The Jingle-Jangle of Work–Nonwork Balance: A Comprehensive and Meta-Analytic Review of Its Meaning and Measurement

Wendy J. Casper
University of Texas at Arlington

Hoda Vaziri
Purdue University

Julie Holliday Wayne
Wake Forest University

Sara DeHauw
Open University

Jeffrey Greenhaus
Drexel University

We review research on work–nonwork balance to examine the presence of the jingle fallacy—attributing different meanings to a single construct label—and the jangle fallacy— using different labels for a single construct. In 290 papers, we found 233 conceptual definitions that clustered into 5 distinct, interpretable types, suggesting evidence of the jingle fallacy. We calculated Euclidean distances to quantify the extent of the jingle fallacy and found high divergence in definitions across time and publication outlet. One exception was more agreement recently in better journals to conceptualize balance as unidimensional, psychological, and distinct from conflict and enrichment. Yet, over time many authors have committed the jangle fallacy by labeling measures of conflict and/or enrichment as balance, and disagreement persists even in better journals about the meanings attributed to balance (e.g., effectiveness, satisfaction). To examine the empirical implications of the jingle and jangle fallacies, we conducted meta-analyses of distinct operational definitions of balance with job, life, and family satisfaction. Effect sizes for conflict and enrichment measures were typically smaller than effects for balance measures, providing evidence of a unique balance construct that is not interchangeable with conflict and enrichment. To begin to remedy concerns raised by our review, we propose a definition of work–nonwork balance drawing from theory, empirical evidence from our review, and normative information about how balance should be defined. We conclude with a theory-based agenda for future research.

Keywords: attitude theory, meta-analysis, person–environment fit, work–family balance, work–nonwork balance

Supplemental materials: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000259.supp

Everyone seems to want work–life balance, and trouble achieving it is often lamented. Anne-Marie Slaughter ignited controversy when she argued that work–life balance is not possible for women, who cannot "have it all" (Slaughter, 2012). A survey by the Society for Human Resource Management finds that men, too, desire balance (Wright, 2011). A *New York Times* article reminds us that single and nonparent employees also want balance (Seligson, 2012). Business periodicals tout work–life balance as a strat-egy to recruit top talent and publish lists of "Best Employers" for achieving balance (Smith, 2013). Self-help books, such as "Work/ Life Balance for Dummies" (Mumford & Lockett, 2009), present tips on how to achieve balance. The ubiquity of work–life balance is evident by a Google search of the term yielding 320,000,000 results. Thus, it seems that work–life balance is a desirable but difficult goal.

Despite extensive discussion of balance[1] in the popular press, this term is relatively new to the scholarly literature. Historically, research has focused on how work and family affect one another. Early discussions centered on work–family conflict in which "work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect," (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77) and showed its

[1] This research reviewed studies using various terms including work–family balance, work–life balance, and role balance. Although studies differ in the specific roles (work and family vs. work and personal life vs. all life roles), all focus on balancing multiple roles, one of which is work. In discussing these different forms of balance as a group, we use the broad term balance. In discussing a specific study, we use the term used by those authors.

negative effects for employees, families, and organizations (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). More recently, researchers have examined work–family enrichment, defined as "the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role" (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 73), and how it relates to positive individual, family, and organizational outcomes (McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010; Shockley & Singla, 2011; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004; Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006). Conflict and enrichment are bidirectional constructs in which work can influence family (i.e., work-to-family conflict or enrichment) and family can influence work (i.e., family to-work conflict or enrichment), and the meaning of these constructs is now well-established. Less consensus exists, however, about the term balance.

The aim of this research is to comprehensively review how balance has been defined, theorized, and measured. Other researchers have noted differences and identified themes in conceptual definitions of balance (e.g., Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007), but in our review, we quantify the extent of scholarly disagreement about the meaning and measurement of balance. We comprehensively characterize the state of the literature and examine whether consensus about balance varies by time and/or publication outlet. We document substantive differences in measuring balance and use meta-analysis to examine whether such differences affect conclusions about the correlates of balance (namely, job, family, and life satisfaction). Finally, we offer a precise conceptual definition that draws from theory, review findings, and normative information on how balance should be defined.

A Brief History of the Balance Construct

We begin by delineating the evolution of the balance construct, highlighting key aspects of previous definitions, and noting similarities and differences across them. In the earliest discussion of balance that we are aware of, Marks and MacDermid (1996) defined "*role balance*" as being fully engaged in performing every role, and provided an eight-item scale to assess it as a *unidimensional construct* involving a *self-evaluation* of full *engagement* across *all life roles*. Yet, as research on balance emerged, definitions distinct from that of Marks and MacDermid (1996) proliferated in the literature.

In the early 2000s, work–family balance was often equated with the *absence of conflict* (Duxbury & Higgins, 2001), or a *combination of low work–family conflict and high work–family enrichment* (Frone, 2003). Around that time, equality emerged as a key feature in some definitions. Greenhaus and colleagues defined work–family balance as being *equally engaged* in and *equally satisfied* with *work roles and family roles* (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003; Greenhaus & Singh, 2003) and Halpern and Murphy (2005) discussed work–family balance as a balance beam—the burden of family on one side and work on the other. An equality definition sees life as a zero-sum game—balance requires equality so that one domain is not short-changed for the other. A few years later, Voydanoff (2005) rejected the equality idea and drew on person-environment (P-E) fit by suggesting that work–family balance involves *demands-resources fit* in which family and work demands are met by resources present in both domains. She

defines *work–family balance* as "a global assessment that work and family resources are sufficient to meet work and family demands such that participation is *effective in both domains*" (p. 825).

In 2007, two new definitions highlighted a key difference in scholars' views of balance—whether balance is a *psychological* construct held in the mind of a focal person or a *relational* construct that can be observed by others. Valcour (2007) defined and measured "satisfaction with work–family balance" as an *attitude*—"an overall level of contentment resulting from an assessment of one's degree of success at meeting work and family role demands" (p. 1512). Valcour saw balance as being psychological- an attitude with affective ("contentment") and cognitive ("assessment of success") components, and measured it accordingly. That same year, Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) argued that work–family balance is not an attitude which exists in the "eye of the beholder" but is embedded in a person's social environment. They conceptualized balance as a relational construct, defining it as "the accomplishment of role-related *expectations that are negotiated and shared* between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the *work and family domain*" (p. 458), and a few years later developed a scale (Carlson, Grzywacz, & Zivnuska, 2009) to measure it by asking respondents to report whether they meet expectations that are shared with work and family role partners.

In more recent definitions, Greenhaus and Allen (2011) reject the equality notion and, like Voydanoff (2005), emphasize fit in defining work–family balance. Yet they emphasize fit with values rather than resources (Voydanoff, 2005). Greenhaus and Allen (2011) argued that balance exists when *role effectiveness and role satisfaction are consistent with life priorities*; thus, balance does not require equality across work and family domains (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). To date, however, no scales have been developed to measure their definition.

This historical overview highlights the many conceptualizations and measures labeled "balance." Balance has been treated as unidimensional (e.g., Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Marks & MacDermid, 1996; Valcour, 2007) and as a multidimensional combination of conflict and enrichment (Frone, 2003). Some authors define balance as a psychological construct (Valcour, 2007); others, as a relational one (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007). The notion of equality across domains, a one-size-fits-all approach, is captured in some definitions (Greenhaus et al., 2003), but others see balance as person- or context-specific, implying a fit perspective (Voydanoff, 2005; Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Among fit definitions, some focus on role demands and resources (Voydanoff, 2005), and others on role satisfaction/effectiveness and values (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Further, some suggest balance is about being effective (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007), involved (Marks & MacDermid, 1996), and/or satisfied (Valcour, 2007) across roles. Definitions also vary in focusing on only work and family (e.g., Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007) or a wider array of life roles (e.g., Marks & MacDermid, 1996). In this research, we quantify trends in defining balance and examine the effects of distinct definitions.

Why We Urgently Need a Better Understanding of Balance

As is apparent from this brief review, the many definitions of balance create confusion and ambiguity about what balance is. It is

not uncommon for constructs to lack precise definitions in early stages of their development (Macey & Schneider, 2008), but because advancing theory requires a full grasp of key constructs (Suddaby, 2010), creating clarity around the definition of balance is essential to moving the literature forward.

Construct clarity requires a precise and parsimonious definition (Suddaby, 2010). Yet, the many definitions for balance represent the "jingle fallacy"—the erroneous assumption that two distinct things are the same because they bear the same name (Kelley, 1927) which occurs when different meanings are attributed to a single label (Thorndike, 1904). In the balance literature, the same label (e.g., "balance") has referred to different conceptualizations and/or measures (e.g., satisfaction, involvement, equality), leaving researchers at a loss for insights into what balance is and how it relates to other variables. For example, it is not clear whether relationships identified with one definition of balance also apply to other definitions. Such ambiguity impedes theory development and the accumulation of research.

A related issue that also threatens building a cohesive body of knowledge is the "jangle fallacy" (Kelley, 1927)—the erroneous assumption that two similar things are unique because they bear different labels. The jangle fallacy can occur when a new concept label repackages an established concept or when the same construct develops under different names. In both cases, multiple terms are used for a single construct. In the balance literature, the question can be raised whether balance is merely a new name for low conflict. If balance and conflict are the same, the label "balance" creates confusion but adds no value. Such redundant construct labels—prevalent in organizational psychology—violate a core principle of science—that of parsimony (Le, Schmidt, Harter, & Lauver, 2010; Schwab, 1980).

In addition to the jingle-jangle fallacies, theory advancement may be hampered by using many theories to define balance. Researchers have referred to scarcity and expansionist theories (e.g., Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005), role salience (e.g., Juliao, 2006), and border theories (e.g., Ward, 2008). Each time a new theory is used to define balance, a unique nomological network and process is suggested, creating confusion about the correlates of balance. In summary, for construct clarity, theoretical development, and empirical progress, greater clarity and consensus is needed on the meaning and measurement of balance.

The Purpose and Contributions of This Research

This research seeks to clarify the construct of balance by reviewing its (a) conceptual definitions, (b) theoretical bases, and (c) measures. Although there have been general summaries of balance research (e.g., Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Kalliath & Brough, 2008), our paper goes beyond existing reviews in several ways.

First, we provide a thorough review of all conceptual and empirical papers on balance through the end of 2016. To our knowledge, no other research has comprehensively and systematically reviewed all balance studies; such analysis is important to accurately characterize the history and current state of the literature.

Second, we provide a fine-grained, quantitative description of how balance has been defined and measured by coding key features of conceptual and operational definitions (e.g., is balance

unidimensional or multidimensional? Is it psychological or relational?). To identify the substantively different conceptual and operational definitions in the literature, we use cluster analyses to succinctly capture the primary meanings and measures of balance. This is essential to fully understand the construct and helps identify areas of scholarly consensus.

Third, we identify all theories used to define balance, which is important for at least two reasons. First, it speaks to whether a core set of theories define balance and guide research. If so, we would expect similar variables to be studied, fostering accumulation of research. Second, for the study of balance to advance, a comprehensive theory of balance is needed, the development of which rests on understanding the theoretical foundation for defining balance.

Fourth, we use Euclidean D-scores to quantify the extent of the jingle fallacy by examining disagreement in how balance has been conceptually and operationally defined by time and publication outlet. As such, we contextualize the boundary conditions under which the jingle fallacy is most problematic, enabling more nuanced conclusions.

Fifth, we explore whether different balance measures (i.e., the jingle fallacy) affect empirical conclusions. Currently, it is not clear whether relationships identified with one balance measure apply to others, which hinders accumulation of research. Measures with nomological validities that are notably different likely reflect unique constructs (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). If nomological validities for measures of conflict and enrichment that are labeled balance clearly differ from those for other balance measures, this suggests a unique balance construct distinct from conflict and enrichment, addressing the jangle fallacy. Beyond demonstrating the important implications of jingle and jangle fallacies, we also contribute to the literature with the first meta-analytic examination of the correlates of balance.

Drawing from our review, theoretical description, empirical analysis of the meaning and measurement of balance, and meta-analysis, in our discussion, we identify concerns with the balance literature. Though fully addressing every concern is beyond the scope of this paper, our final purpose is to begin to address primary concerns, such as the jingle and jangle fallacies. To do so, we consider normative evidence about how balance should be defined, drawing from qualitative research on how employees define balance and dictionary definitions of the term. Drawing from common themes across normative evidence and scholarly definitions, we provide a precise, comprehensive, theoretically based definition of work–nonwork balance, distinct from conflict and enrichment. In conclusion, we suggest theoretically driven novel ideas for research on work–nonwork balance: its dimensionality, stability over time, generalizability across cultures, as well as antecedents and consequences.

Method

Comprehensive Literature Review Procedures

We searched all manuscripts through the end of 2016 in PsycINFO and Business Source Complete for these keywords: *work* and *family* and *balance*, *work* and *life* and *balance*, *work* and *home* and *balance*, *work* and *nonwork* and *balance*, *work* and *nonwork* and *balance*, *role balance*, and *life balance*. A total of 3250

references were possibly relevant, but only papers published in English in books, journals, or PhD dissertations with a conceptual and/or operational definition were included. We omitted self-help literature, papers on policies to support balance, narrative reviews, and expert interviews. Our final sample included 290 quantitative, qualitative, and nonempirical papers.

Content Analysis and Coding Process

Three faculty members and two PhD candidates in organizational behavior coded articles. Based on a preliminary literature review, researchers developed a coding scheme of key features of conceptual and operational definitions. Two researchers coded each article and resolved discrepancies through discussion. Prior to discussions, agreement across coding categories was 95%; after discussions, it was 100%. The following characteristics of each paper were coded.

Conceptual definitions. We developed a list of conceptual definitions from an initial literature review (e.g., Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Marks & MacDermid, 1996; Valcour, 2007), and recorded which definition was used in each paper. Definitions that did not match one in the coding scheme were recorded verbatim and added to the coding scheme. We coded quantitative papers with an operational but no conceptual definition as having no conceptual definition.

Theories invoked in conceptual definitions. Theories used to develop the conceptual definition were coded. For example, Aryee et al. (2005) drew from scarcity (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) and enhancement (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974) theories to define balance with four dimensions (i.e., work-to-family conflict, family to-work conflict, work-to-family enrichment, and family to-work enrichment). Theories used to explain the relationships of balance with other variables or to explain concepts other than balance were not coded.

Operational definitions. To code operational definitions, researchers began with a list of published scales (e.g., Carlson et al., 2009; Marks & MacDermid, 1996; Valcour, 2007) and added others that emerged. When a measure was not previously published or used only some items from a scale, items were recorded verbatim. Number of items and alphas were recorded.

Key features. We drew from the literature to identify key features of conceptual and operational definitions of balance including (a) its dimensionality (i.e., unidimensional or multidimensional), (b) its properties (i.e., a property of a person, or a property of social relationships), (c) its meanings (i.e., satisfaction, effectiveness, importance, involvement, equality, fit, balance, conflict, enrichment), and (d) breadth of roles (i.e., work–family, work–nonwork, or multiple role balance). Examples of features are provided in Table 1. Each conceptual and operational definition was coded on all key features, as described below.

Dimensionality. Coding of dimensionality of definitions was mutually exclusive (coded as either unidimensional or multidimensional). Conceptual definitions were coded based on the authors' conceptualization as unidimensional (i.e., a gestalt or holistic perception of how roles are combined, e.g., Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007) or multidimensional (i.e., includes dimensions such as conflict and/or enrichment that denote aspects of balance, e.g., Frone, 2003). Operational definitions were coded as unidimensional when authors treated them as a single dimension (e.g., Valcour, 2007)

and as multidimensional when authors used multiple distinct scales for unique aspects of a second-order construct (e.g., Gareis, Barnett, Ertel, & Berkman, 2009).

Properties. Balance has been conceptualized as a property of the self (i.e., the focal person) or of relationships. We coded definitions as psychological when balance was defined as constructed in the mind of a person (e.g., Valcour, 2007) and as relational when defined as inherent in relationships—socially constructed in interactions between a focal person and role partners. Relational constructs can be perceived by role partners; researchers have argued that psychological constructs are knowable only to a focal person (e.g., Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007).

Operational definitions were coded as psychological when items assessed inner mental states (e.g., "How dissatisfied/satisfied are you with the way you divide your attention between work and personal or family life?" Valcour, 2007) and relational when items referenced shared meaning in a relationship (e.g., "I do a good job of meeting the role expectations of critical people in my work and family life," Carlson et al., 2009). Coding was not mutually exclusive; both psychological and relational codes were assigned when items required rating both inner states (psychological) and meeting shared expectations (relational). We coded measures as relational or psychological based only on the substantive content of the items, not based on whether items were self-reported or other-reported. However, because relational constructs are defined as including role partners' views regarding balance, they can be captured by multisource data. As such, we also recorded whether each operational definition was captured with single- (e.g., employee only) or multisource (e.g., employee and spouse) data.

Meaning. For conceptual definitions, we coded all the meanings from the balance literature (i.e., satisfaction, effectiveness, importance, involvement, equality, fit, balance, conflict, enrichment) reflected in each definition. For instance, Greenhaus et al.'s (2003) definition of balance as "the extent to which an individual is *equally engaged* in and *equally satisfied* with his or her work role and family role" (p. 513), was coded as equality, involvement, and satisfaction. For operational definitions, all meanings referenced in one or more items were coded. Each meaning is described below with example items provided in Table 1.

Satisfaction. Conceptual and operational definitions were coded as "satisfaction" if they referenced satisfaction, contentment, or positive feelings about roles or balance among roles.

Effectiveness. Conceptual and operational definitions were coded as "effectiveness" when they evaluated success, effectiveness, or good functioning in performing roles or balancing roles.

Importance. Conceptual and operational definitions were classified as "importance" when they focused on the value people place on different roles.

Involvement. Conceptual and operational definitions were coded as "involvement" if they referenced engagement, involvement, or participation in multiple roles.

Equality. Conceptualizations were coded as "equality" when balance was defined as equality across domains on any evaluation (e.g., time, involvement, satisfaction). Operational definitions were coded as "equality" if any item referenced equality across domains or if "equality" was calculated from responses to items in different domains.

Fit. Conceptual and operational definitions were coded as "fit" when balance was defined as a match between any of the

Table 1

Key Features of Definitions Coded

Features	Possible categories	Conceptual definition example[c]	Operational definition example
Dimensionality[a]	*Unidimensional*: Balance is a single overall assessment of one's work and home situation in its entirety.	"An <u>overall level</u> of contentment resulting from an assessment of one's degree of success at meeting work and family role demands" (Valcour, 2007)	"How satisfied are you with the way you divide your attention between work and home?" (Valcour, 2007)
	Multidimensional: Balance is comprised of multiple dimensions, which are combined to form overall balance.	"The two primary dimensions are the direction of influence between work and family roles (work-to-family vs. family-to-work) and the type of effect (conflict vs. facilitation)" (Frone, 2003)	Items drawn from work-to-family and family-to-work conflict and enrichment scales (Aryee et al., 2005)
Properties[b]	*Psychological*: Balance is constructed in the mind and is not directly observable by others. The social context is separate from the construct of balance itself.	"An overall level of contentment resulting from <u>an assessment of one's degree of success</u> at meeting work and family role demands" (Valcour, 2007)	Target employee responds to "How successful do you feel in balancing your work and family lives?" (Wierda-Boer, Gerris, & Vermulst, 2008)
	Relational: Balance exists in the social and relational context; it is a property of a relationship. Balance is constructed within discourse with role partners and is externally observable by role partners.	"Accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and <u>shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners</u> in the work and family domain" (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007)	Peers and supervisors respond to the following item about a target person "This employee does not let job demands cause family problems." (Lyness & Judiesch, 2008)
Meaning[b]	*Satisfaction*: Balance refers to satisfaction, contentment, happiness, or other positive feelings associated with roles or role balance.	"Achieving <u>satisfying experiences</u> in all life domains. To do so requires personal resources such as energy, time and commitment to be well-distributed across domains" (Lyness & Judiesch, 2008)	"I am satisfied with the balance I have achieved between my work and life" (Salzstein, Ting, and Saltzstein, 2001)
	Effectiveness: Balance refers to the degree of success at balancing multiple roles or in the performance across roles.	"The degree to which an individual <u>is able to</u> simultaneously balance the temporal, emotional and behavioral demands of both paid work and family responsibilities" (Hill et al., 2001)	"All in all, how successful do you feel in balancing your work and personal/family life?" (Clarke, Koch, & Hill, 2004)
	Importance: Balance refers to the degree to which different roles are valued or important to the target person or to significant others.	"Promoting a multi-activity society in which housework, family work, club work and voluntary work <u>are prized alongside paid work</u>" (Gardiner et al., 2007)	"Everything I do feels special to me; nothing stands out as more important or more valuable than anything else." (Marks & MacDermid, 1996)
	Involvement: Balance refers to the degree of engagement or involvement in multiple roles.	"The tendency to become <u>fully engaged in the performance of every role in one's total role system</u>, to approach every typical role and role partner with an attitude of attentiveness and care" (Marks & MacDermid, 1996)	Report portion of a 24-hour average day spent in 10 activities: sleeping, working, commuting, school, chores, recreating, health/self-maintenance, community, personal relationships, spirituality or religion (Sheldon, Cummins, & Kamble, 2010)
	Balance: when the word "balance" is used in the definition, without further explaining it.	"The degree to which an individual is able to simultaneously <u>balance</u> the temporal, emotional, and behavioral demands of both paid work and family responsibilities" (Hill et al., 2001)	"How easy or difficult is it for you to balance the demands of your work and your personal and family life?" (Hill et al., 2001)
	Conflict: Balance refers to the degree to which a negative spillover occurs between different roles	"Satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home with a <u>minimum of role conflict</u>" (Clark, 2000)	"The time I spend on family responsibilities often interfere with my work responsibilities" (Carlson et al., 2008)
	Enrichment: Balance refers to the degree to which a positive spillover occurs between different roles	"The two primary dimensions are the direction of influence between work and family roles (work-to-family vs. family-to-work) and the type of effect (conflict vs. <u>facilitation</u>)" (Frone, 2003).	"The time I spend in family activities develops skills in me that are useful at work" (Carlson et al., 2008)
	Equality: Balance requires equality across domains in an evaluation such as satisfaction, importance, effectiveness, or involvement.	"The extent to which an individual is <u>equally engaged in and equally satisfied</u> with his or her work role and family roles" (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003)	"Nowadays, I seem to enjoy every part of my life equally well" (Marks & MacDermid, 1996)

Table 1 (*continued*)

Features	Possible categories	Conceptual definition example[c]	Operational definition example
	Fit: Balance occurs when there is a match between either (a) demands and resources of the situation, (b) the person's abilities and the situation's demands, or (c) the person's needs and the situation's supplies.	"A global assessment that work and family resources are sufficient to meet work and family demands such that participation is effective in both domains" (Voydanoff, 2005)	"I am able to schedule my days off to fit the needs of my personal life" (Nelson & Tarpey, 2010).
Breadth of Roles[a]	*Work-Nonwork Balance* refers to balance between work and multiple nonwork roles or "personal life" (e.g., community role, friendship role, self-care role, etc.).	"Promoting a multi-activity society in which housework, family work, club work and voluntary work are prized alongside paid work" (Gardiner et al., 2007)	"Overall how would you judge your current balance between your working life and other aspects of your life over the past 12 months (e.g. family, friends, leisure)?" (Maruyama et al., 2009)
	Work-Family Balance: refers to balance between work and family roles only	"A global assessment that work and family resources are sufficient to meet work and family demands such that participation is effective in both domains" (Voydanoff, 2005)	"I am able to meet my family responsibilities while still doing what is expected of me at work" (Parkes & Langford, 2008)
	Role Balance: refers to balance between the multiple roles people fulfill in their lives, without pitting one role (e.g., work) against the other (e.g., personal life)	"The tendency to become fully engaged in the performance of every role in one's total role system, to approach every typical role and role partner with an attitude of attentiveness and care" (Marks & MacDermid, 1996)	"I am pretty good at keeping different parts of my life in balance" (Marks & MacDermid, 1996)

[a] Categories are mutually exclusive.   [b] Categories are not mutually exclusive.   [c] Language driving coding of conceptual definition as this category is underlined.

following: (a) demands and resources, (b) demands and ability to meet them, or (c) role resources or opportunities and personal needs or values.

