domain enrichment cannot be described by the absence of life domain conflict but is an independent construct with unique relations to both antecedents and outcomes. In addition, life domain enrichment has the potential to explain variance beyond what is explained by life domain conflict. For example, the results of the first study show that life domain enrichment explains variance in job satisfaction, turnover intentions and the accomplishment of role-related expectations beyond what is explained by life
domain conflict. To obtain a broader picture on the interaction of life domains, life domain enrichment should thus consistently be considered.

Third, the results of the present research show the necessity of adopting a multi-time and a multi-level research perspective on the interplay of life domains. Namely, the results of study four demonstrate that daily life events and mood predict life domain conflict and enrichment over time – a fact that can only be detected by longitudinal research methods. To better describe dynamic relations between life domains and their antecedents and outcomes and to be able to derive causal inferences, future research should thus consequently adopt a longitudinal perspective. Moreover, the second study demonstrates the unique contribution of taking a multi-level perspective on life domain interactions into account. Specifically, this study indicates that the influence of life domain conflict on satisfaction outcomes depends on cultural dimensions on country level. Thus, future studies on the interaction of life domains should integrate multi-level research methodologies.

Fourth, the results of the present research underline the need to investigate the interaction of life domains from an international perspective. Although the importance of the interaction of life domains in an international context was already emphasized by previous research (Caligiuri et al., 1998; Shaffer & Harrison, 2001; Shaffer et al., 2001), the results clearly demonstrate the need to adopt a finer-grained analysis on the interaction of life domains, to conceptually integrate recent advancements, and to transfer them to the international human resources management literature. For example, the first study demonstrates that life domain conflict and enrichment explain important outcome variables in an expatriate context. Moreover, the results of the second study underlie the importance of cultural dimensions such as Individualism and Collectivism in the relationship of life domain conflict and satisfaction outcomes. Furthermore, findings of the third study show the specific features of boundary management tactics on international assignments. This is especially important as an international context implies various challenges differing from those of domestic employees (e.g. Adler & Gundersen, 2008).

From an applied perspective, the results of the present research can help in designing programs fostering a positive interplay of life domains for employees. First, the findings suggest that the interaction of life domains should be systematically included in policies, programs and services for employees. Specifically, the results of the third study that integrates boundary management tactics indicate that it is of particular importance to strengthen the role of the flexibility ability in the private life domain, as flexibility in private life has been shown to be a protecting factor attenuating life domain conflict. Regarding work arrangements and schedules, employers should consequently develop flexible work arrangements and establish flexible home office and teleworking options. Moreover,
based on the results of the third study, organizational structural policies and programs may pay particular attention to the support in private tasks to avoid private life work-conflict and foster private life-work enrichment. For example, employers may provide laundry and shopping services or offer flexible child-care assistance to support their employees in handling the different demands from the private life domain.

Second, besides these measures, life domain conflict and life domain enrichment should also be incorporated into training and coaching activities. As the first study demonstrates, this is especially important for expatriates and their role-related partners. The interaction of life domain should thus be incorporated into existing preparation seminars for international assignments. Moreover, role-related partners in the host and home country should be explicitly considered during preparation and on the assignment. Specifically, training and coaching for international and domestic employees may pick up the subject of life domain conflict and explain factors leading to less conflict between the life domains. For example, trainings may incorporate findings of the last study that underlines the importance of a positive emotional atmosphere at work. Furthermore, training activities may build on the importance of cognitive coping strategies described in the last study and explicitly take emotion management strategies into account (Bolton, 2004). For example, different individual emotion management strategies may be presented in order to avoid the transfer of negative mood after negative work experiences. In addition, training and coaching focusing on the possible positive transfer of resources can help employees in developing a more positive attitude towards the interaction of their life domains. For example, as Clark (2000) argues, sharing successes at work with role-related partners in the private life domain and talking with colleagues about positive experience in the private life domain can increase the awareness for resources transferable from one domain to another. In addition, training and coaching activities should explicitly focus on the influences from the private life domain on the work domain, because the results of the first study show that employers can profit from private life-work enrichment when resources, abilities and knowledge are transferred from the private life domain to the work domain. Finally, training activities may explicitly focus on different boundary management styles. For example, depending on individual preferences for segmentation or integration, different boundary management styles and concrete techniques to separate or integrate life domains may be presented and discussed. For example, while individuals with a high willingness to integrate life domains are likely to benefit from measures that help them to integrate their working life in their private life and vice versa (for example through the use of mobile communication solutions), employees showing less willingness to integrate their life domains may benefit from techniques that help them to protect their life domains (for example through reserving times with reduced
communication). The clusters of boundary management styles obtained in the third study may help in identifying these different boundary management types and design training programs tailored to their individual needs.

