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Abstract

The present study examines the association between job demands and employee turnover intention. Data included measures of job demands, family-to-work transition, focal employee work-family-conflict, spouse’s perception of focal employee’s work-family-conflict, spouse’s perception of psychological contract violation towards focal employee’s organization, and employee turnover intention. Utilizing 158 pairs of dual-earner couples in the U.S., the author tested the proposed relationships among work-family conflict, spousal attitudes toward the organization, and employee turnover intention. Results showed that the frequency of family-to-work transition moderated the relationship between job demands and spouse’s perception of focal employee’s WFC mediated by focal employee WFC only in male employees, suggesting that the domain transitions affected male employees more than female employees. Also, our sequential mediation showed that female employees were more influenced by their spouse’s attitudes toward their organization than male employees, implying gender differences and influence of one’s spouse in the employee turnover process in the context of work-family interface.

Keywords: work-family conflict, spouse perception, spouse contract violation, turnover, family-to-work transition.
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Introduction

Research on the challenges encountered by workers juggling between work and family demands has become recognized as critical to the well-being of families and individuals, as well as to the profitability of the organizations that hire these individuals (Cullen et al., 2009). Accelerated by the rapid increase in female workers in the labor market and changing gender norms in the modern society, the number of dual-earner families has risen significantly in the last few decades (van Gils & Kraaykamp, 2008). As of 2009, dual-earner couples made up approximately 78% of all employees (Cullen et al., 2009). In dual-earner couples, where both partners are expected to fulfill both work and home demands and responsibilities, individuals are at a high risk of experiencing work-family conflict (Elloy & Smith, 2003). Specifically, work-family conflict (WFC) is one form of inter-role conflicts in which participation in the work role makes it more difficult for individuals to participate in the family role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). According to a survey by the American Psychological Association (APA), more than half of adults reported that family responsibilities are a source of stress, and 55% of the respondents indicated that work interfered with their responsibilities at home in the past 3 months (2009).

While some research found that participation in the work role can bring positive effects on both individuals and the family, the consequences of WFC have been mostly negative for both individuals and organizations (Frone, 2003). For example, WFC has been associated with various negative outcomes, such as employee job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, turnover intentions, and decreased productivity (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000).
Another form of inter-role conflict, family-work conflict (FWC), can also occur when individuals struggle to meet their work demands due to their family responsibilities, such as taking care of young children (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This type of conflict also results in negative outcomes, including physical health problems, mental health problems, and dissatisfaction in family life (Eby et al., 2005). According to findings from Frone’s (2003), study participants reported that they experienced WFC (60%) more frequently than FWC (22%). Although both forms of inter-role conflicts yield important outcomes to both employees and employers and thus equally deserve attention, WFC is the focus in the present research because we believe it is more pertinent to the overarching goal of our research, which is to examine the relationship between work-family conflict and spousal attitudes toward the organization, and the implications for employee turnover.

Despite the past rigorous research telling us about the relationships between WFC and employee turnover intentions, limitations in the literature are apparent. There still are theoretical and empirical gaps in our understandings of how WFC influences a couple’s interactions and eventually the focal employee’s work outcomes (Green et al., 2011). The need to address this gap has been widely recognized, and researchers maintain that it is critical that we examine work-family issues using the couple as the unit of analysis (Greenhaus & Powell, 2012); both partners within a couple share the same family environment, and they are constantly affecting each other in a continuous and reciprocal manner (Cox & Paley, 1997). To be more specific, one partner’s strain, attitudes, behaviors, and choices may affect the other partner’s strain, attitudes, behaviors and choices. These effects are defined as crossover effects (Barnett, Gareis, & Brennan, 2009). Therefore, it can be said that WFC alone is an intraindividual transmission of stress or strain, whereas WFC crossover is dyadic, interindividual transmission of stress or strain.
(Schooreel & Verbuggen, 2016). Thus, the crossover effects in a couple in relation to focal employee’s work attitudes deserve further investigation. In Allen et al.’s (2000) review of the relationships between WFC and work outcomes, none of the cited research addressed how these issues might play out within a couple. Since the publication of Allen et al. (2000), there have been several studies examining these dynamics within couples, but we are still left with basic questions about how such dynamics unfold (Green et al., 2011).

Moreover, our current understanding of the possible gender differences in partner crossover influences in a couple is inconclusive although several studies indicate that the difference may exist. For example, Vieira and colleagues (2016) found that a spouse’s WFC affected the quality of parenting attitudes and competencies differently in a male and a female in a couple. More specifically, a male partner’s parenting experience was largely determined by the female partner’s WFC while the female partner was less susceptible to the influence of the male partner’s WFC, suggesting the presence of gender differences in partner crossover effects. The mixed conclusions associated with the possible gender differences in partner crossover effects are partly because many studies on crossover effects in a couple did not account for women’s employment status or levels of strain (Westman, 2002). With our dual-earner couples sample, we attempt to investigate the possible gender differences by conducting separate analyses for female and male partners.