Balance. Conceptual and operational definitions were coded as "balance" if the term balance was used in the definition or any of the items.

Conflict. Conceptual and operational definitions were coded as "conflict" when they referenced negative spillover between roles.

Enrichment. Conceptual and operational definitions were coded as "enrichment" if they referenced positive spillover between roles.

Breadth of roles. For conceptual definitions, we coded whether the definition focused on balance between work and family (*work–family balance*), work and nonwork (*work–nonwork balance*), or among all life roles (*role balance*). Operational definitions were coded as "work–family balance" when all items refer only to work and family, as "work–nonwork balance" when items refer to work and nonwork, to "family and personal life" (e.g., Valcour, 2007), or to both work and family and work and nonwork/personal life. Finally, operational definitions were coded as "role balance" when items specified balancing all roles.

Meta-Analytic Review Procedures

We used meta-analysis to examine whether the jingle fallacy (i.e., different measures) contributed to disparate findings by examining whether effect sizes for balance and its satisfaction-based correlates varied by operational definition. All quantitative articles from the literature review were examined to see whether they met the inclusion criteria for our meta-analysis. Studies were included if they had a correlation between an operational definition of balance and job, life, and/or family satisfaction, or another statistic that could be converted to a correlation. We identified 51 papers from our review relevant to the meta-analysis. Next, to increase our *k*, we searched for unpublished papers in the past five conference programs for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology and the Academy of Management and contacted researchers for working papers, which yielded four more papers with five unique samples. We coded the measure in additional papers as described earlier. For all papers, we coded reliability for balance and its correlates. Two researchers coded each article with 98% agreement. In total, we had 48 unique samples for job satisfaction, 28 for life satisfaction, and 21 for family satisfaction. All studies and variables coded for the meta-analysis can be found in the Appendix.

Results

Conceptual Definitions of Balance

The 290 articles included 233[2] conceptual definitions; 20% of articles (*k* = 58) did not have a conceptual definition. Of 233 definitions, 136 (58%) cited an extant definition, most often Clark (2000), Frone (2003), or Grzywacz and Carlson (2007; see Table 2). Yet, 97 (42%) were uniquely developed for a particular research study.

[2] A total of 232 articles included conceptual definitions, one qualitative article included two different conceptual definitions—one from the introduction of article and one provided based on study results.

Table 2
Conceptual Definitions of Balance

Citation	No. of cites[a]	Construct name	Definition provided
Clark (2000)	14	Work-family balance	"Satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home with a minimum of role conflict." (p. 349)
Frone (2003)	13	Work-family balance	"The two primary dimensions [of work-family balance] are the direction of influence between work and family roles (work-to-family vs. family-to-work) and the type of effect (conflict vs. facilitation)." (p. 145)
Grzywacz & Carlson (2007)	13	Work-family balance	"Accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domain." (p. 458)
Marks & MacDermid (1996)	10	Role balance	"The tendency to become fully engaged in the performance of every role in one's total role system, to approach every typical role and role partner with an attitude of attentiveness and care." (p. 421)
Valcour (2007)	10	Satisfaction with work-family balance	"An overall level of contentment resulting from an assessment of one's degree of success at meeting work and family role demands." (p. 1512)
Greenhaus & Allen (2011)	8	Work-family balance	"An overall appraisal of the extent to which individuals' effectiveness and satisfaction in work and family roles are consistent with their life values at a given point in time." (p. 174)
Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw (2003)	6	Work-family balance	"The extent to which an individual is equally engaged in and equally satisfied with his or her work role and family role." (p. 513)
Voydanoff (2005)	4	Work-family balance	"A global assessment that work and family resources are sufficient to meet work and family demands such that participation is effective in both domains." (p. 825)
Hill et al. (2001)	4	Work-family balance	"The degree to which an individual is able to simultaneously balance the temporal, emotional and behavioral demands of both paid work and family responsibilities." (p. 49)
Pocock (2005)	4	Work-life balance	"People having a measure of control over when, where and how they work. It is achieved when an individual's right to a fulfilled life inside and outside paid work is accepted and respected as the norm to the mutual benefit of the individual, business and society." (p. 201)
Kalliath & Brough (2008)	3	Work-life balance	"The individual perception that work and non-work activities are compatible and promote growth in accordance with an individual's current life priorities." (p. 326)
Kirchmeyer (2000)	3	Work-life balance	"Achieving satisfying experiences in all life domains . . . requires personal resources like energy, time, and commitment to be well distributed across domains." (p. 81)

Note. Includes all conceptual definitions cited three or more times.
[a] Original article not included in number of times cited.

Theoretical basis. In 171 of 233 conceptual definitions (73%), no theory was used as a basis for the definition (see Table 3). In the 62 definitions that invoked theory, 47 unique theories were used (see Table 3). Role balance theory ($k = 17$) was most common, followed by role enhancement theory ($k = 9$), boundary/border theory ($k = 9$), and role conflict theory ($k = 8$).

Key features. Of 233 conceptual definitions (see Table 4), most were conceptualized by the authors as unidimensional (81%), psychological (88%), and drew on multiple meanings (74%). Effectiveness was most often invoked as a meaning (45%), followed by satisfaction (35%) and fit (35%), conflict (30%) and involvement (26%). Half (51%) of definitions referred to work–nonwork balance, a third (33%) to work–family balance, and 15% to role balance.

Operational Definitions of Balance

As shown in Table 5, 126 of 204 operational definitions (62%) were drawn from past studies, but 78 (38%) were created for that specific study. Of 126 measures from past research, 34 used conflict and enrichment scales, 16 used conflict scales, 11 used the Valcour (2007) scale, and 10 used the Marks and MacDermid (1996) scale. Of 78 measures developed by the authors, 64 were treated as unidimensional. Of 204 operationalizations, 19% used single-items and most (94%) assessed balance with single-source data. Three of the four studies using only relational items and 11 of 13 studies using both relational items and psychological items

used only self-report data, even though views of role partners are central to relational definitions of balance.

As noted in Table 4, in terms of key features, most operational definitions were unidimensional (72%), psychological (91%), and drew from multiple meanings (74%). Operationally, most studies defined balance with conflict (40%) and the term "balance" (40%), followed by effectiveness (36%) and satisfaction (36%), and involvement (30%). Of 204 measures, 60% were coded as work–nonwork, 25% as work–family, and 14% as role balance.

Calculation of (Dis)agreement Among Balance Definitions: Extent of Jingle Fallacy

In addition to describing *how* balance definitions differ, we wanted to quantify the *degree* of differences in definitions. To quantify the extent of the jingle fallacy (i.e., (dis)agreement about conceptual and operational definitions), we used the Euclidian distance (i.e., D-score), a measure of separation often used to capture average person-to-person differences within groups (Riordan & Wayne, 2008). In this context, conceptually, D-scores capture the average dyadic differences (disagreement) in definitions among those in a specific group. The computational formula for Euclidean distance is SQRT $[\Sigma(S_i - S_j)^2/(n)]$, where S denotes the attribute of a definition (e.g., effectiveness meaning), i and j represent individual definitions in a group and *n* signifies group size (Harrison & Klein, 2007). We corrected for bias due to group size (Biemann & Kearney, 2010). For each definition, the closer a

Table 3
Theoretical Foundation of Conceptual Definitions

Theoretical basis for definition[a]	Total articles
Role balance theory	17
Role enhancement theory	9
Boundary/border theory	9
Role conflict/interference theory	8
Role theory	6
Scarcity theory/depletion hypothesis	6
Conservation of Resources (COR) model	4
Demands-resources model	4
Spillover theory	4
Self-discrepancy theory	3
Identity theory	3
Classical test theory/Formative and reflective measurement model	3
Systems theory	3
Segmentation theory	2
Compensation theory	2
Symbolic interaction theory	2
Positive psychology	2
Psychological well-being theory	2
Person-environment fit theory	2
Life course perspective	2
Life balance model	2
Generalized other theory	2
Social behaviorism	2
Occupational therapy perspective	2
Time use perspective	2
Ethical ideologies/stakeholder perspective	2
Instrumental theory	2
Multi-activity theory	1
Developmental theory	1
Social exchange theory	1
Congruence model	1
Resource drain model	1
Framework of ethical ideologies	1
Gender equality theory	1
Cognitive appraisal theory	1
Social constructivism theory	1
Self-discrepancy theory	1
Role salience theory	1
Need hierarchy theory	1
Self-determination theory	1
Time bind theory	1
Theory of multiple selves	1
Work-life fit model	1
Person-centered approach	1
Preference theory	1
Meaningful life theory	1
Kaleidoscope career model	1
No theoretical basis	171

[a] A total of 233 conceptual definitions were identified, of which 62 had a theoretical basis. Sum of number of definitions using each theory is larger than 62 because definitions can reference multiple theories.

D-score is to 1, the more dissimilar the definition is to other definitions in the group.

First, we calculated D-scores for each definition in our data set relative to all other definitions in the data set. For each definition, a D-score was computed for meaning, property, and dimensionality relative to other definitions. For meaning, we calculated a D-score for each meaning (satisfaction, effectiveness, importance, involvement, conflict, enrichment, equality, and fit), and averaged them for an average meaning D-score. Next, we calculated average

D-scores for dimensionality and properties. Finally, we formed an overall D-score by averaging D-scores for dimensionality, properties, and all eight meanings to quantify the extent of disagreement when considering all three characteristics of balance.

To interpret the extent of the jingle fallacy, we averaged D-scores within our data set for each definition and computed a ratio of each D-score relative to its maximum.[3] Ratios were directly comparable across D-scores (i.e., property, dimensionality, meaning, overall) and ranged from 0 to 1, like correlations. We drew from Cohen (1988) to interpret ratio size (and thus, jingle fallacy): .1 (small, minor jingle fallacy), .3 (medium, moderate jingle fallacy), and .5 (large, severe jingle fallacy). Ratios for overall conceptual and operational definitions were large at .63 (.340/.541), and .60 (.327/.541), respectively, revealing severe jingle fallacy. Ratios were even larger for meaning at .72 (.361/.5) for conceptual and .69 (.344/.5) for operational definitions, showing major disagreement. There was more agreement about conceptualizing balance as unidimensional, with a ratio of .44 (.313/.66), than there was in operationalizing it, with a ratio of .60 (.397/.66); yet both ratios suggest severe jingle fallacy. There was relatively more agreement that balance be conceptualized as psychological, with a ratio of .27 (.205/.75), and higher agreement in operationalizing balance as psychological, with a ratio of .17 (.125/.75).

We also examined trends over time and publication outlet to see whether there may be more agreement about how balance should be defined and measured in more recent years and/or in higher quality journals. To examine time, we grouped papers published in the same year, or for older articles (when balance research was rare), we combined years (i.e., 1996–2002, 2003–2005, 2006–2007) for more equal group sizes. To examine outlet quality, we grouped papers by impact factor (IF) of the outlet where a definition appeared: (a) 2-year IF over 2.0, (b) 2-year IF less than 2.0, and (c) chapters, dissertations, and journals without IF. We used procedures described above to calculate average D-scores and ratios for these groups (available from the first author).

Extent of jingle fallacy over time. To examine whether disagreement varied over time, we correlated publication year with D-scores (average dimensionality, property, meaning, and general D-score). The overall diversity of conceptual definitions increased over time ($r = .15$, $p < .05$). There was no change in meaning-related disagreement ($r = .13$, $p > .05$), but there was greater disagreement in properties over time ($r = .17$, $p < .05$), reflecting more relational conceptualizations, and less disagreement in dimensionality over time ($r = -.14$, $p < .05$), reflecting more convergence to conceptualize balance as unidimensional. For operational definitions, over time, there was no change in overall disagreement ($r = .13$, $p > .05$), meaning ($r = .07$, $p > .05$) or dimensionality ($r = .01$, $p > .05$), but disagreement in property increased over time ($r = .14$, $p < .05$), with more relational items measuring balance.

---

[3] D-scores for a definition range from 0 (lowest possible difference) to 1 (highest possible difference). However, the range of average D-scores in a group depends on how many categories went into calculating it. Meaning D-scores (2 categories) can range 0 to .5; dimensionality D-scores (3 categories) from 0 to .66; property D-scores (4 categories) from 0 to .75; and overall D-scores from 0 to .541. D-Scores cannot be compared for variables with different metrics (Harrison & Klein, 2007), but ratios computed from D-scores are on a common metric and are directly comparable.

Table 4

Key Features of Conceptual and Operational Definitions

Definition	Total conceptual	Quantitative		Qualitative[d]	Non-empirical[d]
		Conceptual	Operational		
Total number of definitions[a]	233	141	204	51	41
Dimensionality[b]					
Unidimensional	189 (81%)	106 (75%)	146 (72%)	46 (90%)	37 (90%)
Multidimensional	43 (18%)	35 (25%)	58 (28%)	4 (8%)	4 (10%)
Could not classify	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Properties[b]					
Psychological	205 (88%)	123 (87%)	186 (91%)	46 (90%)	36 (88%)
Relational	8 (3%)	6 (4%)	4 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Both	12 (5%)	8 (6%)	13 (6%)	2 (4%)	2 (5%)
Could not classify	8 (3%)	4 (3%)	1 (0%)	2 (4%)	2 (5%)
Meanings[c]					
Effectiveness	106 (45%)	64 (45%)	74 (36%)	27 (53%)	15 (37%)
Satisfaction	81 (35%)	47 (33%)	73 (36%)	21 (41%)	13 (32%)
Importance	37 (16%)	22 (16%)	19 (9%)	8 (16%)	7 (17%)
Involvement	60 (26%)	38 (27%)	61 (30%)	17 (33%)	5 (12%)
Conflict	69 (30%)	46 (33%)	82 (40%)	13 (25%)	10 (24%)
Enrichment	28 (12%)	23 (16%)	38 (19%)	1 (2%)	4 (10%)
Balance	28 (12%)	15 (11%)	81 (40%)	5 (10%)	8 (20%)
Equality	36 (15%)	22 (16%)	18 (9%)	6 (12%)	8 (20%)
Fit	82 (35%)	55 (39%)	44 (22%)	16 (31%)	11 (27%)
Number of meanings[b]					
Multiple meanings	172 (74%)	110 (78%)	150 (74%)	36 (71%)	26 (63%)
Single meaning	46 (20%)	5 (4%)	10 (5%)	5 (10%)	5 (12%)
None	15 (6%)	26 (18%)	44 (22%)	10 (20%)	10 (24%)
Breadth of roles[b]					
Work-nonwork balance	119 (51%)	61 (43%)	122 (60%)	38 (75%)	20 (49%)
Work-family balance	78 (33%)	60 (43%)	51 (25%)	7 (14%)	11 (27%)
Role balance	36 (15%)	20 (14%)	28 (14%)	6 (12%)	10 (24%)
Could not classify	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.
[a] Number of definitions differs from the number of articles because some articles provided multiple conceptual and operational definitions of balance. [b] Classification is mutually exclusive. [c] Sum is larger than total number of definitions because definitions often include more than one meaning. [d] Only conceptual definitions are relevant to qualitative and non-empirical studies.

Extent of jingle fallacy by publication quality. Next, we ran one-way ANOVAs to see if D-scores (average property, dimensionality, meaning and overall D-score) differed based on quality of publication outlet (i.e., IF over 2, less than 2, or no IF). For conceptual definitions, outlet quality was unrelated to overall D-score, $F(2, 231) = 2.46$, $p > .05$, meaning, $F(2, 231) = 2.49$, $p > .05$, or property, $F(2, 231) = .53$, $p > .05$, but did relate to the dimensionality D-score, $F(2, 231) = 7.23$, $p < .05$. Tukey post hoc tests revealed disagreement about dimensionality was higher in the group with no IF than in the group with an IF < 2, but neither group differed from the group with IF >2. Higher agreement in outlets with IF < 2 reflects more agreement in conceptualizing balance as unidimensional relative to outlets with no impact factor.

For operational definitions, outlet quality was related to overall D-score, $F(2, 201) = 5.05$, $p < .05$, and dimensionality, $F(2, 201) = 7.72$, $p < .05$. Tukey post hoc tests indicated that, for both dimensionality and overall D-score, groups with IF > 2 and IF < 2 had significantly more agreement than the no IF group but these two groups did not differ from each other. The greater consensus in outlets with an IF reflected their more consistent use of unidimensional measures than outlets with no IF. Agreement did not vary by outlet quality for meaning, $F(2, 201) = 1.13$, $p > .05$ or property, $F(2, 201) = 2.88$, $p > .05$.

Extent of jingle fallacy in higher quality outlets over time. Finally, we examined whether there was greater consensus about meaning and measurement of balance more recently in higher impact outlets. For journals with IF over 2, we calculated D-scores for four time periods (1996–2007, 2008–2011, 2012–2014, 2015–2016) and correlated them with publication year. For conceptual definitions in higher impact journals, there was no change over time for overall D-scores ($r = -.31$, $p > .05$), meanings ($r = -.17$, $p > .05$), or property ($r = .13$, $p > .05$). However, dimensionality D-scores declined over time ($r = -.81$, $p < .05$), revealing more consensus in conceptualizing balance as unidimensional in higher quality outlets. Overall, D-scores for operational definitions declined over time ($r = -.30$, $p < .05$), revealing more agreement in higher quality outlets more recently. There was no change in disagreement of meanings ($r = .04$, $p > .05$), but disagreement declined for dimensionality ($r = -.49$, $p < .05$) and property ($r = -.41$, $p < .05$), reflecting more consensus in higher IF journals over time that balance be measured as unidimensional and psychological.

