5-2018

Meaningfulness of Work and Family in Working Parents as a Predictor of Work Family Balance, Enrichment, and Conflict

Sydney Reeves
Montclair State University

Abstract

There are arguably great benefits when employees experience a sense of purpose or meaningfulness in their work. The current study examined whether felt meaningfulness of work and family predicts one's tendency to manage work/life outcomes. Via survey methodology, 386 participants reported the sense of meaningfulness they derived from their work and from their family responsibilities. Analyses explored how individuals' relative ratings of work and family meaningfulness, as well as the similarity of these perceptions with those of their spouses/partners, affect Work Family Conflict, Balance, and Enrichment. Results showed that meaningfulness of work and family significantly affected work family outcomes. Furthermore, bigger differences within the individual with respect to his/her perceptions of work-versus-home meaningfulness predicted less balance and enrichment. Bigger differences between spouses with respect to perceptions of work meaningfulness predicted less enrichment while perceptions of family meaningfulness predicted more enrichment and less conflict. Additional detail about sub-factor dimension effects, as well as practical and theoretical implications, are provided.

Keywords:

Meaningfulness of Work; Meaningfulness of Family; Work Family Balance; Work Family Enrichment; Work Family Conflict; Partner Differences

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

Meaningfulness of Work and Family in Working Parents as a Predictor of Work Family Balance, Enrichment, and Conflict

by

Sydney Reeves

A Master's Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Montclair State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 2018

College/School College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department ____Psychology_____

Thesis Committee:

_____ [redacted]

Thesis Sponsor Jennifer Bragger

_____ [redacted]

Committee Member Dan Simonet

_____ [redacted]

Committee Member Gene Kutcher

MEANINGFULNESS OF WORK AND FAMILY IN WORKING PARENTS AS A PREDICTOR OF WORK FAMILY BALANCE, ENRICHMENT, AND CONFLICT

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Masters of Arts

by

SYDNEY REEVES

Montclair State University

Montclair, NJ

2018

Table of Contents

Meaningfulness as a Predictor of Work Family Balance, Enrichment, and Conflict

One of the biggest realities in today's world of work is that employees strive to achieve a sense of balance between work demands and home demands. For dual-income families, where both partners work and care for children at home, the challenges are significant. In fact, dual-income families are a considerable majority of the United States population. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that in 2016, over 60% of married couples with children reported having both partners work– a statistic that increases each year (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). The Pugh Research Center has added that the number of dual income families with children under the age of 18 has increased by over 100% in the last forty years (Kent, 2015). Indeed, most American workers have dealt with some of the challenges of balancing work and non-work life.

Research suggests the goal for employees seems to be some semblance of balance where neither work demands nor home demands dominates the energies of the employee. Accordingly, employers are encouraged to do their part in making such a balance possible (Guest, 2002; Sheldon Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). In fact, as far back as 1999, the US Department of Labor recommended that business leaders should attend to helping employees manage the work and non-work balance in order to attract and retain their valuable talent (Bianchi, 1999). An increasing number of companies have started offering benefits that support the full lives of their employees, for example child care centers or subsidies, on-site laundry and dry-cleaning services, and fitness facilities and programs. Many have also enacted policies related to flexible scheduling, some form of telecommuting, and managerial acknowledgement of the legitimacy of family-related reasons for absence. On a macro-level, the question of paid family leave is receiving attention from state and federal government more than ever (Appelbaum & Milkman, 2011; Baum, 1978; Rowe-Finkbeiner, Martin, Abrams, Zuccaro & Dardari, 2016), while

research has demonstrated the considerable benefits on employees and organizations (e.g., Allen et al., 2014; Choi et al., 2018; Hill, 2013).

Still, part of the answer to avoiding conflict and achieving balance may be in the individual's relationship with his/her work and family. That is, the person who is most aware and finds purpose and peace with his/her professional and personal roles may be most equipped to escape undue stress and enjoy a sense of balance in life. In the current study, we explore whether the degree to which one experiences a sense of meaningfulness in his/her work, as well as a sense of meaningfulness in his/her family life, influences his/her attitudes along important work family outcomes. Recognizing that these dynamics are complex in nature, we also explore whether the individual's relative sense of meaningfulness derived from work and home, or as compared to his/her spouse's same attitudes, are influential in predicting work family conflict, balance, and enrichment.

Work Family Conflict

Consideration of the individual employee experience reveals that achieving a perfect balance between work and non-work demands is difficult. Much of the research in the work-life domain has focused on the conflict present when managing competing priorities (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Work family conflict researchers have identified three main sources of conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Shockley et al., 2017). First, time-based conflict stems from having multiple commitments in one's life that compete for attention. For example, how does one balance being at work, and being at a child's preschool graduation; we can't be in two places at one time and choosing between these roles can induce time-based conflict. Second, strain-based conflict occurs when the psychological energy involved in fulfilling one role compromises the ability to perform other roles. Stress in an individual's family life could carry over into the

workplace and create a short-tempered employee (or vice versa). Finally, role-based or behavior-based conflict occurs when an individual has difficulty adjusting between the expected behaviors of each role. A mother who is nurturing at home may be expected to be assertive in the workplace but may struggle transitioning between her roles. Research suggests that these sources of conflict often lead to problems in the workplace including low job satisfaction, low confidence in the organization, high job-related tension, and withdrawal (Darr & Johns, 2008; Kain & Jex, 2010; King & Delongis, 2014). These negative effects can expand further, as there is the potential for them to spill into the home domain (Jeffrey R. Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). In fact, such spillover may occur in both directions; theorists in work family phenomena note that conflict can also be qualified as either Family Interfering with Work (FIW), where the strain, time or behaviors involved in one's family responsibilities negatively impacts his/her work situation, or as Work Interfering with Family (WIF), where one's career activity negatively impacts his/her family responsibilities (e.g., Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003).

Work Family Balance and Enrichment

In more recent treatments of the work family experience, there is an acknowledgement that these two competing domains of work and family may not actually be fully competing domains. Theories of work family enrichment have illustrated a synergetic effect between roles such that high performance in one role leads to more positive affect in the role and higher performance in other roles. According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), skills, attitudes or affect resulting from the work role serves to improve the home and family experience. For example, imagine the supervisor who becomes more empathetic or compassionate with his employees because his parenting experiences have led him to value listening and understanding others. A

considerable base of research has supported that meaningfulness in work and family contexts may be mutually beneficial in a variety of contexts and job types, and influenced by a host of variables (Annor, 2016; Sprung & Jex, 2012; Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen, 2013; Zhou & Buehler, 2016).

Still, the goal of most individual employees is to strike a comfortable balance between their priorities in the work and home contexts. Carlson, Grzywacz, and Zivnuska (2009) explain that work family balance is not simply an absence of conflict or evidence of enrichment but is its own distinct concept. Unlike conflict or enrichment, balance does not necessarily implicate the role of one domain on the other; rather, it signifies that the individual is able to meet his/her responsibilities in each domain, as negotiated along with his/her partners in each of these domains. In other words, balance occurs when an individual has achieved a level of stability between one's roles and furthermore has shared views of these roles with one's workplace and partner/family. Work family balance as a construct encompasses every aspect of an individual's life and extends beyond work and immediate families to include individuals' own parents, siblings, extended family, friends, and even their personal pieces of life. Grady and McCarthy (2008) conducted a study of working mothers and found that most women admit to putting work and family before their own needs and goals suggesting that working parents' efforts to achieve a balanced life is often more difficult than simply feeling happy with one's work and family.

Meaningfulness of Work

The core of psychology is understanding human behavior. An important place to start in much of the field's research is in human development. Our behaviors are often attributed to how we progress through life as shown by the developmental stages proposed in Erik Erikson's theory of Psychosocial Development. Erikson proposed eight stages of development,

and in these stages, individuals face a challenge for obtaining meaning during the teenage and young adult years as well as our late adult years (Erikson, 1997). While finding our identities we must find meaningfulness and when we reach our later adult years we must feel a sense of purpose and that we have made meaningful contributions to society. Prior to Erikson's theory of development, psychologist Victor Frankl eloquently described human's purpose in life: finding something in life that brings positive feelings and a sense of purpose, and then imagining success and fulfillment of said purpose (Frankl, 1963). Essentially, the purpose of life itself is to find meaning.

