

## Social Integration, Work-Family Conflict and Facilitation, and Job and Marital Quality

*This paper examines relationships between 2 dimensions of social integration (community participation and affective community resources) and job and marital quality. Data from the 1995 National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (n = 1,816) indicate that the level of community participation is unrelated or negatively related to job and marital quality, whereas affective community resources show positive associations with job and marital quality. Relationships between community participation and affective community resources and job stress are partially mediated by work-to-family conflict and facilitation. Family-to-work conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between affective community resources and marital satisfaction and risk. The study takes a beginning step in establishing relationships and exploring processes that make up the work-community-family interface.*

During the past several decades, extensive theoretical and empirical work has demonstrated that work and family are interconnected domains. This research has documented that demands and resources associated with participation in the work or family domain directly affect role qual-

ity and performance in the other domain. In addition, demands and resources in one domain are related to appraisals of conflict or facilitation across domains. These appraisals are linking mechanisms that mediate relationships between demands and resources and role quality and performance (Voydanoff, 2002). The study of these interconnections draws upon the ecological systems approach (Bronfenbrenner, 1989), which proposes that domains such as work and family are microsystems consisting of patterns of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations experienced in a network of face-to-face relationships. The processes and linking mechanisms occurring between two or more microsystems form a mesosystem. Cross-domain processes include resource drain, resource generation, and positive and negative spillover, whereas linking mechanisms include work-family conflict and facilitation (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Voydanoff, 2004a).

Recently, scholars have begun to expand this analysis to include community as a third microsystem that is linked with the work and family microsystems to form a work-community-family mesosystem. To establish linkages within the work-community-family mesosystem, it is necessary to document relationships among work, community, and family characteristics and to understand the processes and linking mechanisms through which these relationships operate. For example, characteristics associated with community participation may influence role quality and performance in the work and family domains, either directly or through linking mechanisms. Relationships between community

---

Raymond L. Fitz, S. M. Center for Leadership in Community, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH 45469-1445 (Patricia.Voydanoff@notes.udayton.edu).

*Key Words:* job quality, marital risk, marital satisfaction, social integration, work-family conflict, work-family facilitation.

characteristics and work and family role quality and performance may be subject to the same processes and linking mechanisms as relationships between work and family characteristics.

Broad-based analyses have indicated that work and family life are embedded in the context of the communities in which they operate. Working families' participation in community organizations and informal neighborhood and friendship relationships provides important resources in their efforts to coordinate their work and family responsibilities and activities (Bookman, 2004). Detailed empirical analyses of the effects of community participation and resources on work and family role quality and performance, however, are just now beginning.

This paper uses an ecological systems approach as a framework for investigating relationships between community participation and affective community resources and job and marital quality. It analyzes data from the 1995 National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS) to examine the extent to which community participation and affective resources are directly related to job and marital quality and to assess whether these relationships are mediated by work-family conflict and facilitation. The study moves beyond previous research by comparing direct and indirect effects of community participation and affective resources on job and marital quality for a large representative sample of U.S. workers.

## BACKGROUND

### *Conceptualizing Social Integration, Work-Family Conflict and Facilitation, and Job and Marital Quality*

Social integration is a concept that has been used to understand both social structure and individual behavior. On the individual level, social integration generally is defined as structural or affective interconnectedness with others and with social institutions. It encompasses patterns of social interaction and participation and attitudes regarding institutions and relationships (Berkman & Glass, 2000; Voydanoff, Donnelly, & Fine, 1988). The structural component of social integration incorporates a behavioral component in which individuals participate in formal organizations and informal social relationships, for example, formal volunteering and spending time with neighbors and friends.

Community participation ranges from low to high. Affective interconnectedness includes a cognitive component in which formal and informal relationships are perceived as supportive, for example, sense of community, neighborhood attachment, and supportive friendships. Affective interconnectedness may be positive or negative, that is, relationships may be supportive or demanding. Supportive and demanding aspects may coexist as independent dimensions within a given relationship. This paper focuses on supportive aspects.

Work-family conflict and facilitation are cognitive appraisals of the effects of the work (family) domain on the family (work) domain. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), cognitive appraisal is the process of deciding whether an experience is positive, stressful, or irrelevant with regard to well-being. A stressful appraisal occurs when individuals perceive that the demands of the environment exceed their resources, thereby endangering their well-being. Thus, work-family conflict and facilitation derive from assessing the relative demands and resources associated with work and family roles. This view of conflict and facilitation focuses on perceptions rather than objective characteristics that may operate outside the individual's awareness because such perceptions generally mediate the effects of more objective characteristics on outcomes (Edwards & Rothbard, 2005).

Work-family conflict is a form of interrole conflict in which the demands of work and family roles are incompatible in some respect so that participation in one role is more difficult because of participation in the other role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This conflict can take two forms: work-to-family conflict in which the demands of work make it difficult to perform family responsibilities and family-to-work conflict in which family demands limit the performance of work duties. Work-family facilitation is a form of synergy in which resources associated with one role enhance or make easier participation in the other role. It also can operate from either work to family or family to work. Work-to-family conflict and work-to-family facilitation are either uncorrelated or show weak negative relationships to each other (see Voydanoff, 2004b, 2005, for reviews). Thus, work-family conflict and work-family facilitation are independent constructs rather than opposite ends of a single continuum. They may coexist within a given individual.

