

Running Head: THE SPILLOVER–CROSSOVER MODEL

THE SPILLOVER–CROSSOVER MODEL

Arnold B. Bakker

Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

and

Evangelia Demerouti

Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Revised Chapter for J.G. Grzywacz & E. Demerouti (Eds.), New frontiers in work and family.

January 30, 2012

Correspondence: Arnold B. Bakker, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Department of Work & Organizational Psychology, Woudestein, T12-47, P.O. Box 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Phone: +31 10 408 8853. Email: bakker@fsw.eur.nl.

THE SPILLOVER–CROSSOVER MODEL

Many studies have shown that job demands (e.g., a high workload and emotionally demanding customers) have a negative impact on employee well-being (Quick & Tetrick, 2003), whereas job resources (e.g., social support, performance feedback, task identity) have a positive impact, particularly on employee engagement (Bakker, 2011; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). However, less attention has been paid to possible consequences of the work environment for those with whom employees frequently interact – their intimate partners. In this chapter, we introduce a model that integrates two lines of research, the Spillover-Crossover model.

To illustrate the gap in the work-family research that this chapter aims to fill, we will provide an example. Imagine an employee who has a poor relationship with her supervisor. This employee will experience some sort of negative strain (like disappointment, negative emotions, mental preoccupation), which will not only be present during working time but most probably also during nonwork time. The employee should be a good actor in order to be able to hide these negative experiences and thus tensed interactions with the partner can arise. Such conflicts and arguments at home can also enhance the experience of negative emotions of the partner as well as disturb his recovery at home. The example illustrates how employees' experiences at work (e.g., a poor relationship with the supervisor) may spill over to the home domain (in the form of negative strain), which then influence their behaviors at home (e.g., conflicts with the partner), and cross over to their partner's well-being (i.e. negative emotions and lack of recovery).

The central aim of this chapter is to integrate two lines of research: spillover and crossover. Spillover researchers have generally neglected the possibility to examine the impact of employees' experiences at work on the well-being of the partner at home. Similarly, crossover researchers have generally ignored the work-related *causes* of the experiences that

cross over from the employee to the partner at home. By integrating both literatures, we may get a better insight in the processes that link the work and family domains.

FIRST SPILLOVER, THEN CROSSOVER

Researchers have identified two different ways in which demands or strain are carried over (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington 1989). *Spillover* is a within-person, across-domains transmission of strain from one area of life to another. Previous research has primarily focused on how reactions experienced in the work domain are transferred to and interfere with the non-work domain for the same individual (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). For example, an employee may experience a time-based conflict between work and private life when work overload results in overwork at the expense of leisure time. Similarly, a worker may experience a strain-based work-family conflict when confronted with something unfair during the day at work, about which he or she continues worrying during the evening at home. Indeed, many studies have now found evidence for such spillover effects (for meta-analyses, see Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007).

In contrast, *crossover* involves transmission across individuals, whereby demands and their consequent strain cross over between closely related persons (Westman, 2001). Thus, in crossover, job strain experienced by an individual may lead to strain being experienced by the individual's partner at home. For example, a person who feels chronically fatigued and has become cynical about the meaning of work may transfer such feelings and attitudes to the partner during conversations at home. Indeed, research suggests that frequent exposure to a burned-out partner may increase one's levels of burnout (Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005; Westman, Etzion, & Danon, 2001). Whereas spillover is an intra-individual transmission of stressors or strain, crossover is a dyadic, inter-individual transmission of

stressors or strain. Crossover research is based upon the propositions of role conflict theory, recognizing the fluid boundaries between work and family life. Crossover of work-related experiences actually implies spillover to happen first. However, the crossover approach adds another level of analysis to previous approaches by adding the inter-individual level, specifically the dyad, as an additional focus of study (Westman, 2001).

Spillover

Conflict theory claims that the work and family environment are incompatible because they have distinct norms and requirements (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). Specifically, work-family conflict is defined as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role.” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Although the latter authors explicitly stated that work-family conflict is inherently non-directional (p. 84), most scholars distinguish between two types of inter-role conflict: (1) *work-family conflict* (WFC), referring to a situation in which role pressures at work hamper functioning at home; and (2) *family-work conflict* (FWC), referring to role pressures at home interfering with functioning at work. Since the Spillover-Crossover model mainly focuses on the impact of work on family, we will restrict ourselves here to discussing research on WFC.

In addition to dispositional variables such as Type A and negative affectivity (Carlson, 1999), work characteristics have been consistently related to WFC (see Byron, 2005; Frone, 2003). Job demands found to be predictors of WFC are work pressure (e.g., Dollard, Winefield & Winefield, 2001; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Wallace, 1997), an unfavorable working time schedule (Demerouti, Geurts, Bakker & Euwema, 2004; Geurts, Rutte & Peeters, 1999), work-role overload (Butler, Grzywacz, Bass, & Linney, 2005; Demerouti,

Bakker, & Bulters, 2004), and emotional demands, such as having frequent interactions with demanding patients or customers (Bakker & Geurts, 2004).