The ways that we make a living (our jobs) are a central component to the way that we find meaning. Researchers are increasingly debating the moral and ethical obligation of the workplace in assisting its employees in the path to developing meaningfulness (Michaelson, Pratt, Grant, & Dunn, 2014; Yeoman, 2014). Indeed, meaningfulness may be among the most widely accepted, but potentially underdeveloped, variables in the organizational sciences. When Hackman and Oldham posited the critical psychological states required for workers to be motivated and satisfied on the job, the first state was their perceptions of meaningfulness (affected by a job's task significance, skill variety, and task identity; Hackman & Oldham, 1976). When Kahn (1990) introduced the concept of Employee Engagement – a phenomenon that remains quite popular in the academic and practitioner agendas – one of the three psychological mechanisms connecting an individual and his/her authentic self in the job role was meaningfulness (along with availability and safety). Brown & Lent (2016) connect eudemonic well-being with meaning, concluding that eudemonic well-being is achieved by living a good or meaningful life (along with having a sense of calling and engagement). Duffy, Autin, and Bott, (2015) found that work volition mediated by person-environment fit and work meaning

accounted for 82% of the variance in job satisfaction when tested using structural equation modeling. These theories have suggested the importance of meaningfulness in the workplace in order to achieve engagement, well-being, motivation, and job satisfaction. While there is a strong recognition that perceived meaningfulness is a key predictor of work motivation and success, the concept has been under-developed in the literature.

In 2003, Chalofsky published a literature review of the state of affairs regarding meaningfulness of work. He found that three main themes emerged out of the literature as central to the experience of meaningful work and forming a life of integrated wholeness: having a strong sense of self, the work itself, and sense of balance. It is crucial to understand that these three themes are equal in importance and are not compensatory; having a stronger sense of self cannot make up for the work itself. As discussed above, much of the developmental theories often revolve around finding purpose and meaning in life and this pursuit does not happen independent of our work lives. Much of how we obtain these pillars of meaningful work falls in our perceptions and feelings towards ourselves and our work. If an individual feels joyful and self-efficient while working in a position that allows empowerment, autonomy, and satisfaction; the individual is likely to experience a sense of meaningful work (Munn, 2013). The path to fulfilling these senses of self, work, and balance are dependent on individuals bringing their whole selves to work and having work that allows growth and continuous learning/development.

While meaningfulness of work has been frequently cited in the organizational literature, there have not been many attempts to create measures that capture the factors and conditions that facilitate meaningfulness in the work place. The organizational studies differentiate meaningfulness from other constructs such as job satisfaction describing meaningfulness as feeling worthwhile, useful, and valuable (Kahn, 1990), while job satisfaction is typically

described as a feeling of basic positive affect (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). Earlier developments measuring meaning assessed the degree of perceived meaningfulness felt by individuals, but the items were not capturing *how* meaningfulness was achieved; one of the important distinctions between meaningfulness and basic job satisfaction. Rather, they relied on some holistic and subjective perception of meaningfulness. Lips-Wiersma and Wright (2012) sought to more fully define the sources of meaningfulness of work, and to more systematically and clearly operationalize this concept of work meaningfulness. Building from the ground up, they developed a qualitative foundation for meaningful work through a small group of participants' daily diary entries and group workshops, in which the goal was to identify what inspired and what resulted from the feeling of meaningful work. In agreement with Chalofsky's literature review, Lips-Wiersma and colleagues found that balance and integration were important themes in meaningful work. Their work pointed to a balance across two dimensions: a 'being' versus 'doing' dimension and a 'self' versus 'other' dimension. Indeed, they reasoned that in order for one to feel a sense of meaningfulness, there must be some balance among natural tensions in an environment or circumstance. The crossing of these two continua forms a conceptual framework of meaningfulness, whereby people are looking to develop a unity with others, to express their full potential, to serve others, and to develop one's inner self. Additionally, they identified three supplemental factors that contribute to meaningfulness of work: reality, inspiration, and balancing these tensions of self-versus-other and being-versus-doing. With this strong qualitative base, Lips-Wiersma and Wright (2012) constructed a psychometrically sound Meaningfulness of Work scale. This scale was tested for convergent as well as divergent validity to show that this scale is related and not related to well-developed constructs and yet different from the existing constructs. Lips-Wiersma and Wright (2012) found

their meaningfulness of work scale to be positively related, though not too overlapping, with meaning in life, work engagement, intrinsic rewards, intrinsic motivation, calling, work as enabling self, and a subscale on meaning in work. Their scale was found to be negatively related, though not overly related, to burnout, depressive symptoms, and work as inhibiting self.

Ultimately, just like the working parent seeks to balance work and life, this new operational definition of meaningfulness requires the individual to balance the tensions of these continua; indeed, we are able to experience the most meaning when we can balance an attention to being reflective versus contributing to the outside world, and an attention to serving our own goals versus those of worthy others.

Meaningfulness Related to Balance, Enrichment, and Conflict

In the current research, we investigate to what degree working parents experience meaningfulness in their work, and the effect on the levels of balance, enrichment, and conflict they experience in their work-family dynamic. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) review several models that explain how work and family domains can influence one another; we posit that two of these models could be applicable in determining how meaningfulness of work influences work family conflict and balance. One version of the *spillover model* of work-life interaction suggests spillover as 'experiences transferred intact between domains' (Near, 1984; Repetti, 1987), such as when work fatigue is displayed at home and inhibits the fulfillment of family-role demands (Eckenrode & Gore, 1990; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), establishes a link between a work construct and a family construct. Alternatively, it is possible that the meaningfulness of work makes working parents feel less conflicted about the concurrent demands of work and time, and more balanced about the two roles. Chalofsky (2003) suggests that meaningfulness of work is not just about the paid work we do, but the manner in which we live our lives such that we are

able to incorporate our values and principles into our work. When we are in work contexts that allow us to fulfill our work duties in this way, it is likely to spill over such that we feel less conflicting demands between the two domains. Munn (2013) added that work can either compete with one's home life or complement it. When work and life are treated as a dichotomy, the competition among these domains increases; however, when there is a complementary relationship among domains, meaningful work has the power to encourage individual growth (p. 408). If someone achieves a sense of meaningfulness or purpose in work, he/she has successfully found a way to balance these *self/other* and *being/doing* demands and is more likely to balance the work/life tensions as well. This makes it more likely that he/she will successfully navigate the behavioral, strain, and time-based tensions inherent in the work/family scenario. Indeed, Munn analyzed an item from the 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) database that asked individuals to agree or disagree that their work was meaningful and found that this item statistically correlated with their reported levels of work-life balance.

Furthermore, to truly understand how an individual can balance his/her parallel commitments of work and family life in this pursuit of balance and meaning, it seems necessary to measure both meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family life. Just as people differ in the meaning they derive from their work, they also differ in the meaning they derive from their home activities. Accordingly, in the current study, we applied the same measurement of meaningfulness to both the work and family contexts. Having an idea of how these pieces operate in our own lives and how our jobs fit into this puzzle make work and family more fluid. In other words, if we have a sense of purpose or meaning in family along with an understanding of how our jobs meet this purpose or meaning, then we can experience overlap and facilitation of

positive events in work and family. We can imagine how disconnect in felt meaning/purpose would result in disconnect and a struggle to attain balance.

Taken together, the first hypotheses state that there are relationships between meaningfulness and work family balance and conflict. As individuals perceive more meaningfulness in their work and their family experiences, they are more likely to achieve work family balance and more open to achieve work family enrichment. They will be less likely to perceive significant work family conflict.

Hypothesis 1a: Both perceived meaningfulness of work and perceived meaningfulness of family will be positively associated with work family balance.

Hypothesis 1b: Both perceived meaningfulness of work and perceived meaningfulness of family will be positively associated with work family enrichment.