The work domain encompasses a range of resources and demands that are associated with a job, that is, paid employment, whereas the family domain incorporates the diverse resources and demands that accompany living in the physical domain called home. The work and family domains, however, also include assessments of the quality of the job and of the various family relationships that exist within the home, for example, the marital relationship. Job and marital quality reflect positive and negative affect associated with paid work and the marital relationship. Job satisfaction is an individual's cognitive or affective evaluation of the overall quality of the job. Job stress is the extent to which a job is perceived to have negative effects on an individual's physical and mental health. Marital satisfaction is an individual's affective appraisal of the overall quality of the marital relationship, whereas marital risk reflects the perception that a marriage is in trouble and may end as well as high levels of marital conflict.

#### *Community Participation and Job and Marital Quality*

This study examines participation in and affective resources associated with activities based in three aspects of community: the local community as a whole, the neighborhood as a small geographically based area, and friends who serve as a major source of informal, nonfamily interaction. It considers three types of community participation as indicators of structural social integration: participation in volunteer work, contact with neighbors, and contact with friends. Participation in volunteer work is the time spent in formal volunteering within the broader community, whereas contact with neighbors and friends reflects informal social relationships. Community participation is associated with resources and demands that may influence job and marital quality. Resources include access to instrumental and emotional social support, companionship, value consensus, role models, identity maintenance, and the rewards of helping others. The social embeddedness associated with these resources may generalize to job and marital quality. Community participation, however, also may be accompanied by demands such as excessive obligations and lack of reciprocity. In addition, community participation is a fixed resource in that time spent in community activities is unavailable for other

activities. These demands may have negative effects on job and marital quality.

Research on the effects of the three types of community participation on job and marital quality is sparse. One study reported that time in community and professional organizations was negatively related to marital happiness and unrelated to marital disagreements, whereas time in religious and organized youth activities was not related to marital happiness or disagreements (Voydanoff, 2004c). Another study found that a less precise measure of participation in volunteer work, number of organizational memberships, showed weak negative relationships to an extreme indicator of marital risk, namely, divorce (Booth, Edwards, & Johnson, 1991). No known studies have investigated relationships between contact with neighbors and marital quality. The number of friends one has shows a weak negative relationship to divorce in one study but is not related to marital conflict in another. The number of wives' friends, however, is positively related to the level of conflict reported by husbands (Booth et al., 1991; Burger & Milardo, 1995). No studies were located that examined relationships between community participation and job quality.

These limited findings provide little guidance. The literature on social integration, however, emphasizes the idea that resources are embedded in community participation. Its acknowledgment of the demanding aspects of participation, for example, the demands associated with social support, is recent and less central to the conceptualization. In addition, the voluntary nature of community participation may allow individuals to adjust their participation so that they either maintain a balance between the resources and demands associated with participation or tilt the balance in the direction of resources. If so, the level of community participation may be relatively independent of job and marital quality or may show weak positive relationships to job and marital quality. This suggests the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Community participation shows weak positive relationships to job and marital satisfaction and weak negative relationships to job stress and marital risk.

#### *Affective Community Resources and Job and Marital Quality*

The idea that community participation is accompanied by resources and demands that

may influence its relationship to job and marital quality can be assessed directly by examining relationships between community resources and demands and job and marital quality. This study focuses on one type of resource—*affective community resources*. Resources are structural or psychological assets that may be used to facilitate performance, reduce demands, or generate additional resources. Resources contribute to positive role quality and performance outcomes by engendering processes that improve performance when they are applied across domains. Affective community resources include three types of social integration based on affective connections: sense of community, neighborhood attachment, and support from friends. Sense of community has been defined by McMillan and Chavis (1986) as consisting of four interrelated elements: feeling of belonging, the sense that the individual and the group matter to each other, the feeling that members' needs will be met through group resources, and a shared history. Attitudinal neighborhood attachment is associated with neighborhood ties, trust, pride, and satisfaction (Woldoff, 2002). Support from friends is one type of informal social support, which may incorporate resources such as emotional support, instrumental support, and support in the form of advice or information. These affective community resources are one type of resource that may be embedded in community participation. In conjunction with several other resources and demands, they may influence the extent to which community participation is related to job and marital quality.

These three affective aspects of social integration are enabling resources that encompass social and psychological assets such as a sense of community belonging and support and assistance and understanding from neighbors and caring friends. These resources provide social embeddedness, social control and regulation, individual and group identity, interpersonal connections and attachment, access to other resources and support, and emotional sustenance. It is proposed that these resources facilitate the efforts of individuals and families to fulfill their work and family responsibilities, thereby increasing job and marital satisfaction and reducing job stress and marital risk. Previous research has not explored these affective community resources in relation to job and marital quality. The social integration approach, however, suggests the following:

Hypothesis 2: Affective community resources are positively related to job and marital satisfaction and negatively related to job stress and marital risk.

#### *Work-Family Conflict and Facilitation as Mediators*

A stringent test of linkages among community, work, and family would assess whether community participation and affective community resources operate through work-family conflict and facilitation to influence job and marital quality. Work-family conflict and facilitation are appraisals of the effects of one domain on the other, rather than characteristics of a single domain. Thus, community participation and affective resources must penetrate two domains simultaneously to influence job and marital quality through work-family conflict and facilitation. They must either enhance an individual's ability to do a job or perform family duties, such that negative interdomain relationships (work-family conflict) are reduced or positive interdomain relationships (work-family facilitation) are increased. If this occurs, work-family conflict and facilitation may mediate relationships between community participation and affective community resources and job and marital quality. Thus, community participation and affective resources would decrease work-family conflict and increase work-family facilitation, which in turn would increase job and marital quality. Because community participation and affective resources also are expected to have direct effects on job and marital quality, work-family conflict and facilitation would be expected to have partial rather than full mediating effects. No extant research has examined the extent to which work-family conflict and facilitation mediate relationships between community participation and affective community resources and job and marital quality.