All 23 conceptual definitions in higher IF journals from 2012–2016 treated balance as unidimensional and 83% viewed it as psychological and distinct from conflict and enrichment. Common meanings were effectiveness ($k = 16$), satisfaction ($k = 14$), and

Table 5
Operational Definitions of Balance

Total number of definitions	204
Source of measure[a]	
Own measure[b]	78 (38%)
Unidimensional measures	64 (31%)
Multidimensional measures	14 (7%)
Previously used measures	126 (62%)
Conflict and enrichment measure	34 (17%)
Conflict measure	16 (8%)
Valcour (2007)	11 (5%)
Marks & McDermid (1996)	10 (5%)
Self-citation[b]	9 (4%)
Carlson et al. (2009)	8 (4%)
Hill et al. (2001)	7 (3%)
Milkie & Peltola (1999)	5 (2%)
Greenhaus et al. (2012)	3 (1%)
Clark (2000)	2 (1%)
Döckel (2003)	2 (1%)
Ezra & Deckman (1996)	2 (1%)
Brett and Stroh (2003)	2 (1%)
Life balance inventory	2 (1%)
Objective time use	2 (1%)
Other measure[c]	11 (5%)
Single versus multi-item[a]	
Single-item	39 (19%)
Multi-item	152 (75%)
Number of items not provided	13 (6%)
Single versus multi-source[a]	
Single-source (self-report)	191 (94%)
Operationalization is psychological	176 (86%)
Operationalization is relational	3 (1%)
Operationalization is both	11 (5%)
Operationalization could not be classified	1 (<1%)
Multi-source (self- and other-report)	13 (6%)
Operationalization is psychological	10 (5%)
Operationalization is relational	1 (<1%)
Operationalization is both	2 (1%)

[a] Classification is mutually exclusive. [b] Scales in the own measure category were developed by the authors in the same study, while self-citation refers use of a scale developed by the same authors in a previously published study. [c] Measures that were cited only once were grouped together as other measure.

fit ($k = 13$); fewer definitions referenced importance ($k = 8$), involvement ($k = 2$), and equality ($k = 1$). Thus, in recent, higher quality outlets, balance is usually conceptualized as a unidimensional psychological construct with multiple meanings, particularly fit, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

Of 26 operationalizations in better journals from 2012–2016, 88% treated balance as unidimensional and 96% as psychological. Common meanings were satisfaction ($k = 15$) and effectiveness ($k = 12$). Fewer studies drew on fit ($k = 8$), conflict ($k = 8$), involvement ($k = 6$), enrichment ($k = 3$), equality ($k = 2$), and importance ($k = 0$). In short, in better journals more recently, authors typically measure balance as unidimensional and psychological, with satisfaction and effectiveness as primary meanings.

Cluster Analyses of Conceptual and Operational Definitions

In the 233 conceptual and 204 operational definitions to date in the literature, there are many unique conceptual ($k = 137$) and operational definitions ($k = 97$). To explore whether they could be reduced to a smaller number based on substantive differences, we used the asw.cluster package in R, which is designed to calculate diversity faultlines. Faultlines are "hypothetical dividing lines" (Lau & Murnighan, 1998, p. 328) defined by a group's alignment of attributes that accentuate within-group similarities and between-groups differences (Lawrence & Zyphur, 2011). Faultlines assume that attributes acquire meaning interdependently and are "defined by the joint distribution of several attributes rather than the individual distributions of each" (Lawrence & Zyphur, 2011, p. 33). This accounts for the fact that definitions include multiple meanings and is appropriate to reduce the definitions into a smaller number.

We found six clusters of conceptual and six clusters of operational definitions (see Table 6 and 7, respectively). We labeled them based on key meanings present in more than 50% of definitions, consistent with Lawrence and Zyphur (2011). This resulted in five interpretable conceptual definition clusters. All six clusters of operationalizations were interpretable. Although six clusters were identified for both conceptual and operational definitions, they did not clearly match each other, suggesting a likely disconnect between conceptual definitions and measures. Next, we examined whether distinct measures had implications for nomological correlates.

Meta-Analysis: Implications of Jingle and Jangle Fallacies

To examine the implications of the jingle fallacy, we conducted meta-analysis with Schmidt and Hunter's (2015) random effects

Table 6
Cluster Analysis of Meanings Present in Conceptual Definitions of Balance

No.	Cluster label	No. of conceptual definitions in cluster	Satisfaction	Effectiveness	Fit	Conflict	Enrichment	Involvement	Equality	Importance
			Meanings invoked in more than 50% of conceptual definitions							
1	Satisfaction, effectiveness, fit	43	x	x	x					
2	Conflict, enrichment	40				x	x			
3	Not interpretable	43								
4	Effectiveness, fit	42		x	x					
5	Involvement, equality	42						x	x	
6	Satisfaction, effectiveness, conflict	23	x	x		x				

Note. No. = number.

Table 7
Cluster Analysis of Meanings Present in Operational Definitions of Balance

No.	Cluster label	No. of operational definitions in cluster	Meanings invoked in more than 50% of operational definitions							
			Satisfaction	Effectiveness	Fit	Conflict	Enrichment	Involvement	Equality	Importance
1	Satisfaction, effectiveness, fit, involvement	22	x	x	x			x		
2	Conflict, enrichment	38				x	x			
3	Involvement, importance	23						x		x
4	Effectiveness	42		x						
5	Satisfaction	36	x							
6	Conflict	43				x				

Note. No. = number.

model to evaluate whether different operational definitions influenced the size of the relationships between balance and its satisfaction-based correlates. Statistics other than correlations[4] were transformed per Peterson and Brown (2005) and Schmidt and Hunter (2015). For meta-analyses of overall balance, a composite effect size was calculated if a study included multiple measures of balance. To calculate effects in each cluster of operational definitions, we included all individual effect sizes if multiple measures of balance fell in different clusters, and created composite effect sizes if multiple measures fell in the same cluster. Population effect sizes were adjusted for unreliability in both balance and the correlate based on reliability from individual studies.[5] When reliability was not reported, we developed an artifact distribution and imputed the weighted mean reliability from other studies. Different artifact distributions were constructed for each meta-analysis: for overall effect sizes for balance, reliabilities of all measures were used (artifact distribution = .84); for the effect size for all balance measures (all measures other than conflict and enrichment), reliabilities of conflict and enrichment measures were removed (artifact distribution = .86); for effect sizes within a cluster, we used reliabilities of the balance measures in that cluster (cluster 1 = .87; cluster 3 = .74; cluster 4 = .87; cluster 5 = .80). No artifact distribution was created for conflict and enrichment measures because all measures could be corrected individually. Reliabilities for single-item measures of balance were corrected with the Spearman-Brown formula, following others (e.g., Joseph, Jin, Newman, & O'Boyle, 2015; McKay & McDaniel, 2006; Roth, Huffcutt, & Bobko, 2003). Artifact distributions of .82, .81, and .90 were used for job satisfaction, life satisfaction and family satisfaction, respectively. For single-item measures of the correlates, we imputed a reliability of .69 based on Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997).[6]

We identified 48 unique samples for the correlation of balance with job satisfaction [N = 76,730]. As shown in Table 8, the average weighted correlation was .35 (SD_r = .08). The 95% CI [.32, .37] did not include zero. The estimated mean-corrected correlation between balance and job satisfaction was .48 (SD_ρ = .16). The 90% credibility interval of [.21, .75] indicated that balance and job satisfaction were positively related in most studies, but the strength of the relationship varied considerably. The Q-test (Cochran, 1954) was significant, indicating heterogeneity, and the I^2 of 93.11% indicated high between—studies variability, as values over 75% (I^2 = 75) are considered high (Higgins & Thompson, 2002).

We identified 28 unique samples for the balance-life satisfaction relationship [N = 19,096]. Table 9 shows an average weighted correlation of .44 (SD_r = .12), with a 95% CI [.39, .48]. The estimated mean-corrected correlation was .55 (SD_ρ = .14), with a 90% credibility interval of [.32, .78]. The Q-test was significant and the I^2 of 93.73% indicated high between—studies variability.

Finally, we identified 21 unique samples with correlations between balance and family satisfaction [N = 11,285]. Table 10 shows that the average weighted correlation was .34 (SD_r = .15). The 95% CI [.28, .41] did not include zero. The estimated mean-corrected correlation was .48 (SD_ρ = .17). The 90% credibility interval of [.20, .75] revealed considerable variance in effect size. The Q-test was significant and I^2 = 93.96%, indicated high between—studies variability.

Moderator Analysis

To account for unexplained variance in meta-analytic correlations, we conducted subgroup analysis per Schmidt and Hunter (2015). First, we examined the implications of labeling measures of conflict and enrichment as balance (a form of the jangle fallacy) by conducting meta-analyses of work-to-nonwork[7] and nonwork-to-work conflict and enrichment and a separate meta-analysis of balance measures.[8] This allowed us to examine whether effect sizes for conflict and/or enrichment scales differ from balance measures. Because conflict and enrichment are distinct bidirectional constructs (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996), we conducted separate meta-analyses for the work-to-nonwork and nonwork-to-work directions of both conflict and enrichment. Correlations with conflict

---

[4] For job satisfaction, 1 F test and 2 betas were converted to correlations to include in the meta-analysis. For life satisfaction, all effect sizes were originally reported as correlations. For family satisfaction, 3 F tests and 3 betas were converted for inclusion in the meta-analysis.

[5] Alphas for individually corrected primary studies are reported in the appendix and range from .56 to .97.

[6] Wanous et al. (1997) suggest a range of .45–.69 for reliability of a single-item measure of job satisfaction. We impute the higher value of .69 for a more conservative choice and to avoid overcorrecting for measurement error.

[7] We use the broader terms work-to-nonwork and nonwork-to-work conflict and enrichment, but included both measures that focused on work–nonwork and work–family in these meta-analyses.

[8] We use the term "balance measures" to refer to the aggregate of all measures in the four clusters that did not include conflict or enrichment.

Table 8

Meta-Analysis of Balance Measures With Job Satisfaction

Balance measure	k	N	r	SD_r	95% CI	ρ_c	SD_ρ	90% CV	Q (df)	I^2
All measures (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)[a]	48	76,730	.35	.08	[.32, .37]	.48	.16	[.21, .75]	682.39 (47)*	93.11
Balance scales (1, 3, 4, 5)[a]	32	70,441	.35	.08	[.32, .38]	.48	.14	[.26, .70]	575.31 (31)*	94.61
Specific balance clusters										
Sat, effect, involve & fit (1)[a]	9	24,077	.32	.08	[.26, .38]	.38	.09	[.23, .54]	223.59 (8)*	96.42
Involvement & importance (3)[a]	3	641	.33	.08	[.22, .44]	.40	.12	[.21, .60]	8.00 (2)*	75.01
Effectiveness (4)[a]	15	6,138	.42	.11	[.36, .48]	.50	.10	[.33, .67]	132.09 (14)*	89.40
Satisfaction (5)[a]	8	43,447	.36	.05	[.33, .40]	.56	.08	[.42, .69]	160.14 (7)*	95.63
Conflict and enrichment measures labeled as balance[b]										
All conflict measures (reverse coded)	11	4,445	.25	.08	[.20, .31]	.33	.09	[.19, .47]	42.65 (10)*	76.55
All enrichment measures	6	1,762	.34	.15	[.21, .46]	.47	.18	[.17, .77]	56.72 (5)*	91.18
Work-to-nonwork conflict (reverse coded) measures	8	3,551	.27	.09	[.20, .34]	.34	.11	[.16, .51]	39.68 (7)*	82.36
Nonwork-to-work conflict (reverse coded) measures	5	1,157	.19	.08	[.10, .27]	.23	.09	[.08, .38]	12.43 (4)*	67.82
Work-to-nonwork enrichment measures	3	617	.37	.08	[.25, .48]	.45	.11	[.28, .63]	8.85 (2)*	77.41
Nonwork-to-work enrichment measures	3	617	.30	.09	[.18, .43]	.39	.12	[.19, .59]	9.34 (2)*	78.59
Number of items										
Single item measures	7	38,361	.37	.04	[.34, .40]	.70	.06	[.60, .81]	93.85 (6)*	93.61
Multi item measures	43	41,277	.33	.10	[.30, .36]	.40	.12	[.21, .59]	556.31 (42)*	92.45
Specific scales										
Carlson et al. (2009)	6	3,564	.46	.12	[.36, .56]	.51	.11	[.33, .69]	84.13 (5)*	94.06
Haar (2013)	3	2,733	.40	.05	[.34, .47]	.50	.06	[.40, .60]	13.68 (2)*	85.38
Valcour (2007)	4	4,140	.47	.08	[.38, .55]	.55	.06	[.45, .65]	50.54 (3)*	94.06

Note. Number of samples in each cluster does not add to total number of samples in the all measure category because composites were created in studies with multiple definitions of balance; r = sample weighted mean correlation; I^2 = percent of total variability attributable to true heterogeneity (between-studies variance).
[a] Number(s) in parentheses refer to the cluster numbers referenced in Table 7 for measures that were included in this meta-analysis. [b] Rather than meta-analyzing measures that fell in certain clusters for conflict and enrichment, we followed previous meta-analyses and meta-analyzed the four bidirectional constructs as well as all conflict measures in aggregate and all enrichment measures in aggregate.
* Q statistic is significant at $p < .05$.

were reverse coded to reflect defining balance as low conflict. Finally, we ran separate meta-analyses on each unique balance cluster.

To compare effect sizes for distinct operationalizations, we used a z test (Raju & Brand, 2003) to compare corrected correlations (see Table 11). Balance measures were more strongly correlated with life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .58$, $r = .47$) than aggregated enrichment measures ($\rho_c = .35$, $r = .26$), $z_\rho = 2.10$, $p < .05$, or work-to-nonwork enrichment ($\rho_c = .28$, $.20$), $z_\rho = 3.00$, $p < .05$. Balance measures had higher effect sizes for job ($\rho_c = .48$. $r = .35$) and life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .58$, $r = .47$) than did nonwork-to-work conflict with either job ($\rho_c = .23$, $r = .19$), $z_\rho = 2.43$, $p < .05$, or life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .24$, $r = .17$), $z_\rho = 3.24$, $p < .05$.

When balance measures were disaggregated into four clusters, the four-meaning cluster (Cluster 1: satisfaction, effectiveness, involvement, and fit) exhibited larger effect sizes with job ($\rho_c = .38$, $r = .32$) and life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .54$, $r = .44$) than did nonwork-to-work conflict (job satisfaction $\rho_c = .23$, $r = .19$, $z_\rho = 2.09$, $p < .05$; life satisfaction $\rho_c = .24$, $r = .17$, $z_\rho = 3.89$, $p < .05$) and work-to-nonwork enrichment for life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .28$, $r = .20$), $z_\rho = 3.70$, $p < .05$, suggesting this operationalization is not interchangeable with conflict or enrichment.

Table 11 also shows that the effect size for involvement/importance measures (cluster 3) with job satisfaction ($\rho_c = .40$, $r = .33$) was larger than that for nonwork-to-work conflict ($\rho_c = .23$, $r = .19$), $z_\rho = 2.00$, $p < .05$. Effectiveness-only measures (cluster 4) exhibited stronger relationships with both job ($\rho_c = .50$, $r = .42$) and life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .56$, $r = .50$) than did nonwork-to-work conflict (job satisfaction $\rho_c = .23$, $r = .19$, $z_\rho = 3.24$, $p < .05$; life

satisfaction $\rho_c = .24$, $r = .17$, $z_\rho = 5.04$, $p < .05$) and a stronger relationship with life satisfaction than work-to-nonwork enrichment ($\rho_c = .28$, $r = .20$), $z_\rho = 5.13$, $p < .05$. Satisfaction-only measures (cluster 5) also had a stronger relationship with job satisfaction ($\rho_c = .56$, $r = .36$) than did work-to-nonwork conflict ($\rho_c = .34$, $r = .27$), $z_\rho = 2.55$, $p < .05$, and nonwork-to-work conflict ($\rho_c = .23$, $r = .19$), $z = 4.38$, $p < .05$, and a larger relationship with life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .69$, $r = .53$) than did nonwork-to-work conflict ($\rho_c = .24$, $r = .17$), $z_\rho = 3.40$, $p < .05$, or work-to-nonwork enrichment ($\rho_c = .28$, $r = .20$), $z_\rho = 3.19$, $p < .05$. In short, balance measures were often more strongly related to satisfaction correlates that were conflict and enrichment, suggesting that balance may differ from these established constructs.

Evidence was weaker that balance measures differ from one another. Satisfaction-only measures were more strongly correlated with job satisfaction ($\rho_c = .56$, $r = .36$) than were the four-meaning measures ($\rho_c = .38$, $r = .32$), $z_\rho = 2.08$, $p < .05$, but no other differences in effect sizes for balance clusters were found. When three or more samples were available, we conducted meta-analyses on published scales (see Tables 8–10). Four scales were used in three or more samples: Carlson et al. (2009); Haar (2013); Valcour (2007), and Marks and MacDermid (1996). The Marks and MacDermid (1996) scale correlated more strongly with life satisfaction ($\rho_c = .61$, $r = .45$) than did the Valcour (2007) scale ($\rho_c = .52$, $r = .42$), $z_\rho = 2.08$, $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

Finally, there were enough studies for job (see Table 8) and family (see Table 10) satisfaction to compare single- to multiitem measures of balance. Counter to expectations, there was a larger

Table 9

Meta-Analysis of Balance Measures With Life Satisfaction

Relationship	k	N	r	SD_r	95% CI	ρ_c	SD_ρ	90% CV	Q (df)	I^2
All measures (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)[a]	28	19,096	.44	.12	[.39, .48]	.55	.14	[.32, .78]	430.58 (27)*	93.73
Balance measures (1, 3, 4, 5)[a]	20	15,213	.47	.09	[.43, .51]	.58	.11	[.39, .77]	208.14 (19)*	90.87
Specific balance clusters										
Sat, effect, involve & fit (1)[a]	7	9,748	.44	.04	[.40, .47]	.54	.06	[.44, .63]	31.90 (6)*	81.19
Involvement & importance (3)[a]	4	808	.37	.18	[.18, .55]	.48	.25	[.06, .90]	38.89 (3)*	92.29
Effectiveness (4)[a]	5	1,594	.50	.05	[.44, .56]	.56	.00	[.56, .56]	11.88 (4)*	66.34
Satisfaction (5)[a]	6	5,971	.53	.06	[.48, .58]	.69	.14	[.45, .92]	47.51 (5)*	89.48
Conflict and enrichment measures labeled as balance[b]										
All conflict measures (reverse coded)	6	3,194	.32	.14	[.21, .44]	.47	.17	[.19, .76]	79.73 (5)*	93.73
All enrichment measures	7	3,373	.26	.10	[.18, .34]	.35	.12	[.15, .55]	47.37 (6)*	87.33
Work-to-nonwork conflict (reverse coded) measures	6	3,194	.34	.10	[.26, .43]	.45	.11	[.26, .64]	45.50 (5)*	89.01
Nonwork-to-work conflict (reverse coded) measures	5	2,976	.17	.11	[.07, .27]	.24	.13	[.02, .45]	42.30 (4)*	90.54
Work-to-nonwork enrichment measures	4	2,654	.20	.08	[.11, .28]	.28	.10	[.11, .45]	23.92 (3)*	87.46
Nonwork-to-work enrichment measures	3	2,436	.32	.07	[.23, .40]	.46	.12	[.26, .66]	17.20 (2)*	88.37
Specific scales										
Valcour (2007) measure	3	6,595	.42	.04	[.37, .46]	.52	.06	[.41, .63]	14.93 (2)*	86.60
Marks & MacDermid (1996) measure	3	678	.45	.00	[.41, .49]	.61	.00	[.61, .61]	1.36 (2)	0[c]

Note. Number of samples in each cluster does not add to total number of samples in the all measure category because composites were created in studies with multiple definitions of balance; r = sample weighted mean correlation; I^2 = percent of total variability due to true heterogeneity (between-studies variance).
[a] Number(s) in parentheses refer to the clusters numbers referenced in Table 7 for all clusters with measures that were included in this meta-analysis. [b] Rather than meta-analyzing measures that fell in certain clusters for conflict and enrichment, we followed previous meta-analyses and meta-analyzed the four bidirectional constructs as well as all conflict measures in aggregate and all enrichment measures in aggregate. [c] Higgins & Thompson (2002) suggest that when Q < df and I^2 is negative, I^2 be rounded to 0.
* Q statistic is significant at $p < .05$.

effect size with job satisfaction for single- (ρ_c = .70, r = .37) over multiitem measures (ρ_c = .40, r = .33), z_ρ = 3.27, $p < .05$. This finding may reflect overcorrection for attenuation when imputing the corrected reliability of a single-item measure with the Spearman-Brown formula, as there was no difference in uncorrected effect sizes, z_r = .62, $p > .05$.

In sum, results of our meta-analysis suggest significant empirical consequences of committing the jangle fallacy by labeling measures of conflict and enrichment as balance. Balance measures typically correlate more strongly with both job and life satisfaction than do work-to-nonwork conflict and nonwork-to-work enrichment, suggesting that differentiating balance from conflict and enrichment is im-

Table 10

Meta-Analysis of Balance Measures With Family Satisfaction

Relationship	k	N	r	SD_r	95% CI	ρ_c	SD_ρ	90% CV	Q (df)	I^2
All measures (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)[a]	21	11,285	.34	.15	[.28, .41]	.48	.17	[.20, .75]	331.36 (20)*	93.96
Balance measures (1, 3, 4, 5)[a]	18	10,301	.34	.15	[.27, .41]	.46	.16	[.20, .71]	323.19 (17)*	94.74
Specific balance clusters										
Sat, effect, involve & fit (1)[a]	4	3,959	.41	.13	[.28, .53]	.49	.13	[.28, .70]	96.92 (3)*	96.90
Involvement & importance (3)[a]	4	916	.31	.10	[.20, .42]	.36	.11	[.18, .55]	14.86 (3)*	79.82
Effectiveness (4)[a]	8	3,452	.46	.16	[.35, .57]	.54	.15	[.29, .80]	142.66 (7)*	95.09
Satisfaction (5)[a]	5	5,825	.26	.07	[.20, .32]	.39	.08	[.27, .52]	34.16 (4)*	88.29
Conflict measures labeled as balance[b]										
All conflict measures (reverse coded)	4	1,682	.22	.10	[.11, .32]	.26	.11	[.07, .44]	21.70 (3)*	86.18
Number of items										
Single item measure	6	6,478	.26	.08	[.19, .33]	.47	.14	[.70, .24]	55.04 (5)*	90.92
Multi item measure	17	7,715	.39	.14	[.32, .46]	.46	.18	[.75, .17]	223.13 (16)*	92.83
Specific scales										
Carlson et al. (2009) measure	4	2,537	.56	.10	[.46, .66]	.61	.11	[.42, .79]	57.96 (3)*	94.82
Marks & MacDermid (1996) measure	5	842	.32	.10	[.21, .43]	.41	.12	[.21, .60]	16.14 (4)*	75.21

Note. Number of samples in each cluster does not add to total number of samples in the all measure category because composites were created in studies with multiple definitions of balance; r = sample weighted mean correlation; I^2 = percent of total variability attributable to true heterogeneity (between-studies variance).
[a] Number(s) in parentheses refer to the cluster numbers referenced in Table 7 for all clusters with measures that were included in this meta-analysis. [b] Rather than meta-analyzing measures that fell in certain clusters for conflict and enrichment, we followed previous meta-analyses and meta-analyzed all conflict measures in aggregate.
* Q statistic is significant at $p < .05$.