In order to address these gaps in the literature, the present research aims to examine how job demands perceived by a focal employee eventually lead to his/her turnover intention, as a result of the partner’s perceived work-family conflict of the focal employee. Taking future research suggestions from the previous literature (Bull Schaefer et al., 2013; Wayne et al., 2013), we consider the mediating role of partner’s psychological contract violation towards the focal
employee’s organization in the relationship between WFC and employee turnover intention. In addition, we also aim to explore a possible moderator, family-to-work transition, in the relationship between focal employee job demands and focal employee’s perceived WFC. In this study using dual-earner couples, our primary goal is to incorporate important findings from previous WFC and crossover research in order to propose an integrative model. The conceptual model is graphically depicted in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. The hypothesized work-family conflict crossover in dual-earner couples conceptual model.](image)

**Figure 1.** The hypothesized work-family conflict crossover in dual-earner couples conceptual model.

![Figure 2. The moderated mediation model.](image)

**Figure 2.** The moderated mediation model.

**Literature Review**

**Relationship between Job Demands and Focal Employee’s WFC**

In line with Bakker et al. (2008), we assume that the process of WFC starts in the workplace in the form of job demands, which include work pressure (Dollard, Winefield, & Winefield, 2001), an unfavorable working time-schedule (Demerouti et al., 2004), work-role overload (Parasuraman et al., 1996), and emotional demands (Bakker & Geurts, 2004).
According to Hobfoll’s (1989) Conservation of Resources theory (COR), individuals aim to secure and preserve resources that are useful in achieving their goals. When an individual perceives a threat of loss in resource or when the loss actually happens, stress occurs (Hobfoll, 1989). From this perspective, juggling between work and family life itself depletes resources in individuals. Also, high job demands require employees to invest more resources, such as time and emotions, into work, leaving them with fewer resources to put into their family life (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). Several meta-analyses have also corroborated the finding that various forms of job demands (e.g., long working hours and job stress) are positively linked to WFC (NG & Feldman, 2008; Ford et al., 2007). Therefore, we hypothesize that employees who are faced with high job demands would perceive higher WFC (hypothesis 1).

**Hypothesis 1: Job demands positively predict employee’s WFC.**

Crossover Effects of Focal Employee’s WFC to the Partner

Whereas WFC is a within-person across-domains transmission of demands and consequent strain from one domain of life to another, crossover involves transmission across individuals, whereby demands and their consequent strain cross over between closely related persons (Westman, 2002). Therefore, in crossover, job stress experienced at work by an individual may lead to stress being experienced by the individual’s partner at home (Bakker et al., 2008). Empirically, previous research has found that one partner’s WFC carries crossover effects onto the other partner in a couple (e.g., Bakker et al., 2008; Bull Schaefer et al., 2013). For example, Bakker and colleagues (2008) indicated that a focal employee’s job demands predict his/her perception of WFC, and this in turn predicts the partner’s FWC, which eventually leads to the partner’s exhaustion. This effect was explained by the fact that WFC disrupts an individual’s optimal functioning at home (Bakker et al., 2008). For example, if an employee
comes home with more work to do and cannot participate in parenting, the parenting responsibility will fall onto his/her partner, thus creating more work for the partner. Also, Bull Schaefer and colleagues (2013) found that a partner’s affective commitment towards the focal employee’s organization predicts the employee’s reports of partner positive or negative emotional displays, which later predict the employee’s affective commitment towards his/her own organization. In addition, Wayne et al. (2013) also concluded a similar finding, such that an employee’s family supportive organizational perception predicts the partner’s affective commitment towards the focal employee’s organization, which in turn predicts the employee’s organizational commitment. To summarize, a number of previous studies have reported that employees unavoidably share and are influenced by thoughts, attitudes, and evaluations of their workplace with their partners.

One of the outcome variables in the aforementioned studies, employee’s commitment towards his/her organization, is known to be a strong predictor of employee turnover. Ferguson and colleagues (2015) found that partner’s attitudes and feelings about the focal employee’s job and employing organization are critical factors in the turnover process and thus deserve further research.

Although previous research found an influence of partner’s emotions or attitudes on focal employee’s turnover intention, little is known whether or not focal employee’s perception of WFC is observed by the partner, and the consequence of the partner perception. Thus, examining the direct relationship between employee’s WFC and the partner’s perception of the employee’s WFC will broaden the crossover literature and invite a new way of thinking about the crossover between couples. To our knowledge, only one study (Green et al., 2011) has found that a focal employee’s WFC correlated with the partner’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC. In this
study, we aim to replicate and extend the findings from Green et al. (2011). We hypothesize that focal employee’s WFC would positively predict the partner’s perception of the employee’s WFC (hypothesis 2).

**Hypothesis 2:** Focal employee’s WFC would positively predict the partner’s perception of the employee’s WFC

Hypothesis 1 posits that job demands predict employee’s WFC, and Hypothesis 2 predicts a positive relationship between employee’s WFC and the partner’s perception of the employee’s WFC. Together, these hypotheses specify a model in which job demands indirectly increase the partner’s perception of the employee’s WFC. As suggested in the crossover literature, we predict that the focal employee’s job demands will increase his/her own perception of WFC, and the observation of WFC will crossover to the partner, who shares the same living environment with the worker.

**Hypothesis 3:** Focal employee’s WFC mediates the relationship between job demands and the partner’s perception of the employee’s WFC

**Moderating Role of Family-to-Work Transition**

According to Kreiner et al. (2009), people manage work and home lives by drawing boundaries between the two domains. While “boundary violation” in psychology has generally referred to an inappropriate psychiatrist-patient relationship in clinical psychology, the concept of boundary violation has more recently been used in the boundary theory literature to refer to instances in which a boundary is not treated in the way an individual prefers (Kreiner et al., 2009). Depending on individual preferences, “segmenters” prefer to keep the two domains as separate as possible, creating a strict boundary while “integrators” prefer to combine elements of both domains, essentially blurring boundaries between the two domains (Kreiner et al., 2009). As
individual’s perceptions that a behavior, event, or episode either breaches or neglects the boundary the individual set between the two domains, work-home boundary violation occurs (Kreiner et al., 2009). Kreiner and colleagues (2009) introduced the term work-home boundary violation and defined it as an individual’s perception that a behavior, event, or episode either violates or neglects an important facet of the desired work-home boundary. They proposed that work-home conflict increases as (a) the frequency of violations increases and/or the (b) intensity of violation increases (Kreiner et al., 2009).