The role scarcity hypothesis (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) has been used to explain negative spillover. Accordingly, people possess limited and fixed amounts of resources (e.g., time and energy). Managing multiple roles (e.g., of employee, spouse, and parent) is problematic as they draw on the same, scarce resources. High job demands require employees to devote more resources (e.g., time, emotions) to work, leaving them with fewer resources to devote to their family (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). Previous research has demonstrated that especially time- and strain-based conflict (i.e. fulfilment of demands in one domain is difficult owing to the time devoted to and strain produced in the other domain, respectively) are associated with various negative work-, family-, and stress-related outcome variables (see, Allen et al., 2000; Amstad et al., 2011). Thus, employees who are confronted with work overload and high emotional demands have more problems in combining their work and family. In other words, job demands can spill over to the home domain and interfere with family life.

Fortunately, inter-role management may not only result in the experience of conflict but also in the experience of positive spillover between life domains. Generally, positive spillover or work-family enrichment has been defined as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in another role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Work-family enrichment is generally positively related to job resources, like autonomy and social support (Demerouti, Geurts, & Kompier, 2004), and positively related to outcomes like job performance (Demerouti, Bakker, & Voydanoff, 2010).

According to Marks' (1977) *expansion hypothesis*, participation in multiple roles may provide a greater number of opportunities and resources to the individual, which can be used to promote growth and better functioning in both life domains. This is consistent with the

notion that identification with and engagement in a role can be enriching to other roles and identities (Rothbard, 2001). According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), inter-role enrichment can occur in one of two pathways. The first is an instrumental pathway and occurs when resources such as skills and opportunities for self-growth gained from one role directly improve functioning in another role. The second pathway is affective and occurs when a resource in one domain produces positive affect such as positive emotions and energy within that domain, which, in turn, improves individual functioning in another domain (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson & Kacmar, 2007).

Crossover

Once experiences built up at work have spilled over to the family domain, they may influence the partner. Crossover is the term used to describe the interpersonal process that occurs when job stress or psychological strain experienced by one person affects the level of strain of another person in the same social environment (Bolger et al., 1989). Some researchers have focused on the crossover of job stressors from the individual to the spouse, others have examined the process whereby job stressors of the individual affect the *strain* of the spouse, and yet others have studied how psychological strain of one partner affects the strain of the other (see Westman, 2001). Note that most previous crossover studies have focused on the transference of strain – that is why we will use strain crossover as a starting point. However, we will see later in this chapter that positive experiences can also cross over between partners.

Westman (2006) suggested several possible mechanisms to explain the crossover process. First, direct crossover can take place between two spouses/partners through empathic processes. That is, since spouses/partners spend considerable time together they become aware of and are affected by each others' affective states. Second, spouses/partners may share some common stressors (e.g., financial pressures, life events) that can lead to increased levels

of common strains (e.g., negative affect). Third, crossover may be an indirect process in which the transmission of strain is mediated by the communication and interaction of spouses/partners (e.g., coping strategies, social undermining, and lack of social support).

Most studies have investigated and found evidence for the crossover of psychological strains, such as anxiety (Westman, Etzion, & Horovitz, 2004), burnout (e.g., Bakker & Schaufeli, 2000), distress (Barnett, Raudenbush, Brennan, Pleck, & Marshall, 1995), depression (Howe, Levy, & Caplan, 2004), and marital dissatisfaction (Westman, Vinokur, Hamilton, & Roziner, 2004). A few studies investigated crossover of health complaints and perceived health between partners (Bakker, 2009; Gorgievski-Duijvesteijn, Giesen & Bakker, 2000; Westman, Keinan, Vinokur & Benyamini, 2008). There are, however, also studies that have detected direct crossover of *positive* experiences, like work engagement (Bakker et al., 2005; Bakker & Demerouti, 2009), life satisfaction (Demerouti et al., 2005), and vigor (Westman et al., 2009). Some studies focused on unidirectional crossover from husbands to wives, whereas others looked for bi-directional crossover, from husbands to wives and from wives to husbands (Westman & Bakker, 2008).

Hatfield, Cacioppo, and Rapson (1994) have argued that there are several circumstances under which people should be especially likely to catch others' emotions. Emotional contagion or direct crossover is particularly likely, for example, if individuals pay close attention to others, and if they construe themselves as interrelated to others rather than as independent and unique. Furthermore, a number of studies have shown that there exist stable individual differences in people's susceptibility to emotional stimuli (Doherty, Orimoto, Singelis, Hatfield & Hebb, 1995; Stiff, Dillard, Somera, Kim, & Sleight, 1988), and that these individual differences are good predictors of the extent to which people catch positive and negative emotions from others.