Therefore, in addition to investigating the direct effects of community participation and affective community resources on job and marital quality, this study also examines the extent to which community participation and affective resources influence job and marital quality indirectly through work-family conflict and facilitation. Such indirect relationships require that community participation and affective resources are related to work-family conflict and facilitation. Community participation and affective

resources may reduce work-family conflict and contribute to work-family facilitation by increasing the competence and capacities to perform in the work and family domains. For example, when friends are supportive, individuals may be better able to perform family duties, thereby experiencing higher levels of family-to-work facilitation, which in turn is associated with marital quality. They also may be associated with energy creation that enhances participation in other domains (Marks, 1977). An earlier study documented that sense of community and friend support were negatively related to work-family conflict and positively associated with work-family facilitation, whereas neighborhood attachment was not related to conflict or facilitation (Voydanoff, 2004c, 2005).

For work-family conflict and facilitation to serve as mediators, work-family conflict and facilitation also must be associated with job and marital quality. Extensive research has indicated that work-to-family and family-to-work conflict are negatively related to job and marital or family satisfaction (see Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000, Bellavia & Frone, 2005, and Kossek & Ozeki, 1998, for reviews). Several studies also have documented that work-to-family and family-to-work conflict are positively associated with job stress (Behson, 2002; Geurts, Rutte, & Peeters, 1999; Judge, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1994), whereas evidence for relationships between work-to-family and family-to-work conflict and marital risk distress is relatively limited (Kinnunen, Vermulst, Gerris, & Makikangas, 2003; Vinokur, Pierce, & Buck, 1999). Findings for work-family facilitation are meager. Brockwood, Hammer, and Neal (2003) reported positive relationships between work-to-family facilitation and family satisfaction and family-to-work facilitation and job satisfaction. No known studies have examined relationships between work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation and job stress and marital risk.

In addition to the findings cited above that both work-to-family and family-to-work conflict are related to affective job and marital outcomes, two more specific approaches have been proposed. Frone, Yardley, and Markel (1997) have suggested that work-to-family conflict is related to family dissatisfaction or distress, whereas family-to-work conflict is associated with negative work outcomes. Thus, interference from the originating domain reduces the

quality of life in the receiving domain, for example, the quality of family life suffers when work interferes with family. Two other studies, however, have revealed a different pattern of findings (Grandey, Cordeiro, & Crouter, in press; Wayne, Musica, & Fleeson, 2004). They found that work-family conflict and work-family facilitation were related to satisfaction with the originating domain rather than the receiving domain. They suggested that attributing blame for conflict to the originating domain leads to negative affect toward that role, for example, work-to-family conflict is positively related to job stress. Positive attribution to the originating role for work-family facilitation may account for the relationship between work-family facilitation and satisfaction in the originating domain, for example, work-to-family facilitation is positively related to job satisfaction.

If work-to-family and family-to-work conflict and facilitation are differentially related to job and marital quality, their mediating effects also may differ. For example, if work-to-family conflict and facilitation are more strongly associated with job satisfaction and stress than family-to-work conflict and facilitation are, then work-to-family conflict and facilitation should have stronger mediating effects than family-to-work conflict and facilitation. Alternatively, relationships between community participation and affective community resources and marital satisfaction and risk should be mediated by family-to-work conflict and facilitation rather than work-to-family conflict and facilitation. Thus, mediating effects should be stronger for the direction of conflict and facilitation that is most closely associated with the domain of the outcome variable. Previous research provides limited guidance in this area. Because the rationale and results are more consistent and comprehensive for the Wayne et al. (2004) and Grandey et al. (in press) approach than for the Frone et al. (1997) approach, however, the following hypotheses are suggested:

Hypothesis 3: Work-to-family conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between community participation and affective community resources and job satisfaction and stress.

Hypothesis 4: Family-to-work conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between community participation and affective community resources and marital satisfaction and risk.

### Control Variables

Control variables are included in the analyses to account for the effects of additional variables that may influence job and marital quality. They include gender, age, education, a child aged 6 or younger in the home, and negative affectivity. Marital quality tends to be lower for women and for those who are younger, have lower levels of education, and have a child less than 6 years old in the home (Amato, Johnson, Booth, & Rogers, 2003; Dush, Cohan, & Amato, 2003; Glenn, 1990). The findings for job quality show a similar pattern but are weaker and less consistent (Ganzach, 2003; Kiecolt, 2003). Negative affectivity is a generalized mood-dispositional trait that corresponds to the personality dimension of neuroticism. It is controlled here because it is positively correlated with several aspects of stress and negatively related to well-being and role quality (Burke, Brief, & George, 1993).