In a similar vein, Matthews et al. (2010) defined inter-domain transitions in terms of the number of physical and cognitive transitions made from one domain to another. They suggested that inter-domain transitions have important implications for a variety of relevant work-family outcomes (Matthews et al., 2010). Drawing on COR, the authors indicated that the frequency of such transitions is positively related to experiences of WFC, because frequent moves from one domain to another exhausts resources. This eventually leads an individual to form the basis for perceptions of inter-domain conflict (Matthews et al., 2010). For example, if a worker transitions frequently from the family domain to the work domain (e.g., frequently receiving a phone call from a supervisor while at home), this would make the worker to think that work is interfering with the family life.

Matthews and colleagues (2010) indicated that inter-domain transitions should result in experiences of WFC when the frequency of transitions is perceived as a threat or drain on available resources. This important remark leads to a conclusion that inter-domain transition and WFC are related but not same (Matthews et al., 2010). In this study, we believe that family-to-work transition (e.g., an employee is engaged in family life at home and gets interrupted by a work email) will moderate the relationship between job demands and perceived WFC. More
specifically, we believe that the relationship between job demands and perceived WFC will be different depending on how frequently an employee needs to make shift from the family domain to the work domain. For example, the effect of job demands on WFC will be stronger for those who make more frequent family-to-work transition (e.g., an employee who is playing with his son at home after work frequently receives a phone call from colleague asking him to check his work email) than those who make less frequent family to work transitions, because those who make frequent transitions keep spending their resource to make the transitions and are more likely to feel that their work requires their attention even when they are away from work, thus feeling the increased job demands while at home. Therefore, we hypothesize that the frequency of family-to-work transition would moderate the relationship between job demands and employee WFC, such that more frequent transition strengthens the relationship.

*Hypothesis 4a: The relationship between job demands and employee WFC will be moderated by family-to-work transition.*

So far, we have argued that job demands positively influence focal employee’s WFC (Hypothesis 1). Furthermore, we proposed that focal employee’s WFC is positively related to the partner’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC (Hypothesis 2) and that focal employee’s WFC acts as the mediator by which job demands positively link to the partner’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC (Hypothesis 3). Then, we posited that family-to-work transitions present an important moderator of the relationship between job demands and focal employee’s WFC (Hypothesis 4a). To capture all relationships of this moderated mediation model fully, we formulate an additional hypothesis indicating the conditional indirect effect of focal employee’s job demands on the partner’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC through the focal
employee’s WFC, such that the impact is stronger for employees who make more frequent family-to-work transitions (see Figure 2).

_Hypothesis 4b: Job demands are positively related to the partner’s perception of the focal employees’ WFC through indirect effects such that the relationship will be moderated by family-to-work transition and mediated by focal employee’s WFC._

**Spouse’s Psychological Contract Violation, Focal Employees’ WFC, and Focal Employee Turnover Intention**

Based on the crossover literature, we previously hypothesized that focal employee’s WFC positively predicts the partner’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC (Hypothesis 2). Furthermore, in response to answer future research questions posed by both Bull Schaefer et al. (2013) and Wayne et al. (2013), we attempt to examine the mechanism through which the focal employee’s WFC indirectly predicts focal employee turnover intention, borrowing the findings from the crossover literature.

Despite the consistent findings on crossover effect of a focal employee’s WFC to his/her partner in a couple, research points out that future research needs to examine other variables that might better explain the mechanism behind partner influence on the focal employee’s turnover intention. Both Bull Schaefer et al. (2013) and Wayne et al. (2013) suggested that future studies look at partner’s psychological contract violation towards the focal employee’s organization and how it affects the employee’s attitudes toward his/her own organization. Psychological contract violation refers to employees’ feelings of disappointment (ranging from minor frustration to betrayal) arising from their belief that their organization has broken its work-related promises (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). More specifically, a violation of the psychological contract occurs when an employee perceives that the organization has failed to fulfill its obligations in exchange
for his/her time, effort, and skill (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). The lack of fulfillment of aspects of the psychological contract leads to a violation of the contract, with a change in employee’s attitudes and in behavior as a consequence (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). According to Rousseau (1989), a violation of the psychological contract may lead to strong emotional reactions such as anger, resentment, and a sense of injustice. These feelings would be expressed as high cynicism or disengagement about one’s work (Schaufeli & Greenglass, 2001). With regards to behavior, Robinson and Morrison (1994) indicated that violation of the psychological contract may result in poor performance and an increase in employee turnover.

Figure 3. The two mediators model.

The present study posits that if a partner perceives that the focal employee is suffering from WFC and is not able to spend quality family time at home due to work spillover and deprived resources, the partner will eventually blame the focal employee’s organization for not allowing the employee to have family time that should be guaranteed after normal working hours. We acknowledge that such work-family life expectation from a partner in a couple will depend on the nature of the focal employee’s work. For example, if partner A is working as an investment banker, his/her partner will feel less violation toward partner A’s organization even though partner A cannot make time for the family because the family gets compensated with financial rewards in exchange of partner A’s long work hours. However, if partner A is working long hours but does not receive corresponding compensation, partner B will feel more
psychological violation towards partner A’s organization. Unfortunately, this moderating role of partner’s job industry is beyond the scope of the present study. However, we still predict a positive relationship between partner’s perception of focal employees’ WFC and partner’s psychological contract violation towards the focal employee’s organization although we acknowledge the strength of the relationship will depend on different levels of possible moderators such as focal employee’s income. To our knowledge, the present study is the first to examine the link between partner’s perception of focal employee’s WFC and partner’s psychological contract violation towards the focal employee’s organization.