Westman and Vinokur (1998) have argued that empathy can be a moderator of the crossover process. Literally, the root meaning of the word empathy is “feeling into”. Starcevic and Piontek (1997) define empathy as interpersonal communication that is predominantly emotional in nature. It involves the ability to be affected by the other’s affective state, as well as to be able to read in oneself what that affect has been. Similarly, Lazarus (1991) defined empathy as “sharing another’s feelings by placing oneself psychologically in that person’s circumstances” (p. 287). The core relational theme for empathy would have to involve a sharing of another person’s emotional state, distressed or otherwise. Accordingly, an individual’s strain produces an empathic reaction in the partner that increases the partner’s strain, by way of what may be called *empathic identification*. Social learning theorists (e.g., Bandura, 2001; Stotland, 1969) support this view, and have explained the transmission of emotions as a conscious processing of information. They suggested that individuals imagine how they would feel in the position of another – empathic identification – and thus come to experience and share the other’s feelings.

THE SPILLOVER-CROSSOVER MODEL

The Spillover-Crossover model (SCM) combines the spillover and crossover literatures, and proposes that work-related experiences first spill over to the home domain, and then cross over to the partner through social interaction. As can be seen in Figure 1, we assume that the spillover process can start in both partners’ work environment. Using the Job Demands – Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Demerouti & Bakker, 2011; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001), we first propose that although every job may be characterized by different working conditions, these conditions can still be categorized as either job demands or job resources. Job demands are the aspects of work that cost effort, like workload and mental demands. Confrontation with job demands is therefore straining;

repeated confrontation may even lead to a state of exhaustion or burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001). In contrast, job resources are those aspects of work that help to deal with the job demands, and have motivational potential. Job resources such as social support from colleagues, performance feedback, and task significance have been shown to satisfy basic human needs (Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, & Lens, 2008), and have positive effects on work engagement and job performance (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011).

The SCM typically departs from the work domain. Job demands are hypothesized to evoke strain which can spill over into the home domain, and lead to work-family conflict. For instance, employees who are confronted with high emotional demands may feel fatigued after a day at work, and may continue to ruminate about work when at home. According to the SCM, this state of work-family conflict will have a negative impact on the interaction with the partner at home and indirectly on the partner's well-being (see Figure 1). In contrast, job resources are hypothesized to foster engagement, which leads to work-family enrichment when these resources are high. Employees who enjoy their work because they have, for instance, ample opportunities for professional development and interesting interactions with others (clients, colleagues), may feel self-efficacious after a day at work, and may go home in a positive mood. According to the SCM, this state of work-family enrichment will have a positive impact on partner's well-being through positive interactions.

The SCM suggests that the impact on partner's well-being occurs either through direct crossover of negative and positive experiences or through indirect crossover (see Figure 1). The indirect crossover uncovers the mechanism through which the inter-individual transmission occurs. Evidence for indirect crossover, i.e., a transmission mediated by interpersonal exchange, can explain why crossover among partners happens. Up to now, particularly social undermining and social support have been examined as behavioral transmitters of crossover in the SCM. These behavioral transmitters influence one's partner

well-being directly or through impacting the family level demands and resources. For instance, Bakker et al. (2008) found that work-family conflict increased the partner's home demands because the employee undermined the partner. We will now zoom in on the specific process through which experiences built up at work cross over to the partner.

Exchange between Partners

Westman (2001) has used the stress and coping literature to argue that crossover may be the result of an indirect process of social undermining. Social undermining consists of behaviors directed toward the target person that express negative affect, convey negative evaluation or criticism, or hinder the attainment of instrumental goals (Vinokur & Van Ryn, 1993). The construct of social undermining comes close to what has been called “hostile marital interactions” (Matthews, Conger, & Wickrama, 1996) – the frequency with which one is hostile toward the partner (gets angry, criticizes, shouts, and argues).

The hypothesis that the crossover process is mediated by negative social interactions is supported by empirical findings from two lines of research. First, research documents that distress and its accompanying frustration leads to aggressive behavior (Berkowitz, 1989). Second, the literature on family processes shows that stressed couples exhibit high levels of negative interactions and conflicts (Schaefer, Coyne, & Lazarus, 1981; Westman & Vinokur, 1998). The increased distress (associated with the experience of WFC) and its accompanying frustration lead an individual to initiate or exacerbate a negative interaction sequence with the partner (Westman, 2005). Therefore, it can be expected that strain-based WFC is positively related to social undermining and, consequently, to reduced well-being of the partner (see Figure 1).