Table 11
Z Tests Comparing Corrected Nomological Validities for Different Operational Definitions of Balance

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Balance measures[8] (1, 3, 4, 5)[a]										
2. Satisfaction, Effectiveness, Involvement & Fit (1)[a]										
JS	.91									
LS	.42									
FS	.21									
3. Involvement & Importance (3)[a]										
JS	.65	.24								
LS	.52	.34								
FS	.79	1.16								
4. Effectiveness (4)[a]										
JS	.16	1.30	.94							
LS	.24	.45	.46							
FS	.52	.35	1.40							
5. Satisfaction (5)[a]										
JS	.66	2.08*	1.58	.59						
LS	.77	1.21	1.01	1.12						
FS	.59	.96	.36	1.24						
6. All conflict measures (reverse coded)										
JS	1.42	.66	.81	1.95	2.87*					
LS	.72	.52	.03	.72	1.29					
FS	1.65	2.16*	1.17	2.27*	1.74					
7. All enrichment measures										
JS	.06	.66	.47	.19	.59	1.05				
LS	2.10*	2.29*	.69	2.98*	2.50*	.89				
FS	—	—	—	—	—					
8. Work-to-Nonwork Conflict (reverse coded)										
JS	1.29	.53	.69	1.75	2.55*	.08	.97			
LS	1.16	1.04	.16	1.46	1.74	.18	.96			
FS	—	—	—	—	—	—				
9. Nonwork-to-Work Conflict (reverse coded)										
JS	2.43*	2.09*	2.00*	3.24*	4.38*	1.52	1.82	1.42		
LS	3.24*	3.89*	1.31	5.04*	3.40*	1.74	1.18	2.13*		
FS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—			
10. Work-to-Nonwork Enrichment										
JS	.23	.80	.49	.46	1.09	1.43	.13	1.26	2.70*	
LS	3.00*	3.70*	1.10	5.13*	3.19*	1.47	.78	1.81	.50	
FS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
11. Nonwork-to-Work Enrichment										
JS	.77	.09	.13	1.07	1.73	.66	.57	.55	1.85	.63
LS	1.01	.84	.10	1.20	1.61	.09	1.03	.11	2.14*	1.83
FS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

Note. JS = job satisfaction; LS = life satisfaction; FS = family satisfaction.
[a] Number(s) in parentheses refer to the cluster numbers for all clusters with measures that were included in this meta-analysis.
* $p < .05$.

portant. Though some authors have committed the jangle fallacy by measuring balance with conflict and/or enrichment scales, balance has been, and we argue should be, defined as a unique construct.

We found less evidence of empirical consequences of the jingle fallacy. Of the four balance clusters, just two exhibited differences in their nomological network, with satisfaction-only measures exhibiting stronger relationships with job satisfaction than four-meaning measures. Because using clusters for meta-analyses (rather than original scales) resulted in within-cluster variability in measures, when we had three or more samples, we conducted meta-analyses on the original scales. The higher effect size for life satisfaction using Marks and MacDermid (1996) rather than Valcour (2007) suggests that scale choice affects empirical findings. As such, treating all balance measures as the same (i.e., the jingle fallacy) may produce inconsistent findings about the magnitude of relationships. Still, as balance effect sizes tend to differ in magnitude but not direction and many clusters

showed similar effect sizes, balance may be best reflected as a higher order construct with multiple overlapping meanings.

Discussion

The concept of balance is ubiquitous. Working mothers and fathers, single and nonparent workers all want to achieve this elusive thing called balance. Our meta-analysis indicates that balance relates to job, life, and family satisfaction, suggesting the importance of its further study. Scholars who wish to develop theory and study balance are hindered by poor construct clarity. The jingle and jangle fallacies, common problems for emerging constructs, prevent theory and research from advancing (Suddaby, 2010). To theorize about or study balance, we must understand what it is and how to measure it. In our discussion, we summarize key problems in the balance litera-

Table 12
Z Test for Corrected Correlations From Independent Samples Comparing Different Scales of Balance

Measure	Carlson measure			Haar measure			Marks & MacDermid measure		
	JS	LS	FS	JS	LS	FS	JS	LS	FS
Carlson measure									
Haar measure	.11	—	—						
Marks & MacDermid measure	—	—	1.74	—	—	—			
Valcour measure	.44	—	—	.81	—	—	—	2.08*	—

Note. JS = job satisfaction; LS = life satisfaction; FS = family satisfaction.
* $p < .05$.

ture and make recommendations for beginning to remedy them (see Table 13).

Major Issues Identified in the Balance Literature

First, a major concern is the low consensus about the meaning of balance, exacerbated by the fact that, in many studies, scholars did not provide a conceptual definition at all. This is a major omission as theory development rests on a precise definition of the central construct (Suddaby, 2010). Conceptual definitions may be excluded when there is consensus about the meaning of a construct. Yet, given high overall D-scores for conceptualizations of balance, no such agreement about balance exists. Of 233 conceptual definitions, 137 of them were unique, and cluster analysis found five interpretable, substantively different meanings: (a) satisfaction, effectiveness, and fit, (b) conflict and enrichment, (c) effectiveness and fit, (d) involvement and equality, and (e) satisfaction, effectiveness, and conflict, evidence of the jingle fallacy. This poor consensus about the meaning of balance may reflect the fact that theory was rarely used to define balance. When it was, there was much disparity, with scholars drawing on 47 distinct theories.

Second, many scholars who claim to study balance have committed the jangle fallacy. Almost a third of conceptualizations and 40% of operationalizations of balance included conflict, and 12% of conceptualizations and 19% of operationalizations included enrichment. Our meta-analysis found that balance measures were more strongly related to satisfaction correlates than were conflict and enrichment, highlighting the importance of differentiating balance from conflict and enrichment. A positive trend is that labeling conflict and enrichment measures as balance is on the decline more recently in better journals.

Third, closer attention to how balance is measured is needed. Cluster analysis revealed four operational definitions of balance different from conflict and enrichment. Cluster 1 included four

meanings (effectiveness, fit, satisfaction, and involvement); the other clusters involved two meanings (involvement and importance) or a single meaning (effectiveness or satisfaction). In aggregate, balance measures often exhibited stronger relationships with satisfaction correlates than conflict and enrichment, but the evidence was weaker that balance measures could be discriminated from one another. Although satisfaction-only balance measures were more strongly correlated with job satisfaction than were four-meaning measures, effect sizes for other balance operational definitions did not differ from each other. Notably, correlates in our meta-analysis were all satisfaction-based; as such, different balance measures may show unique relationships if different variables are considered (e.g., performance; withdrawal behaviors). In short, the balance construct is not well-understood but may involve multiple meanings.

Finally, our review speaks to concerns about balance measures. Relative to work–family research in general, there are more problems with measurement in the balance literature. Almost one fifth of balance measures were single items, whereas a review of work–family research found only 4% of measures used single items (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007). Single items are a problem because internal consistency cannot be assessed, and complex constructs, like balance, cannot adequately be captured (Loo, 2002). Studies of balance more often used their own measures (38%) than tends to occur in the work–family literature (31%) more generally (Casper et al., 2007). Finally, cluster analyses tentatively suggest that measures do not always align with conceptualizations, raising construct validity concerns. One example of such misalignment was that relational definitions were most often assessed with single-source, self-report measures from the focal person. Because relational items reflect shared expectations between role partners, capturing perceptions of both self and role partners may be more suitable. Construct validity problems such as those raised here are a major impediment to

Table 13
Recommendations for Balance Researchers Based on Review Findings

1. Address the jangle fallacy by conceptualizing, measuring, and studying balance as distinct from conflict and enrichment.
2. Specify the conceptual definition of balance in all research.
3. Ensure construct adequacy by including satisfaction, involvement, effectiveness, and fit in definitions of balance.
4. Adopt the term work-nonwork balance and incorporate multiple nonwork roles into definitions and measures.
5. Develop and validate multi-item measures that align with conceptual definition to enhance construct validity.
    a. Use multidimensional scales when balance is defined as multiple dimensions with distinct meanings.
6. Measure relational balance constructs with multi-source data.
7. Begin to develop comprehensive theory about balance and its nomological network, based on attitude and P-E fit theory.

theory building—that is, when measures tap variance other than the latent construct of interest, findings do not provide knowledge about the focal construct (Schwab, 1980).

In sum, our review documents problems with jingle and jangle fallacies in defining and measuring balance that persist across time and publication outlet. Although recent research in better journals tends to conceptualize balance as unidimensional and distinct from conflict and enrichment, disagreement persists, even in better journals, about meanings attributed to balance (e.g., effectiveness, satisfaction, involvement, importance).

Addressing the Jangle Fallacy: Do We Need the Balance Construct?

Given that many scholars have committed the jangle fallacy by labeling measures of conflict and/or enrichment as balance, we consider whether balance adds value to the literature. Several scholars have found balance measures are empirically distinct from and predict job and family variables above conflict and enrichment (Carlson et al., 2009; De Hauw, 2014; Grawitch, Maloney, Barber, & Mooshegian, 2013; Wayne, Butts, Casper, & Allen, 2017). We contribute to this evidence by finding clusters of conceptual and operational definitions of balance different from conflict and enrichment. Our meta-analysis found that corrected effect sizes for balance were higher than those for conflict and enrichment, suggesting the value of studying balance, given its relationship to important attitudes. This evidence and trends in better journals toward differentiating balance from conflict and enrichment suggest the value of defining balance as a nondirectional perception of how one manages work and nonwork simultaneously (Carlson et al., 2009; Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Marks & MacDermid, 1996; Valcour, 2007).

Addressing the Jingle Fallacy: How Do We Define Balance?

To begin to remedy the jingle fallacy, we offer a comprehensive conceptual definition of work–nonwork balance. We focus on work–nonwork balance because it is a broad construct including nonwork areas beyond family (e.g., Bellavia & Frone, 2005; Casper & DePaulo, 2012). A broad focus is important because people hold multiple nonwork identities (e.g., friend, volunteer; Thoits, 1983) that vary in salience between people and within the same person over time (Super, 1980). Moreover, because work is a central focus of organizational psychologists, we avoid overly broad terms like "role balance" that can apply to balance only between roles (e.g., leisure enthusiast, hobbyist) outside of work. Finally, the term work–life balance is popular, but imprecise because it implies that work is not part of life. In sum, the term work–nonwork balance includes all salient roles, retains work as one role, and is a precise label.

The literature on construct measurement notes the importance of defining the conceptual domain of a construct (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2016). In defining a construct, the goal is to capture the most relevant and important aspects of the concept and ensure it reflects the words, experiences, and perspective of the population of interest (Brod, Tesler, & Christensen, 2009). Brod et al. (2009) suggest that to ensure content validity,

researchers should draw from a comprehensive literature review, expert opinion, and the population's perspective through qualitative research to define a construct domain. In defining work–nonwork balance, we considered three sources. First, we drew from our review and analysis of how balance is defined by scholars. Second, we consulted dictionary meanings of balance to ensure consistency between our definition and everyday uses of the term. Finally, we consulted qualitative research in which employees, as subject matter experts, identified what they mean when they use the term balance.

Our review indicated that scholars most often define balance as a psychological construct with multiple meanings, particularly effectiveness (45%), satisfaction (35%), fit (35%), and involvement (26%). Recent research (Wayne et al., 2017) found that different balance meanings (i.e., satisfaction and effectiveness) were not interchangeable and should be treated as distinct. Balance has many distinct dictionary definitions (www.merriam-webster .com), including an "aesthetically pleasing integration of elements," "mental and emotional steadiness," "a counterbalancing weight, force or influence," and "equipoise between contrasting, opposing, or interacting elements." Finally, we consulted a qualitative study that asked 753 employees "When you think about work–family balance, what does that mean to you? How do YOU define work–family balance?" (Allen, Wayne, Casper, & Caza, 2012). The primary themes mentioned by at least 15% of employees were (a) adequate time for involvement in both roles (41%), (b) a perception of performing both roles effectively (32%), (c) satisfaction and positive affect in both roles (16%), and (d) being mentally present and engaged in both roles (15%). As such, the perspective, experiences, and words of employees suggest that involvement, effectiveness, and satisfaction are key meanings attributed to balance. Notably, 10% of employees defined balance as a fit with values, but no employee (0%) defined balance by invoking equality.

Several themes across these three sources converge to suggest how balance should be defined. First, balance is a psychological construct that reflects an individual's own view rather than the view of others (i.e., relational definitions). Second, balance is a complex construct with multiple meanings that should be distinguished. Third, common meanings across scholarly experts and views of the population are satisfaction, involvement, effectiveness, and fit. Based on these three sources, we propose that work–nonwork balance be defined as:

> *Employees' evaluation of the favorability of their combination of work and nonwork roles, arising from the degree to which their affective experiences and their perceived involvement and effectiveness in work and nonwork roles are commensurate with the value they attach to these roles.*

Next, we elaborate on each aspect of this comprehensive definition.

Combination of work and nonwork roles. We view balance as employees' appraisals of how well they combine work with nonwork roles. This reflects recent definitions (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Kalliath & Brough, 2008; Valcour, 2007; Voydanoff, 2005) of balance as an overall assessment of work and nonwork roles simultaneously instead of a directional perception of one role interfering with or enriching another. We see balance as an attitude—"a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a

particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor" (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 1)—where the entity is the "combination of work and nonwork roles." Like other attitudes, work–nonwork balance arises from both affective and cognitive factors (Petty, Wegener, & Fabrigar, 1997; Van den Berg, Manstead, van der Pligt, & Wigboldus, 2006) that people consider in appraising their balance. Research indicates that cognitive and affective aspects of attitudes are distinct and that different people weigh cognitive and affective aspects differently in making an overall evaluation (Huskinson & Haddock, 2006; Van den Berg et al., 2006). As such, overall attitudes are best assessed by capturing both cognitive and affective aspects of the evaluation (Cervellon & Dubé, 2002).

Affective experiences, involvement, and effectiveness. Consistent with sources described above, how favorably employees evaluate their combination of work and nonwork roles is based on an affective factor (i.e., affective experiences in roles) and two cognitive factors (i.e., involvement in roles, effectiveness in roles). Dictionary definitions include "aesthetically pleasing" or satisfaction-based meanings of balance. Satisfaction, involvement, and effectiveness were all commonly invoked in conceptual definitions in the literature. The inclusion of affect, involvement, and effectiveness also aligns nicely with qualitative findings on how employees define balance wherein two themes relate to involvement (time and psychological involvement), one with effectiveness, and another with satisfaction. As such, our definition reflects not only the scholarly literature but also what *many employees mean* when they use the term balance.[9]

Commensurate with values. The above sources suggest that balance arises from role-related affect, involvement, and effectiveness that are commensurate with the value employees attach to these roles (i.e., fit). That is, employees do not require *equal* affect, involvement, and effectiveness in work and nonwork roles to experience balance. For instance, employees who strongly value work and family roles (but not the volunteer role) experience balance when they are reasonably satisfied, involved, and effective at work and in family, regardless of volunteer role experiences. In contrast, employees who strongly value all three roles need to be reasonably satisfied, involved, and effective in all roles to experience high balance. Our rejection of equality is consistent with recent scholarly views (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Kalliath & Brough, 2008; Reiter, 2007; Valcour, 2007; Voydanoff, 2005) in which equality is not commonly referenced. In our comprehensive review, conceptual definitions more often invoked fit (35%) than equality (15%). Though equality is one dictionary definition of balance, these definitions also invoke fit (i.e., elements are in "correct proportions"), and a fit-based definition reflects qualitative study findings where 10% of 753 participants referenced fit in defining balance but no one defined it with equality. As such, our notion that work–nonwork balance arises from fit between role-based affect, involvement, and effectiveness and values aligns with dictionary definitions, scholarly views, and employees' own definitions.

Our definition sees balance as an attitude about one's own needs-supplies fit or the degree to which one's needs (i.e., goals or values) are met by what the environment supplies (Kristof, 1996). Our definition implies that people have needs in the form of values or priorities and environmental supplies in the form of role-based affect, involvement, and effectiveness. Needs (i.e., values) are

person-specific and do not presume which "roles or identities . . . are . . . centerpieces of respondents' self-systems" (Marks & MacDermid, 1996, p. 420). This approach reflects recent scholarly views (e.g., Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Kalliath & Brough, 2008) that personal values and priorities are central to how role experiences translate into balance appraisals. Because each person values each role differently, distinct levels of affect, effectiveness, and involvement in work and nonwork roles foster balance for each person.

A multidimensional construct. Scholarly work suggests that in defining a construct one should consider whether there is "more than one conceptually distinguishable facet, aspect, or subdimension" to avoid construct deficiency (MacKenzie et al., 2011, p. 300). Our analysis and prior qualitative research findings (Allen et al., 2012) suggest that affective experiences, involvement, and effectiveness are all critical to avoid construct deficiency. Because these are conceptually different meanings, we view work–nonwork balance as multidimensional. Despite evidence that balance has multiple meanings, trends over time in higher impact journals were toward conceptualizing and measuring balance as unidimensional. A multidimensional definition encourages the field to specify and measure the facets of balance. As fleshing out a construct's facets is central to construct specification (MacKenzie et al., 2011; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 2016), we define the key dimensions of work–nonwork balance below.

We define *affective balance* as "The perception that one experiences sufficiently pleasant emotions in work and nonwork roles commensurate with the value attached to those roles." People should experience high (low) affective balance when they have more (fewer) positive and fewer (more) negative emotions in highly valued roles. We define *effectiveness balance* as "The perception that one's effectiveness in work and nonwork roles is commensurate with the value attached to the roles." People should experience high (low) effectiveness balance when they believe that they perform well (poorly) in highly valued roles. Finally, we define *involvement balance* as "The perception that one's involvement in work and nonwork roles is commensurate with the value attached to the roles." People experience high (low) involvement balance when they believe that they are adequately (inadequately) engaged in highly valued roles.

Comparison With Other Definitions

Our definition differs from extant scholarly definitions, including Greenhaus and Allen's (2011), in at least three key ways. First, as noted earlier, the scope of our balance construct includes work and nonwork roles, whereas Greenhaus and Allen, and 34% of conceptualizations we reviewed, focused only on work and family. Our definition recognizes that the experience of balance incorporates nonwork roles besides family, such as friend, community member, or even the self. Because many roles may matter to a person's identity (Marks & MacDermid, 1996), our definition includes all nonwork roles that may

---

[9] One of the themes mentioned by 13% of respondents in the qualitative study was "having little conflict between roles." We omit conflict from our definition of balance, despite these respondents and the emphasis on conflict in Cluster 2 and 6 to avoid the jangle fallacy by differentiating balance and conflict.

contribute to evaluations of balance, which may be particularly relevant for single and nonparent employees.

Second, our definition is comprehensive in that it includes the most common empirically derived and normative meanings for balance other than conflict: satisfaction, involvement, effectiveness, and fit. Other definitions include one, two, or three meanings (see Table 14), but none have all four. Qualitative findings suggest that all four meanings are key to what people mean when they discuss balance (Allen et al., 2012), so all are important to avoid construct deficiency. Although Greenhaus and Allen (2011) discuss involvement as an antecedent to balance, our definition sees involvement as an element of meaning of balance for three reasons. Theoretically, early research on and definitions of balance (Greenhaus et al., 2003; Marks & MacDermid, 1996) as well as role balance theory (Marks & MacDermid, 1996) consider role involvement as central to how balance is defined and measured. Empirically, involvement is a common meaning in conceptualizations of balance, suggesting scholars see it as important to the definition. Finally, involvement—in terms of time and psychological engagement—was often mentioned by employees in defining balance, with time involvement the most common theme (Allen et al., 2012). As such, including involvement is critical to aligning scholarly definitions with employees' normative definitions. As recent conceptualizations tend to omit involvement (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Kalliath & Brough, 2008; Valcour, 2007), a key contribution of our definition is including involvement as a key element.

Third, our definition of balance is integrative - it draws from various perspectives in conceptualizing what balance is. In addition to

incorporating multiple meanings invoked by scholars and employees, we also reconcile what appears as contradictory arguments about balance. For instance, extant definitions conceptualize balance and measure it as either unidimensional *or* multidimensional. Drawing parallels from the construct of job satisfaction, we conceptualize balance as an attitude that can be assessed *both* as a global unidimensional reflective construct, and as a multidimensional formative construct. Similarly, extant definitions conceptualize balance as either psychological *or* relational. Although we view balance as psychological, we appreciate the merit of relational views. Because a balance evaluation is made within an ecosystem of role senders, we assert that social cues from role partners may be key antecedents of one's balance (see *An Agenda for Future Research* for additional discussion).