_Hypothesis 5: Spouse’s perception of a focal employee’s WFC positively predicts the spouse’s psychological contract violation towards the focal employee’s organization._

_Hypothesis 6: Spouse’s perception of a focal employee’s WFC mediates the relationship between the focal employee WFC and the spouse’s psychological contract violation towards the focal employee’s organization._

Furthermore, we posit that partner’s psychological contract violation will positively predict the focal employee’s turnover intention. As aforementioned, a number of crossover studies have found that one partner’s thoughts and affective attitudes crossover to the other partner (e.g., Bakker et al., 2008; Bull Schaefer., 2013). More specifically, Wayne and colleagues (2013) suggested that a focal employee’s family supportive organizational perception predicts the partner’s affective commitment towards the focal employee’s organization, which is known to be one of the best predictors of employee turnover intention. Also, Bull Schaefer and colleagues (2013) indicated that a spouse’s organizational commitment towards the military member’s organization and desire for the member to reenlist in the army predicted the member’s organizational commitment and desire to reenlist via spouse’s emotional reactions to discussions
of reenlistment. Drawing upon these findings, we predict that a partner’s psychological contract violation positively predicts the focal employee’s turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 7:** Partner’s psychological contract violation towards focal employee’s employer positively predicts focal employee’s turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 8:** Partner’s psychological contract violation mediates the relationship between partner’s perception of focal employee WFC and focal employee turnover intention.

Incorporating our predictions yields a two-mediator serial (sequential) mediation model (see figure 3), which suggests that the relationship between focal employee’s WFC and the employee’s turnover intention is mediated by the two mediators, partner’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC and partner’s psychological contract violation towards the focal employee’s organization.

**Hypothesis 9:** Focal employee’s WFC predicts employee turnover intention through spouse perception of focal employee’s WFC and spouse’s psychological contract violation.

**Method**

**Participants and Procedure**

A total of 158 pairs of dual-earner couples \((N = 316)\) completed a set of surveys for the present study. In order to locate spouses who are willing to participate in our study, we utilized the services of Survey Sampling International (SSI) which is a data management service company that maintains a database of willing survey participants. First, we sent our Qualtrics survey link to SSI, and they forwarded the link to the qualified participants. Our inclusion criteria for this study was that participants are married and both spouses were working. If a participant in the SSI database met our standard, he/she was given the link to our survey. After the participant took the survey, he/she forwarded the survey link to his/her spouse, and the
spouse completed the same set of survey. Due to the nature of the broad SSI database, we recruited couples working in diverse industries. For the data analyses, we conducted two separate analyses for men and women. Previous research has pointed out that crossover effect of work-family conflict in a couple differently affects men and women (e.g., Westman & Etzion, 1995).

**Measures**

Below are the survey instruments that were presented in our Qualtrics survey webpage:

**Work-Family Conflict Scale.** Developed by Gutek et al. (1991), the scale includes 4 items that measure one’s role conflict due to work interfering with family (WIF). Survey respondents respond to the items on a 5-point Likert-type response scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree). Items include “After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I like to do,” and “My work takes up time that I’d like to spend with family friends” (α = .80 for Women, α = .84 for Men).

**Work-Family Conflict Scale (Spouse).** We adapted items from Gutek et al. (1991) to capture the degree to which a spouse perceives work-family conflict the incumbent is experiencing. “I” was converted to “My spouse” in the questionnaire while everything else remained the same. For example, items include “After work, my spouse comes home too tired to do some of the things he/she would like to do,” and “My spouse’s work takes up time that he/she would like to spend with family friends” (α = .89 for Women, α = .85 for Men).

**Psychological Contract Violation (Spouse).** We modified items from Robinson & Morrison’s (2000) Psychological Contract Violation scale to measure the degree to which a spouse feels psychological contract violation towards the incumbent’s organization. “I” and “my organization” were replaced with “my spouse” and “my spouse’s organization,” respectively. Items include “The things my spouse does at work help him/her deal with personal and practical
issues in my life.” The scale consists of 4 items measured on a 5-point Likert-type response scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) (α = .96 for Women, α = .97 for Men).

**Quantitative Workload Inventory, QWI.** Developed by Spector & Jex (1998), the scale consists of 5 items designed to measure employees’ job demands. Participants responded to the 5 items on a 5-point Likert-type frequency response scale (1=Less than once per month or never, 5=Several times per day). Items include “How often does your job require you to work very fast?” (α = .90 for Women, α = .89 for Men)

**Family to Work Transition.** Developed by Matthews (2010), the scale consists of 5 items designed to measure how often one is taken out of the family domain and put in the work domain. Participants responded to the 5-item measure on a 5-point Likert-type frequency response scale (1=Never, 5=All of the time). Items include “Received calls from co-workers or your supervisor while at home?” and “Changed plans with your family to meet work related responsibilities?” (α = .82 for Women, α = .87 for Men)

**Turnover Intention.** Developed by Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham (1999), the 3-item scale measures an employee’s intention to quit his/her job. Participants responded on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree). Items include “I plan on leaving my job within the next year” and “I have been actively looking for other jobs” (α = .93 for Women, α = .90 for Men)