## METHOD

### Data

The data for the study are from the 1995 National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS), a nationally representative random-digit-dial sample of noninstitutionalized English-speaking adults, aged 25–74, selected from working telephone banks in the coterminous United States. Respondents participated in a telephone interview, with a response rate of 70%, and a mail questionnaire, with a response rate of 87%, which yielded an overall rate of 61% for both parts of the survey. The total sample included 4,242 respondents. The subsample used in the analysis included the 1,816 respondents who were employed and living with a spouse or partner. When cases with missing data on any variable were omitted, sample sizes ranged from 1,725 to 1,741 for the four dependent variables.

### Measures

*Job and marital quality.* *Job satisfaction* is measured by responses to a question asking respondents to rate their work situation on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = *the worst possible work situation* and 10 = *the best possible work situation*. The *job stress* measure was the average of responses to two questions ( $\alpha = .77$ ,  $r = .63$ )

asking respondents about the overall effects their job has on their physical health and their emotional or mental health. Responses are coded from 1 = *very positive* to 5 = *very negative*. The measure of *marital satisfaction* is comparable to the job satisfaction measure, that is, respondents were asked to rate their marriage or close relationship from 0 to 10 where 0 = *the worst possible marriage or close relationship* and 10 = *the best possible marriage or close relationship*. The measure of *marital risk* was the mean response to the following five questions ( $\alpha = .77$ ): “During the past year, how often have you thought your relationship might be in trouble?” (1 = *never or once* to 4 = *all the time*), “Realistically, what do you think the chances are that you and your partner will eventually separate?” (1 = *not likely at all* to 4 = *very likely*), “How much do you and your spouse or partner disagree on the following issues? Money matters, such as how much to spend, save, or invest; household tasks, such as what needs doing and who does it; leisure time activities, such as what to do and with whom” (1 = *not at all* to 4 = *a lot*).

*Community participation.* The measure of *participation in volunteer work* was the total number of hours per month spent doing formal volunteer work of any of the following types: hospital, nursing home, or other health care-oriented volunteer work; school or other youth-oriented volunteer work; volunteer work for political organizations or causes; and volunteer work for any other organizations, cause, or charity. After reports of spending more than 30 hours per month were recoded to 30 to reduce right skewness, scores ranged from 0 to 30. *Contact with neighbors* was assessed by averaging responses to the following two questions ( $\alpha = .72$ ,  $r = .56$ ): “How often do you have any contact—even something as simple as saying ‘hello’—with any of your neighbors?” and “How often do you have a real conversation or get together socially with any of your neighbors?” (1 = *never or hardly ever* to 6 = *almost every day*). The measure of *contact with friends* was the response to the following question: “How often are you in contact with any of your friends—including visits, phone calls, letters, or electronic mail messages?” (1 = *never or hardly ever* to 8 = *several times a day*).

*Affective community resources.* *Sense of community* was the mean response to three

questions ( $\alpha = .73$ ) asking respondents how strongly they agree with the following: "I don't feel I belong to anything I'd call a community (reverse coded); I feel close to other people in my community; My community is a source of comfort" (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). The measure of *neighborhood attachment* was the average of four items asking respondents how much the following describes their situation ( $\alpha = .79$ ): "I could call on a neighbor for help if I needed it; People in my neighborhood trust each other; I feel very good about my home and my neighborhood; My neighborhood is kept clean" (1 = *not at all* to 4 = *a lot*). *Support from friends* was assessed by averaging responses to the following four questions ( $\alpha = .79$ ): "How much do your friends really care about you? How much do they understand the way you feel about things? How much can you rely on them for help if you have a serious problem? How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?" (1 = *not at all* to 4 = *a lot*).

*Work-family conflict and facilitation.* The measure of *work-to-family conflict* was the mean response to four items ( $\alpha = .83$ ) asking respondents how often in the past year they have experienced the following: "Your job reduces the effort you can give to activities at home; Stress at work makes you irritable at home; Your job makes you feel too tired to do the things that need attention at home; Job worries or problems distract you when you are at home." Responses ranged from 1 = *never* to 5 = *all the time*. *Work-to-family facilitation* was assessed by averaging responses to three items ( $\alpha = .73$ ) asking respondents how often in the past year they experienced the following: "The things you do at work help you deal with personal and practical issues at home; The things you do at work make you a more interesting person at home; The skills you use on your job are useful for things you have to do at home" (1 = *never* to 5 = *all the time*). The measure of *family-to-work conflict* was the mean response to four items ( $\alpha = .80$ ) asking respondents how often in the past year they have experienced the following: "Responsibilities at home reduce the effort you can devote to your job; Personal or family worries and problems distract you when you are at work; Activities and chores at home prevent you from getting the amount of sleep you need to do your job well; Stress at home

makes you irritable at work." Responses ranged from 1 = *never* to 5 = *all the time*. *Family-to-work facilitation* was the mean response to three items ( $\alpha = .70$ ) asking respondents how often in the past year they experienced the following: "Talking with someone at home helps you deal with problems at work; The love and respect you get at home makes you feel confident about yourself at work; Your home life helps you relax and feel ready for the next day's work." Responses ranged from 1 = *never* to 5 = *all the time*.

*Control variables.* *Gender* was a dummy variable coded 1 for male. *Age* was coded in years ranging from 25 to 74. *Education* was coded in 12 categories ranging from 1 = *no school or some grade school* to 12 = *professional degree*. The presence of young children in the household was assessed by a dummy variable coded 1 if there was a *child 6 years or younger* present. *Negative affectivity* was the average response to four items asking respondents how much each adjective described them ( $\alpha = .74$ ): moody, worrying, nervous, calm (item reversed). Responses ranged from 1 = *not at all* to 4 = *a lot*.