Finally, the theoretical foundation of our definition also differentiates it from others, as few authors provided a theoretical basis. Like Valcour (2007), we draw from attitude theory to define work–nonwork balance as an attitude; yet, we also draw from P-E fit theory to discuss balance as an attitude about one's needs-supplies fit (see *An Agenda for Future Research*). Because our definition is grounded in both attitude and P-E fit theories, a wealth of novel, theoretically based questions can be examined in future research.

Addressing the Operationalization of Balance: How Do We Measure Balance?

Measure development should start with a clear construct definition, as we provide above, to ensure alignment between operational and

Table 14

Comparison of Our Proposed Definition With Other Common Conceptual Definitions of Balance

Definition	Properties	Meanings	Breadth of roles
Our Definition: The extent to which employees hold a favorable evaluation regarding their combination of work and nonwork roles, arising from the belief that their emotional experiences, involvement, and effectiveness in work and nonwork roles are commensurate (compatible) with the value they attach to the roles.	Psychological	Effectiveness, Satisfaction, Fit, Involvement	Work-nonwork balance
Marks & MacDermid (1996): "The tendency to become fully engaged in the performance of every role in one's total role system, to approach every typical role and role partner with an attitude of attentiveness and care. Put differently, it is the practice of that evenhanded alertness known sometimes as mindfulness."	Psychological	Involvement	Role balance
Greenhaus & Allen (2011): "An overall appraisal of the extent to which individuals' effectiveness and satisfaction in work and family roles are consistent with their life values at a given point in time."	Psychological	Effectiveness, Satisfaction, Fit	Work-family balance
Valcour (2007): "An overall level of contentment resulting from an assessment of one's degree of success at meeting work and family role demands."	Psychological	Satisfaction, Effectiveness	Work-family balance
Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw (2003): "The extent to which an individual is equally engaged in and equally satisfied with his or her work role and family role."	Psychological	Involvement, Satisfaction, Equality	Work-family balance
Grzywacz & Carlson (2007): "Accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domain."	Relational	Effectiveness	Work-family balance
Voydanoff (2005): "A global assessment that work and family resources are sufficient to meet work and family demands such that participation is effective in both domains."	Psychological	Effectiveness, Fit	Work-family balance

conceptual definitions (MacKenzie et al., 2011; Netemeyer, Bearden, & Sharma, 2003). Although developing a measure of work–nonwork balance is beyond the scope of this article, we make recommendations for how the field should move forward to measure balance. As noted, our definition of work–nonwork balance, like job satisfaction, can be measured as a unidimensional reflective construct and a multidimensional formative construct (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012; Mackenzie et al., 2011). A unidimensional reflective construct could involve a multiitem global assessment of how one combines work and nonwork roles. One type of scale favored for global attitudes is a semantic differential approach (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) where respondents rate an attitude object on bipolar adjectives reflecting evaluation, potency, and activity. In this approach, participants would consider the work and nonwork roles that matter most to them and rate bipolar dimensions describing how these roles are combined (e.g., good-bad, successful-unsuccessful; involved-uninvolved; healthy-unhealthy; satisfying-unsatisfying). Semantic differential scales have several advantages; they capture both intensity and direction of an appraisal, can be used in short forms, and exhibit reliability and validity (Chin, Johnson, & Schwarts, 2008; Mindak, 1961; Van Auken & Barry, 1995; Wirtz & Lee, 2003).

Our review found that most measures of balance have been treated as unidimensional, except for studies that use conflict and enrichment scales and treat them as dimensions of balance. Yet, our cluster analysis of all measures revealed four interpretable types of balance measures with unique meanings differing from conflict and enrichment. This suggests that these various meanings of balance may be unique, multiple dimensions of balance rather than a single dimension. Though we suggest scholars *avoid* labeling conflict and enrichment scales as balance to avert the jangle fallacy, we suggest they consider multidimensional scales that align with their conceptual definitions. Given convergence across scholarly opinion (i.e., the literature) and normative (i.e., employee) perceptions (Allen et al., 2012) that balance entails effectiveness, satisfaction, involvement, and fit, all these concepts are likely critical. Scholars can measure distinct meanings that contribute to work–nonwork balance (involvement, affective, and effectiveness) as unique facets. This should foster cleaner measures than occurs when scales with multiple meanings are treated as unidimensional. For example, Valcour's (2007) scale is often said to assess a single meaning-balance satisfaction (see Wayne et al., 2017)—but items also tap involvement and effectiveness. Measuring each facet of balance (i.e., involvement) with multiple items for a single meaning can improve construct validity when multidimensional measures align with conceptual definitions of a construct that involve multiple meanings.

Also, because we define balance facets as attitudes about needs-supplies fit, the P-E fit literature can inform how to measure balance facets. Measures of P-E fit vary on a reductionist versus subjective continuum with the best approach that which matches the fit conceptualization (Edwards et al., 2006). We define balance facets as subjective appraisals of fit, so a molar approach, focusing on subjective fit perceptions, reflects our definition. In this approach, people rate their perceptions of affective balance (e.g., "Reflecting on combining my work and nonwork roles, I am happy in the roles that I value most"), effectiveness balance (e.g., "In considering how I combine my work and nonwork roles, I do well in roles that are my biggest priorities"), and involvement balance (e.g., "The time I spend in my work and nonwork roles reflects what I most value") using a Likert scale. In sum, both a global

reflective measure of our balance definition and facet measures (i.e., affective, involvement, and effectiveness balance) are needed.

An Agenda for Future Research

Because our definition is based in attitude and P-E fit theories, we suggest balance research draw from both these theories. From attitude theory, researchers might explore whether balance is organized hierarchically as a general factor with facets (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). *Global work–nonwork balance* may be at the top of the hierarchy, with three facets driving the global evaluation—affect, involvement, and effectiveness. Scholars could examine whether a reflective measure of global balance (i.e., "global balance") equates to an average of three formative facets (i.e., "formative balance"), or whether some facets relate more strongly to global balance than others. Because people differ in their emphasis on cognitive versus affective aspects in evaluating an attitude object (Huskinson & Haddock, 2006; Van den Berg et al., 2006), research could explore whether the facets that relate most strongly to global balance differ by person or change over time with life events. For example, effectiveness balance may be key to global balance for people with high achievement needs, but involvement or affective balance may be more important for people with high relational needs or an interdependent self-construal (Singelis, 1994). Longitudinal research could examine if changes in one facet (e.g., involvement) temporally precede changes in another (e.g., effectiveness), or whether facets change in tandem.

Longitudinal designs are needed to examine the stability of global balance and its facets. Maertz and Boyar (2011) suggest that balance is relatively stable unless there are changes in episodes of conflict or enrichment. Because stronger attitudes are more stable and weaker attitudes are more malleable (Krosnick & Petty, 1995), weaker formative balance evaluations—such as when involvement balance is high but affective balance is low—may be more dynamic than a stronger formative balance evaluation in which affective, effectiveness, and involvement are all similarly moderate in level. Strong contextual factors influence attitudes (Schwarz, 2007), so research might examine how change in the work (e.g., promotion) and nonwork (e.g., personal illness) events relate to change in global and/or facets of balance over time.

Attitude theories also provide a lens to study the relationships of formative balance, its facets, and consequences. For example, when an overall attitude is more strongly (relative to weakly) held, it more strongly relates to outcomes because the internal components of strongly held attitudes are more tightly connected (Petty et al., 1997; Schleicher, Watt, & Greguras, 2004). Thus, in a stronger formative balance evaluation, facets positively relate to one another, and in such cases, formative balance should relate more strongly to outcomes relative to a weaker formative balance evaluation in which facets are not highly related to each other. Following research on job satisfaction-outcome relationships, one could also examine the interconnection among balance facets as a moderator of the relationship of global or formative balance with outcomes (Schleicher et al., 2004, 2015).

Social information processing (SIP) theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), might also inspire research. SIP theory argues that attitudes are influenced by other people, either directly, as when attitudes are passed from person to person, or indirectly, by directing attention to

information that is made more salient. SIP theory suggests that social cues (e.g., feedback from role partners) may affect people's emotions about salient roles or perceptions of how involved or effective they are. For instance, social cues from a spouse may be a key antecedent of the effectiveness facet. This approach incorporates ideas from scholars who define balance as relational (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007) by recognizing social cues from role partners (e.g., supervisor feedback, spouse mood, or child behavior) as potential antecedents of psychological perceptions of balance.

Because we see balance facets as a subjective form of needs-supplies fit, P-E fit theory also provides fertile ground for balance research. Regardless of "objective" levels of fit, subjective fit perceptions are a proximal driver of attitudes (Kristof, 1996). As such, when a person feels effective in valued roles (i.e., effectiveness balance), this perception may drive global balance. Needs-supplies fit occurs when the environment supplies resources (financial, physical, and psychological) and opportunities (task and interpersonal) that satisfy needs (i.e., values, goals; Kristof, 1996). As such, work and nonwork environments that provide resources and opportunities that enable involvement in valued roles should optimize involvement balance, which may foster global balance and its outcomes. For instance, work factors (e.g., flexibility, family supportive supervision) that foster involvement and effectiveness in nonwork roles might interact with nonwork values (e.g., family values) to predict involvement and effectiveness balance, contributing to global balance and its outcomes. Longitudinal research could examine the causal order theorized here where resources precede balance facets (i.e., involvement, effectiveness, and/or satisfaction), contributing to global balance and outcomes.

It is also important to consider which variables fall in the nomological network of global balance and its facets. Our findings and other recent evidence (Carlson et al., 2009; Wayne et al., 2017) suggest that balance is distinct from conflict and enrichment, but how these variables relate to each other is not well-understood. Some scholars have proposed conflict and enrichment as antecedents of balance (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Maertz & Boyar, 2011), and two empirical studies (Grawitch et al., 2013; Wayne et al., 2017) found that satisfaction- and effectiveness-based balance mediated the effects of conflict and enrichment on attitudes, supporting this view. Yet, as both these studies were cross-sectional, temporal precedence could not be directly assessed. Research is also needed to examine whether and how balance relates to work and nonwork outcomes. Although our meta-analysis contributes to understanding the link between balance and satisfaction correlates, research that examines intentions and behaviors is needed. Future research might explore the link between balance and work outcomes such as job performance, turnover, and burnout, as well as success and engagement in nonwork roles.

Another consideration is whether our definition generalizes cross-culturally and resonates with employees from diverse cultures. Developing work–nonwork constructs that generalize globally is important but difficult due to value differences (Powell, Francesco, & Ling, 2009). By adopting a fit approach, our aim was to define global balance and its facets to generalize across employees with unique priorities both within and between cultures. Thus, our definition should apply equally to employees from masculine cultures prioritizing work and those from feminine cultures prioritizing nonwork, but different employees would be balanced under different conditions. People who value work highly (masculine cultures) would experience balance when affect, effectiveness, and involvement at work are positive and high. In contrast, those who most value the nonwork domain (feminine cultures) would be balanced when affect, effectiveness, and involvement in valued nonwork roles are positive and high. Of course, research will need to verify whether our definition generalizes with tests of measurement equivalence across cultures.

In conclusion, our review of the balance literature reveals problems with poor construct clarity, poor measurement, and heterogeneous theories. We empirically demonstrate the extent and implications of the jingle and jangle fallacies, over time and across publication outlets, and potential implications for the nomological network. To begin to remedy these concerns, we provide a comprehensive conceptual definition, suggest a measurement strategy, and outline a theoretical basis to move the field toward consensus about balance and advance our knowledge of it in a significant way.

References

*Refers to articles which are included in the qualitative review.
**Refers to articles which are included in the meta-analysis but not in the qualitative review.

*Abendroth, A. K., & den Dulk, L. (2011). Support for the work–life balance in Europe: The impact of state, workplace and family support on work–life balance satisfaction. *Work, Employment and Society, 25,* 234–256. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0950017011398892

*Adisa, T. A., Mordi, C., & Mordi, T. (2014). The challenges and realities of work–family balance among Nigerian female doctors and nurses. *Economic Insights - Trends and Challenges, 66,* 23–37.

*Agarwal, S., & Lenka, U. (2015). Study on work–life balance of women entrepreneurs: Review and research agenda. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 47,* 356–362. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ICT-01-2015-0006

*Akanji, B., Mordi, C., & Ojo, S. (2015). Reviewing gaps in work–life research and prospecting conceptual advancement. *Economic Insights - Trends and Challenges, 67,* 21–30.

*Alegre, I., Mas-Machuca, M., & Berbegal-Mirabent, J. (2015). Antecedents of employee job satisfaction: Do they matter? *Journal of Business Research, 69,* 1390–1395. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.113

Ali Omran, S. K. (2016). Work-family balance dilemma among employed parents (an empirical study). *International Journal of Business and Economic Development, 4,* 31–46.

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., 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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.278

*Allen, T. D., & Kiburz, K. M. (2012). Trait mindfulness and work–family balance among working parents: The mediating effects of vitality and sleep quality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80,* 372–379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.002

Allen, T. D., Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., & Caza, B. (2012). *Work–family balance: A qualitative investigation.* Paper presented at the Work–family Researchers Network Conference, New York, NY.

*Almestica, M. (2013). *Work–life balance issues and mentoring strategies for women in the contract management profession* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Amazue, L., & Onyishi, I. (2016). Stress coping strategies, perceived organizational support and marital status as predictors of work–life balance among Nigerian bank employees. *Social Indicators Research, 128,* 147–159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1023-5

*Anand, V., Dash, M., & Gangadharan, A. (2012). Perceptions of work–life balance among IT professionals. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11,* 51–65.

*Annink, A., & den Dulk, L. (2012). Autonomy: The panacea for self-employed women's work–life balance? *Community, Work, & Family, 15,* 383–402. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2012.723901

*Antai, D., Oke, A., Braithwaite, P., & Anthony, D. S. (2015). A 'balanced' life: Work–life balance and sickness absence in four Nordic countries. *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 6,* 205–222.

*Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work–family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 132–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.132

*Au, W. C., & Ahmed, P. K. (2015). Exploring the effects of workplace support on work–life experience: A study of Malaysia. *Human Resource Development International, 18,* 346–365.

*Aziz, A., & Chang, A. (2013). Work–family balance: The 3-way interaction effect of role demands, collectivism value and ethnicity. *Journal of Global Management, 6,* 22–39.

*Aziz, S., Wuensch, K. L., & Brandon, H. R. (2010). A comparison among worker types using a composites approach and median splits. *The Psychological Record, 60,* 627–641. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03395736

Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12,* 39–53.

*Backman, C. L. (2004). Occupational balance: Exploring the relationships among daily occupations and their influence on well-being. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy/Revue Canadienne D'Ergotherapie, 71,* 202–209.

*Bae, J. (2015). The impact of social capital on men's mental health from the perspective of social support theory. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology, 24,* 65–77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ijjs.12034

*Baer, S. M., Jenkins, J. S., & Barber, L. K. (2016). Home is private-do not enter! Introversion and sensitivity to work-home conflict. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress, 32,* 441–445. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smi.2628

*Bailey, S. J. (2007). family and work role-identities of divorced parents: The relationship of role balance to well-being. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 46,* 63–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J087v46n03_05

*Baltes, B. B., Clark, M. A., Chakrabarti, M., Linley, P. A., Harrington, S., & Garcea, N. (2010). Work–life balance: The roles of work–family conflict and work–family facilitation. P. A. Linley, S. Harrington, & N. Garcea (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology and work* (pp. 201–212). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

*Baran, H. (2013). *The role of ethnic culture in work–family balance among Armenian women in leadership positions in higher education* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Barbulescu, R., & Bidwell, M. (2013). Do women choose different jobs from men? Mechanisms of application segregation in the market for managerial workers. *Organization Science, 24,* 737–756. http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0757

*Bardoel, E. A., & Drago, R. (2016). Does the quality of information technology support affect work–life balance? A study of Australian physicians. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27,* 2604–2620. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1232293

*Bass, B. L., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2011). Job adequacy and work–family balance: Looking at jobs as a whole. *Journal of Family Issues, 32,* 317–345. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X10384215

*Beckett, L., Nettiksimmons, J., Howell, L. P., & Villablanca, A. C. (2015). Do family responsibilities and a clinical versus research faculty position affect satisfaction with career and work–life balance for medical school faculty? *Journal of Women's Health, 24,* 471–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2014.4858

*Beham, B., & Drobnic, S. (2010). Satisfaction with work–family balance among German office workers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25,* 669–689. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941011056987

*Beham, B., Präg, P., & Drobnič, S. (2012). Who's got the balance? A study of satisfaction with the work–family balance among part-time service sector employees in five western European countries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23,* 3725–3741. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.654808

*Bell, A. S., Rajendran, D., & Theiler, S. (2012). Job stress, wellbeing, work–life balance and work–life conflict among Australian academics. *E-Journal of Applied Psychology, 8,* 25–37.

Bellavia, G., & Frone, M. (2005). Work–family conflict. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of Work Stress* (pp. 113–147). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412975995.n6

Berg, P., Kalleberg, A. L., & Appelbaum, E. (2003). Balancing work and family: The role of high-commitment environments. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society, 42,* 168–188.

*Bhalla, J. (2016). Women executives on work–life balance: An analytical study. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management, 5,* 1–12.

Biemann, T., & Kearney, E. (2010). Size does matter: How varying group sizes in a sample affect the most common measures of group diversity. *Organizational Research Methods, 13,* 582–599. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428109338875

Bohen, H. H., & Viveros-Long, A. (1981). *Balancing jobs and family life: Do flexible schedules help?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple Univ. Press.

*Borah, N., & Bagla, N. (2016). Work–life balance: Assessing perceptions. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management, 13,* 112–119.

*Bornstein, M. H., Hendricks, C., Hahn, C.-S., Haynes, O., Painter, K. M., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2003). Contributors to self-perceived competence, satisfaction, investment, and role balance in maternal parenting: A multivariate ecological analysis. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 3,* 285–326. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327922par0304_2

Brett, J. M., & Stroh, L. K. (2003). Working 61 plus hours a week: Why do managers do it? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 67–78.

*Bridger, R. S., Dobson, K., & Davison, H. (2016). Using the HSE stress indicator tool in a military context. *Ergonomics, 59,* 195–206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2015.1057544

Brod, M., Tesler, L. E., & Christensen, T. L. (2009). Qualitative research and content validity: Developing best practices based on science and experience. *Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation, 18,* 1263–1278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11136-009-9540-9

*Brough, P., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2010). Organizational interventions for balancing work and home demands: An overview. *Work and Stress, 24,* 280–297. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2010.506808

Brough, P., Timms, C., O'Driscoll, M. P., Kalliath, T., Siu, O. L., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (2014). Work–life balance: A longitudinal evaluation of a new measure across Australia and New Zealand workers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25,* 2724–2744.

*Brown, M. (2012). Responses to work intensification: Does generation matter? *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23,* 3578–3595. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.654348

*Brown, W. S., & Palvia, P. (2015). Are mobile devices threatening your work–life balance? *International Journal of Mobile Communications, 13,* 317–338. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJMC.2015.069128

*Bryant, R. M., & Constantine, M. G. (2006). Multiple role balance, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction in women school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 9,* 265–271. http://dx.doi.org/10.5330/prsc.9.4.31ht45132278x818

*Buchheit, S., Dalton, D. W., Harp, N. L., & Hollingsworth, C. W. (2016). A contemporary analysis of accounting professionals' work–life balance. *Accounting Horizons, 30,* 41–62. http://dx.doi.org/10.2308/acch-51262

*Bulger, C. A., Matthews, R. A., & Hoffman, M. E. (2007). Work and personal life boundary management: Boundary strength, work/personal life balance, and the segmentation-integration continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12,* 365–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.365

*Burchielli, R., Bartram, T., & Thanacoody, R. (2008). Work–family balance or greedy organizations? *Industrial Relations, 63,* 108–133. http://dx.doi.org/10.7202/018124ar

*Byington, M. K. (2010). *Principal balance: Life role balance among women in secondary school administration* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Cahill, K. E., McNamara, T. K., Pitt-Catsouphes, M., & Valcour, M. (2015). Linking shifts in the national economy with changes in job satisfaction, employee engagement and work–life balance. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics, 56,* 40–54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2015.03.002

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

*Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Grzywacz, J. G., Tepper, B., & Whitten, D. (2013). Work–family balance and supervisor appraised citizenship behavior: The link of positive affect. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 14,* 87–106.

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

*Carlson, D. S., Witt, L., Zivnuska, S., Kacmar, K., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2008). Supervisor appraisal as the link between family-work balance and contextual performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 23,* 37–49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9083-z

*Carmon, A. F., Miller, A. N., & Brasher, K. J. (2013). Privacy orientations: A look at family satisfaction, job satisfaction, and work–life balance. *Communication Reports, 26,* 101–112. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2013.824017

*Carvalho, V. S., & Chambel, M. J. (2016). Perceived high-performance work systems and subjective well-being: Work-to-family balance and well-being at work as mediators. *Journal of Career Development, 43,* 116–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894845315583113

*Casey, P. R., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2008). Employee health and well-being: The role of flexibility and work–family balance. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 11,* 31–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10887150801963885

Casper, W. J., & DePaulo, B. (2012). A new layer to inclusion: Creating singles-friendly work environments. In M. J. Sirgy, N. P. Reilly, & C. A. Gorman (Eds.), *Handbook of ethics and employee well-being* (Vol. VII). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer Publishers. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4059-4_12

Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work–family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 28–43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.28

Cervellon, M., & Dubé, L. (2002). Assessing the cross-cultural applicability of affective and cognitive components of attitude. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33,* 346–357. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033003009

*Chan, X. W., Kalliath, T., Brough, P., Siu, O. L., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Timms, C. (2016). Work–family enrichment and satisfaction: The mediating role of self-efficacy and work–life balance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27,* 1755–1776. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1075574

*Chen, L. H., & Li, T. S. (2012). Role balance and marital satisfaction in Taiwanese couples: An actor-partner interdependence model approach. *Social Indicators Research, 107,* 187–199. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9836-3

*Chieh-Heng, K. (2016). Exploring the relationship of conflict between family and work among hotel employees. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation, 8,* 239–247.