**Data Analyses**

In a preliminary stage, a couple’s response to each question was matched into one case in SPSS before separate analyses were conducted for women and men. PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2016) in SPSS was utilized for the data analyses. PROCESS is an advanced and accessible regression-based approach that enables researchers to test a number of different statistical models
including moderated mediation and conditional indirect effect testing via bootstrapping. To test indirect effects, researchers have traditionally relied on the Sobel (1982) test. However, the problem with the Sobel (1982) test is with its assumption of a normal sampling distribution of indirect effects, which in reality is often not the case. On the other hand, PROCESS does not assume normal distribution and accounts for non-normality by employing a bootstrapping procedure. The confidence intervals are generated from the bootstrapped sampling distribution and these intervals are then used for subsequent hypothesis testing (Hayes, 2016).

We tested our study hypotheses in two steps by using PROCESS. First, we examined a moderated mediation model (Hypotheses 1-4b). Second, we tested a serial mediation model (Hypotheses 5). Both models were tested first with the female sample, and later with the male sample.

**Results**

All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics. Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the variables for Women, meaning the focal employee is a woman and the spouse is a man. An inspection of correlations reveals that all hypothesized relationships were moderately or highly correlated; job demands were positively related to focal employee’s WFC ($r = .51, p < .05$), and focal employee’s WFC is positively related to spouse’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC ($r = .72, p < .05$), which was positively related to spouse’s psychological violation towards the focal employee’s organization ($r = .42, p < .05$). Spouse’s felt violation was also positively related to focal employee’s turnover intention ($r = .45, p < .05$).
Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the variables for Men, meaning the focal employee is a man and the spouse is a woman. All hypothesized relationships showed moderate to high correlations. Similar to the pattern of the correlation analysis for female focal employees (see Table 1), job demands were positively related to focal employee WFC ($r = .36, p < .05$), and focal employee WFC was positively related to spouse’s perception of focal employee’s WFC ($r = .81, p < .05$). As hypothesized, spouse’s perception of the focal employee WFC was also positively related to the spouse’s psychological contract violation towards the focal employee’s organization ($r = .28, p < .05$), which was then positively related to the focal employee’s turnover intention ($r = .48, p < .05$). In sum, the hypothesized correlations among the variables in both female and male respondents indicated moderate to high correlations.

**Test of Moderated Mediation**

**Condition 1: Focal Employee is Female**
Table 3
Regression results for conditional indirect effects of job demand on spouse's perception of focal employee's WFC (focal employee = Women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediator variable model: focal employee WFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demand</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family to work transition</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demand X Family to work transition</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable model: spouse's perception of focal employee's WFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal employee WFC</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demand</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal employee WFC</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bootstrapping results for test of conditional indirect effects at specific levels of the moderator (family to work transition) on spouse's perception of employee WFC

spouse perception = $M \pm 1 SD$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family to work transition</th>
<th>Boot indirect effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD (1.42)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (2.22)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (3.02)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index of moderated mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal employee WFC</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 158$ female employees

Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit.
Table 3 presents the results for Hypotheses 1-4b for female employees. A simple mediation test without the presence of the moderator revealed that job demands were positively associated with employee’s WFC, thereby supporting Hypothesis 1 ($B = 0.39, t = 7.30, p < .05$). Supporting Hypothesis 2, focal employee WFC was positively associated with her spouse’s perception of the employee’s WFC ($B = 0.70, t = 9.80, p < .05$). This finding was consistent with the result of a simple mediation. Also, in support of Hypothesis 3, focal employee WFC was found to have an indirect effect on the spouse’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC; this indirect effect was positive (0.27), as we hypothesized (Hypothesis 3).

Hypothesis 4a predicted that the relationship between job demands and the focal employee WFC will be moderated by family-to-work transition, such that the relationship is stronger for individuals who make frequent transitions. Results revealed that the interaction is not significant ($B = 0.11, t = 1.67, p > .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 4a was rejected. In addition, Hypothesis 4b predicted that job demands are positively related to partner’s perception of the focal employees’ WFC through indirect effects such that the relationship will be moderated by family-to-work transition and mediated by focal employee’s WFC. As the CI for the index of moderated mediation by focal employee WFC includes zero [-.01, .16], we conclude that the evidence does not support Hypothesis 4b. However, this result is almost marginal, thus caution is needed in interpreting the outcome.

*Condition 2: Focal Employee is Male*
### Table 4

**Regression results for conditional indirect effects of job demand on spouse’s perception of focal employee’s WFC (focal employee = Men)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Boot LL CI</th>
<th>Boot UL CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator variable model: focal employee WFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demand</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family to work transition</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demand X Family to work transition</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent variable model: spouse’s perception of focal employee's WFC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Boot LL CI</th>
<th>Boot UL CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal employee WFC</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demand</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indirect effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal employee WFC</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bootstrap results for test of conditional indirect effects at specific levels of the moderator (family to work transition) on spouse's perception of employee WFC

**spouse perception = $M \pm 1 SD$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family to work transition</th>
<th>Boot indirect effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD (1.46)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (2.43)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (3.40)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Index of moderated mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal employee WFC</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: n = 158 male employees*

Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit.
Table 4 presents the results for Hypothesis 1-4b for male employees. A simple mediation analysis without the presence of the moderator showed that job demands were significantly associated with focal employee’s WFC, thereby supporting Hypothesis 1 ($B = .34$, $t = 4.84$, $p < .05$). Supporting Hypothesis 2, focal employee WFC was positively related to the spouse’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC ($B = 0.86$, $t = 15.72$, $p <.05$). This finding was consistent with the result of simple mediation. Also, in support of Hypothesis 3, focal employee WFC was found to have an indirect effect on spouse’s perception of employee WFC; this indirect effect was positive (.29), as we hypothesized (Hypothesis 3). Moreover, when focal employee WFC was entered in the simple mediation model, job demands were no longer significantly related to spouse perception of employee WFC, indicating a full mediation.