There is some indirect evidence for the latter process. Using a multi-source study among 337 couples, Matthews et al. (1996) showed that both husbands' and wives' WFC was

indirectly (through psychological distress) related to hostile interactions between the partners. Burke, Weir, and DuWors (1980), in a study among 85 senior administrators in correctional institutions and their wives, found that wives whose husbands reported higher job demands (e.g., high responsibility), more often had explosive outbursts, and reported reduced marital and life satisfaction. Similarly, Jackson and Maslach (1982) found that police officers with high levels of stress were more likely to display anger and be less involved in family life, whilst their wives showed a corresponding increase in distress. In short, WFC seems to foster social undermining behaviors, and reduces involvement in family life. This means that the partner is confronted with increased emotional demands and may experience lower levels of relationship satisfaction.

Until now, we have particularly focused on negative spillover and crossover, but we will see later in this chapter that positive spillover and crossover is probably equally likely. As can be seen in Figure 1, the SCM proposes that stress factors like job demands and burnout spill over to the home domain, and have an indirect negative impact on the social support offered to the partner. This process holds for both partners, and the social support offered by men is positively related to the social support offered by women – in other words, support is reciprocated. This means that, in the long run, work-family conflict also reduces the social support one *receives* – work-family conflict undermines the quality of the relationship. This proposition is based on equity theory (Adams, 1965). Accordingly, people evaluate their relationships with others in terms of investments and outcomes. A central proposition is that people have a deeply rooted tendency to pursue reciprocity in interpersonal relationships and that they feel distressed if they perceive these relationships as inequitable (Walster, Walster & Berscheid, 1978). Buunk and Schaufeli (1999) have argued that reciprocity is a universal and evolutionary rooted psychological principle that increased the likelihood of our ancestors' survival in the evolutionary past.

We further argue that social support offered to the partner has a positive effect on own and the partner's well-being. Lyubomirsky, Tkach, and Sheldon (2004) showed that simply asking people to commit random acts of kindness can significantly increase happiness levels for several weeks. In their study, Lyubomirsky and colleagues randomly assigned students to a no-treatment control group or to an experimental group, in which students were asked to commit five random acts of kindness a week for six weeks. As predicted, students who engaged in random acts of kindness were significantly happier than controls. Consistent with these findings, experimental work suggests a causal relationship between giving (support) and happiness. For example, when Field, Hernandez-Reif, Quintino, Schanberg, and Kuhn (1998) asked a volunteer group of retired senior citizens to give infants a massage three times a week for three weeks, these seniors experienced less anxiety and depression. The seniors also showed improved health and a reduction in stress-related hormones.

Many studies have shown how received social support has a positive impact on well-being. One reason for this is that social support is a key resource, in that it is functional in achieving one's goals. Thus, instrumental support from one's partner can help to get something done in time, and may therefore alleviate the impact of time pressure on strain (Van der Doef & Maes, 1999). In addition, the stress-buffering hypothesis states that social support protects individuals from the pathological consequences of stressful experiences (Cohen & Wills, 1985).

Finally, the SCM proposes that well-being crosses over directly between partners. We have already discussed studies showing a positive relationship between the strain of partners (see, for an overview Bakker, Westman & Van Emmerik, 2009). Since crossover is particularly likely if individuals pay close attention to others, and if they construe themselves as interrelated to others rather than as independent and unique, direct crossover between intimate partners is highly likely. Indeed, since partners are likely to discuss their feelings and

be attuned to each other, it is rather likely that their states cross over. Demerouti, Bakker and Schaufeli (2005) found that women's job demands were positively related to their own exhaustion via work-family conflict; women's exhaustion consequently predicted their partner's level of exhaustion. Additionally, they found that men's job demands were negatively related to their own life satisfaction via work-family conflict; men's life satisfaction consequently predicted their partner's level of life satisfaction. This study also indicated that partners influence each other with their happiness.

EVIDENCE FOR THE SCM

A series of studies has provided evidence for the SCM – although it should be noted that most studies focused exclusively on negative spillover and crossover. In a study among Dutch couples of dual-earner parents, Bakker, Demerouti and Dollard (2008) hypothesized and found that for both genders job demands fostered their own work-family conflict (WFC), which, in turn, contributed to their partner's home demands and exhaustion. In addition, as predicted, social undermining mediated the relationship between individuals' WFC and their partner's home demands. Thus, as employees' work overload and emotional demands increased, their work started to interfere with family life, resulting in negative behaviors toward the partner. This behavior increased the partner's home demands (overload of household tasks and emotional demands at home), resulting in high levels of partner exhaustion.