Chin, W. W., Johnson, N., & Schwarts, A. (2008). A fast form approach to measuring technology acceptance and other constructs. *Management Information Systems Quarterly, 32,* 687–704.

*Cho, Y., Kim, N., Lee, M. M., Lim, J. H., Han, H., & Park, H. Y. (2015). South Korean women leaders struggles for a work and family balance. *Human Resource Development International, 18,* 521–537. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1076562

*Choudhary, N., & Singh, N. K. (2016). Work–family balance as per life stage and total experience: An empirical study among officers of Defense (Central Public Sector Enterprises) in Bangalore. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15,* 49–70.

*Chuang, A., Hsu, R. S., Wang, A., & Judge, T. A. (2015). Does west "fit" with east? In search of a Chinese model of person-environment fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 58,* 480–510. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.1076

*Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations, 53,* 747–770. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001

*Clark, S. C. (2001). Work cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58,* 348–365. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1759

*Clarke, M. C., Koch, L. C., & Hill, E. (2004). The work–family interface: Differentiating balance and fit. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 33,* 121–140. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077727X04269610

Cochran, W. G. (1954). The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics, 10,* 101–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3001666

*Coetzee, M., Oosthuizen, R. M., & Stoltz, E. (2016). Psychosocial employability attributes as predictors of staff satisfaction with retention factors. *South African Journal of Psychology Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Sielkunde, 46,* 232–243. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0081246315595971

*Coetzee, M., & Stoltz, E. (2015). Employees' satisfaction with retention factors: Exploring the role of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 89,* 83–91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.012

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

*Cousins, K. C., & Varshney, U. (2009). Designing ubiquitous computing environments to support work life balance. *Communications of the ACM, 52,* 117–123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1506409.1506438

*Craig, L., & Sawrikar, P. (2008). Satisfaction with work–family balance for parents of early adolescents compared to parents of younger children. *Journal of Family Studies, 14,* 91–106. http://dx.doi.org/10.5172/jfs.327.14.1.91

*Craig, L., & Sawrikar, P. (2009). Work and family: How does the (gender) balance change as children grow? *Gender, Work and Organization, 16,* 684–709. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00481.x

*Crawford, A., & Naar, J. (2016). Exit planning of lifestyle and profit-oriented entrepreneurs in bed and breakfasts. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 17,* 260–285. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2016.1183548

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52,* 281–302. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0040957

*Crooker, K. J., Smith, F. L., & Tabak, F. (2002). Creating work–life balance: A model of pluralism across life domains. *Human Resource Development Review, 1,* 387–419. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1534484302238434

*Dahlgren, A., Tucker, P., Gustavsson, P., & Rudman, A. (2016). Quick returns and night work as predictors of sleep quality, fatigue, work–family balance and satisfaction with work hours. *Chronobiology Inter-*

national: The Journal of Biological & Medical Rhythm Research, 33, 759–767. http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/07420528.2016.1167725

*Darcy, C., McCarthy, A., Hill, J., & Grady, G. (2012). Work–life balance: One size fits all? An exploratory analysis of the differential effects of career stage. *European Management Journal, 30,* 111–120. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2011.11.001

*Davis, R. J., Balkin, R. S., & Juhnke, G. A. (2014). Validation of the Juhnke–Balkin life balance inventory. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 47,* 181–198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0748175614531796

*De Araujo, B. F. V. B., Tureta, C. A., & De Araujo, D. A. V. (2015). How do working mothers negotiate the work-home interface? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30,* 565–581. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-11-2013-0375

**DeHauw, S. (2014). *In search of work-home balance: A study on individual and contextual antecedents and career outcomes* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Dex, S., & Bond, S. (2005). Measuring work–life balance and its covariates. *Work, Employment and Society, 19,* 627–637. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0950017005055676

*Diaz-Chao, A., Ficapal-Cusi, P., & Torrent-Sellens, J. (2016). Economic crisis and job quality in Spain: A multi-dimensional and micro-data empirical approach. *Social Indicators Research, 125,* 613–633. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0850-0

*Direnzo, M. S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Weer, C. H. (2015). Relationship between protean career orientation and work–life balance: A resource perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36,* 538–560. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.1996

Döckel, A. (2003). The effect of retention factors on organisational commitment: An investigation of high technology employees (Master's thesis). University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.

*Donohoe, T. N. (2013). *A holistic approach to work–life balance and job-life satisfaction: A multiple case study* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Dulk, L. D., Peper, B., Kanjuo, M., Aleksandra, K. M., & Ignjatovic, M. (2016). Supervisory support in Slovenian and Dutch organizations: A contextualizing approach. *Community, Work, & Family, 19,* 193–212. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2015.1134127

*Duncan, K. A., & Pettigrew, R. N. (2012). The effect of work arrangements on perception of work–family balance. *Community, Work, & Family, 15,* 403–423. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2012.724832

Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2001). *Work–life balance in the new millennium: Where are we? Where do we need to go?* Ottawa, Canada: CPRN.

*Dyrbye, L. N., West, C. P., Richards, M. L., Ross, H. J., Satele, D., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2016). A randomized, controlled study of an online intervention to promote job satisfaction and well-being among physicians. *Burnout Research, 3,* 69–75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2016.06.002

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

*Eakman, A. M. (2015). The meaningful activity wants and needs assessment: A perspective on life balance. *Journal of Occupational Science, 22,* 210–227. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2013.769405

*Eakman, A. M. (2016). A subjectively-based definition of life balance using personal meaning in occupation. *Journal of Occupational Science, 23,* 108–127. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2014.955603

*Eberman, L. E., & Kahanov, L. (2013). Athletic trainer perceptions of life-work balance and parenting concerns. *Journal of Athletic Training, 48,* 416–423. http://dx.doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-48.2.01

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003

*Eddleston, K. A., & Powell, G. N. (2012). Nurturing entrepreneurs' work–family balance: A gendered perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 36,* 513–541. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00506.x

*Edgar, F., Geare, A., Zhang, J. A., & McAndrew, I. (2015). Mutual gains or conflicting outcomes? How HRM benefits professionals. *International Journal of Manpower, 36,* 1248–1265. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJM-12-2014-0254

Edwards, J. R., Cable, D. M., Williamson, I. O., Lambert, L. S., & Shipp, A. J. (2006). The phenomenology of fit: Linking the person and environment to the subjective experience of person-environment fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 802–827. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.802

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *The Academy of Management Review, 25,* 178–199.

*Ellwart, T., & Konradt, U. (2011). Formative versus reflective measurement: An illustration using work–family balance. *The Journal of Psychology, 145,* 391–417. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2011.580388

*Emslie, C., & Hunt, K. (2009). 'Live to work' or 'work to live'? A qualitative study of gender and work–life balance among men and women in mid-life. *Gender, Work and Organization, 16,* 151–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00434.x

*Evans, A. M., Carney, J. S., & Wilkinson, M. (2013). Work–life balance for men: Counseling implications. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 91,* 436–441. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2013.00115.x

*Ezra, M., & Deckman, M. (1996). Balanced work and family responsibilities: Flextime and child care in the federal government. *Public Administration Review, 56,* 174–179. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/977205

*Fagan, J., & Press, J. (2008). Father influences on employed mothers' work–family balance. *Journal of Family Issues, 29,* 1136–1160. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07311954

*Farivar, F., Cameron, R., & Yaghoubi, M. (2016). Work–family balance and cultural dimensions: From a developing nation perspective. *Personnel Review, 45,* 315–333. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2014-0196

*Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Kacmar, K. M., & Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2016). The supportive spouse at work: Does being work-linked help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21,* 37–50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039538

*Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Zivnuska, S., & Whitten, D. (2012). Support at work and home: The path to satisfaction through balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80,* 299–307. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.001

*Finegold, D., Mohrman, S., & Spreitzer, G. (2002). Age effects on the predictors of technical workers' commitment and willingness to turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 655–674. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.159

*Fischlmayr, I. C., & Kollinger, I. (2010). Work–life balance - a neglected issue among Austrian female expatriates. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21,* 455–487. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585191003611978

Fisher, G. G. (2002). *Work/personal life balance: A construct development study* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. The Sciences and Engineering.

Fisher, G. G., Bulger, C. A., & Smith, C. S. (2009). Beyond work and family: A measure of work/nonwork interference and enhancement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14,* 441–456.

*Friedman, S. D., & Lobel, S. (2003). The happy workaholic: A role model for employees. *The Academy of Management Executive, 17,* 87–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AME.2003.10954764

*Frone, M. R. (2003). Work–family balance. In *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143–162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10474-007

Frone, M. R., & Yardley, J. K. (1996). Workplace family-supportive programmes: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69,* 351–366.

*Gächter, M., Savage, D. A., & Torgler, B. (2013). Retaining the thin blue line: What shapes workers' intentions not to quit the current work environment. *International Journal of Social Economics, 40,* 479–503. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03068291311315359

*Galea, C., Houkes, I., & De Rijk, A. (2014). An insider's point of view: How a system of flexible working hours helps employees to strike a proper balance between work and personal life. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25,* 1090–1111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.816862

*Gardiner, J., Stuart, M., Forde, C., Greenwood, I., MacKenzie, R., & Perrett, R. (2007). Work–life balance and older workers: Employees' perspectives on retirement transitions following redundancy. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18,* 476–489. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190601167904

*Gareis, K. C., Barnett, R. C., Ertel, K. A., & Berkman, L. F. (2009). Work–family enrichment and conflict: Additive effects, buffering, or balance? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 71,* 696–707. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00627.x

*Giauque, D. (2015). Attitudes toward organizational change among public middle managers. *Public Personnel Management, 44,* 70–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091026014556512

*Goni-Legaz, S., & Ollo-Lopez, A. (2015). The impact of family-friendly practices on work-family balance in Spain. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 11,* 983–1007. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11482-015-9417-8

*Goodman, A., Mazerolle, S. M., & Pitney, W. A. (2015). Achieving work–life balance in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I setting, part II: Perspectives from head athletic trainers. *Journal of Athletic Training, 50,* 89–94. http://dx.doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-49.3.87

*Grawitch, M. J., Maloney, P. W., Barber, L. K., & Mooshegian, S. E. (2013). Examining the nomological network of satisfaction with work–life balance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18,* 276–284. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032754

*Greenblatt, E. (2002). Work/life balance: Wisdom or whining. *Organizational Dynamics, 31,* 177–193. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00100-6

Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work–family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 165–183). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63,* 510–531. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.19379625

Greenhaus, J. H., & Singh, R. (2003). Work–family linkages. *Sloan work and family research network.* http://workfamily.sas.upenn.edu/wfrn-repo/object/is5jc110dr1wn4q9

*Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. A. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work–family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80,* 266–275. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008

*Gröpel, P., & Kuhl, J. (2009). Work–life balance and subjective well-being: The mediating role of need fulfilment. *British Journal of Psychology, 100,* 365–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000712608X337797

*Grzywacz, J. G., Butler, A. B., & Almeida, D. M. (2008). Work, family, and health: Work–family balance as a protective factor against stresses of daily life. In A. Marcus-Newhall, D. F. Halpern, & S. J. Tan (Eds.), *The changing realities of work and family: A multidisciplinary approach* (pp. 194–215). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781444305272.ch10

*Grzywacz, J. G., & Carlson, D. S. (2007). Conceptualizing work–family balance: Implications for practice and research. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9,* 455–471. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1523422307305487

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.

*Gudmunson, C. G., Danes, S. M., Werbel, J. D., & Loy, J. T.-C. (2009). Spousal support and work–family balance in launching a family business. *Journal of Family Issues, 30,* 1098–1121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X09333758

*Haar, J. M. (2013). Testing a new measure of work–life balance: A study of parent and non-parent employees from New Zealand. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24,* 3305–3324. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.775175

*Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Suñe, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work–life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85,* 361–373. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.08.010

Halpern, D. F., & Murphy, S. E. (2005). *From work–family balance to work–family interaction: Changing the metaphor.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Publishers.

Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 32,* 1199–1228. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.26586096

*Hayman, J. (2005). Psychometric assessment of an instrument designed to measure work life balance. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management, 13,* 85–91.

*Hayman, J. R. (2009). Flexible work arrangements: Exploring the linkages between perceived usability of flexible work schedules and work/life balance. *Community Work & Family, 12,* 327–338. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668800902966331

*Hayman, J., & Rasmussen, E. (2013). Gender, caring, part time employment and work/life balance. *Employment Relations Record, 13,* 45–58.

*Heisey, A. G. (2013). *Teleworking: Work/life balance of online instructors with disabilities: A phenomenological study.* Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest Information & Learning.

*Hennessy, K. D. (2007). Work–family balance: An exploration of conflict and enrichment for women in a traditional occupation. *Dissertation Abstracts International A, The Humanities and Social Sciences, 68,* 3295.

*Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Johnson, K. L. (2000). Part-time work for women: Does it really help balance work and family? *Human Resource Management, 39,* 17–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(200021)39:1<17::AID-HRM3>3.0.CO;2-Y

Higgins, J. P. T., & Thompson, S. G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine, 21,* 1539–1558. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186

*Hilbrecht, M., & Lero, D. S. (2014). Self-employment and family life: Constructing work–life balance when you're 'always on.' *Community Work & Family, 17,* 20–42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2013.862214

*Hilbrecht, M., Shaw, S. M., Johnson, L. C., & Andrey, J. (2008). 'I'm home for the kids': Contradictory implications for work–life balance of teleworking mothers. *Gender, Work and Organization, 15,* 454–476. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00413.x

*Hill, E., Ferris, M., & Martinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63,* 220–241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00042-3

*Hill, E., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations, 50,* 49–58. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00049.x

*Hobson, B., & Fahlen, S. (2009). Competing scenarios for European fathers: Applying Sen's capabilities and agency framework to work–family balance. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 624,* 214–233. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002716209334435

*Hoeven, C. L., & Zoonen, W. (2015). Flexible work designs and employee well-being: Examining the effects of resources and demands. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 30,* 237–255. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12052

*Hone, L. C., Jarden, A., Duncan, S., & Schofield, G. M. (2015). Flourishing in New Zealand workers: Associations with lifestyle behaviors, physical health, psychosocial, and work-related indicators. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 57,* 973–983. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000508

*Hosboyar, M. (2013). *A quasi-experimental study on flexible work arrangements and job satisfaction: The moderational and mediational roles of work social support, work–family conflict and work–life balance* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Hsieh, Y.-C., & Lin, Y.-H. (2010). Bed and breakfast operators' work and personal life balance: A cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 29,* 576–581. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.10.018

*Hughes, J., & Bozionelos, N. (2007). Work–life balance as source of job dissatisfaction and withdrawal attitudes: An exploratory study on the views of male workers. *Personnel Review, 36,* 145–154. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480710716768

Huskinson, T. H., & Haddock, G. (2006). Individual differences in attitude structure and the accessibility of the affective and cognitive components of attitude. *Social Cognition, 24,* 453–468. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco.2006.24.4.453

*Huth, M. (2014). *Work–life balance satisfaction formation: A quantitative and qualitative investigation of how workers contribute to their own work–life balance satisfaction formation within the context of workgroups* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. The Sciences and Engineering.

*Jain, R., & Jain, S. (2015). Work–life balance among bank mangers: An empirical study of Indian banks. *Abhigyan, 32,* 15–26.

*James, A. (2014). Work–life 'balance,' recession and the gendered limits to learning and innovation (or, why it pays employers to care). *Gender, Work and Organization, 2,* 273–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12037

*Jang, S. J. (2008). *Relationships among perceived work–life balance, resources, and the well-being of working parents* (Dissertation). *Dissertation Abstracts International. A, The Humanities and Social Sciences.*

*Jang, S. J. (2012). The relationships of flexible work schedules, workplace support, supervisory support, work–life balance, and well-being of working parents. *Journal of Social Service Research, 35,* 93–104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01488370802678561

*Jensen, C. C. (2014). *Native American women leaders' use of information and communication technologies (ICTS) for work–life balance (WIB) and capacity building* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. Humanities and Social Sciences.

*Jia-Fang, L., Oi-Ling, S., Spector, P. E., & Shi, K. (2009). Antecedents and outcomes of a fourfold taxonomy of work-family balance in Chinese employed parents. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14,* 182–192.

*Joncich, A. (2014). *Mindfulness, role balance, behavioral engagement, and success among college transfer students* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. Humanities and Social Sciences.

Jones, F., Burke, R. J., & Westman, M. (2006). Work-life balance: A psychological perspective. Psychology Press.

*Joplin, J. R. W., Shaffer, M. A., Lau, T., & Francesco, A. M. 2007. *Life balance: Developing and validating a cross-cultural measure*. Presented at the Academy of International Business 2007, Indianapolis, IN.

Joseph, D. L., Jin, J., Newman, D. A., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2015). Why does self-reported emotional intelligence predict job performance? A meta-analytic investigation of mixed EI. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100,* 298–342. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037681

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

Juliao, T. R. (2005). *Women's multiple roles, role balance, and social support as predictors of life satisfaction and mental health* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. The Sciences and Engineering.

*Kalliath, T., & Brough, P. (2008). Work–life balance: A review of the meaning of the balance construct. *Journal of Management & Organization, 14,* 323–327.

*Kamel, S., & Omran, A. (2016). Work–family balance dilemma among employed parents (An empirical study). *International Journal of Business & Economic Development, 4,* 31–46.

*Kanwar, Y. P. S., Singh, A. K., & Kodwani, A. D. (2009). Work—Life balance and burnout as predictors of job satisfaction in the IT-ITES industry. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective, 13,* 1–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/097226290901300201

*Karassvidou, E., & Glaveli, N. (2015). Work–family balance through border theory lens: The case of a company driving in the fast lane. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, 34,* 84–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EDI-05-2014-0038

*Karkoulian, S., Srour, J., & Sinan, T. (2016). A gender perspective on work–life balance, perceived stress, and locus of control. *Journal of Business Research, 69,* 4918–4923. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.053

*Keene, J. R., & Quadagno, J. (2004). Predictors of perceived work–family balance: Gender difference or gender similarity? *Sociological Perspectives, 47,* 1–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sop.2004.47.1.1

Kelley, T. L. (1927). *Interpretation of educational measurements*. New York, NY: World Book.

*Khullar, A. (2012). *Celebrating imbalance: A critical review of the literature* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Kim, H. K. (2014). Work–life balance and employees' performance: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Global Business and Management Research, 6,* 37–51.

*King, E. B., Botsford, W. E., & Huffman, A. H. (2009). Work, family, and organizational advancement: Does balance support the perceived advancement of mothers? *Sex Roles, 61,* 879–891. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9692-7

Kirchmeyer, C. (2000). Work–life initiatives: Greed or benevolence regarding workers' time? In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior: Time in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 79–94). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

*Kirkwood, J., & Tootell, B. (2008). Is entrepreneurship the answer to achieving work–family balance? *Journal of Management & Organization, 14,* 285–302.

*Kishino, S. (2015). The effect of supervisor characteristics on subordinates' work–life balance: A dyadic analysis in Japan. *Journal of Organizational Culture*. Communications & Conflict, *19,* 19–29.

*Ko, C. H. (2016). Exploring the relationship of conflict between family and work among hotel employees. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online), 8,* 239.

Kossek, 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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.139

*Koubova, V., & Buchko, A. A. (2013). Life-work balance: Emotional intelligence as a crucial component of achieving both personal life and work performance. *Management Research Review, 36,* 700–719. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MRR-05-2012-0115

*Krasulja, N., Blagojevic, M. V., & Radojevic, I. (2015). Working from home as alternative for achieving work–life balance. *Ekonomika (Nis), 61,* 131–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.5937/ekonomika1502131K

*Krisor, S. M., Diebig, M., & Rowold, J. (2015). Is cortisol as a biomarker of stress influenced by the interplay of work–family conflict, work–family balance and resilience? *Personnel Review, 44,* 648–661. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2013-0168

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49,* 1–49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x

Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences* (pp. 1–24). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

*Kumar, H., & Chakraborty, S. K. (2013). Work life balance (WLB): A key to organizational efficacy. *Prin LN Welingkar Institute of Management Development & Research, 15,* 62–70.

*Ladva, P., & Andrew, J. (2014). Weaving a web of control: "The promise of opportunity" and work–life balance in multinational accounting firms. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 27,* 634–654. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-02-2012-00955

*Lammers-van der Holst, H. M., & Kerkhof, G. A., & the Lammers-van der. (2015). Shift work tolerance and the importance of sleep quality: A study of police officers. *Biological Rhythm Research, 46,* 257–264. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09291016.2014.985002

*Larivière, N., Denis, C., Payeur, A., Ferron, A., Levesque, S., & Rivard, G. (2016). Comparison of objective and subjective life balance between women with and without a personality disorder. *Psychiatric Quarterly, 87,* 663–673. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11126-016-9417-3

*Las Heras, M., Bosch, M. J., & Raes, A. M. L. (2015). Sequential mediation among family friendly culture and outcomes. *Journal of Business Research, 68,* 2366–2373. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.03.042

Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (1998). Demographic diversity and fault-lines: The compositional dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 325–340.