Hypothesis 4a posited that the relationship between job demands and employee WFC will be moderated by family-to-work transition, such that the relationship is stronger for individuals who make frequent transitions. Results indicated that the cross-product term between job demands and focal employee WFC was significant ($B = 0.21$, $t = 3.17$, $p < .05$). We applied conventional procedures for plotting simple slopes (see Figure 4) at one standard deviation above and below the mean of family-to-work transition. Consistent with our expectations (and supporting Hypothesis 4a), the slope of the relationship between job demands and focal employee WFC was relatively strong (and positive) for those who make frequent family-to-work transitions whereas the slope was relatively weak for those make less frequent family-to-work transitions. This result is consistent with the findings from the PROCESS output (see Table 4); findings demonstrate that the conditional indirect effects of job demands on spouse’s perception of employee’s WFC via employee WFC were significant at higher levels of the moderator, family-to-work transition. That is, both CI did not contain zero for moderate and high levels of
the moderator (moderate transition, CI [0.16, 0.39]; high transition, CI [0.30, 0.63]), suggesting that the indirect effect of job demands on spouse perception of focal employee WFC via focal employee WFC is stronger when employees make more frequent family-to-work transitions. Furthermore, these results, combined with the evidence from the overall index of moderated mediation (CI [0.05, 0.34]), also support Hypothesis 4b; results indicate that the impact of job demands on spouse’s perception of employee WFC through focal employee WFC varies depending on the frequency level of family-to-work transition.

![Figure 4. Employee WFC predicted by job demands moderated by family-to-work transition.](image)

**Test of Serial Mediation with Two Mediators**

**Condition 3: Focal Employee is Female**

To conduct the mediation analyses, we performed serial mediational analyses to test whether the proposed mediators (spouse’s perception of focal employee WFC and spouse’s psychological contract violation towards employee’s organization) produced indirect effects on the relation between focal employee WFC and turnover intention. We used the PROCESS macro (model 6) developed by Hayes (2016) to estimate direct and indirect effects and confidence intervals using bootstrapping methods. Serial mediation assumes “a causal chain linking the
mediators, with a specific direction of causal flow” (Hayes, 2012). The PROCESS produces point estimates for the size of the indirect effect and a 95% confidence interval (95% CI) based on the distribution of the 5,000 bootstrapped samples. The mediation pathway is significant if the CI does not include zero.

First, the analysis was conducted for female employees. Consistent with Hypothesis 5, a male partner’s perception of the female partner’s WFC positively predicted the male partner’s psychological contract violation towards the female partner’s employer ($B = 0.46, t = 5.74, p < .05$). Hypothesis 6, the mediating role of a male partner’s perception of a female employee’s WFC in the relationship between the female employee WFC and the male partner’s psychological violation was also supported ($B = 0.35, \text{CI} [0.14, 0.56]$). Consistent with Hypothesis 7, a male partner’s psychological contract violation towards the female partner’s organization positively predicted the female partner’s turnover intention ($B = 0.47, t = 6.20, p < .05$). Partner’s psychological contract violation mediated the relationship between partner’s perception of focal employee’s WFC and focal employee turnover intention, supporting Hypothesis 8 ($B = 0.22, \text{CI} [0.11, 0.36]$). Next, we tested Hypothesis 9, the sequential mediation. The results are presented in Figure 5. First, we conducted a simple linear regression to examine the direct relationship between focal employee WFC and her turnover intention. We found a positive direct effect of female employee WFC and turnover intention ($B = 0.29, t = 2.83, p < .05$). However, as predicted, this relationship became non-significant when both spouse mediators were included in the serial mediation model ($B = 0.22, t = 1.59, p > .05$). We then tested whether the relation between female employee WFC and her turnover intention was mediated by the sequential spouse perception-to-spouse felt violation-employee turnover intention processes. Consistent with Hypothesis 9, there was a significant indirect effect through spouse’s perception of the
female employee’s WFC and the spouse’s felt contract violation towards the female employee’s organization ($B = 0.16, \text{ CI } [0.06, 0.32])$.

![Diagram](image.png)

*Figure 5. Results of the serial mediation model assessing the relationship between female employee WFC and turnover intention through spouse’s perception of female employee’s WFC and spouse’s psychological contract violation towards employee’s organization. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.*

Second, the same analysis was conducted for male employees. Consistent with Hypothesis 5, a female partner’s perception of the male partner’s WFC positively predicted the female partner’s psychological contract violation towards the male partner’s employer ($B = 0.29, t = 3.56, p < .05$). Contrary to Hypothesis 6, a female partner’s perception of the male partner’s WFC did not mediate the relationship between the male employee WFC and the female partner’s psychological violation ($B = 0.21, \text{ CI } [-0.05, 0.48]$). Consistent with Hypothesis 7, a female partner’s psychological contract violation towards the male partner’s organization positively predicted the male employees’ turnover intention ($B = 0.49, t = 6.88, p < .05$). Partner’s psychological contract violation mediated the relationship between partner’s perception of focal employee’s WFC and focal employee turnover intention, supporting Hypothesis 8 ($B = 0.15, \text{ CI } [0.06, 0.27]$). Next, we tested Hypothesis 9, the sequential mediation. Figure 6 shows the results.