This study was replicated and expanded using the data of 99 couples of dual-earner parents in Japan. Shimazu, Bakker and Demerouti (2009) showed that men's job demands (i.e. overload and emotional demands) were positively related to own and partner's reports of WFC. Consequently, men's WFC was negatively related to the quality of the social interaction (i.e. decreased social support from and increased social undermining by men),

which, in turn, led to women's ill-health (i.e. depressive symptoms and physical complaints). We found similar findings for the model starting with women's job demands; gender did not affect the strength of the relationships in the model. Taken together, these two studies clearly indicate that high job demands initiate a process of work-family conflict and poor relationship quality, which may eventually affect the intimate partner's well-being in an unfavorable way.

Using workaholism as the trigger in the SCM, Bakker, Demerouti and Burke (2009) hypothesized that workaholism would result in reduced support provided to the partner, through work–family conflict. In addition, it was predicted that individuals who receive considerable support from their partners are more satisfied with their relationship, and that relationship satisfaction would cross over between the partners. The results of structural equation modeling analyses using the matched responses of both partners supported these hypotheses. Again, gender did not affect the strength of the relationships in the proposed model. These findings indicate that employees who feel compelled to work excessively hard are more likely to bring their work home, which results in lower efforts to help the partner. This reduced social support has a negative impact on partner's relationship satisfaction.

Shimazu, Demerouti, Bakker, Shimada, and Kawakami (2011) tried to replicate parts of these findings using a large sample of Japanese dual-earner couples. The results of logistic regression analyses showed that “workaholics” (i.e., employees scoring high on both working excessively and working compulsively) were more likely to experience work-to-family conflict (i.e., WFC) and psychological distress compared to “relaxed workers” (i.e., low on both working excessively and working compulsively) for both genders. In addition, husbands of workaholic women were more likely to experience family-to-work conflict (i.e., FWC) whereas wives of workaholic men were not.

Finally, Bakker, Petrou and Tsaousis (in press) conducted a study among 267 Greek teachers and their partners to test the SCM and to integrate equity theory in the model by

formulating hypotheses about exchange in interpersonal relationships. Structural equation modeling analyses supported the spillover hypothesis that teachers who lose their work engagement as a result of an inequitable relationship with their students invest less in the relationship with their partner. In addition, the results supported the crossover hypothesis that teachers' relationship investments, in turn, show a negative relationship with inequity in the intimate relationship as perceived by the partner; and inequity in the intimate relationship contributed to partner depression. These findings shed more light on the exchange between partners, and offer additional support for the central claim of the SCM that experiences built up at work can spill over to the home domain, and consequently have an impact on one's partner.

POSITIVE SPILLOVER AND CROSSOVER

Although the focus in most work-family studies has primarily been on negative spillover, research has clearly indicated that positive spillover is also possible (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Wayne et al., 2007). Whereas work-family conflict refers to incompatibility between work and family roles, work-family enrichment is defined as “the extent to which participation at work (or home) is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed at home (or work)” (Frone, 2003, p.145). This means that participation in the family role is facilitated by what has happened at work. There are only two tests of the combined, positive spillover and crossover process. Bakker, Shimazu, Demerouti, Shimada, and Kawakami (in press) conducted a longitudinal study among Japanese couples to investigate how two types of heavy work investment, workaholism and work engagement, influence one's partner's family satisfaction through a process of negative or positive spillover. The results of SEM showed that whereas workaholism has a negative impact on family satisfaction through work family conflict; work engagement has a positive

influence on family satisfaction through work-family enrichment. Moreover, the findings indicated that partners influenced each other's life satisfaction, also over a longer time period. Life satisfaction was thus the result of own workaholism and engagement, but also the workaholism and engagement of the partner.

Demerouti (in press) tested the positive spillover-crossover model in a study among Dutch dual-earner couples. Job resources of one partner were predicted to spill over to their individual energy, i.e., reduced fatigue and increased motivation. Consequently, individual energy was predicted to influence the partner's family resources (i.e. autonomy, social support and developmental possibilities at home), which eventually were hypothesized to influence the partner's level of individual energy. Rather than focusing on work-family enrichment as a measure of positive spillover, this study examined work-self enrichment and family-self enrichment as the mechanisms through which the favorable effects of job and home resources, respectively, impact on individual energy. Work-self and family-self enrichment represent the degree to which individual's engagement in one life domain (i.e., work/family) contributes to enhanced functioning during time spent on personal interests. Results confirmed that job resources influence one's own individual energy through work-self enrichment. Consequently, the levels of individual energy positively influence one's partner's perception of home resources, which eventually influence partner's individual energy through experienced family-self enrichment. Work-self and family-self enrichment were useful in explaining why job and family resources may enhance the levels of energy that individuals invest in different life domains.