Hypothesis 1c: Both perceived meaningfulness of work and perceived meaningfulness of family will be negatively associated with work family conflict.

Intra-Individual Differences (Congruence)

Our next hypotheses relate to the working parent's relative perceptions of work-related meaningfulness and family-related meaningfulness. Given how meaningfulness is influenced by values, inspiration and the *balance of doing-versus-being and self-versus-others* it is likely that congruence between meaningfulness in our work lives and meaningfulness in our family lives also increases work family balance and reduces feelings of work family conflict. This proposed relationship is most analogous with the congruence model of work family integration, which suggests a similarity between work and family, due to a third variable that acts as a common cause (Morf, 1989; S. Zedeck, 1992); in this case it would be the congruence between the two similar, but not identical constructs (meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family lives)

that leads to the congruence (balance) between work and family domains. Grady and McCarthy (2008) note that meaningful work is influenced by an inclusiveness of the aspects of our lives and that this leads to an 'integrated wholeness'. They also suggest that meaningful work is not just about the work, but about the manner in which we live our lives such that we incorporate our values and principles into our work. Duckworth and Buzzanell (2009) interviewed 18 fathers about how they constructed work family balance and found that men linked family to their meanings of work. When we have congruence between the aspects and considerations at work that give our life meaning and those in our family lives this will lead to the balance between work and family domains. We examine the congruence between their reported work meaningfulness and family/home meaningfulness and posit that when there is less distance between these two (that is, when the individual experiences congruence between these two domains), this will create less conflict, more balance and more enrichment.

Hypothesis 2a: Intra-individual distance (less congruence) between one's felt meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family will negatively predict work family balance.

Hypothesis 2b: Intra-individual distance (less congruence) between one's felt meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family will negatively predict work family enrichment.

Hypothesis 2c: Intra-individual distance (less congruence) between one's felt meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family will positively predict work family conflict.

Partner Differences (Congruence) in Meaningfulness

Finally, it is possible that a variation of the congruence of work and family can explain the relationship between partners' congruence (or differences) between work meaningfulness (and between their family life meaningfulness) and the work and family relationship. If partners have similar levels of meaningfulness of work (or home) this could result in an 'integrated

wholeness' within the household (N. Chalofsky, 2003) that arises from the similar values and inspirations. Partners are likely to share values and hopes, which can lead them to find and keep jobs that have characteristics that provide meaning for them. If both partners in a household sharing parental and home duties have work that is meaningful, it is possible that this shared meaningfulness increases the enrichment and balance between the work and home lives and decreases conflict. With increased congruence of both work meaningfulness and of family meaningfulness between partners there may be less conflict (and more balance) in dividing up duties and dealing with the many responsibilities and problems of family life. Congruence in meaningfulness can mean a shared view regarding what is important and how to accomplish it. While there has not been much discussion on how congruence between partners would influence work family conflict and balance, Chalofsky notes that meaningful work "gives essence to what we do and brings a sense of fulfillment to our lives" (Chalofsky, 2010, p. 19). Sharing this essence and sense of fulfillment with one's partner is likely to bring increased balance and reduced conflict. In this third set of hypotheses, we further examine the relationships between meaningfulness and work family outcomes by testing whether inter-partner similarity/difference in perceptions of meaningfulness affect balance, enrichment, and conflict.

Hypothesis 3a: Differences between partners' ratings of meaningfulness of work will negatively predict work family balance.

Hypothesis 3b: Differences between partners' ratings of meaningfulness of family will negatively predict work family balance.

Hypothesis 3c: Differences between partners' ratings of meaningfulness of work will negatively predict work family enrichment.

Hypothesis 3d: Differences between partners' ratings of meaningfulness of family will negatively predict work family enrichment.

Hypothesis 3e: Differences between partners' ratings of meaningfulness of work will positively predict work family conflict.

Hypothesis 3f: Differences between partners' ratings of meaningfulness of family will positively predict work family conflict.

Methods

Participants

To qualify for the study, individuals must have been in a dual-income family, with both partners working at least part time and having at least one child under the age of 18. Participants who met this description were recruited in one of two ways. First, researchers utilized a snowball sampling approach by contacting close friends, family, and local institutions that have access to potential respondents (e.g., day care centers); accordingly, anyone who was contacted was encouraged to share the survey with his/her spouse/partner, and to also refer additional people who met the qualifying criteria. When obtaining complete couple data proved challenging, we also engaged Qualtrics' Panel Services to recruit participants and administer the survey. The vendor identified couples who met selection criteria and managed their timely completion of the survey. In exchange for participation, Panel Service respondents were compensated for their time and effort ($7.50 per couple).

Data were collected from 386 individuals. This sample includes 155 couples plus an additional 76 individuals whose spouse or partner did not complete the survey. For Hypotheses 1 and 2, which do not require a partner for eligibility, all 386 responses were submitted for analyses. For Hypothesis 3, only the 310 respondents with spouse data were used. Within the

sample, 44% were men. The average participant age range was 30-39 years and spanned from under 20 to 60 or older. Most (83%) participants were White, 7% were African American, 6% were Asian, 2% were multiple races, and 1% were American Indian. Nearly all (95%) participants reported being married, 4% were in domestic partnerships, and the remaining were single and living with their partner. In terms of employment, 86% reported working full time. The average number of children per couple was two (ranging from one to five children), with children's ages ranging from three months to 17 years. Participants' occupations were highly varied, with roles including office and administrative, education, healthcare, computer and mathematical, management, sales and related occupations, etc. The highest reported frequency (24%) of household income was between $75,000 and $100,000, 18% earned less than $50,000 in their household, 19% earned between $100,000 and $125,000, 10% earned between $125,000 and $150,000, 4% earned between $150,000-$175,000, 7% earned between $175,000-$200,000, and 13% earned more than $200,000. The highest frequency of participants (33%) reported having a bachelor's degree, 4% had less than a high school degree, 16% had a high school degree, 13% had some college without a degree, 22% had an associate's degree, and 13% had a graduate degree.

Procedure

In the snowball sampling recruitment method, individuals were sent a message via e-mail inviting them to participate in the study. The text of the e-mail message detailed the general purpose of the survey, estimated time of completion, a link where individuals could access additional information, the informed consent statement, and a link to continue to the survey itself. These participants were asked to invite their spouse/partner to complete the survey (a

unique code was used to match spouses) and were encouraged to share contact information for other people who fit the qualifying criteria.

With the Qualtrics Panel population, the research team shared the online survey and all qualifying criteria with the vendor's project manager, who sourced participants from their participant pool. They specifically recruited couples, where each partner completed his/her half of the survey in turn.

Participants from each sampling method were instructed to complete the survey without their spouse/partner in the room in order to increase honest responses from each individual partner. All participants completed the survey online and were thanked for their participation. The survey contained an attention checkpoint about two thirds into the survey for each partner. Any participants who responded incorrectly were removed. Participants who took the survey in less than seven minutes were also removed.

Materials

Meaningfulness of work. As discussed above, Lips-Wiersma and Wright (2012) identified seven important dimensions for meaningful work: developing the inner self, unity with others, service to others, and expressing full potential, reality, inspiration, and achieving balance among tensions. These four dimensions are measured by 28 items. Cronbach's alpha for the overall instrument is $\alpha = .94$. The first dimension, developing inner self, is dependent upon an individual's unique perspective on the world and is defined as wanting to be a good person, or becoming the best an individual can be. There are three items representing this dimension, and an example is "I feel inspired at work." This subscale Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .82$. The second dimension, unity with others, refers to the meaningfulness of working together with other individuals through a common bond of shared values and belonging. A sample item is, "We openly talk about our values when we make a decision." There are six items in this dimension,

and the Cronbach's alphas was found to be α =.92. The third dimension, expressing full potential, is focused on expressing talents, creativity and having a sense of achievement. It is different from developing the inner self in that it is active and outward directed, whereas the former is inward and reflective. An example item is "I create and apply new ideas or concepts." There are four items in this dimension, and the Cronbach's alpha was α = .86. The final major dimension is serving others which describes meaningfulness derived from making a contribution to the wellbeing of others on both an individual level and, on a larger level, the world. There are four items in this dimension, and one sample item is "I feel I truly help our customers/clients." The Cronbach's alpha for this dimension was α = .85. Of the three additional dimensions, inspiration describes the drive and creativity of an individual to achieve goals and balance and is measured by four items. An example item is, "The work we are doing makes me feel hopeful about the future." The Cronbach's alpha for inspiration was α =.87. Conversely, reality describes the practical perceptions that one feels and maintains in pursuit of these goals and balance. Of the three items, an example is "We recognize that life is messy and that is OK." The Cronbach's alpha for reality was α = .74. Finally, balancing Tensions wraps this balance continuum by describing the conflicts faced in being and doing. Four items make up this scale, and an example is, "I have a good balance between the needs of others and my own needs." The Cronbach's alpha for Balancing Tensions was α =.86.