The significant direct relationship between male employee WFC and his turnover intention was detected from the simple regression analysis ($B = 0.24, t = 2.64, p < .01$). Interestingly, the significant direct effect still existed even after the two mediators were entered in the sequential mediation model ($B = 0.37, t = 2.69, p < .01$). The indirect effect through the sequential
mediators, spouse’s perception of male employee’s WFC and spouse’s felt violation, was not significant ($B = 0.11, CI [-.02, .27]$). Thus, Hypothesis 9 was not supported for male employees. However, the first indirect path (Male employee WFC -> Spouse’s perception of his WFC -> his turnover intention) was significant ($B = -0.27, CI [-.49, -.04]$). The negative direction of the path was unexpected.

![Figure 6. Results of the serial mediation model assessing the relationship between male employee WFC and turnover intention through spouse’s perception of male employee’s WFC and spouse’s psychological contract violation towards employee’s organization. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.](image)

**Discussion**

The present study attempted to incorporate work-family conflict literature with couples-crossover research in order to expand our knowledge in the occupational health psychology literature. Most importantly, we examined the moderating role of family-to-work transition and the mediating role of spouse’s attitudinal variables for the relationship between job demands and focal employee turnover intention. Specifically, our research is novel in that it examined the relationship of job demands and turnover intention by exploring some of the new variables borrowed from the boundary, and crossover literature in order to explain the mechanisms by which job demands and WFC positively affect employee turnover intention. Also, our research is meaningful in that we used dual-earner couples and examined the differential effects of gender on some of the key variables, thereby broadening the scope of the current literature.
Our first analyses of the relationships among job demand, family-to-work transition, focal employee WFC, and spouse’s perception of focal employee WFC showed some similarities and discrepancies across male and female employees. Regardless of gender, job demands were positively associated with employee WFC, which then positively predicted spouse’s perception of the focal employee’s WFC. The mediating role of focal employee WFC for the relationship between job demands and spouse’s perception of focal employee’s WFC is shown to be significant. Although the positive relationship between job demands and employee WFC has been replicated in a number of studies, our finding that employee WFC can be largely observed by the spouse is relatively new. This is one of our contributions to the crossover literature.

However, female and male employees showed differential patterns with regards to the moderator. Our results found the moderating role of family-to-work transition (Matthews et al., 2010) on the relationship between job demands and employee WFC only in male employees. Specifically, male employees’ WFC predicted by job demands was higher for those who make more frequent family-to-work transitions. That is, if a male employee is often interrupted with work-related duties when spending time at home, he would report experiencing higher WFC than those who make less transitions, and his WFC would be more strongly influenced by work demands. This relationship was not supported in female employees; for female employees, the moderator, family-to-work transition, did not moderate the relationship between job demands and focal employee WFC, and the moderated mediation model did not work.

This gender difference may indicate that female employees might be more flexible than male employees to transition from family to work domain when necessary, while male employees may build more definite boundary between the family and work domains. One possible explanation will be that female employees might perceive themselves to be equally
responsible for both work and family responsibilities (e.g., taking care of children) and become used to juggling between the two roles relatively easily. Then they might use few resources when transitioning from and to other domains, while male employees may traditionally believe that their primary responsibility is being the provider for the family and less often encounter inter-role conflicts, which might lead them to exhaust significant amount of resources when the domain transition occurs. Furthermore, beyond the moderating effects of family-to-work transition seen in male employees, we also found that male employee WFC presents a mediating mechanism by which job demands impact the spouse’s perception of the male employee’s WFC, and this relationship also varies depending on the employee’s frequency of family-to-work transition. Again, this moderating effect was not found in female employees. However, it is necessary to be cautious of interpreting the gender differences too strongly because the difference between men and women in the moderator may not be significant.

Our second analyses, the sequential mediation, mainly contributed to the crossover literature. Due to the novelty of the mediators, spouse’s perception of focal employee WFC and spouse’s psychological contract violation towards the employee’s organization, our hypothesized model was not thoroughly built on the previous literature. However, the explanatory nature of our research question yielded several interesting outcomes that extend previous findings in the crossover literature. We first found that female employee’s WFC positively predicted her turnover intention through the husband’s perception of her WFC and the husband’s felt psychological contract violation towards her employer. All directions were positive, indicating that spouse’s thoughts and attitudes toward female employee’s work organization may be important. The husband may observe the female employee’s WFC, feel upset at her organization for not letting her be involved in family life, and may express his negative feelings to the female
employee, which may lead her to quit. This finding aligns with previous research suggesting that spouse’s affective commitment towards the employee’s organization affects the employee’s organizational commitment (Wayne et al., 2013). Surprisingly, however, this sequential mediation was not replicated in male employees. The direct effect between male employee WFC and his turnover intention was still significant and even increased after the mediators were included in the model. Another interesting finding was that male employees’ turnover intention decreased as spouse’s perception of male employees’ WFC increased; specifically, male employee WFC negatively predicted his turnover intention mediated by the wife’s perception of the employee’s WFC, indicating that male employees are less likely to quit their job when they feel high WFC. In order to examine the nature of the unexpected associations, simple linear regression analyses were conducted; they showed a strong, significant positive relation between male employee WFC and wife’s perception of the employee’s WFC. The wife’s perception was also positively but not significantly associated with male employees’ turnover intention. Therefore, this counterintuitive finding may be a function of collinearity among the spouse’s psychological contract violation and perceived WFC along with the male employee’s experienced WFC. However, we should not draw a definite conclusion about the observed direction of the variables because the links among the variables included in the model have not been previously examined.