Lawrence, B. S., & Zyphur, M. J. (2011). Identifying organizational faultlines with latent class cluster analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 14,* 32–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428110376838

*Lawson, M. A. G. (2014). *Masculinity and femininity in the superintendency: Gender differences in the perceptions of public school superintendents about work–life conflict and balance* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. Humanities and Social Sciences.

Le, H., Schmidt, F. L., Harter, J. K., & Lauver, K. J. (2010). The problem of empirical redundancy of constructs in organizational research: An empirical investigation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 112,* 112–125. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.02.003

*Lee, N., Zvonkovic, A. M., & Crawford, D. W. (2014). The impact of work–family conflict and facilitation on women's perceptions of role balance. *Journal of Family Issues, 35,* 1252–1274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X13481332

*Lee, Y. W., Dai, Y. T., & McCreary, L. L. (2015). Quality of work life as a predictor of nurses' intention to leave units, organisations and the profession. *Journal of Nursing Management, 23,* 521–531. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12166

*Le Fevre, M., Boxall, P., & Macky, K. (2015). Which workers are more vulnerable to work intensification? An analysis of two national surveys. *International Journal of Manpower, 36,* 966–983. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJM-01-2014-0035

*Lenaghan, J. A., & Sengupta, K. (2007). Role conflict, role balance and affect: A model of well-being of the working student. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 9,* 88–109.

*Lewis, J., & Campbell, M. (2008). What's in a name? 'Work and family' or 'work and life' balance policies in the UK since 1997 and the implications for the pursuit of gender equality. *Social Policy and Administration, 42,* 524–541. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2008.00615.x

*Li, Y., Miao, L., Zhao, X., & Lehto, X. (2013). When family rooms become guest lounges: Work–family balance of B&B innkeepers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34,* 138–149. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.03.002

*Lingard, H. C., Francis, V., & Turner, M. (2010). The rhythms of project life: A longitudinal analysis of work hours and work–life experiences in construction. *Construction Management and Economics, 28,* 1085–1098. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2010.480977

*Litano, M. L., & Major, D. A. (2016). Facilitating a whole-life approach to career development: The role of organizational leadership. *Journal of Career Development, 43,* 52–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894845315569303

Loo, R. (2002). A caveat on using single-item versus multiple-I tem scales. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 17,* 68–75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940210415933

*Lopez, F. G., & Fons-Scheyd, A. (2008). Role balance and depression among college students: The moderating influence of adult attachment orientations. *Journal of College Counseling, 11,* 133–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1882.2008.tb00030.x

*Lu, J.-F., Siu, O.-L., Spector, P. E., & Shi, K. (2009). Antecedents and outcomes of a fourfold taxonomy of work–family balance in Chinese employed parents. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14,* 182–192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014115

*Lunau, T., Bambra, C., Eikemo, T. A., van der Wel, K. A., & Dragano, N. (2014). A balancing act? Work–life balance, health and well-being in European welfare states. *European Journal of Public Health, 24,* 422–427. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cku010

*Lyness, K. S., & Judiesch, M. K. (2008). Can a manager have a life and a career? International and multisource perspectives on work–life balance and career advancement potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 789–805. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.789

*Lyness, K. S., & Judiesch, M. K. (2014). Gender egalitarianism and work–life balance for managers: Multisource perspectives in 36 countries. *Applied Psychology, 63,* 96–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/apps.12011

*Lyness, K. S., & Kropf, M. B. (2005). The relationships of national gender equality and organizational support with work–family balance: A study of European managers. *Human Relations, 58,* 33–60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726705050934

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 1,* 3–30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques. *Management Information Systems Quarterly, 35,* 293–334.

MacPhee, D., Benson, J. B., & Bullock, D. (1986). *Influences on maternal self-perceptions.* Paper presented at the Fifth Biennial International Conference on Infant Studies, Los Angeles.

*Maertz, C. P., Jr., & Boyar, S. L. (2011). Work–family conflict, enrichment, and balance under "levels" and "episodes" approaches. *Journal of Management, 37,* 68–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206310382455

*Mahanta, M. (2015). Exploring the relationship between emotional intelligence and work–life balance in the service industry. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14,* 42–60.

*Majnemer, A. (2010). Balancing the boat: Enabling an ocean of possibilities. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy/Revue Canadienne D'Ergotherapie, 77,* 198–208.

Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 921–936. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2094577

*Marks, S. R., Huston, T. L., Johnson, E. M., & MacDermid, S. M. (2001). Role balance among white married couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63,* 1083–1098. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.01083.x

*Marks, S. R., & MacDermid, S. M. (1996). Multiple roles and the self: A theory of role balance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 417–432. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/353506

Marshall, N. L., & Barnett, R. C. (1991). The relationship between women's work and family role and their subjective well-being and psychological distress. In M. Frankenhaeuser, U. Lundberg, & M. Chesney (Eds.), *Women, work and health: Stress and opportunities* (pp. 111–136). New York, NY: Plenum.

*Maruyama, T., Hopkinson, P. G., & James, P. W. (2009). A multivariate analysis of work–life balance outcomes from a large-scale telework programme. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 24,* 76–88. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.2008.00219.x

*Mas-Machuca, M., Berbegal-Mirabent, J., & Alegre, I. (2016). Work–life balance and its relationship with organizational pride and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31,* 586–602. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-09-2014-0272

*Matheson, J. L., & Rosen, K. H. (2012). Marriage and family therapy faculty members' balance of work and personal life. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 38,* 394–416. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2009.00137.x

*Matuska, K. (2012a). Description and development of the life balance inventory. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation, and Health, 32,* 220–228.

*Matuska, K. (2012b). Validity evidence of a model and measure of life balance. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health, 32,* 229–237. http://dx.doi.org/10.3928/15394492-20110610-02

*Matuska, K., & Bass, J. (2016). Life balance and stress in adults with medical conditions or obesity. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health, 36,* 74–81. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1539449216628859

*Matuska, K., Bass, J., & Schmitt, J. S. (2013). Life balance and perceived stress: Predictors and demographic profile. *Participation and Health, 33,* 146–158. http://dx.doi.org/10.3928/15394492-20130614-03

*Mazerolle, S. M., Goodman, A., & Pitney, W. A. (2015). Achieving work–life balance in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I setting, part I: The role of the head athletic trainer. *Journal of Athletic Training, 50,* 82–88. http://dx.doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-49.3.88

*Mazur-Wierzbicka, E. (2015). Implementing the work–life balance as a CSR tool in polish companies. *Research Papers of the Wroclaw University of Economics, 387,* 109–121.

*McDowall, A., & Lindsay, A. (2014). Work–life balance in the police: The development of a self-management competency framework. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 29,* 397–411. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9321-x

*McGrath, C. B. (2013). *Balancing work and family: A qualitative exploratory study of alternative work arrangements and employee preferences in the manufacturing sector* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

McKay, P. F., & McDaniel, M. A. (2006). A reexamination of black-white mean differences in work performance: More data, more moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 538–554. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.538

McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work–family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25,* 381–396. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1

*McNamara, T. K., Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Matz-Costa, C., Brown, M., & Valcour, M. (2013). Across the continuum of satisfaction with work–family balance: Work hours, flexibility-fit, and work–family culture. *Social Science Research, 42,* 283–298. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.10.002

*Michel, A., Bosch, C., & Rexroth, M. (2014). Mindfulness as a cognitive–emotional segmentation strategy: An intervention promoting work–life balance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87,* 733–754. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/joop.12072

*Milkie, M. A., Kendig, S. M., Nomaguchi, K. M., & Denny, K. E. (2010). Time with children, children's well-being, and work–family balance among employed parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 72,* 1329–1343. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00768.x

*Milkie, M. A., & Peltola, P. (1999). Playing all the roles: Gender and the work–family balancing act. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61,* 476–490. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/353763

Mindak, W. A. (1961). Fitting the semantic differential to the marketing problem. *Journal of Marketing, 25,* 28–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1248988

*Mohd Noor, K. (2011). Work–life balance and intention to leave among academics in Malaysian public higher education institutions. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2,* 240–248.

*Moore, F. (2007). Work–life balance: Contrasting managers and workers in an MNC. *Employee Relations, 29,* 385–399. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01425450710759217

Mumford, J., & Lockett, K. (2009). *Work/life balance for dummies.* Chichester, UK: Wiley, Ltd.

*Munn, S. L. (2013). Unveiling the work–life system the influence of work–life balance on meaningful work. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 15,* 401–417. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1523422313498567

*Murphy, F., & Doherty, L. (2011). The experience of work life balance for Irish senior managers. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, 30,* 252–277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02610151111135732

*Nam, T. (2014). Technology use and work–life balance. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 9,* 1017–1040. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11482-013-9283-1

*Namin-Hedayati, F. (2007). *An exploration of the effects of emotional intelligence on work–life balance, above and beyond personality components in working, graduate and undergraduate students* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. The Sciences and Engineering.

*Nayak, T., Sahoo, C. K., Mohanty, P. K., & Sundaray, B. K. (2016). HR interventions and quality of work life of healthcare employees: An investigation. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 48,* 234–240. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ICT-02-2015-0019

*Nayeem, M. A., & Tripathy, M. R. (2012). Work–life balance among teachers of technical institutions. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 47,* 724–736.

*Nelson, M. F., & Tarpey, R. J. (2010). Work scheduling satisfaction and work life balance for nurses: The perception of organizational justice. *Academy of Health Care Management Journal, 6,* 25–36.

Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling procedures: Issues and Applications.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412985772

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family-work conflict scales.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 400–410. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400

*Neupane, S., Nygård, C. H., & Oakman, J. (2016). Work-related determinants of multi-site musculoskeletal pain among employees in the health care sector. *Work, 54,* 689–697. http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/WOR-162320

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory.* New York NY: McGraw-Hill.

*Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Britt, T. W., & Bobko, P. (2012). Work–family balance, well-being, and organizational outcomes: Investigating actual versus desired work/family time discrepancies. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27,* 331–343. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9246-1

*Olsen, K. M., & Dahl, S. A. (2010). Working time: Implications for sickness absence and the work–family balance. *International Journal of Social Welfare, 19,* 45–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2397.2008.00619.x

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1957). *The measurement of meaning.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

*Padma, S., & Reddy, S. (2013). Work life balance: Women police constables. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management, 10,* 39–47.

*Palmeri, S. (2013). *Surviving a reduction in force: The impact of flexible work arrangements on employee job satisfaction and work/life balance following the 2008 recession* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Parkes, L. P., & Langford, P. H. (2008). Work–life balance or work–life alignment? A test of the importance of work–life balance for employee engagement and intention to stay in organisations. *Journal of Management & Organization, 14,* 267–284.

*Parris, M. A., Vickers, M. H., & Wilkes, L. (2008). Caught in the middle: Organizational impediments to middle managers' work–life balance. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 20,* 101–117. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10672-008-9069-z

*Patel, S. P., & Cunningham, C. J. (2012). Religion, resources, and work–family balance. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15,* 389–401. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2011.577765

*Pattusamy, M., & Jacob, J. (2016). Testing the mediation of work–family balance in the relationship between work–family conflict and job and family satisfaction. *South African Journal of Psychology Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Sielkunde, 46,* 218–231. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0081246315608527

*Pentland, W., & McColl, M. A. (2008). Occupational integrity: Another perspective on "life balance." *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy/Revue Canadienne D'Ergotherapie, 75,* 135–138.

*Peters, P., den Dulk, L., & Van der Lippe, T. (2009). The effects of time-spatial flexibility and new working conditions on employees' work–life balance: The Dutch case. *Community Work & Family, 12,* 279–297. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668800902968907

Peterson, R. A., & Brown, S. P. (2005). On the use of beta coefficients in meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 175–181. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.175

*Petrie, R. (2013). *Late-adolescent well-being: The balance of life domains* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Petty, R. E., Wegener, D. T., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1997). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48,* 609–647. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.609

*Phipps, S. T. A., & Prieto, L. C. (2014). A discovery of early labor organizations and the women who advocated work–life balance: An ethical perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 134,* 249–261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2428-9

*Phipps, S., & Prieto, L. (2016). A discovery of early labor organizations and the women who advocated work–life balance: An ethical perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 134,* 249–261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2428-9

*Pocock, B. (2005). Work–life 'balance' in Australia: Limited progress, dim prospects. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 43,* 198–209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1038411105055058

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. (2016). Recommendations for creating better concept definitions in the organizational, behavioral, and social sciences. *Organizational Research Methods, 19,* 159–203. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428115624965

Powell, G. N., Francesco, A. M., & Ling, Y. (2009). Toward cultural-sensitive theories of the work–family interface. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30,* 597–616. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.568

*Pryce, J., Albertsen, K., & Nielsen, K. (2006). Evaluation of an open-rota system in a Danish psychiatric hospital: A mechanism for improving job satisfaction and work–life balance. *Journal of Nursing Management, 14,* 282–288. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2934.2006.00617.x

*Raiden, A. B., & Raisanen, C. (2013). Striving to achieve it all: Men and work–family-life balance in Sweden and the UK. *Construction Management and Economics, 31,* 899–913. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2013.802364

Raju, N. S., & Brand, P. A. (2003). Determining the significance of correlations corrected for unreliability and range restriction. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 27,* 52–71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146621602239476

*Rama Devi, V., & Nagini, A. (2014). Work-life balance and burnout as predictors of job satisfaction in private banking sector. *Skyline Business Journal, 9,* 50–53.

*Ramos, R., Brauchli, R., Bauer, G., Wehner, T., & Hämmig, O. (2015). Busy yet socially engaged: Volunteering, work–life balance, and health in the working population. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 57,* 164–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000327

*Rantanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Tement, S. (2013). Patterns of conflict and enrichment in work–family balance: A three-dimensional typology. *Work and Stress, 27,* 141–163. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2013.791074

*Rantanen, J., Kinnunen, U., & Pulkkinen, L. (2013). The role of personality and role engagement in work–family balance. *Psihološka Obzorja/Horizons of Psychology, 22,* 14–26.

*Reece, K. T., Davis, J. A., & Polatajko, H. J. (2009). The representations of work–life balance in Canadian newspapers. *Work (Reading, Mass.), 32,* 431–442.

*Reiter, N. (2007). Work life balance: What do you mean? The ethical ideology underpinning appropriate application. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43,* 273–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295639

Riordan, C. M., & Wayne, J. H. (2008). A review and examination of demographic similarity measures used to assess relational demography within groups. *Organizational Research Methods, 11,* 562–592. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428106295503

*Roberts, E. (2008). Time and work–life balance: The roles of 'temporal customization' and 'life temporality.' *Gender, Work and Organization, 15,* 430–453. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00412.x

*Roemer, M. K. (2010). Religion and psychological distress in Japan. *Social Forces, 89,* 559–583. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sof.2010.0049

*Rotariu, I. I., & Serbu, R. (2015). How work related stress affects private lives. *Revista Economica, 67,* 106–113.

Roth, P. L., Huffcutt, A. I., & Bobko, P. (2003). Ethnic group differences in measures of job performance: A new meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 694–706. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.694

*Roy, G. (2016). Impact of mobile communication technology on the work life balance of working women: A review of discourses. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research, 10,* 79–101.

*Russo, M., Shteigman, A., & Carmeli, A. (2016). Workplace and family support and work–life balance: Implications for individual psychological

availability and energy at work. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 11,* 173–188. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1025424

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23,* 224–253. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2392563

*Salzstein, A. L., Ting, Y., & Saltzstein, G. H. (2001). Work–family balance and job satisfaction: The impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public Administration Review, 61,* 452–467. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00049

*Sang, K. J. C., Ison, S. G., & Dainty, A. R. J. (2009). The job satisfaction of UK architects and relationships with work–life balance and turnover intentions. *Engineering, Construction, and Architectural Management, 16,* 288–300. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09699980910951681

*Sav, A., Harris, N., & Sebar, B. (2014). Australian Muslim men balancing work, family and religion: A positive look at a negative issue. *Personnel Review, 43,* 2–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2012-0130

*Schilling, E. (2015). Success is satisfaction with what you have? Biographical work–life balance of older female employees in public administration. *Gender, Work and Organization, 22,* 474–494. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12097

Schleicher, D. J., Smith, T. A., Casper, W. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2015). It's all in the attitude: The role of job attitude strength in job attitude-outcome relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100,* 1259–1274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038664

Schleicher, D. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2004). Reexamining the job satisfaction-performance relationship: The complexity of attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 165–177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.165

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (2015). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research synthesis* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483398105

Schwab, D. E. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 3–43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Schwarz, N. (2007). Attitude construction: Evaluation in context. *Social Cognition, 25,* 638–656. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco.2007.25.5.638

Seligson, H. (2012, September 1). When the work–life scales are unequal. *New York Times.* http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/02/business/straightening-out-the-work-life-balance.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

*Selvakumar, M., Manjula, S., Sathyalakshmi V., & Murugan, S. (2015). Factors influencing quality of work life of employees of private sector commercial banks. *Vinimya, 36,* 33–66.

*Senarathne Tennakoon, K. L. U. (2012). *Empowerment or enslavement: ICT use and work–life balance of managers and professionals* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Seong, J. Y., & Hong, D. S. (2015). *Person-organization fit, work–life balance and their outcomes: A longitudinal analysis.* Philadelphia, PA: Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

*Shah, R. A. (2015). Work–life balance and gender: A study of professionals in India. *Review of Management, 5,* 5–18.

*Shankar, T., & Bhatnagar, J. (2010). Work life balance, employee engagement, emotional consonance/dissonance and turnover intention. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 46,* 74–87.

*Sharma, N., & Nayak, P. (2016). Study on work life balance and organisation policy in IT sector in NCR. *Amity Global Business Review, 11,* 115–122.

*Sheldon, K. M., Cummins, R., & Kamble, S. (2010). Life balance and well-being: Testing a novel conceptual and measurement approach. *Journal of Personality, 78,* 1093–1134.

Shockley, K. M., & Singla, N. (2011). Reconsidering work–family interactions and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 37,* 861–886. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206310394864

Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review, 39,* 567–578. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2094422

*Simmons, J. (2013). *The Kaleidoscope Career Model: An investigation of authenticity, balance, and challenge and their relationship with networking behavior* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Šimonova, K., & Šafrankova, J. M. (2015). Work–life balance as rediscovered modern trend in HR management. *Social & Economic Revue, 13,* 62–67.

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 580–591. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205014

*Siu, O. L. (2013). Psychological capital, work well-being, and work–life balance among Chinese employees: A cross-lagged analysis. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 12,* 170–181. http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000092

Siu, O. L., & Phillips, D. R. (2005). Study of stress among staff in MTRCL. *Commissioned by MTR Corporation Limited.* Unpublished Report, MTRCL.

Slaughter, A. (2012, July/August). Why women still can't have it all. *The Atlantic.* http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/07/why-women-still-cant-have-it-all/309020/

*Sliwinski, L. J. (2004). *Work–life balance and exempt employees: Making sense of work in the broader context of life* (Dissertation). Retrieved from *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 65,* 2680.

Small, S. A., & Riley, D. (1990). Toward a multidimensional assessment of work spillover into family life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52,* 51–61.

Smith, J. (2013, June 6). The best big companies for work–life balance. *Forbes.* http://www.forbes.com/sites/jacquelynsmith/2013/06/03/the-best-big-companies-for-work-life-balance/

*Stirling, C. C. (2013). *The work–life balance pursuit: Challenges, supports, and strategies of successful women senior student affairs officers* (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Stuart, T. D., & Garrison, M. E. (2002). The influence of daily hassles and role balance on health status: A study of mothers of grade school children. *Women & Health, 36,* 1–11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J013v36n03_01

*Sturges, J. (2008). All in a day's work? Career self-management and the management of the boundary between work and non-work. *Human Resource Management Journal, 18,* 118–134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2007.00054.x

*Sturges, J. (2012). Crafting a balance between work and home. *Human Relations, 65,* 1539–1559. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726712457435

*Sturges, J., & Guest, D. (2004). Working to live or living to work? Work/life balance early in the career. *Human Resource Management Journal, 14,* 5–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2004.tb00130.x

*St. Vil, N. M. (2014). African American marital satisfaction as a function of work–family balance and work–family conflict and implications for social workers. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 24,* 208–216. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2014.848694

Suddaby, R. (2010). Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *The Academy of Management Review, 35,* 346–357. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2010.51141319

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16,* 282–298. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(80)90056-1

*Süß, S., & Sayah, S. (2013). Balance between work and life: A qualitative study of German contract workers. *European Management Journal, 31,* 250–262. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2012.12.003

*Syrek, C. J., Apostel, E., & Antoni, C. H. (2013). Stress in highly demanding IT jobs: Transformational leadership moderates the impact of time pressure on exhaustion and work–life balance. *Journal of Oc-

cupational Health Psychology, 18, 252–261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033085

**Syrek, C., Bauer-Emmel, C., Antoni, C., & Klusemann, J. (2011). Development and validation of the Trierer Scale to Measure Work–life Balance (TKS-LB). Diagnostica, 57, 134–145. http://dx.doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924/a000044

*Tausig, M., & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding time: Alternate work schedules and work–life balance. Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 22, 101–119. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1016626028720

Thoits, P. A. (1983). Multiple identities and psychological well-being: A reformulation and test of the social isolation hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 48, 174–187. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2095103

*Thompson, N., Yau, J., & Ng, S.-M. (2008). Work–life balance: Lessons from the United Kingdom and Hong Kong. Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies, 9, 85–101.