## FINDINGS

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, zero-order correlations, and alpha coefficients of reliability for the variables in the analysis. The means indicate relatively high levels of job and marital satisfaction and moderate levels of job stress and marital risk. The means for the community participation measures reveal low levels of participation in volunteer work and moderately high levels of contact with neighbors and friends. The means for the affective community resources scales reveal moderately high levels of these resources. With one exception, the means for work-family conflict and facilitation indicate moderate levels of conflict and facilitation. The level of family-to-work facilitation is relatively high. Correlations among the predictors are low. The only correlations higher than .35 are between age and child 6 or younger ( $r = -.45$ ), contact with friends and friend support ( $r = .45$ ), and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict ( $r = .52$ ). All the alpha coefficients of reliability are .70 or higher.

TABLE 1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, CORRELATIONS, AND RELIABILITIES FOR THE VARIABLES IN THE ANALYSIS

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1 Job satisfaction	7.41	2.00	—																		
2 Job stress	2.65	.93	-.42	.77																	
3 Marital satisfaction	8.17	1.80	.23	-.14	—																
4 Marital risk	1.97	.66	-.22	.15	-.68	.77															
5 Gender (1 = male)	.61	.49	-.01	.06	.13	-.08	—														
6 Age	44.16	11.22	.09	-.10	.12	-.19	.07	—													
7 Education	7.12	2.47	.08	.02	-.02	-.03	.06	.03	—												
8 Child aged 6 or younger (1 = yes)	.21	.41	-.03	.02	-.10	.10	.03	-.45	-.01	—											
9 Negative affectivity	2.21	.65	-.22	.23	-.21	.25	-.15	-.16	-.11	.03	.74										
10 Volunteer participation	4.81	8.07	.00	-.06	-.01	-.03	-.03	.03	.17	-.03	-.05	—									
11 Contact with neighbors	3.98	1.21	.09	-.12	.10	-.05	.08	.04	.00	.07	-.09	.13	.72								
12 Contact with friends	5.47	1.69	.09	-.12	-.01	.02	-.04	-.06	.04	-.00	-.07	.17	.26	—							
13 Sense of community	4.69	1.40	.19	-.18	.18	-.18	-.02	.16	.11	-.05	-.24	.22	.31	.21	.73						
14 Neighborhood attachment	3.41	.57	.22	-.12	.18	-.18	-.02	.21	.10	-.05	-.19	.10	.30	.10	.39	.79					
15 Support from friends	3.20	.67	.14	-.16	.11	-.13	-.19	.02	.09	-.04	-.15	.11	.18	.45	.31	.29	.79				
16 Work-to-family conflict	2.63	.71	-.32	.39	-.20	.27	.04	-.16	.12	.05	.34	-.00	-.13	-.08	-.17	-.14	-.16	.83			
17 Work-to-family facilitation	2.65	.81	.24	-.30	.07	-.03	-.06	.07	.11	-.08	-.10	.10	.10	.12	.19	.12	.14	-.05	.73		
18 Family-to-work conflict	2.09	.63	-.17	.15	-.27	.33	-.08	-.22	.06	.17	.31	.01	-.04	-.02	-.15	-.17	-.10	.52	.08	.80	
19 Family-to-work facilitation	3.51	.81	.18	-.18	.48	-.39	.02	-.00	.05	-.02	-.17	.05	.09	.07	.25	.16	.19	-.08	.28	-.15	.70

Note:  $n = 1,704$ . Correlations greater than .05 in absolute magnitude are significant at the  $p < .05$  level. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities are on the diagonal where appropriate. Decimals for correlations and alpha reliabilities are omitted.

The hypotheses are tested through ordinary least squares regression analysis. The findings for job satisfaction and stress are presented in Table 2, followed by the findings for marital satisfaction and risk in Table 3. Model 1 for each dependent variable includes control variables and community participation and affective community resources. Model 2 adds work-to-family conflict and facilitation, and Model 3 includes family-to-work conflict and facilitation.

The results for the control variables presented in Model 1 in Table 2 indicate that job satisfaction is lower for those with high levels of negative affectivity, whereas job stress is higher for men, those who are younger, and those with high levels of education and negative affectivity. A child aged 6 or younger in the home is unrelated to marital quality. Model 1 in Table 3 reveals that marital quality is higher among men and those with low negative affectivity. Marital satisfaction is lower for those with lower educational levels and those who have a child aged 6

or younger in the home. Marital risk is lower for older respondents.

The first hypothesis predicted that community participation shows weak positive relationships to job and marital satisfaction and weak negative relationships to job stress and marital risk. Model 1 in Table 2 reveals that participation in volunteer work shows a negative rather than positive association with job satisfaction. Another indicator, contact with neighbors, reveals a negative relationship to job stress. Model 1 in Table 3 indicates that contact with friends is negatively related to marital satisfaction and positively associated with marital risk. Thus, when relationships are statistically significant, they generally document negative rather than positive relationships to job and marital quality. Hypothesis 1 is not supported.