Third, the results of the present study underline the magnitude of influences from the work domain on the private life domain. For example, findings of the first study demonstrate larger effects from the work-private life direction on the different outcomes than for the private life-work direction. This is consistent with early findings speaking of the “long arm of the job” (Meissner, 1971). Consequently employers should also develop measures creating resources on the job, for example through work design focusing on skill variety, autonomy, and feedback (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). These resources may then be transferred to the private life domain leading to more life domain enrichment.

Finally, it has to be noted that employers should adapt their policies and programs to the cultural norms prevalent in their subsidiaries. Namely, the results of the second study suggest that the perception of the interaction of life domains may be dependent on cultural values such as Individualism and Collectivism. Thus, policies and programs may not be equally effective in countries with different cultural backgrounds. To be successful, policies and programs should consequently be designed by host country nationals familiar with traditions and values of the given country.

3.3 General Limitations

As in all research, some limitations of the present studies need to be noted. First, three of the four studies presented here rely on cross-sectional research design. As a consequence, a reverse causality of the variable relations cannot be ruled out. Future research should consequently adopt a longitudinal perspective and investigate the interplay of life domains over time. As the fourth study of this research has shown, diary methods have the potential to better capture the dynamic character of the interplay of life domains. In addition, future research may also make use of cross-lagged designs and latent growth modeling.

Second, another limitation of the present studies is the exclusive use of self-report data. This focus on a single data source raises the possibility that the effects are overestimated due to a common method bias. Future research may consequently control for this potential bias and try to integrate different forms of data assessment.

Third, although this research is concerned with role conflicts and interactions with role-related partners, only one individual perspective on life domain conflict and enrichment was assessed. Consequently, future research should integrate multiple stakeholders and include the perspective of role-related partners. In the case of research
on international assignments, the perspective of host country nationals should be taken into account.

Fourth, it can be argued that the denomination of life domains used in the present research is rather broad, potentially limiting the generalizability of the effects. Namely, the concept of “private life” instead of “family” may be interpreted differently by the respondents. While some participants may think of time spent on leisure activities, others might primarily think of their friends or voluntary work and others may refer in their answers to time spent with their family only. This ambiguity may potentially limit the validity of the present findings. However, the use of the “family” concept excludes several individuals from participating in research on the interplay of life domains. Moreover, individuals may vary in their emphasis placed on different life roles. Consequently, future research could focus on empirically investigating which are the focal life roles for individuals and then include them in their studies on the interplay of these roles.

Fifth, although one of the studies presented here uses a longitudinal research design, it has been argued that the interaction of life domains is best investigated over a longer period of time (such as a period up to six years; Rantanen, Kinnunen, Feldt, & Pulkkinen, 2008) to better capture its relation to major life events and to determine its stability. Hence, future research could include longer time spans in their research designs and consequently investigate the interaction of life domains from a time-span perspective (Roberts, 2008).

Overall, despite its limitations, the present research makes an important contribution to the knowledge on the interaction of life domains, because it broadens our perspective by conceptually integrating recent advancements of the literature, by investigating the interplay of life domains from an international perspective and by incorporating boundary management tactics and research on emotions at the workplace.