A few other studies have detected crossover of positive experiences between intimate partners, without necessarily examining the spillover process that precedes it (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2005; Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005; Prince, Manolis, & Minetor, 2007). For example, Bakker et al. (2005) tested the hypothesis that burnout and work

engagement may cross over from husbands to wives and vice versa among couples working in a variety of occupations. Their findings provided evidence for the crossover of burnout (exhaustion and cynicism) and work engagement (vigor and dedication) among partners. The bi-directional crossover relationships were significant and about equally strong for both partners, after controlling for important characteristics of the work and home environment.

In a similar vein, Bakker and Demerouti (2009) investigated the crossover of engagement from working wives to their husbands. The results of moderated SEM analyses showed that work engagement crossed over from wives to husbands. Furthermore, they found that empathy (particularly perspective taking) moderated the crossover effect. Men who were perspective takers were more strongly influenced by their partners' work engagement than their counterparts who were not perspective takers. Finally, in an international context, Westman, Etzion, and Chen (2009) studied 275 business travelers and their working spouses and found crossover of vigor from business travelers to their working spouses.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The negative consequences of an imbalance between work and family mainly concerned outcomes within the individual (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Frone, 2003; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). The SCM suggests that work-family conflict is only one part of the multiple challenges that employed parents experience in balancing work and family demands. The conflict of work with family is also linked to the quality of social interactions at home, and these linkages are alike for both men and women. To date, strategies implemented by employers have sought to mitigate the impact of family on work behavior with an eye toward improving employee productivity while on the job, and have paid less attention to how working conditions can be improved in order to mitigate the negative influence and promote a positive influence of work on family. Most employers use family responsive policies such as

maternity and parental leaves, child care programs, alternative work schedules, and employee assistance and relocation programs (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990) which are appropriate for dealing with family demands and consequently for reducing the negative influence of family life on work. Undoubtedly, such practices can help employees balance both life domains. However, the SCM suggests that organizations should simultaneously pay attention to work related characteristics – i.e. the job demands and job resources – that influence work to family interference and enrichment.

FUTURE RESEARCH

As we have seen in the reviewed studies, work-family/self conflict and, less often, enrichment play the role of mediator/transmitter in spillover processes. Montgomery, Panagopoulou, de Wildt, and Meenks (2006) have argued that the definition of work-family conflict implies mediation, as there will be no conflict when there are no demands at work. Similarly, there will not be any enrichment from work to home when there are no resources to facilitate functioning in the other domain. In essence, variables such as work-life conflict or enrichment cannot exist without reference to the relevant life domains. The challenge for future research is to examine whether there are alternative ways to capture spillover (or interrole conflict and enrichment) in a more direct, objective way.

Essential for the crossover effect is that the individual's energy is influencing the energy of other system members (*cf.* Wayne et al., 2007). We have suggested social undermining and social support as the ways or behavioral transmitters through which crossover in the family occurs. However, we are aware that other possible ways might exist that can be relevant for specific cultural and family contexts. Future research is therefore necessary to expand our view, and shed more light on the possible transmitters of crossover.

It is clear from the literature review that the majority of the studies has focused on negative spillover-crossover processes. Although there are some studies on positive spillover-

crossover there is definitely a need for more research on such positive processes. Such research can uncover whether other transmitters than provided social support might be involved in the positive processes. Moreover, future studies can examine whether there are differences between positive and negative spillover-crossover processes. One difference between the crossover of positive vs. negative experiences from one partner to the other is that in the study of Demerouti (in press) individual energy was directly and positively related to partner's home resources, while negative experiences crossed over to the partner through increased social undermining (Bakker et al., 2008; Shimazu et al., 2009), and diminished social support (Bakker et al., 2009; Shimazu et al., 2009).

Finally, currently the SCM has been applied to examine the processes through which work is influencing family life. However, it is conceivable that the model can also be applied to examine the impact of family life on work. To this end and similar to the study of Demerouti et al. (2010), family demands and resources would be supposed to spill over to the work domain through family-work conflict and enrichment which consequently would impact colleague's strain. Bakker and colleagues (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009; Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2006) have found evidence for the crossover of positive and negative strain among colleagues.

CONCLUSION

Whereas previous research has shown that job demands and job resources may influence employee well-being through work-family conflict and enrichment, the SCM goes one step further and shows how experiences built up at work can influence the partner at home. The SCM integrates two lines of research and shows how negative, but also positive experiences at work can have an impact on one's partner's well-being. Whereas job demands and burnout seem to undermine social support provided to the partner, job resources and

engagement seem to facilitate social support and have a positive impact on partner's well-being. We hope that this chapter inspires researchers to test the model in other countries than The Netherlands, Japan, and Greece.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T.D., Herst, D.E.L., Bruck, C.S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 278-308.
- Amstad, F.T., Meier, L.L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N.K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*, 151-169.
- Bakker, A.B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*, 265–269.
- Bakker, A.B. (2009). The crossover of burnout and its relation to partner health. *Stress & Health, 25*, 343-353.
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International, 13*, 209-223.
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2009). The crossover of work engagement between working couples: A closer look at the role of empathy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*, 220-236.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Burke, R. (2009). Workaholism and relationship quality: A spillover-crossover perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*, 23-33.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Dollard, M. (2008). How job demands influence partners' experience of exhaustion: Integrating work-family conflict and crossover theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 901-911.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2005). Crossover of burnout and work engagement among working couples. *Human Relations, 58*, 661-689.

- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). The socially induced burnout model. In Columbus (Ed.), *Leading edge research in cognitive psychology*. New York: Nova Science.
- Bakker, A.B., & Geurts, S. (2004). Toward a dual-process model of work-home interference. *Work & Occupations, 31*, 345-366.
- Bakker, A.B., Petrou, P., & Tsaousis, I. (in press). Inequity in work and intimate relationships: A Spillover-Crossover model. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*.
- Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2000). Burnout contagion processes among teachers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 2289-2308.
- Bakker, A.B., Shimazu, A., Demerouti, E., Shimada, K., & Kawakami, N. (in press). Work engagement versus workaholism: A test of the Spillover-Crossover model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Bakker, A.B., Westman, M., & Van Emmerik, I.J.H. (2009). Advancements in crossover theory. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*, 206-219.
- Bakker, A.B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2009). The crossover of daily work engagement: Test of an actor-partner interdependence model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1562–1571.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 1-26.
- Barnett, R.C., Raudenbush, S.W., Brennan, R.T., Pleck, J.H., & Marshall, N.L. (1995). Changes in job and marital experience and change in psychological distress: A longitudinal study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 839–850.
- Berkowitz, L. (1989). The frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*, 59-73.

- Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R., & Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *51*, 175-183.
- Burke, R.J., Weir, T., & DuWors, R.E. (1980). Work demands on administrators and spouse well-being. *Human Relations*, *33*, 253-278.
- Butler, A.B., Grzywacz, J.G., Bass, B.L., & Linney, K.D. (2005). Extending the demands-control model: A daily diary study of job characteristics, work-family conflict and work-family facilitation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *78*, 155-169.
- Buunk, B.P., & Schaufeli, W.B. (1999). Reciprocity in interpersonal relationships: An evolutionary perspective on its importance for health and well-being. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *10*, 259-291.
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *67*, 169-198.
- Carlson, D. S. (1999). Personality and role variables as predictors of three forms of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *55*, 236-253.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *98*, 310-357.
- Demerouti, E. (in press). The spillover and crossover of resources among partners: The role of work-self and family-self facilitation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*.
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A.B. (2011). The Job Demands–Resources model: Challenges for future research. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *37*, 1-9.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., & Bulters, A. (2004). The loss spiral of work pressure, work-home interference and exhaustion: Reciprocal relationships in a three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*, 131-149.

- Demerouti E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The Job Demands - Resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 499-512.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2005). Spillover and crossover of exhaustion and life satisfaction among dual-earner parents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*, 266-289.
- Demerouti, E., Geurts, S.A.E., & Kompier, M.A.J. (2004). Positive and negative work-home interaction: Prevalence and correlates. *Equal Opportunities International, 23*, 6-35.
- Demerouti, E., Geurts, S.A.E., Bakker, A.B., & Euwema, M. (2004). The impact of shiftwork on work-home interference, job attitudes and health. *Ergonomics, 47*, 987-1002.
- Doherty, R.W., Orimoto, L., Singelis, T.M., Hatfield, E., and Hebb, J. (1995). Emotional contagion: Gender and occupational differences. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 355-371.
- Dollard, M.F., Winefield, H.R., & Winefield, A.H. (2001). *Occupational strain and efficacy in human service workers*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Eby, L.T., Casper, W.J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 124-197.
- Edwards, J.R., & Rothbard N. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 178–200.
- Field, T. M., Hernandez-Reif, M., Quintino, O., Schanberg, S., & Kuhn, C. (1998). Elder retired volunteers benefit from giving massage therapy to infants. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 17*, 229-239

- Ford, M.T., Heinen B.A., & Langkamer K.L.J. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: a meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 57-80.
- Frone, M.R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J.C. Quick & L.E. Tetrick (Eds), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M.R., Yardley, J.K., & Markel, K.S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 145-167.
- Geurts, S.A.E., Rutte, C., & Peeters, M. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of work-home interference among medical residents. *Social Science & Medicine, 48*, 1135-1148.
- Gorgievski-Duijvesteijn, M.J., Giessen, C., & Bakker, A.B. (2000). Financial problems and health complaints among farm couples: Results of a ten-year follow-up study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 359–373.
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 72–92.
- Grzywacz, J.G., & Marks, N.F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 111-126.
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J.T., & Rapson, R.L. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Howe, G., Levy, M., and Caplan, R. (2004). Job loss and depressive symptoms in couples: Common stressors, stress transmission, or relationship disruption? *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*, 639-650.