Hypothesis 2 posited that affective community resources are positively related to job and marital satisfaction and negatively related to job stress and marital risk. Model 1 in Table 2 documents

TABLE 2. REGRESSIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION AND STRESS ON CONTROL VARIABLES, COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND RESOURCES, AND WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT AND FACILITATION

Variables	Job Satisfaction			Job Stress		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Control variables</b>						
Gender (1 = male)	-.03	.00	-.04	.08**	.04	.08**
Age	.03	.00	.03	-.07**	-.03	-.08**
Education	.04	.07**	.05*	.06**	.03	.06*
Child 6 or younger (1 = yes)	.00	.01	.02	-.02	-.03	-.03
Negative affectivity	-.16***	-.06*	-.12***	.20***	.09***	.18***
<b>Community participation</b>						
Participation in volunteer work	-.06*	-.06*	-.05*	-.02	-.01	-.02
Contact with neighbors	-.00	-.03	.00	-.05*	-.02	-.05*
Contact with friends	.05	.03	.05	-.05	-.03	-.05
<b>Affective community resources</b>						
Sense of community	.08**	.05	.06*	-.07**	-.03	-.05
Neighborhood attachment	.14***	.14***	.13***	-.01	.00	.00
Support from friends	.03	-.00	.01	-.07*	-.03*	-.05
<b>Work-family conflict and facilitation</b>						
Work-to-family conflict		-.28***			.33***	
Work-to-family facilitation		.20***			-.26***	
Family-to-work conflict			-.09***			.05*
Family-to-work facilitation			.10***			-.11***
$R^2$	.10	.20	.11	.10	.24	.11
$n$		1,732			1,741	

Note: Standardized regression coefficients are presented.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$  (two-tailed tests).

TABLE 3. REGRESSIONS OF MARITAL SATISFACTION AND RISK ON CONTROL VARIABLES, COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND RESOURCES, AND WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT AND FACILITATION

Variables	Marital Satisfaction			Marital Risk		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control variables						
Gender (1 = male)	.13***	.14***	.10***	-.07**	-.08**	-.04
Age	.02	.01	.04	-.11***	-.09**	-.11***
Education	-.06*	-.04	-.04	.02	-.01	.00
Child 6 or younger (1 = yes)	-.08**	-.08**	-.05*	.03	.04	-.00
Negative affectivity	-.14***	-.10***	-.06*	.18***	.12***	.09***
Community participation						
Participation in volunteer work	-.04	-.04	-.03	-.00	-.01	-.01
Contact with neighbors	.03	.02	.04	.02	.03	.02
Contact with friends	-.08**	-.09**	-.06**	.09**	.09**	.07**
Affective community resources						
Sense of community	.10***	.09**	.01	-.09**	-.08**	-.01
Neighborhood attachment	.09**	.09**	.06*	-.07**	-.07**	-.04
Support from friends	.10***	.09**	.04	-.11***	-.10***	-.05*
Work-family conflict and facilitation						
Work-to-family conflict		-.12***			.19***	
Work-to-family facilitation		.04			.02	
Family-to-work conflict			-.15***			.21***
Family-to-work facilitation			.43***			-.33***
$R^2$	.11	.12	.30	.11	.15	.26
$n$		1,725			1,727	

Note: Standardized regression coefficients are presented.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$  (two-tailed tests).

that sense of community and neighborhood attachment are positively associated with job satisfaction, whereas sense of community and support from friends are negatively related to job stress. Model 1 in Table 3 reveals that all three affective community resources are positively related to marital satisfaction and negatively associated with marital risk. This hypothesis receives some support for job quality and consistent support for marital quality.

The third hypothesis proposed that work-to-family conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between community participation and affective community resources and job satisfaction and stress. Model 2 in Table 2 reveals that none of the coefficients for statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction are reduced substantially when work-to-family conflict and facilitation are included in the equation. However, for job stress, Model 2 in Table 2 shows that the coefficients for all three statistically significant predictors are reduced by at least half when work-to-family conflict and

facilitation are added to the equation. Thus, the hypothesis receives support for job stress but not for job satisfaction. Model 3 in Table 2 provides support for the directionality of the mediating effects (work-to-family conflict and facilitation rather than family-to-work conflict and facilitation). Family-to-work conflict and facilitation do not mediate relationships between community participation and affective resources and job satisfaction and stress.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that family-to-work conflict and facilitation mediate relationships between community participation and affective resources and marital satisfaction and risk. This hypothesis is not supported for community participation. The relationships between contact with friends and marital quality, which are opposite in direction from the hypothesis, are not mediated by family-to-work conflict and facilitation. Relationships between two affective resources (sense of community and support from friends) and marital satisfaction and risk, however, are substantially reduced when

TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF THE HYPOTHESES AND FINDINGS RELATING COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND AFFECTIVE COMMUNITY RESOURCES TO JOB AND MARITAL QUALITY

Hypothesis	Job Satisfaction	Job Stress	Marital Satisfaction	Marital Risk
Community participation shows weak positive relationships to job and marital satisfaction	No		No	
Community participation shows weak negative relationships to job stress and marital risk		Weak		No
Affective community resources are positively related to job and marital satisfaction	Moderate		Moderate	
Affective community resources are negatively related to job stress and marital risk		Weak		Moderate
Work-to-family conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between community participation and job satisfaction and job stress	No (0 of 1 measure)	Yes (1 of 1 measure)		
Work-to-family conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between affective community resources and job satisfaction and job stress	No (0 of 2 measures)	Yes (2 of 2 measures)		
Family-to-work conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between community participation and marital satisfaction and risk			No (0 of 1 measure)	No (0 of 1 measure)
Family-to-work conflict and facilitation partially mediate relationships between affective community resources and marital satisfaction and risk			Yes (2 of 3 measures)	Yes (2 of 3 measures)