3.4 Outlook

Based on the findings of the present studies, several fruitful avenues for future research can be described. Namely, regarding the conceptual advancements in research on the interaction of life domains, new methodological approaches should be integrated. Moreover, given the continuing changes at the workplace mentioned above, more research is needed addressing the effect of internationalization, virtualization and the growing importance of emotions on the interplay of life domains. Consequently, future research should continue examining international and intercultural perspectives on life domain conflict and enrichment as well as further exploring the influences of boundary management tactics and emotions.
From a conceptual and methodological perspective, the present research has shown the importance of a longitudinal research design for the investigation of the interplay of life domains. Following the call for more longitudinal studies (Casper et al., 2007), future studies should consequently adopt longitudinal research methods to further contribute to the knowledge on life domain conflict and enrichment. Specifically, future research should focus on the relations between life domain conflict and enrichment and established antecedents and outcomes. For example, the relationship between life domain conflict and enrichment and satisfaction has been reported by several studies (e.g. Allen et al., 2000; McNall et al., 2010). Moreover, previous studies discuss domain specificity and source attribution as underlying processes for this relationship. While the domain specificity model argues that consequences of life domain conflict primarily affect the receiving life domain (e.g. work-private life conflict reduces family satisfaction), the source attribution model posits that negative effects of life domain conflict mainly affect the originating life domain (e.g. work-private life conflict reduces work satisfaction; Shockley & Singla, 2011). However, the vast majority of these studies are cross-sectional, raising questions about the causal inferences drawn. Future research could apply cross-lagged panel designs to test the proposed relationship between life domain interaction and satisfaction. In addition, a longitudinal investigation of the competing hypothesis of domain specificity and source attribution using cross-lagged designs would be helpful. Furthermore, future research on life domain conflict and enrichment could expand the longitudinal perspective and investigate the interaction of life domains across the life span. Within this approach, major life events and their impact on life domain conflict and enrichment could be taken into account.

In addition to multi-time research approaches, future research can build on the findings of the present studies and further explore multi-level and cross-level effects when examining life domain conflict and enrichment. For example, future research could examine the influences of life domain friendly policies on the organizational level or co-worker support on team level on the individual perception of life domain interactions.

Moreover, future research on the interaction of life domains would also benefit from considering more advanced research methods. For example, the fuzzy set methodology could be fruitfully applied to research on the interaction of life domains. Within this approach, the predictive potential of configurations of variables is tested (Fiss, 2007). Specifically, fuzzy set methodology is able to identify the relationships and interdependencies of multiple elements instead of resting on an additive, linear attribute as in, for example, conventional correlational methods. For instance, fuzzy set methodology could contribute substantially in identifying relevant combinations of organizational factors (e.g. organizational support, flexible time arrangement, home office
options) contributing to a positive interactions of life domains instead of focusing on the single effect of one of those factors.

Adopting a cross-cultural perspective, the present research underlines the need to consider value dimensions on country level when examining the relation between life domain conflict and its outcomes. Based on this result, future research should investigate how value dimensions affect the outcomes associated with life domain enrichment. Moreover, it would be beneficial to analyze in more detail how value dimensions interact in their influence on the relationship between life domain conflict and enrichment and various outcomes. Following the idea of a configurational approach in cross-cultural research (Tsui et al., 2007), a combination of value dimensions should consequently be investigated. For example, based on the cultural framework described in the GLOBE studies (Chhokar et al., 2013), various value dimensions that are expected to affect the interplay of life domains (such as gender egalitarianism, future orientation, performance orientation or collectivism) should be considered simultaneously in research on life domain interaction. In addition, previous research has shown that values at the individual level may affect the interaction of life domains (Carlson & Kacmar, 2000). Consequently, future research could expand on this attempt and take personal values and their influence on the interaction of life domains into account. Specifically, work centrality or post-materialistic value orientations are expected to play a focal role here as they describe differences in the value attributed to the work or the private life domain. For example, it could be hypothesized that positive and negative effects from the work domain on the private life domain are stronger if work centrality is an important value for an individual. Contrary, stronger effects for the influences from the private life domain on the work domain are expected if the post-materialistic orientation is high.