Meaningfulness of family. To examine participants' perceived meaningfulness of home life in a way that is parallel to his/her perceived meaningfulness at work, the researchers adapted the 28-item meaningfulness of work scale to relate to home life. For example, the meaningfulness of work item, "The work we are doing makes me feel hopeful about the future," was rewritten as, "Regarding my family/personal life, how we live makes me feel hopeful about

the future." The overall Cronbach Alpha for this meaningfulness of family scale was α =.94. Cronbach's Alphas for the various facets are as follows: *d*eveloping inner self α =.88, unity with others α =.94, expressing full potential α =.87, serving others α =.83, inspiration α =.88, reality α =.76, and balancing tensions α =.89.

Recoding process for intra-individual differences. Because some of the study's inquiries relate to the similarity or difference between work meaningfulness and family meaningfulness within each participant, intra-individual difference scores were calculated between each participant's meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family item scores (both total measure scores and subscale scores, as suggested by Castro-Schilo & Grimm [2018] and Rogers, Wood, & Furr [2018]). The absolute value of these differences was used, such that the size but not the direction (i.e., work or home meaningfulness was higher or lower) was considered in analyses (Rogers et al., 2018).

Recoding process for meaningfulness partner comparisons. Because other hypotheses relate to the similarity or difference between partners/spouses on the meaningfulness perceptions, inter-partner difference scores were calculated for the meaningfulness of work variables and their subscales and meaningfulness of home variables and their subscales (Castro-Schilo & Grimm, 2018; Rogers et al., 2018). Again, the absolute value of differences was used as the variable such that the size but not the direction (e.g. male had higher scores than females vs. females has higher scores than males) was considered in analyses.

Work family balance. We measured work family balance with a 6-item scale developed by Carlson et al. (2009). Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with a series of statements on a 5-point Likert-style agreement scale. Sample items include, "I am able to negotiate and accomplish what is expected of me at work and in my family" and "My co-workers

and members of my family would say that I am meeting their expectations." Cronbach's alpha was found to be α =.90.

Work family enrichment. To obtain the perceived enrichment between work and family, we used an 18-item scale developed by (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). Whereas the work family conflict scale is based on the interference of one domain on the success of the other, this work family enrichment scale is based on the facilitation of one domain from the other domain. Similar to the work family conflict scale, the work family enrichment scale includes two subscales: work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment. Example items include, "My involvement in my work helps me acquire skills, and this helps me be a better family member" (measuring work to family enrichment) and "My involvement in my family puts me in a good mood, and this helps me be a better worker" (measuring family to work enrichment). Cronbach's alpha was found to be α =.95.

Work family conflict. Finally, work family conflict was assessed using an 18 item 7-point agreement scale instrument developed by Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000). The scale consists of two, nine-item subscales that measure family interfering with work (e.g. "Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work") and work interfering with family (e.g. "My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like"). Cronbach's alpha was found to be α =.96.

Results

The means and standard deviations for the main variables of interest (meaningfulness of work, meaningfulness of family, work family balance, work family enrichment, and work family conflict) by gender and race/ethnicity are shown in Table 1 of Appendix A. An analysis of variance revealed that there were no significant differences between gender excluding average

perceived work family enrichment, and no significant differences based on race/ethnicity. The overall mean and standard deviation for the variables of interest are listed in Table 2 of Appendix A, along with a correlation matrix. Each hypothesis was tested using simple regression.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 explores the relationship of perceived meaningfulness of work (MoW) and meaningfulness of family (MoF) with the work family outcomes (balance, enrichment, and conflict). Table 3 in Appendix A shows the coefficients and the effect size for each predictor and the corresponding dependent variable. It should be noted that separate analyses were conducted for the aggregate variables and for their seven facets. Because we ran 8 separate regressions to investigate the relationship of meaningfulness of work (and meaningfulness of family) and each of its separate facets on each work family outcome, we applied a Bonferroni adjustment. We divided the .05 p-value significance level by 8 (the number of conceptually related independent variables per dependent variable) for a critical value of .006, though we mention the facets significant at .05 if the overall MoW or MoF scales were significant.

With regard to work family balance (WFB), overall MoW was a significant predictor as was the *Developing and Becoming Self* facet, and *Balancing Tensions* facet. The facet of *Serving Others* was significant at less than .05, but not at the corrected Bonferroni level. Overall MoF was also a significant predictor of balance, as was the facet of *Expressing Full Potential* (*Developing and Becoming Self* was significant at .05). Together these findings provide support for Hypothesis 1a.

Table 3 also shows support for Hypothesis 1b in that overall MoW, along with the *Inspiration* and *Balancing Tensions* facets, significantly predicted work family enrichment.

Similarly, the overall MoF variable significantly predicted enrichment, as did the *Inspiration* facet (and *Expressing Full Potential at the .05 level*).

Finally, as predicted by Hypothesis 1c, overall MoW significantly (negatively) predicted work family conflict, as did the facet of *Developing and Becoming Self (Serving Others* did so at the .05 level). Overall MoF and the facet of *Developing and Becoming Self* predicted work family conflict (*Expressing Full Potential* did so at the .05 level).

Hypothesis 2

Table 4 in Appendix A shows results of regression analyses testing Hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2c. As in the Hypothesis 1 analyses, Bonferroni adjustments were used to determine a critical *p*-value of .006. The overall difference between individuals' ratings of MoW and their ratings of MoF significantly and negatively predicted work life balance and work life enrichment but did not significantly predict work family conflict. At the facet level, differences between *Serving Others* (and *Expressing Full Potential* at the .05 level) was significant in predicting both balance and enrichment. Differences between MoW and MoF in *Developing and Becoming Self* was significant only for balance and differences in *Unity with Others* was significant only for enrichment. These results provide support for Hypothesis 2a which predicted that larger intra-individual distances (less congruence) between one's felt meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family would predict less work family balance and Hypothesis 2b which predicted that larger intra-individual differences between felt MoW and MoF would predict less work family enrichment. These results, however, did not support Hypothesis 2c, which predicted that larger intra-individual differences (less congruence) between a person's felt MoW and MoF would predict higher work family conflict.

Hypothesis 3

The results of analyses regressing each of the work family outcomes on partner differences in overall felt MoW and MoF (and their facets) can be seen in Table 5 of Appendix A. Neither overall partner differences in MoW nor partner differences in MoF were significant predictors of work family balance. Only the *Unity with Others* partner difference of MoW significantly predicted balance (at the corrected alpha of .006) while the partner difference facets of *Unity with Others* and *Expressing Full Potential* in MoF predicted balance at the .05 level. These results show little support for Hypothesis 3a and 3b, which predicted that differences (less congruence) between partners' ratings of MoW (3a) and MoF (3b) would negatively predict work family balance.

Differences in partners' perceived overall MoW and differences in partners' perceived overall MoF were both significant predictors of work family enrichment. However, partner differences (less congruence) in MoF predicted higher levels of work family enrichment, which was opposite our predictions. In terms of facet differences, *Unity with Others* was significant for MoW in predicting enrichment while *Expressing Full Potential* was significant for MoF in predicting enrichment. These results provide support for Hypothesis 3c (MoW predicting WFE), but not for Hypothesis 3d (MoF predicting WFE).