Thorndike, E. L. (1904). An introduction to the theory of mental and social measurements. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/13283-000

*Trefalt, Š., Drnovšek, M., Svetina-Nabergoj, A., & Adlešič, R. V. (2013). Work–life experiences in rapidly changing national contexts: Structural misalignment, comparisons and choice overload as explanatory mechanisms. European Management Journal, 31, 448–463. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2013.04.006

*Ugwu, D. I., Orjiakor, C. T., Enwereuzor, I. K., Onyedibe, C. C., & Ugwu, L. I. (2016). Business-life balance and wellbeing: Exploring the lived experiences of women in a low-to-middle income country. International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 11, 30492. http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v11.30492

*Umene-Nakano, W., Kato, T. A., Kikuchi, S., Tateno, M., Fujisawa, D., Hoshuyama, T., & Nakamura, J. (2013). Nationwide survey of work environment, work–life balance and burnout among psychiatrists in Japan. PLoS ONE, 8, e55189. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0055189

*Unick, E. B. (2014). The work–life balance of first-time fathers utilizing unpaid paternal leave (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. The Sciences and Engineering.

*Valcour, M. (2007). Work-based resources as moderators of the relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work–family balance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 1512–1523. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1512

Van Auken, S., & Barry, T. E. (1995). An assessment of the trait validity of cognitive age measures. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 4, 107–132. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0402_02

Van den Berg, H., Manstead, A. S., van der Pligt, J., & Wigboldus, D. H. (2006). The impact of affective and cognitive focus on attitude formation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42, 373–379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2005.04.009

*Van der Lippe, T., Jager, A., & Kops, Y. (2006). Combination pressure: The paid work–family balance of men and women in European countries. Acta Sociologica, 49, 303–319. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0001699306067711

*Vasquez, S. (2013). Cultivating strategies for success: How mid-level women leaders of color in student affairs navigate the balance of work and family (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

*Vieira, J. M., Avila, M., & Matos, P. M. (2012). Attachment and parenting: The mediating role of work–family balance in Portuguese parents of preschool children. Family Relations, 61, 31–50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00680.x

*Virick, M., Lilly, J. D., & Casper, W. J. (2007). Doing more with less: An analysis of work life balance among layoff survivors. The Career Development International, 12, 463–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13620430710773772

*Voydanoff, P. (2002). Linkages between the work–family interface and work, family, and individual outcomes: An integrative model. Journal of Family Issues, 23, 138–164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X02023001007

*Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work–family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. Journal of Marriage and Family, 67, 822–836. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00178.x

*Wada, M., Backman, C. L., Forwell, S. J., Roth, W. M., & Ponzetti, J. J., Jr. (2014). Balance in everyday life: Dual-income parents' collective and individual conceptions. Journal of Occupational Science, 21, 259–276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2014.913331

*Wagman, P., Björklund, A., Håkansson, C., Jacobsson, C., & Falkmer, T. (2011). Perceptions of life balance among a working population in Sweden. Qualitative Health Research, 21, 410–418. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732310379240

*Walia, P. (2015). Gender and age as correlates of work–life balance. Journal of Organisation & Human Behaviour, 4, 13–18.

*Wang, K., & Zhou, A. (2016). Effects of servant leadership on work–family balance in China. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12122

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 247–252. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.247

Ward, R. R. (2008). The relationship of individual intrinsic capacity with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived life balance: An exploratory study of the Intrinsic Coaching (RTM) methodology (Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. Humanities and Social Sciences.

*Warren, T. (2015). Work–life balance/imbalance: The dominance of the middle class and the neglect of the working class. British Journal of Sociology, 66, 691–717. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12160

*Watts, J. H. (2009). 'Allowed into a man's world' Meanings of work–life balance: Perspectives of women civil engineers as 'minority' workers in construction. Gender, Work and Organization, 16, 37–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00352.x

*Waumsley, J. A., Hemmings, B., & Payne, S. M. (2010). Work–life balance, role conflict and the UK sport psychology consultant. The Sport Psychologist, 24, 245–262. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/tsp.24.2.245

**Wayne, J. H., Butts, M. B., Casper, W. J., & Allen, T. D. (2017). In search of balance: A conceptual and empirical integration of multiple meanings of work–family balance. Personnel Psychology, 70, 167–210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/peps.12132

Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work–family experience: Relationships of the big five to work–family conflict and facilitation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64, 108–130. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00035-6

Wayne, J., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work–family support in work–family enrichment and its work-related consequences. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69, 445–461. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.002

*Wepfer, A. G., Brauchli, R., Jenny, G. J., Hämmig, O., & Bauer, G. F. (2015). The experience of work–life balance across family-life stages in Switzerland: A cross-sectional questionnaire-based study. BMC Public Health, 15, 1290–2001. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2584-6

*Wheatley, D. (2012). Work–life balance, travel-to-work, and the dual career household. Personnel Review, 41, 813–831. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483481211263764

*White, J. M. (1999). Work–family stage and satisfaction with work–family balance. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 30, 163–175.

*White, M., Hill, S., McGovern, P., Mills, C., & Smeaton, D. (2003). 'High-performance' management practices, working hours and work–life balance. British Journal of Industrial Relations, 41, 175–195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8543.00268

*Wierda-Boer, H. H., Gerris, J. R., & Vermulst, A. A. (2008). Adaptive strategies, gender ideology, and work–family balance among Dutch dual earners. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 70,* 1004–1014. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00542.x

*Wirtz, A., & Nachreiner, F. (2010). The effects of extended working hours on health and social well-being—A comparative analysis of four independent samples. *Chronobiology International, 27,* 1124–1134. http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/07420528.2010.490099

Wirtz, J., & Lee, M. C. (2003). An examination of the quality and context-specific applicability of common used customer satisfaction measures. *Journal of Service Research, 5,* 345–355. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094670503005004006

*Won, S. Y. (2016). State policy? Traditional gender stereotypes? Relative contributions of factors affecting positive work–family interface for working mothers in Korea. *Gender, Work and Organization, 23,* 147–164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12118

*Wong, S. C., & Ko, A. (2009). Exploratory study of understanding hotel employees' perception on work–life balance issues. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28,* 195–203. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.07.001

Wright, A. D. (2011, December 6). *Men, too, want work–life balance.* Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management. Retrieved from http://www.shrm.org/hrdisciplines/benefits/Articles/Pages/WorkLifeMen.aspx

*Wu, L., Rusyidi, B., Claiborne, N., & McCarthy, M. L. (2013). Relationships between work–life balance and job-related factors among child

welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review, 35,* 1447–1454. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2013.05.017

*Yu-Chin, H., Kline, S. F., & Pearson, T. E. (2008). Lodging managers' perceptions of work and personal life: Balanced or imbalanced? *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 9,* 18–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15256480801910442

*Yuile, C., Chang, A., Gudmundsson, A., & Sawang, S. (2012). The role of life friendly policies on employees' work–life balance. *Journal of Management & Organization, 18,* 53–63.

*Zhang, H., Yip, P. S., Chi, P., Chan, K., Cheung, Y. T., & Zhang, X. (2012). Factor structure and psychometric properties of the work–family balance scale in an urban Chinese sample. *Social Indicators Research, 105,* 409–418. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9776-3

*Zheng, C., Molineux, J., Mirshekary, S., & Scarparo, S. (2015). Developing individual and organisational work–life balance strategies to improve employee health and wellbeing. *Employee Relations, 37,* 354–379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2013-0142

*Zhou, W., Guan, Y., Xin, L., Mak, M. C. K., & Deng, Y. (2016). Career success criteria and locus of control as indicators of adaptive readiness in the career adaptation model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 94,* 124–130. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.02.015

*Zivnuska, S., Kacmar, K. M., Ferguson, M., & Carlson, D. S. (2016). Mindfulness at work: Resource accumulation, well-being, and attitudes. *The Career Development International, 21,* 106–124. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CDI-06-2015-0086

Appendix

Detailed Information on Primary Studies Included in Meta-Analysis

Study	Outcome	N	r	r_{xx}	r_{yy}	Balance measure	Cluster	Single vs. multi-item
Abendroth & den Dulk (2011)	LS	5,904	.43	.89		Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
Ali Omran (2016)	LS	276	.54	.85	.92	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Aryee et al. (2005)	JS	267	−.26	.75	.82	Grzywacz and Marks (2000) - WFC	2	Multi-item
Aryee et al. (2005)	JS	267	.28	.75	.82	Grzywacz and Marks (2000) - WFE	2	Multi-item
Aryee et al. (2005)	JS	267	−.21	.76	.82	Grzywacz and Marks (2000) - FWC	2	Multi-item
Aryee et al. (2005)	JS	267	.25	.73	.82	Grzywacz and Marks (2000) - FWE	2	Multi-item
Aziz et al. (2010)	JS	199	.01	.93	.88	Fisher et al. (2009)	2	Multi-item
Bornstein et al. (2003)	LS	234	.35	.70		Macphee et al. (1986)	4	Multi-item
Bryant & Constantine (2006)	JS	133	.20	.76	.69	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Bryant & Constantine (2006)	LS	133	.45	.76	.91	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Cahill et al. (2015)	JS	2,495	.40	.97		Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
Carlson et al. (2009)	FS	685	.52	.93	.94	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Carlson et al. (2009)	JS	685	.62	.93	.93	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Carvalho & Chambel (2016)	LS	218	−.16	.88	.88	Carlson et al. (2009) - WFC	2	Multi-item
Carvalho & Chambel (2016)	LS	218	.27	.96	.88	Carlson et al. (2009) - WFE	2	Multi-item
Chan et al. (2016)	FS	234	.29	.94	.97	Brough et al. (2014)	3	Multi-item
Chan et al. (2016)	JS	234	.27	.94	.86	Brough et al. (2014)	3	Multi-item
Chen & Li (2012) Sample 1	FS	204	.37	.72	.95	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Chen & Li (2012) Sample 2	FS	204	.47	.71	.96	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Clark (2000)	JS	179	−.10	.86	.91	Bohen & Viveros-Long (1981) - WFC & FWC	6	Multi-item
Clark (2000)	LS	179	−.15	.86	.85	Bohen & Viveros-Long (1981) - WFC & FWC	6	Multi-item
Clarke et al. (2004)	JS	387	.22[b]			Milkie & Peltola (1999)	4	Single-item
Clarke et al. (2004)	FS	387	.12[a]			Milkie & Peltola (1999)	4	Single-item
DeHauw (2014) Sample 1	JS	395	.43	.93	.88	Own measure	4	Multi-item

(Appendix continues)

Appendix (*continued*)

Study	Outcome	N	r	r_{xx}	r_{yy}	Balance measure	Cluster	Single vs. multi-item
DeHauw (2014) Sample 1	LS	395	.50	.93	.91	Own measure	4	Multi-item
DeHauw (2014) Sample 2	JS	413	.52	.93	.89	Own measure	4	Multi-item
DeHauw (2014) Sample 2	LS	413	.53	.93	.93	Own measure	4	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	FS	698	.23		.87	Jones et al. (2006)	1	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	FS	698	.19	.85	.87	Brett and Stroh (2003)	6	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	FS	698	.26		.87	Berg et al. (2003)	5	Single-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	JS	698	.41		.83	Jones et al. (2006)	1	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	JS	698	.59	.85	.83	Brett and Stroh (2003)	6	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	JS	698	.52		.83	Berg et al. (2003)	5	Single-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	LS	698	.42		.82	Jones et al. (2006)	1	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	LS	698	.46	.85	.82	Brett and Stroh (2003)	6	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 1	LS	698	.52		.82	Berg et al. (2003)	5	Single-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 2	FS	2,210	.30		.85	Jones et al. (2006)	1	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 2	FS	2,210	.34		.85	Berg et al. (2003)	5	Single-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 2	JS	2,210	.37		.80	Jones et al. (2006)	1	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 2	JS	2,210	.50		.80	Berg et al. (2003)	5	Single-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 2	LS	2,210	.49		.82	Jones et al. (2006)	1	Multi-item
Ellwart & Konradt (2011) Sample 2	LS	2,210	.61		.82	Berg et al. (2003)	5	Single-item
Farivar et al. (2016)	JS	513	.23	.84	.89	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Ferguson et al. (2012)	FS	270	.42	.88	.97	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Ferguson et al. (2012)	JS	270	.30	.88	.88	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Ferguson et al. (2016)	FS	639	.42	.94	.92	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Ferguson et al. (2016)	JS	639	.51	.94	.95	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Finegold et al. (2002)	JS	2,946	.24[a]		.6[c]	Own measure	5	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 1	JS	267	−.28	.83	.91	Own measure - PLIW	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 1	JS	267	−.31	.94	.91	Own measure - WIPL	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 1	JS	267	.52	.77	.91	Own measure - WPLE	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 1	LS	267	−.42	.83	.85	Own measure - PLIW	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 1	LS	267	−.55	.94	.85	Own measure - WIPL	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 1	LS	267	.61	.77	.85	Own measure - WPLE	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 2	JS	273	−.21	.76	.90	Own measure - PLIW	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 2	JS	273	−.41	.93	.90	Own measure - WIPL	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 2	JS	273	.45	.76	.90	Own measure - WPLE	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 2	LS	273	−.34	.76	.86	Own measure - PLIW	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 2	LS	273	−.56	.93	.86	Own measure - WIPL	2	Multi-item
Fisher (2002) Sample 2	LS	273	.63	.76	.86	Own measure - WPLE	2	Multi-item
Gareis et al. (2009)	LS	2,031	−.32[b]	.82	.64	MIDUS I - WFC	2	Multi-item
Gareis et al. (2009)	LS	2,031	.15[b]	.72	.64	MIDUS I - WFE	2	Multi-item
Gareis et al. (2009)	LS	2,031	−.10[b]	.79	.64	MIDUS I - FWC	2	Multi-item
Gareis et al. (2009)	LS	2,031	.34[b]	.68	.64	MIDUS I - FWE	2	Multi-item
Grawitch et al. (2013)	JS	456	.55	.94	.86	Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
Grawitch et al. (2013)	LS	456	.28	.94	.90	Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
Greenhaus et al. (2003)	LS	353	.01		.83	Own measure	5	Multi-item
Haar (2013) Sample 1	JS	609	.51	.80	.86	Haar (2013)	5	Multi-item
Haar (2013) Sample 1	LS	609	.48	.80	.82	Haar (2013)	5	Multi-item
Haar (2013) Sample 2	JS	708	.40	.74	.81	Haar (2013)	5	Multi-item
Haar (2013) Sample 2	LS	708	.49	.74	.80	Haar (2013)	5	Multi-item
Haar et al. (2014)	JS	1,416	.36	.84	.79	Haar (2013)	5	Multi-item
Haar et al. (2014)	LS	1,416	.47	.84	.83	Haar (2013)	5	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	FS	161	.29	.91	.86	Carlson et al. (2009) - WFE	2	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	FS	161	.37	.79	.86	Carlson et al. (2009) - FWE	2	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	FS	161	−.33	.92	.86	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - WFC	2	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	FS	161	−.23	.79	.86	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - FWC	2	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	JS	161	.33	.91	.80	Carlson et al. (2009) - WFE	2	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	JS	161	.20	.79	.80	Carlson et al. (2009) - FWE	2	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	JS	161	−.17	.92	.80	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - FWC	2	Multi-item
Hennessy (2007)	JS	161	.05	.79	.80	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - FWC	2	Multi-item
Hosboyar (2013)	JS	103	.38		.92	Own measure	4	Single-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	JS	189	.52	.79	.81	Grzywacyz and Marks (2000) - WFE	2	Multi-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	JS	189	.47	.75	.81	Grzywacyz and Marks (2000) - FWE	2	Multi-item

(*Appendix continues*)

Appendix (*continued*)

Study	Outcome	N	r	r_{xx}	r_{yy}	Balance measure	Cluster	Single vs. multi-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	JS	189	.01	.86	.81	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - WFC	2	Multi-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	JS	189	−.18	.72	.81	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - FWC	2	Multi-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	LS	189	.46	.79	.79	Grzywacyz and Marks (2000) - WFE	2	Multi-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	LS	189	.33	.75	.79	Grzywacyz and Marks (2000) - FWE	2	Multi-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	LS	189	−.22	.86	.79	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - WFC	2	Multi-item
Jia-Fang et al. (2009)	LS	189	−.16	.72	.79	Netemeyer et al. (1996) - FWC	2	Multi-item
Juliao (2005)	LS	271	.49	.68	.88	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Kamel & Omran (2016)	LS	276	.54	.93	.91	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Kanwar et al. (2009) Sample 1	JS	191	.32	.76	.71	Own measure	4	Multi-item
Kanwar et al. (2009) Sample 2	JS	122	.56	.76	.71	Own measure	4	Multi-item
Ko (2016)	LS	216	−.31	.72	.77	No citation given - WFC	2	Multi-item
Ko (2016)	LS	216	.32	.60	.77	No citation given - WFE	2	Multi-item
Ko (2016)	LS	216	−.34	.84	.77	No citation given - FWC	2	Multi-item
Ko (2016)	LS	216	.07	.73	.77	No citation given - FWE	2	Multi-item
Le Fevre et al. (2015) Sample 1	JS	1,004	−.36	.90		Frone and Yardley (1996) - WFC	6	Multi-item
Le Fevre et al. (2015) Sample 2	JS	1,016	−.22	.90		Frone and Yardley (1996) - WFC	6	Multi-item
Lee et al. (2014)	FS	274	.16	.63	.98	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Lee et al. (2014)	JS	274	.44	.63	.90	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Lee et al. (2014)	LS	274	.41	.63		Marks & MacDermid (1996)	3	Multi-item
Marks et al. (2001) Sample 1	FS	80	.42	.64	.92	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	5	Multi-item
Marks et al. (2001) Sample 2	FS	80	.28	.56	.92	Marks & MacDermid (1996)	5	Multi-item
Mas-Machuca et al. (2016)	JS	374	.21	.62		Hayman (2005)	6	Multi-item
Milkie & Peltola (1999) Sample 1	FS	234	.46[b]			Own measure	4	Single-item
Milkie & Peltola (1999) Sample 2	FS	192	.38[b]			Own measure	4	Single-item
Nayeem & Tripathy (2012)	JS	152	.55	.77	.83	Own measure	6	Multi-item
Odle-Dusseau et al. (2012)	LS	330	.44	.89	.87	Greenhaus et al. (2012)	5	Multi-item
Parkes & Langford (2008)	JS	16,784	.27	.86		Own measure	1	Multi-item
Pattusamy et al. (2016)	FS	218	.46	.83	.97	Hill et al. (2001)	6	Multi-item
Pattusamy et al. (2016)	JS	218	.33	.83	.88	Hill et al. (2001)	6	Multi-item
Petrie (2013)	LS	130	−.06		.88	Own measure	3	Multi-item
RamaDevi & Nagini (2014)	JS	103	.38			Own measure	4	Single-item
Salzstein et al. (2001)	JS	32,103	.36[b]			Ezra & Deckman (1996)	5	Single-item
Sang et al. (2009)	JS	110	−.49	.90	.91	Small & Riley (1990) and Bacharach et al. (1991) - WFC & FWC	6	Multi-item
Seong & Hong (2015)	JS	765	.26		.81	Brett and Stroh (2003)	6	Multi-item
Siu (2013)	JS	287	.30	.76	.88	Siu & Phillips (2005)	4	Multi-item
St. Vil (2014)	FS	102	.28[b]		.94	Own measure	4	Multi-item
Syrek et al. (2011) Sample 1	JS	137	.35	.95		Syrek et al. (2011)	1	Multi-item
Syrek et al. (2011) Sample 1	LS	137	.49	.95		Syrek et al. (2011)	1	Multi-item
Syrek et al. (2011) Sample 2	FS	108	.34	.95		Syrek et al. (2011)	1	Multi-item
Syrek et al. (2011) Sample 2	JS	108	.55	.95		Syrek et al. (2011)	1	Multi-item
Syrek et al. (2011) Sample 2	LS	108	.55	.95		Syrek et al. (2011)	1	Multi-item
Virick et al. (2007)	JS	510	.28	.86	.92	Hill et al. (2001)	6	Multi-item
Virick et al. (2007)	LS	510	.36	.86	.84	Hill et al. (2001)	6	Multi-item
Wayne et al. (2017) Sample 1	FS	943	.65	.89	.92	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Wayne et al. (2017) Sample 1	FS	943	.63	.95	.92	Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
Wayne et al. (2017) Sample 1	JS	954	.46	.89	.92	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item
Wayne et al. (2017) Sample 1	JS	954	.60	.95	.92	Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
Wayne et al. (2017) Sample 2	JS	235	.44	.94		Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
Wayne et al. (2017) Sample 2	LS	235	.49	.94	.88	Valcour (2007)	1	Multi-item
White (1999)	FS	2757	.19[b]			Own measure	5	Single-item
White (1999)	JS	2757	.33			Own measure	5	Single-item
Wu et al. (2013)	JS	573	.35[b]	.76		Own measure	4	Multi-item
Zhang et al. (2012)	FS	605	−.13	.75		Marshall & Barnett (1991) - WFC & FWC	2	Multi-item
Zhang et al. (2012)	FS	605	.33	.71		Marshall & Barnett (1991) - WFE & FWE	2	Multi-item
Zhang et al. (2012)	JS	605	−.20	.75		Marshall & Barnett (1991) - WFC & FWC	2	Multi-item
Zhang et al. (2012)	JS	605	.14	.71		Marshall & Barnett (1991) - WFE & FWE	2	Multi-item
Zivnuska et al. (2016)	JS	503	.49	.93	.92	Carlson et al. (2009)	4	Multi-item

Note. LS = life satisfaction; JS = job satisfaction; FS = family satisfaction.
[a] Correlation calculated based on composite of outcome variables. [b] Correlation calculated using a conversion formula. [c] Reliability calculated based on the correlation among composites.