*Note:* For direct relationships, no =  $R^2$  change for the group of three variables is <1%; weak =  $R^2$  change is >1% and <2.5%; moderate =  $R^2$  change is >2.5%. For mediating effects, the beta coefficient for a statistically significant predictor is reduced by at least one half when mediators are added to the equation.

family-to-work conflict and facilitation are included in the equations in Model 3 of Table 3. Smaller reductions are found for neighborhood attachment. Thus, Hypothesis 4 is supported for affective resources. In addition, Model 2 in Table 3 shows that work-to-family conflict and facilitation do not mediate relationships between community participation and affective resources and marital satisfaction and risk.

#### DISCUSSION

This paper uses an ecological systems approach to explore the extent to which community participation and affective community resources are related to job and marital quality, both

directly and indirectly through work-family conflict and facilitation. The hypotheses and findings are summarized in Table 4. The findings for community participation indicate that the predicted weak positive relationships with job and marital quality generally did not occur. With one exception, indicators of community participation either were unrelated to or showed negative relationships to job and marital quality. This suggests that the resources and demands embedded in community participation are either relatively balanced or tilted toward demands. Interestingly, contact with friends was negatively related to marital satisfaction and positively associated with marital risk. This supports earlier research indicating that the

number of wives' friends was related to husbands' reports of marital conflict. It is not clear, however, whether high contact with friends is a cause or consequence of low marital quality. Alternatively, when an individual's sense of community, neighborhood attachment, and support from friends are high, job and marital satisfaction are increased and job stress and marital risk are reduced. These findings indicate that the affective community resources associated with community participation are positively related to job and marital quality, rather than to community participation itself.

The hypotheses predicting that direct relationships between community participation and affective community resources and job and marital quality would be mediated by work-family conflict and facilitation received mixed support. Work-family conflict and facilitation mediated the statistically significant effects of community participation and affective resources on job stress but did not have mediating effects in relation to job satisfaction. Family-to-work conflict and facilitation reduced the effects of affective community resources on marital satisfaction and risk, whereas they did not mediate relationships between community participation and marital quality. These findings suggest that some aspects of community participation and affective resources are tied to job and marital quality through their association with work-family conflict and facilitation. Thus, community participation and affective resources can influence the extent to which demands and resources in the work or family domain can interfere with or facilitate participation in the other domain, which in turn affects job and marital quality. Such processes indicate relatively close linkages among work, community, and family life.

The findings also reveal that work-to-family conflict and facilitation are more strongly related to job quality than family-to-work conflict and facilitation, whereas the opposite is true for marital quality, that is, family-to-work conflict and facilitation are relatively more important in relation to marital quality than are work-to-family conflict and facilitation. These findings support the approach of Wayne et al. (2004) and Grandey et al. (in press) who proposed that attributing the source of work-family conflict to the work domain is associated with reduced satisfaction with the work role, whereas attributing it to the family domain contributes to lower marital quality. This pattern of findings

extends to the relative strength of the mediating effects of work-to-family versus family-to-work conflict and facilitation. Work-to-family conflict and facilitation are more effective mediators in relation to job satisfaction and stress, whereas family-to-work conflict and facilitation are more effective for marital satisfaction and risk. Thus, both work-to-family conflict and facilitation and family-to-work conflict and facilitation are important mediators. They differ only in whether they are more relevant for job or marital quality. This indicates that not only do community participation and affective resources have direct effects on job and marital quality but they also operate through work-family conflict and facilitation to influence job and marital quality.

The study has taken an important step in beginning to understand the work-community-family interface. Despite its strengths, it suffers important limitations. First, as a cross-sectional study of individual self-reports, it cannot address issues of change, causal order, self-selection, or common method variance. Second, several of the measures are limited. Two of the outcome variables, job satisfaction and marital satisfaction, are single items. The measures of job stress and marital risk are somewhat better, consisting of two and five items, respectively, with alpha coefficients of reliability of .77. The more sophisticated measures of job stress that are available in the literature were not part of the MIDUS questionnaire. The consistency of findings across outcomes, however, reduces somewhat the concern about these outcome measures. Although the measures of affective community resources are adapted from the work of Schuster, Kessler, and Aseltine (1990), information on their psychometric properties is limited. The same is true for the measures of work-family conflict and facilitation. The measures of work-family conflict, with reliability coefficients of .83 and .80, are comparable to those used in other studies. Reliability coefficients of .73 and .70 for the measures of work-family facilitation are adequate. Our lack of knowledge about facilitation, however, makes it difficult to assess the validity of the measures and limits our confidence that they encompass the core aspects of facilitation.

The examination of community factors in relation to the work-family interface is in its early stages. This study has focused on two aspects of social integration: structural integration (community participation) and affective

interconnectedness (affective community resources). The findings suggest that community participation and affective resources operate as part of the work-community-family interface, although other aspects of community participation and resources also may be important components of this interface. Indicators of community participation could be more specific by measuring participation in various types of volunteer work such as work-related professional and community organizations and family-related or youth organizations. Aspects of neighborhood and friend contact could be distinguished, for example, time in informal socializing with friends and neighbors could be examined separately from time in direct assistance, such as transportation and child care. Additional community resources also may be relevant to work and family life, for example, the psychological rewards associated with community participation, such as sense of accomplishment, mastery, and self-esteem. Other potentially important resources include community-based programs and services needed by working families such as child and elder care, community-based transportation to and from work and after-school programs, and a physical layout that makes it easy to access needed services. Additional studies should explore the influence of these aspects of community participation and resources on work-family processes and outcomes.