In sum, the present study attempted to incorporate important and novel interdisciplinary variables across work-family, boundary, and crossover literature. Our results indicated that male and female employees are differently affected by unwanted disruption from work while at home, and that spouse’s attitude toward focal employee’s work organization is more important to female employees than male employees. Also, regardless of gender, our results showed that focal
employee’s WFC can be observed by his/her spouse. The present study contributes to the current literature by extending findings that are based on multidisciplinary approaches.

**Practical Implications**

We recommend that organizations try to minimize interrupting employees’ family lives. Although our research showed that the frequency of family-to-work transition only moderated the effects of job demands for male employees, our research also indicates that employee’s work family conflict can be observed by his/her spouse, which often has detrimental effect on employee commitment. In addition, companies need to pinpoint which specific aspects of job demands in their organizations seem to increase inter-role conflicts in employees in order to lower employee turnover intention. Also, companies will benefit from implementing family-friendly policies for their employees to help them juggle between work and life responsibilities.

**Limitations and Future Research**

In spite of our contributions, the present research has some limitations. One major concern is that we were not able to test the entire conceptual model (see Figure 1) due to the lack of more sophisticated statistical analysis tool. Specifically, utilizing Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) program to examine the complicated paths will yield interesting findings. However, such limitations did not prevent our research from providing meaningful contributions. We believe that the present study contributed to broadening the future avenue of research in the field.

A second concern lies on the novelty of mediating variables. Although we successfully demonstrated that the spouse can observe a focal employee’s WFC, we do not know which specific type of emotion is triggered and whether or not the emotion becomes weaker or stronger as the employees’ WFC persists. Future research should look into the nature of spouse’s emotion.
at the onset of his/her perception of spouse’s WFC and how it progresses. Also, we do not fully understand the construct of the other mediator, spouse’s psychological contract violation. The construct may involve mostly negative emotions, but we do not know the true nature of the emotions and how they affect the couple’s relationships. Future research will benefit from conducting longitudinal research on the variables to examine the changes.

Another limitation of our study is the use of cross-sectional data. One common concern with cross-sectional studies on WFC is that they often limit the ability to test effects over time; for example, an employee’s perception of his/her WFC can vary depending on the time of the measurement. If a travel agent evaluates the level of his/her WFC and completes the WFC survey on Monday in a high-season, he/she may report experiencing high WFC. On the contrary, if the same person takes the WFC survey on Saturday in a low-season, he/she might report lower WFC due to decreased job demands. Future research investigating WFC should keep this in mind and acknowledge that WFC is less stable than how it is usually measured in this field.

Also, we found that the proposed mediators did not mediate the relationship between male employee WFC and his turnover intention in the sequential mediation model. Rather, there was a significant direct effect of male employee WFC on turnover intention, indicating presence of moderators or other mediators not considered in the present study. Future study will contribute to the literature by examining possible moderators and mediators for the relationship.

Lastly, our sample only consists of traditional couples. We expect the interactional mechanisms and gender role of same-sex couples will be different from those of our traditional sample; for example, our results indicate that male employees are more affected by frequent family-to-work transitions than female employees. It will be interesting to investigate the moderating role of the domain transition in a gay couple in comparison to a lesbian couple, and
see how it affects their WFC. Given that the number of non-traditional couples increases around the world, future study will make meaningful contributions by replicating our study using those couples.

**Conclusion**

This study investigated the relationship between work-family conflict and spousal attitudes toward the organization, and the implications for employee turnover. Our results suggest that frequent family-to-work transitions strengthen the relationship between job demands and employee’s perceived work family conflict in male employees and that spousal attitudes toward focal employee’s organization may be more important to female employees than to male employees. In addition, regardless of gender, job demands were positively associated with a focal employee’s work family conflict and the spouse’s perception of the focal employee’s work family conflict. In sum, the present study contributes to the literature by investigating the links among the variables that have not been previously examined. Nevertheless, the functioning of couples is complex, and more research is still needed to deepen our understanding of the interactions between partners.
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### Appendix A: Work-family conflict (self)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I like to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job I have so much work to do that it takes away from my personal interests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family/friends dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work takes up time that I’d like to spend with family friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Work-family conflict (spouse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After work, my spouse comes home too tired to do some of the things he/she would like to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job my spouse has so much work to do that it takes away from his/her personal interests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family and I dislike how often my spouse is preoccupied with work while I am at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse’s work takes up time that he/she would like to spend with family friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Psychological contract violation (spouse’s job)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my spouse’s organization has violated the contract between our family and the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel betrayed by my spouse’s organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a great deal of anger toward my spouse’s organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel extremely frustrated by how my family has been treated by my spouse’s organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D: QWI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than once per month or never</th>
<th>Once or twice per month</th>
<th>Once or twice per week</th>
<th>Once or twice per day</th>
<th>Several times per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often does your job require you to work very fast?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does your job require you to work very hard?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does your job leave you with little time to get things done?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often is there a great deal to be done?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you have to do more work than you can do well?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E: Family-to-work transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often have you….</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received calls from co-workers or your supervisor while at home?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone into work on the weekend to meet work responsibilities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped what you were working on at home to call work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed plans with your family to meet work related responsibilities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered work related e-mails while at home?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX F: Turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I plan on leaving my job within the next year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been actively looking for other jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to remain in my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>