Support was found for Hypothesis 3f as overall partner differences on felt MoF was found to be a significant predictor of work family conflict, but there was no support for Hypothesis 3e as overall partner differences on felt MoW was non-significant in predicting work family conflict. At the facet level, *Developing and Becoming Self* facet differences in MoW was significant while partner differences in *Unity with Others* was significant at the MoF facet level.

Discussion

The present study aimed to investigate the relationship of meaningfulness with various work family outcomes including balance, enrichment, and conflict. Meaningfulness was examined in terms of meaningfulness of work (Chalofsky, 2010; Lips-Wiersma & Wright, 2012) and meaningfulness of family (developed in a parallel fashion to MoW). While other researchers have posited that meaningfulness of work might influence life and work family balance (Chalofsky, 2010), Lips-Wiersma and colleagues (2002; 2009; 2012) conducted grounded theory research to determine the factors that give work its meaningfulness, and developed a validated scale of work meaningfulness based on this research (Lips-Wiersma & Wright, 2012), which allowed us to empirically investigate whether meaningfulness of both work and family life (as well as their sub-facets) influence balance, enrichment and conflict between work and home domains. We also examined whether intra-individual congruence (differences) between felt work and home meaningfulness and inter-partner congruence (differences) in meaningfulness influenced these work family outcomes.

Findings

Results from the present study provide support that higher levels of MoW and MoF lead to greater work family balance and enrichment and lower work family conflict. When interpreting the results of the study, it is important to remember that meaningfulness should be considered an ongoing pursuit, and not a dichotomous goal that is either achieved or not achieved (Lips-Wiersma & Wright, 2012). Similarly, the search for enrichment and balance between our work lives and our home lives is a process of continuous development.

When the participants in the current study felt a greater sense of meaningfulness in their work, they experienced less work family conflict, more work family balance, and more work

family enrichment. The same was true when they felt a greater sense of meaningfulness in their home/family life. Analyses also revealed that various sub-facets of meaningfulness predicted these outcomes. For example, a sense of *Developing and Becoming Self* at work significantly predicted work family balance and conflict. *Balancing Tensions* at work predicted one's work family balance and enrichment. *Expressing Full Potential* at home predicted work family balance. Experiencing *Inspiration* at home and at work predicted work family enrichment, and *Developing and Becoming Self* both at work and at home predicted work family conflict.

A further research interest examined in this study was the effect of congruence in an individual's meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of home on work family balance, enrichment, and conflict as meaning is sought after in both work and family. In line with hypothesis two, when an individual had smaller differences (more congruence) in MoW and MoF, the individual felt more balance and enrichment. There was no effect of congruence on work family conflict. Again, several sub-facets likewise predicted work family enrichment and/or balance (e.g., *Serving Others, Developing and Becoming Self, Unity with Others*).

Finally and importantly, in the current study, we examined these data not only at the individual level, but within dual-earner couples. Specifically, how similar or congruent partners' felt meaningfulness at work (and at home) effects individuals' work family balance, enrichment, and conflict. Results showed that when partners felt more similarly about the meaningfulness they each derive from home life, this predicted less conflict. Furthermore, when they felt more similarly about the meaningfulness in each of their work experiences, this predicted more enrichment. Interestingly, when they felt more similarly about the meaningfulness they derive from family, this predicted less enrichment. Sub-facet data provide additional insight into these effects. For example, when partners felt similarly in *Unity with Others* at work, this predicted

more balance and enrichment and when partners felt similarly about *Developing and Becoming Self* at work, this predicted less conflict. When partners felt more similarly about *Unity with Others* at home, this predicted less conflict, and when partners felt more similarly about *Expressing Full Potential* at home, this predicted less enrichment.

Implications

Theoretical. The current study examined the phenomenon of meaningfulness, as well as the facets that determine meaningfulness according to research by Lips-Wierma and colleagues (Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009; Lips-Wiersma & Wright, 2012; Lips-Wiersma, 2002). As suggested by Chalofsky (2003), Edwards and Rothbard (2000), Munn (2013), Near (1984), Repetti (1987), and others, our study found support for meaningfulness as a linking mechanism between work and family. Our findings provide some support for both the *spillover* and the *congruence* models of work family linkage (Jeffrey R. Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). In our analysis of Hypothesis 1, we found that meaningfulness of work and meaningfulness of family positively predicted balance and enrichment and negatively predicted conflict, which provides support for the idea that the 'intact constructs' (Jeffrey R. Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) of MoW could spill over into non-work (family, life) and that meaningfulness of family could spill over into work. The findings showed that only certain facets significantly contributed to life outcomes while some were non-significant in any predictions. For example, *Unity with Others* and *Reality* were non-significant even at the uncorrected .05 alpha level in each model predicting balance, enrichment, and conflict. Finding a balance in meaning requires a balance of each facet, however, it may be that certain facets are more important than others when developing a sense of engagement or performing well in a job. The base of these findings are in agreement with Edwards and Rothbard (2000), Grady and McCarthy (2008), Munn (2013) who suggest that

meaningfulness of work and of home can spill over and affect the other domain. It seems that when one finds meaning in developing oneself and balancing various sources of stress and tensions at work that this meaningfulness spills over outside of work into family life. Our findings endorse Chalosfky's assertion that meaningful work gives essence and brings fulfillment to our lives.

Analyses of Hypotheses 2 and 3 provide some support for a *Congruence* model of work family linkage (Jeffrey R. Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) in that the construct of congruence (less distance) between individuals' home and work meaningfulness was found to increase work family balance and enrichment, and in that the construct of congruence (less difference) between partners in meaningfulness of work was related to more enrichment while Congruence between partners in meaningfulness at home was related to less work family conflict. Results of Hypothesis 2 regarding the congruence between home and work meaningfulness support Munn's (2013) suggestion that when there is a complementary relationship between work and home, this can increase growth, balance and enrichment. Because the model predicting conflict was non-significant, and none of the facets were found to be significant predictors, this provides further evidence that conflict is not simply an absence of balance or enrichment (Powell & Greenhaus, 2006). In a similar manner, partners who share their lives, live together and raise children together can have a competitive or complementary relationship between work and home demands. Often there are conflicts between the time and role demands of partner's work demands and their responsibilities as partners and parents (Carlson et al., 2000). However, if partners have similar outlooks regarding what their home lives mean to them, then our research suggests this reduces that conflict.

Practical. Organizations have the power to help employees find meaningfulness in their work, which can balance and enrich their lives, and in turn increases their commitment to the organization. At the high level, simply taking steps to assure employees find camaraderie with others and that their contributions help not only the organization but the greater good could help individuals develop and maintain a high level of meaningfulness. Management training should include instruction and reinforcement on how managers can reveal the purpose and importance of their staff members' tasks.

The results also support that organizations should invest in assisting employees' ability to experience a maximum level of meaningfulness at home. Because research has shown association between work family conflict and employee outcomes such as decreased job satisfaction and increased withdrawal, and because higher meaningfulness of family is tied to lower work family conflict, leaders at organizations have a vested interest in aiding individuals as they navigate the interface between their work and family domains. Perhaps by introducing the importance of seeking meaningfulness and purpose in one's work, and then encouraging employees to apply this pursuit to their non-work lives, organizations can help increase work family balance and enrichment and decrease work family conflict. The bottom line results in more enthusiastic and engaged employees, which has been linked to bigger organization profits (Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2009; Sirota & Klein, 2014).

Limitations and Future Directions

Because the current study employed a survey methodology, the self-report nature of the data and the potential for social desirability bias affecting the responses should be noted. In addition, our interest in including instruments to measure key psychological variables in both the home and work domains increased the length of the survey, which may have increased survey

fatigue or decreased participant attention. The researchers took precaution with these foreseen limitations by using quality check points in the survey and removing individuals with short survey duration times (operationalized as one standard deviation below the mean response time). We also told partners at the beginning of the survey and prompted them in the middle not to take the survey in vicinity of one another.