Furthermore, the present research has underlined the specific challenges regarding the interaction of life domains for international assignees. Building on these results, future research could also take the potential effect of cultural values of the host country on the interaction of life domains into account. Specifically, it would be fruitful to investigate how the value fit between the expatriates’ personal values and the host country values affect the perception of the interaction of life domains. For example, it could be hypothesized that an expatriate with a strong focus on gender egalitarianism has difficulties in balancing different role expectations in a country with very low gender egalitarianism. Consequently, the investigation of cultural value dimensions in relation to the interaction of life domains both for domestic and international employees is a field where future research could flourish.

In the light of the digitalization and the virtualization of work processes, the present research adopted a boundary management perspective and has shown the importance of
boundary management flexibility and permeability and its influence on life domain conflict and enrichment. Based on these findings, future research could elaborate in more detail the relevant facets of boundary management tactics. Specifically, it has been argued that flexibility and permeability of life domains are sometimes difficult to discern (Hecht & Allen, 2009). In addition, regarding the various influences of new communication technologies and the growing virtualization of work, a finer-grained analysis of boundary management tactics seems necessary. For example, the segmentation-integration continuum proposed by Ashforth et al. (2000) could be further differentiated on various sub-dimensions. Namely, time, space, social aspects, and psychological aspects may play a central role. For example, some individuals may primarily focus on segmenting or integrating the time dedicated to a specific role, while others prefer to integrate or segment the space reserved for the different life domains. Specifically, some individuals may prefer to reserve time slots for work tasks or private tasks (segmenting time), while others prefer to constantly switch between work tasks and private tasks (integrating time). Regarding the sub-dimension space, some employees may prefer to reserve a specific space (e.g. the office) for work tasks (segmenting space), while others prefer to work from home or to take care of private issues at work (integrating space). Moreover, social aspects of boundary management tactics refer to the management of expectations and demands of the different role-related partners. Finally, differences in behavioral demands or a high identity contrast between the different life domains can be described as psychological aspects of boundary management tactics. A differentiation of segmentation and integration on these sub-facets could help in obtaining a more detailed picture of boundary management tactics. To investigate the relation between these sub-facets of boundary management tactics and life domain conflict and enrichment, future research could make use of experimental vignette studies (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). This method consists of presenting carefully prepared scenarios in separate vignettes. It has the advantage of enhancing the realism of the research and of contributing to both internal and external validity (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). In the case of boundary management tactics, the different sub-facets could be manipulated and combined in different scenarios in order to test their effect on life domain conflict and enrichment. Moreover, future research could investigate the preference of an individual for a certain boundary management tactic based on the distinction of time, space, social aspects and psychological aspects. In a second step, the congruence or fit between these preferences and the boundary management options offered by an organization could be determined.

Regarding the importance of emotions at the workplace, the present research has shown that daily affective events and mood have the potential to affect the interaction of life domains. Based on these findings, future research should elaborate in more detail how
daily affective events and mood contribute to the prediction of life domain conflict and enrichment in combination with other relevant characteristics of the workplace and the individual. Specifically, following the propositions made by the affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), future research should investigate in more detail how work environment characteristics, daily affective events and affective dispositions of an individual interact in the prediction of the interplay of life domains. From an applied perspective, it would also be fruitful to investigate the influence of emotion management strategies (Bolton, 2004) on the influence of life domain conflict and enrichment. For example, active strategies in coping with negative affective events at work may reduce the influence of negative affective events and mood on life domain conflict. At the same time, these strategies may equally contribute to the positive transfer of resources and thus foster the effect of positive affective events and life domain enrichment.

Taken together, the present research can inspire future studies in various ways. It is hoped that future studies can build on the present findings and further explore the interaction of life domains in the light of recent conceptual advancements and major changes affecting the workplace.
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