Limitations of the data set also prevent exploration of two other areas of importance. The conceptualization of social integration implies that demands as well as resources are embedded in community participation. Thus, community demands such as the unavailability of needed community services, an unsafe or undesirable neighborhood or school, excessive demands from neighbors or friends, and the lack of fit between the scheduling of community services and schools and work and family responsibilities need to be incorporated into future studies. Second, the effects of community participation, resources, and demands should be examined in relation to job and family role performance as well as role quality.

In conclusion, this application of an ecological systems approach suggests that community participation and affective community resources are embedded in a work-community-family interface. They influence job and marital quality directly and indirectly through work-family conflict and facilitation. The indirect relation-

ships tie community participation and affective resources more closely to the work-family interface than the direct relationships between community participation and resources and job and marital quality. They help us begin to understand the processes through which community participation and resources intersect with work and family life to influence job and marital quality. Additional research needs to examine these linkages with a broader range of community participation, resources, and demands and additional work and family outcomes. Such research will provide guidance for programs and policies through which the positive consequences of community resources on the quality and performance of work and family life can be enhanced and the negative effects of community demands can be reduced. It is becoming clear that work and family life are interrelated within a community context. Future research will reveal further the nature and texture of these linkages and the processes through which they operate.

#### REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 278–308.
- Amato, P. R., Johnson, D. R., Booth, A., & Rogers, S. J. (2003). Continuity and change in marital quality between 1980 and 2000. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 1–22.
- Behson, S. J. (2002). Coping with family-to-work conflict. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*, 324–341.
- Bellavia, G., & Frone, M. R. (2005). Work-family conflict. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 113–147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berkman, L. F., & Glass, T. (2000). Social integration, social networks, social support, and health. In L. F. Berman & I. Kawachi (Eds.), *Social epidemiology* (pp. 137–173). New York: Oxford.
- Bookman, A. (2004). *Starting in our own backyards*. London: Routledge.
- Booth, A., Edwards, J. N., & Johnson, D. R. (1991). Social integration and divorce. *Social Forces, 70*, 207–224.
- Brockwood, K. J., Hammer, L. B., & Neal, M. B. (2003, April). An examination of positive work-family spillover among dual-earner couples in the sandwiched generation. Paper presented at the

- annual meetings of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological systems theory. *Annals of Child Development*, 6, 187–249.
- Burger, E., & Milardo, R. M. (1995). Marital interdependence and social networks. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 12, 403–415.
- Burke, M. J., Brief, A. P., & George, J. M. (1993). The role of negative affectivity in understanding relations between self-reports of stressors of strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 402–412.
- Dush, C. M. K., Cohan, C. L., & Amato, P. R. (2003). The relationship between cohabitation and marital quality and stability. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 539–549.
- Edwards, J. E., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 178–199.
- Edwards, J. E., & Rothbard, N. P. (2005). Work and family stress and well-being. In E. E. Kossek & S. J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and life integration* (pp. 211–242). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 145–167.
- Ganzach, Y. (2003). Intelligence, education, and facets of job satisfaction. *Work and Occupations*, 30, 97–122.
- Geurts, S., Rutte, C., & Peeters, M. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of work-home interference among medical residents. *Social Science and Medicine*, 48, 1135–1148.
- Glenn, N. D. (1990). Quantitative research on marital quality in the 1980s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 52, 818–831.
- Grandey, A. A., Cordeiro, B. L., & Crouter, A. C. (in press). A longitudinal and multi-source test of the work-family conflict and job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Journal*, 10, 76–88.
- Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D., Jr. (1994). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 767–782.
- Kiecolt, K. J. (2003). Satisfaction with work and family life. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 23–35.
- Kinnunen, U., Vermulst, A., Gerris, J., & Makikangas, A. (2003). Work-family conflict and its relation to well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1669–1683.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139–149.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921–936.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14, 6–23.
- Schuster, T. L., Kessler, R. C., & Aseltine, R. H. (1990). Supportive interactions, negative interactions, and depressed mood. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 423–438.
- Vinokur, A. D., Pierce, P. F., & Buck, C. L. (1999). Work-family conflicts of women in the Air Force. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 865–878.
- Voydanoff, P. (2002). Linkages between the work-family interface and work, family, and individual outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23, 138–164.
- Voydanoff, P. (2004a). The effects of work demands and resources on work-to-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 398–412.
- Voydanoff, P. (2004b). Implications of work and community demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9, 275–285.
- Voydanoff, P. (2004c). Implications of work and community resources and demands for marital quality. *Community, Work, & Family*, 7, 311–325.
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). The differential salience of family and community demands and resources for family-to-work conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 26.
- Voydanoff, P., Donnelly, B. W., & Fine, M. A. (1988). Economic distress, social integration, and family satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues*, 9, 545–564.
- Wayne, J. H., Musica, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 108–130.
- Woldoff, R. A. (2002). The effects of local stressors on neighborhood attachment. *Social Forces*, 31, 87–116.