We use item level and mean averaged absolute difference scores to analyze our data as suggested by various partner and relationship researchers (Castro-Schilo & Grimm, 2018; Rogers et al., 2018). Difference scores can become troublesome when finding the difference between scores from different scales. Because the meaningfulness scales are commensurable and have high reliability levels, we are confident in our use of partner difference scores. Some researchers suggest analyzing partner data using the *Actor Partner Interaction Model* (Cook & Kenny, 2005; Kenny & Cook, 1999) or using polynomial regression (Edwards & Parry, 1993; Shanock, Baran, Gentry, Pattison, & Heggestad, 2010). Our sample size was too small to analyze using SEM and some researchers have suggested that multilevel modeling increases error when analyzing dyads (Mcmahon, Zijl, & Gilad, 2015), while other researchers have suggested polynomial regression is problematic for the analysis of certain types of partner level data (Gelman & Imbens, 2017; Gelman & Zelizer, 2015). The purpose of our research was to analyze whether congruence (differences) between contexts (work and home) or between partners influence these work family outcomes. Utilizing difference scores was therefore a correct way to analyze this data (Rogers et al., 2018).

This research was the first empirical analysis of how meaningfulness of work and its facets influence work family related outcomes, and how congruence between one's perceived meaningfulness at home and perceived meaningfulness at work and between partners' perceived

meaningfulness of work and home affect work family balance, enrichment and conflict. In addition, this study was original in that meaningfulness of family was examined in relation to work family related outcomes. While the study has its limitations, it is important in that it empirically investigated how the meaningfulness of our work and our family influences our lives.

Future research may investigate how partners themselves interpret differences of meaningfulness in relation to the life outcomes of balance, enrichment, and conflict. If partners are unaware of the difference in meaningfulness they each feel, there is likely to be less balance and enrichment and more conflict. There are also other potential moderators that would add insight to our findings. For example, the degree to which individuals or households value work-related outcomes, family and children, gender roles and equality would likely reveal interesting dynamics to these work family questions. While the current study examined absolute differences of perceived meaningfulness within partners as a predictor of work life effects, future research might also examine any gender differences that illuminate patterns in work life attitudes. Finally, research in the organizational sciences (Industrial Organizational Psychology, Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior) understandably tend to focus on workplace factors that affect work family attitudes and perceptions. Future scholarly work may seek to integrate findings from this literature base with those from marriage and family psychology and therapy. It could be that strategies and interventions from each domain may equally contribute toward future theoretical and practical investigations and solutions to challenges around work family phenomena. Our study was a first step in investigating how meaningfulness influences life outcomes at work and at home; considering the importance of the pursuit of purpose and meaning in the human experience, future research is certainly warranted.

References

Allen, T. D., Lapierre, L. M., Spector, P. E., Poelmans, S. A. Y., O'Driscoll, M., Sanchez, J. I., … Woo, J. M. (2014). The link between national paid leave policy and work-family conflict among married working parents. *Applied Psychology*, *63*(1), 5–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12004

Annor, F. (2016). Work–family demands and support: Examining direct and moderating influences on work–family conflict. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, *31*(2), 87–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2015.1119656

Appelbaum, E., & Milkman, R. (2011). Leaves That Pay: Employer and Worker Experiences with Paid Family Leave in California. *Center for Economic and Policy Research*, 1–36. Retrieved from http://www.cepr.net/documents/publications/paid-family-leave-1-2011.pdf

Baum, J. F. (1978). Effectiveness of an Attendance Control Policy in Reducing Chronic Absenteeism. *Personnel Psychology*, *31*(1), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1978.tb02110.x

Bianchi, S. M. (1999). New Realities of Working Families: Overview. Retrieved from https://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/herman/reports/futurework/conference/workingfamilies/workingfamilies_toc.htm

Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (2016). Vocational Psychology: Agency, Equity, and Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *67*(1), 541–565. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122414-033237

Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G., & Zivnuska, S. (2009). Is work—family balance more than conflict and enrichment? *Human Relations*, *62*(10), 1459–1486. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709336500

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*(1), 131–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *56*(2), 249–276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713

Castro-Schilo, L., & Grimm, K. J. (2018). Using residualized change versus difference scores for longitudinal research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *35*(1), 32–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517718387

Chalofsky, N. (2003). An emerging construct for meaningful work An emerging construct for meaningful work. *Human Resource Development International*. https://doi.org/10.1080/1367886022000016785

Chalofsky, N. E. (2010). *Meaningful Workplaces: Reframing how and where we work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Cook, W. L., & Kenny, D. A. (2005). The actor-partner interdependence model: A model of bidirectional effects in developmental studies. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *29*(2), 101–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250444000405

Darr, W., & Johns, G. (2008). Work strain, health, and absenteeism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *13*(4), 293–318. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012639

Duckworth, J. D., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2009). Constructing Work-Life Balance and Fatherhood: Men's Framing of the Meanings of *Both* Work *and* Family. *Communication Studies*, *60*(5), 558–573. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970903260392

Duffy, R. D., Autin, K. L., & Bott, E. M. (2015). Work volition and job satisfaction: Examining the role of work meaning and person-environment fit. *Career Development Quarterly*, *63*(2), 126–140. https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12009

Eckenrode, J., & Gore, S. (1990). *Stress and coping at the boundary of work and family*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Edwards, J. R., & Parry, M. E. (1993). on the Use of Polynomial Regression Equations As an Alternative To Difference Scores in Organizational Research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(6), 1577–1613. https://doi.org/10.2307/256822

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms Linking Work and Family : Clarifying the Relationship between Work and Family Constructs Author (s): Jeffrey R . Edwards and Nancy P . Rothbard Source : The Academy of Management Review , Vol . 25 , No . 1 (Jan ., 2000), pp . 178-199 Publis. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 178–199.

Erikson, E. H. (1997). *The life cycle completed: Extended version with new chapters on the ninth stage by Joan M. Erikson*. *The life cycle completed: Extended version with new chapters on the ninth stage by Joan M. Erikson*.

Frankl, V. E. (1963). Man's search for meaning : An introduction to logotherapy. *Psychotherapy Research Journal of the Society for Psychotherapy Research*, *20*, 142. https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300903527393

Gelman, A., & Imbens, G. (2017). Why high-order polynomials should not be used in regression discontinuity designs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 0–0. https://doi.org/10.1080/07350015.2017.1366909

Gelman, A., & Zelizer, A. (2015). Evidence on the deleterious impact of sustained use of polynomial regression on causal inference. *Research & Politics*, *2*(1), 205316801556983.

https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168015569830

Grady, G., & McCarthy, A. M. (2008). Work-life integration: experiences of mid-career professional working mothers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*(5), 599–622. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810884559

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of and Conflict Family Between Work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, *10*(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1985.4277352

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-wamily enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*(1), 72–92. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.19379625

Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. In *Social Science Information* (Vol. 41, pp. 255–279). https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018402041002005

Gutek, B. a., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(4), 560–568. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.4.560

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *16*(2), 250–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Hammer, L. B., Bauer, T. N., & Grandey, A. A. (2003). Work-family conflict and work-related withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022820609967

Hill, H. D. (2013). Paid Sick Leave and Job Stability. *Work and Occupations*, *40*(2), 143–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888413480893

Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job Attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *63*(1), 341–367. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100511

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement At Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 692–724. https://doi.org/10.2307/256287

Kain, J., & Jex, S. (2010). Karasek's (1979) job demands-control model: A summary of current issues and recommendations for future research, *8*, 237–268. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555(2010)0000008009

Kenny, D. A., & Cook, W. (1999). Partner effects in relationship research: Conceptual issues, analytic difficulties, and illustrations. *Personal Relationships*, *6*(4), 433–448. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1999.tb00202.x

Kent, L. (2015). The Rise in Dual Income Households.

King, D. B., & Delongis, A. (2014). When Couples Disconnect : Rumination and Withdrawal as Maladaptive Responses to Everyday Stress, *28*(4), 460–469.