- Jackson, S.E., & Maslach, C. (1982). After-effects of job-related stress: Families as victims. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 3*, 63-77.
- Kossek, E.E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 139-149.
- Lazarus, R.S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford.
- Lyubomirsky, S., Tkach, C., & Sheldon, K. M. (2004). *Pursuing sustained happiness through random acts of kindness and counting one's blessings: Tests of two six-week interventions*. Unpublished data, Department of Psychology, University of California, Riverside.
- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 921–936.
- Matthews, L.S., Conger, R.D., & Wickrama, K.A.S. (1996). Work-family conflict and marital quality: Mediating processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*, 62-79.
- Montgomery, A. J., Panagopoulou, E., de Wildt, M., & Meenks, E. (2006). Work-family interference, emotional labor and burnout. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 36–51.
- Prince, M., Manolis, C. & Minetor, R. (2007). Life satisfaction crossover among couples. In R.J. Estes (red.), *Advancing Quality of life in a Turbulent World*, (p. 191-208). Dordrecht, Nederland: Springer.
- Quick, J.C., & Tetrick, L.E. (2003). *Handbook of occupational health psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rothbard, N. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 655-684.

- Schaefer, C., Coyne, J.C., & Lazarus, R.S. (1981). The health-related functions of social support. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*, 381-406.
- Shimazu, A., Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2009). How job demands influence partners' well-being: A test of the Spillover-Crossover model in Japan. *Journal of Occupational Health, 51*, 239-248.
- Shimazu, A., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Shimada, K., & Kawakami, N. (2011). Workaholism and well-being among Japanese dual-earner couples: A spillover-crossover perspective. *Social Science and Medicine, 73*, 399-409.
- Starcevic, V., & Piontek, C.M. (1997). Empathic understanding revisited: Conceptualization, controversies, and limitations. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 51*, 317-328.
- Stiff, J.B., Dillard, J.P., Somera, L., Kim, H., and Sleight, C. (1988). Empathy, communication, and prosocial behavior. *Communication Monographs, 55*, 198-213.
- Stotland, E. (1969). Exploratory investigations of empathy. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 4, pp. 271-314). New York: Academic Press.
- Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., & Lens, W. (2008). Explaining the relationships between job characteristics, burnout, and engagement: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *Work & Stress, 22*, 277-294.
- Van der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The job demand-control (-support) model and psychological well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. *Work & Stress, 13*, 87-114.
- Vinokur, A. D., & Van Ryn, M. (1993). Social support and undermining in close relationships: Their independent effects on the mental health of unemployed persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 350–359.
- Wallace, J.E. (1997). It's about time: A study of hours worked and work spillover among law firm lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 227-248.

- Walster, F., Walster, G.W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wayne J.H., Grzywacz J.G., Carlson, D.S., & Kacmar, K.M. (2007). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*, 63–76.
- Westman, M. (2001). Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations, 54*, 557-591.
- Westman, M. (2005). Cross-cultural differences in crossover research. In S.A.Y. Poelmans (Ed.), *Work and family: An international research perspective. Series in applied psychology* (pp. 241-260). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Westman, M. (2006). Models of work-family interactions: Stress and strain crossover. In R. K. Suri (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of organizational behavior* (pp. 498-522). New Delhi: Pentagon Press.
- Westman, M., & Bakker, A.B. (2008). Crossover of burnout among health care professionals. In J. Halbesleben (Ed.), *Handbook of stress and burnout in health care*. Hauppauge NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Westman, M., Etzion, D., & Chen, S. (2009). Crossover of positive experiences from business travelers to their spouses. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*, 269–284.
- Westman, M., Etzion, D., Danon, E. (2001). Job insecurity and crossover of burnout in married couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 467-481.
- Westman, M., Etzion, D., & Horovitz, S. (2004). The toll of unemployment does not stop with the unemployed. *Human Relations, 57*, 823-844.
- Westman, M., Keinan, G., Roziner, R., & Benyamini, Y. (2008). The crossover of perceived health between couples: A theoretical model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13*, 168-180.

Westman, M., & Vinokur, A. (1998). Unraveling the relationship of distress levels within couples: Common stressors, emphatic reactions, or crossover via social interactions?

Human Relations, 51, 137-156.

Westman, M., Vinokur, A., Hamilton, L., & Roziner, I. (2004). Crossover of marital dissatisfaction during military downsizing among Russian army officers and their spouses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 769-779.

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

American Psychologist, 45, 240-251.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. The Spillover–Crossover Model.