Lips-Wiersma, M., & Morris, L. (2009). Discriminating between "meaningful work" and the "management of meaning." *Journal of Business Ethics*, *88*(3), 491–511. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0118-9

Lips-Wiersma, M., & Wright, S. (2012). Measuring the Meaning of Meaningful Work. *Group & Organization Management*, *37*(5), 655–685. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601112461578

Lips-Wiersma, M. (2002). The influence of spiritual "meaning-making" on career behavior. *Journal of Management Development*, *21*(7), 497–520. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710210434638

Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). *Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444306538.ch1

Mcmahon, T., Zijl, P. C. M. Van, & Gilad, A. A. (2015). NIH Public Access, *27*(3), 320–331. https://doi.org/10.1002/nbm.3066.Non-invasive

Michaelson, C., Pratt, M. G., Grant, A. M., & Dunn, C. P. (2014). Meaningful Work: Connecting Business Ethics and Organization Studies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *121*(1), 77–90. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1675-5

Morf, M. (1989). *The work/life dichotomy*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Munn, S. L. (2013). Unveiling the Work-Life System: The Influence of Work-Life Balance on Meaningful Work. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *15*(4), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422313498567

Near, J. P. (1984). Relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction: Test of a causal model. *Social Indicators Research*, *15*(4), 351–367. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00351444

Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2006). Is the opposite of positive negative? *Career Development International*, *11*(7), 650–659. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430610713508

Repetti, R. L. (1987). Linkages between work and family roles. *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, *7*, 98–127.

Rogers, K. H., Wood, D., & Furr, R. M. (2018). Assessment of similarity and self-other agreement in dyadic relationships: A guide to best practices. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *35*(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517712615

Shanock, L. R., Baran, B. E., Gentry, W. A., Pattison, S. C., & Heggestad, E. D. (2010). Polynomial Regression with Response Surface Analysis: A Powerful Approach for Examining Moderation and Overcoming Limitations of Difference Scores. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *25*(4), 543–554. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9183-4

Shockley, K. M., Shen, W., DeNunzio, M. M., Arvan, M. L., Knudsen, E. A., & Shockley, C. (2017). Disentangling the Relationship Between Gender and Work–Family Conflict: An Integration of Theoretical Perspectives Using Meta-Analytic Methods Disentangling the Relationship Between Gender and Work–Family Conflict: An Integration of Theoretical Perspectiv. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(12), 1601–1635. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000246

Sirota, D., & Klein, D. A. (2014). *The enthusiastic employee: how companies profit by giving workers what they want*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Sprung, J. M., & Jex, S. M. (2012). Work locus of control as a moderator of the relationship between work stressors and counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *19*(4), 272–291. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030320

Statistics, B. of L. (2017). Employment Characteristics of Families Summary. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/news.release/famee.nr0.htm

Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Family-Supportive organization perceptions and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work-family conflict and enrichment and partner attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(4), 606–622. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032491

Yeoman, R. (2014). Conceptualising Meaningful Work as a Fundamental Human Need. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *125*(2), 235–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1894-9

Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: Exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In *Work, Families, and Organizations* (pp. 1–32). Retrieved from http://doi.apa.org/psycinfo/1992-97601-001

Zedeck, S., & Mosier, K. L. (1990). Work in the family and employing organization. *American*

Psychologist, *45*(2), 240–251. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.240

Zhou, N., & Buehler, C. (2016). Family, employment, and individual resource-based antecedents of maternal work-family enrichment from infancy through middle childhood. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *21*(3), 309–321. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000016

Appendix A

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for MoW, MoF, WFB, WFE, and WFC

	MoW Mean (S.D.)	MoF Mean (S.D.)	WFB Mean (S.D.)	WFE Mean (S.D.)	WFC Mean (S.D.)
Sex					
Male (n=170)	3.79 (0.68)	4.18 (0.62)	4.15 (0.62)	3.78 (0.74)	2.79 (0.88)
Female (n=216)	3.91 (0.65)	4.19 (0.61)	4.17 (0.62)	3.97 (0.60)	2.63 (0.94)
Race					
White (n = 315)	3.89 (0.66)	4.20 (0.62)	4.18 (0.64)	3.89 (0.69)	2.68 (0.93)
African-American (n = 27)	3.81 (0.77)	3.93 (0.73)	4.07 (0.58)	3.92(0.66)	2.97 (0.91)
Asian (n = 2)	3.41 (0.13)	3.55 (0.30)	3.25 (0.35)	3.36 (0.35)	3.00 (0.63)
Two or More Races (n = 24)	3.54 (0.55)	4.16 (0.50)	4.10 (0.53)	3.85 (0.42)	2.84 (0.97)
American Indian (n = 8)	3.59 (0.99)	4.46 (0.34)	4.07 (0.38)	3.55 (0.64)	2.33 (0.51)
Not Reported (n = 4)	4.15 (0.48)	4.61 (0.23)	4.17 (0.62)	4.26 (0.25)	2.44 (0.73)

Note. MoW = Meaningfulness of Work, MoF = Meaningfulness of Family, WFB = Work Family Balance, WFE = Work Family Enrichment, WFC = Work Family Conflict.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Variables of Interest

Variable	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5
1. MoW	3.86	0.67					
2. MoF	4.19	0.61	.38**				
3. WFB	4.16	0.62	.42**	.53**			
4. WFE	3.88	0.67	.63**	.48**	.62**		
5. WFC	2.70	0.92	-.19**	-.33**	-.25**	-.07	

Note. *N* = 386. MoW = Meaningfulness of Work, MoF = Meaningfulness of Family, WFB = Work Family Balance, WFE = Work Family Enrichment, WFC = Work Family Conflict. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Table 3
Regression Coefficients and effect sizes for Hypothesis 1

DV	Hyp.	Variable	ß (S.E.)	t	R^2
WFB	1a	**MoW**	0.39 (0.04)	8.98**	0.17
	1a	MoW Unity with Others	-.02 (0.05)	-0.28	0.18
		MoW Serving Others	0.15 (0.05)	2.52*	
		MoW Expressing Full Potential	0.06 (0.06)	0.93	
		MoW Developing and Becoming Self	0.08 (0.03)	3.19**	
		MoW Reality	-0.06 (0.04)	-1.34	
		MoW Inspiration	0.02 (0.05)	0.41	
		MoW Balancing Tensions	0.17 (0.05)	3.65**	
	1a	**MoF**	0.53 (0.04)	12.09**	0.28
	1a	MoF Unity with Others	0.05 (0.06)	0.74	0.29
		MoF Serving Others	-0.04 (0.07)	-0.59	
		MoF Expressing Full Potential	0.30 (0.06)	5.11**	
		MoF Developing and Becoming Self	0.05 (0.02)	2.52*	
		MoF Reality	0.03 (0.05)	0.69	
		MoF Inspiration	0.07 (0.06)	1.12	
		MoF Balancing Tensions	0.06 (0.04)	1.59	
WFE	1b	**MoW**	0.64 (0.04)	15.71**	0.39
	1b	MoW Unity with Others	0.05 (0.05)	1.07	0.42
		MoW Serving Others	0.04 (0.05)	0.67	
		MoW Expressing Full Potential	0.08 (0.06)	1.46	
		MoW Developing and Becoming Self	0.04 (0.02)	1.55	
		MoW Reality	-.03 (0.04)	-0.68	
		MoW Inspiration	0.24 (0.05)	4.85**	
		MoW Balancing Tensions	0.15 (0.04)	3.43**	
	1b	**MoF**	0.52 (0.05)	10.55**	0.23
	1b	MoF Unity with Others	-0.03 (0.07)	-0.43	0.28
		MoF Serving Others	0.10 (0.08)	1.2	
		MoF Expressing Full Potential	0.18 (0.07)	2.71*	
		MoF Developing and Becoming Self	-0.03 (0.02)	-1.32	
		MoF Reality	-0.001 (0.05)	-0.02	
		MoF Inspiration	0.22 (0.07)	3.33**	
		MoF Balancing Tensions	0.05 (0.05)	1.02	

Table 3 continued

DV	Hyp.	Variable	ß (S.E.)	t	R^2
WFC	1c	**MoW**	-0.26 (0.07)	-3.80**	0.03
	1c	MoW Unity with Others	0.11 (0.08)	1.42	0.27
		MoW Serving Others	-0.19 (0.08)	-2.22*	
		MoW Expressing Full Potential	0.03 (0.09)	0.31	
		MoW Developing and Becoming Self	-0.41 (0.04)	-10.97**	
		MoW Reality	0.02 (0.06)	0.26	
		MoW Inspiration	0.06 (0.08)	0.78	
		MoW Balancing Tensions	-0.10 (0.07)	-1.48	
	1c	**MoF**	-0.49 (0.07)	-6.80**	0.11
	1c	MoF Unity with Others	-0.13 (0.10)	-1.27	0.23
		MoF Serving Others	0.07 (0.12)	0.62	
		MoF Expressing Full Potential	-0.22 (0.09)	-2.44*	
		MoF Developing and Becoming Self	-0.29 (0.03)	-8.41**	
		MoF Reality	-0.03 (0.07)	-0.36	
		MoF Inspiration	0.08 (0.09)	0.85	
		MoF Balancing Tensions	-0.02 (0.06)	-0.40	

Note. N = 386. MoW = Meaningfulness of Work, MoF = Meaningfulness of Family, WFB = Work Family Balance, WFE = Work Family Enrichment, WFC = Work Family Conflict. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .006$. Bold variables indicate significance at the Bonferroni corrected alpha of .006.

Table 4

Regression Coefficients and effect sizes for Hypothesis 2

DV	Hyp.	Variable	ß (S.E.)	t	R^2
WFB	2a	**Overall MoW-MoF Difference (Congruence)**	-0.20 (0.06)	-3.60**	0.03
	2a	Unity with Others Difference (Congruence)	-0.08 (0.05)	-1.45	0.09
		Serving Others Difference (Congruence)	-0.20 (0.07)	-3.04**	
		Expressing Full Potential Difference (Congruence)	-0.14 (0.06)	-2.24*	
		Developing and Becoming Self Difference (Congruence)	-0.09 (0.03)	2.78**	
		Reality Difference (Congruence)	0.02 (0.05)	0.31	
		Inspiration Difference (Congruence)	0.06 (0.05)	1.1	
		Balancing Tensions Difference (Congruence)	0.04 (0.05)	0.84	
WFE	2b	**Overall MoW-MoF Difference (Congruence)**	-0.49 (0.06)	-8.83**	0.17
	2b	**Unity with Others Difference (Congruence)**	-.22 (.05)	-4.05**	0.25
		Serving Others Difference (Congruence)	-.19 (0.07)	-2.83**	
		Expressing Full Potential Difference (Congruence)	-0.15 (0.06)	-2.41*	
		Developing and Becoming Self Difference (Congruence)	-.04 (0.03)	-1.34	
		Reality Difference (Congruence)	0.00 (.05)	0	
		Inspiration Difference (Congruence)	-0.08 (0.05)	-1.55	
		Balancing Tensions Difference (Congruence)	0.03 (0.05)	0.54	
WFC	2c	Overall MoW-MoF Difference (Congruence)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.21	0.00
	2c	Unity with Others Difference (Congruence)	0.01 (0.09)	0.1	0.01
		Serving Others Difference (Congruence)	-0.02 (0.10)	-0.24	
		Expressing Full Potential Difference (Congruence)	-0.04 (0.10)	-0.39	
		Developing and Becoming Self Difference (Congruence)	0.14 (0.05)	2.72*	
		Reality Difference (Congruence)	0.07 (0.08)	0.83	
		Inspiration Difference (Congruence)	-0.08 (0.08)	-0.96	
		Balancing Tensions Difference (Congruence)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.27	

Note. $N = 386$. MoW = Meaningfulness of Work, MoF = Meaningfulness of Family, WFB = Work Family Balance, WFE = Work Family Enrichment, WFC = Work Family Conflict. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .006$. Bold variables indicate significance at the Bonferroni corrected alpha of .006.

Table 5

Regression Coefficients and effect sizes for Hypothesis 3

DV	Hyp	Variable	ß (S.E.)	t	R^2
WFB	3a	MoW Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.10 (0.06)	-1.58	0.00
	3a	**MoW Unity with Others Partner Difference (Congruence)**	-0.18 (0.06)	-2.82**	0.02
		MoW Serving Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.04 (0.06)	0.57	
		MoW Expressing Full Potential Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.12	
		MoW Developing and Becoming Self Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.69	
		MoW Reality Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.11 (0.06)	1.95	
		MoW Inspiration Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.02 (0.06)	-0.32	
		Difference (Congruence)	-.03 (0.07)	-0.36	
	3b	MoF Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.04 (0.04)	1.05	0.00
	3b	MoF Unity with Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.18 (0.09)	-2.10*	0.06
		MoF Serving Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.04 (0.09)	0.41	
		MoF Expressing Full Potential Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.21 (0.08)	-2.46*	
		MoF Developing and Becoming Self Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.21	
		MoF Reality Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.01 (0.07)	0.21	
		MoF Inspiration Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.8	
		MoF Balancing Tensions Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.15 (0.07)	2.14*	
WFE	3c	**MoW Partner Difference**	-0.24 (0.07)	-3.58**	0.04
	3c	**MoW Unity with Others Partner Difference (Congruence)**	-0.28 (0.07)	-4.20**	0.08
		MoW Serving Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.02 (0.07)	0.33	
		MoW Expressing Full Potential Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.04 (0.08)	0.51	
		MoW Developing and Becoming Self Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.02 (0.05)	0.34	
		MoW Reality Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.11 (0.06)	1.75	
		MoW Inspiration Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.12 (0.06	-1.88	
		MoW Balancing Tensions Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.12 (0.07)	0.25	
	3d	**MoF Partner Difference**	0.13 (0.05)	2.83**	0.02
	3d	MoF Unity with Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.29	0.05
		MoF Serving Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.15 (0.10)	-1.45	
		MoF Expressing Full Potential Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.25 (0.09)	-2.80**	
		MoF Developing and Becoming Self Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.07 (0.04)	1.61	
		MoF Reality Partner Difference (Congruence)	0 (0.04)	-0.01	
		MoF Inspiration Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.06 (0.09)	0.72	
		MoF Balancing Tensions Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.10 (0.08)	1.23	

Table 5 Continued

DV	Hyp	Variable	ß (S.E.)	t	R^2
	3e	MoW Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.03 (0.10)	0.31	0.00
	3e	MoW Unity with Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.02 (0.10)	-0.17	0.03
		MoW Serving Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.12 (0.10)	1.29	
		MoW Expressing Full Potential Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.01 (0.11)	0.12	
		MoW Developing and Becoming Self Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.23 (0.07)	3.49**	
		MoW Reality Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.00 (0.09)	0.04	
		MoW Inspiration Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.09 (0.09)	-0.94	
		MoW Balancing Tensions Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.01 (0.11)	-0.06	
WFC	3f	**MoF Partner Difference (Congruence)**	**0.33 (0.06)**	**5.30****	**0.08**
	3f	**MoF Unity with Others Partner Difference (Congruence)**	0.56 (0.13)	4.31**	0.10
		MoF Serving Others Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.19 (0.14)	-1.36	
		MoF Expressing Full Potential Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.03 (0.12)	-0.21	
		MoF Developing and Becoming Self Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.05 (0.06)	0.87	
		MoF Reality Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.06 (0.10)	0.63	
		MoF Inspiration Partner Difference (Congruence)	0.16 (0.12)	1.30	
		MoF Balancing Tensions Partner Difference (Congruence)	-0.03 (0.11)	-0.26	

Note. *N* = 155. MoW = Meaningfulness of Work, MoF = Meaningfulness of Family, WFB = Work Family Balance, WFE = Work Family Enrichment, WFC = Work Family Conflict. * p < .05. ** p < .006. Bold variables indicate significance at the Bonferroni corrected alpha of .006.