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Basic Concepts & Definitions

Researchers have long recognized that work and family are not "separate spheres", but are interdependent domains or roles with "permeable" boundaries (Kanter, 1977; Pleck, 1977). Some have gone beyond recognizing this linkage to advocate initiatives that allow working families to integrate these domains (e.g., Bailyn, Drago, & Kochan, 2001). But others have expressed concerns over the blurring boundary between work and family that workers can experience if there is too much work-family integration in their lives, which can occur if arrangements such as working at home and using mobile technologies tend to keep work constantly accessible (Chesley, Moen, & Shore, 2001; Galinsky & Kim, 2000; Shamir, 1992). Work-family border theory (Clark, 2000) and boundary theory (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000) address the integration and blurring of boundaries in work and family life. These theories contribute to the study of work-family linkages by describing the conditions under which varying degrees of work-family integration are likely to improve or diminish individual well-being. Both address how people construct, maintain, negotiate and cross boundaries or borders, the "lines of demarcation" (Clark, 2000) between work and family. Next, we examine the theories more closely.

Boundary theory is a general cognitive theory of social classification (Zerubavel, 1991; 1996) that focuses on outcomes such as the meanings people assign to home and work (Nippert-Eng, 1996) and the ease and frequency of transitioning between roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). In contrast, work-family border theory is devoted only to work and family domains. The outcome of interest in this theory is work-family balance, which refers to "satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home, with a minimum of role conflict" (Clark, 2000, p. 751). It also differs from boundary theory in that its definition of borders encompasses not
only those psychological categories but also tangible boundaries that divide the times, place and people associated with work versus family.

Aside from these and other minor differences, the two theories share a set of propositions (Clark, 2000; Ashforth et al., 2000, Kreiner, 2002; Nippert-Eng, 1996):

• keeping work and family separate makes it easier to manage work-family borders;

• integrating work and family facilitates transitions between these domains;

• either strategy can improve the well-being of employees, depending on the characteristics of employees (e.g., time management skills, being a "self starter", or social influence at home and work), the idiosyncratic meanings they attach to work and family (e.g., the extent to which they see these as similar roles), their preferences for integration versus segmentation, contextual factors (e.g., "family friendly" workplace norms and policies, long or irregular work hours, or social support from supervisors, coworkers and family), and the fit between their preferences and the boundaries allowed by their social context.

Integration versus segmentation. Boundaries are clearer and more easily maintained when roles are separated. On the other hand, more integrated role sets can make role transitions less difficult, but they can also confound the demands of these roles, increasing the chance of role blurring. Work-family blurring, or work-family boundary ambiguity, can be defined as the experience of confusion or difficulty in distinguishing one's work from one's family roles in a given setting in which these roles are seen as highly integrated, such as doing paid work at home (Desrochers, 2002). The integration-segmentation distinction is not a dichotomy, but a continuum in boundary theory.

Integration is believed to occur through two mechanisms: flexibility and permeability. Flexibility refers to the malleability of the boundary between two or more role/domains-its ability to expand or contract-to accommodate the demands of one domain or another (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000; Hall & Richter, 1988). For example, a female telecommuter might be called upon to play the role of mother at any point or place during the day. Permeability involves the extent to which a boundary allows psychological or behavioral aspects of one role or domain to enter another (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000; Hall & Richter, 1988; Pleck, 1977). For example, a call center operator who is not allowed to accept personal calls nor visitors at work has an impermeable work role boundary. When two or more roles or domains are flexible and permeable, they are said to be blended (Clark, 2000) or integrated (Ashforth et al., 2000). Researchers propose that work-family blurring is more likely to occur in integrated domains (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996). In contrast, Nippert-Eng (1996) argues that when boundaries are highly
Segmented, they are "thickened" by the presence of distinct schedules, behaviors and people in each domain, so that transitions between domains requires more effort.

Boundary crossing, role transitions, and boundary work. Ashforth (2001) argues that role transitions involve crossing role boundaries, and he draws a distinction between "macro role transitions" and "micro role transitions." Macro transitions are the sequential (and often permanent) exiting from one role and entering of another over time, such as promotion (Ashforth, 2001) or downward job transitions (Sargent, 2001). Micro role transitions involve switching back and forth among one's currently held roles. For example, on workdays, employees may move from the roles of parent to spouse at home, transitioning to employee after the commute to work, and switching back to spouse or parent after the commute home. Because working parents who telecommute can switch within the home from work to family roles, these micro role transitions can be made more easily and more frequently. This is partly because "getting ready" for work and transportation to work are less salient (though home workers still need to be psychologically ready to work). But the extent of integration also depends on one's boundary work—the mental and behavioral activities that make up the "the strategies, principles, and practices we use to create, maintain, and modify cultural categories" (Nippert-Eng, 1996, p. 7). Nippert-Eng posits two forms of boundary work: placement, which "draws the line between realms"; and transcendence, which keeps the boundary "in place by allowing us to jump back and forth over it" (p. 8). For example, a telecommuter may "draw the line" by asking not to be called at home during late hours unless there is a serious problem that demands immediate attention. Thus, with effort, employees can maintain a clear work-family boundary that is adaptive to their needs, even in highly integrated arrangements such as working at home or running a family business. However, there are some occupations such as a Priest or an on-call medical doctor where boundary work is difficult, because these workers have little control over the placement and transcendence of work-nonwork boundaries. One mechanism that aids in placement and transcendence (boundary crossing) are transition rituals. Transition rituals such as putting on professional clothes or packing a briefcase are habitual, patterned behaviors signifying to the individual (and sometimes to others) that he or she is in the process of exiting one role and preparing to enter another (Ashforth et al., 2000).

Importance of Topic to Work-Family Studies

Boundary and border theory can be applied to a range of work-family topics. In this section we highlight the importance of the theories to the study of work and family.

• Working at home: While working at home can reduce time-based work-family conflict by saving time that might otherwise be spent in preparation for and transportation to work, it can exacerbate other aspects of work-family conflict (Nippert-Eng, 1998). People who do some or all of their paid work at home can simultaneously experience both work cues and family cues; although these may involve
different behaviors, the fact that these behaviors are situated in the same place and often at the same time can make the salience of work and family roles seem equivocal (Nippert-Eng, 1996; Desrochers, 2002), which sets the stage for work-family blurring. On the other hand, working at home can be beneficial in that it allows one to spend more time at home with loved ones.

- **Working with family:** Working with a spouse or other family member, whether it involves running a family business (Marshack, 1994) or working for the same employer at the same job site (Moen & Sweet, 2002), can mean that work-related behaviors and family-related behaviors are so enmeshed that accomplishments and failures in one domain are nearly inseparable from those in the other. This can blur work-family borders, but it can also help balance work and family by giving family members a greater awareness of the worker's job demands (Clark, 2002).

- **Flexible scheduling:** While working at home or working with family can increase both the flexibility and permeability of the work-family boundary, flexible scheduling allows flexible but impermeable boundaries. Thus, employees can adapt to the changing demands of work and family while minimizing the chance that distractions from home will interfere with work life and distractions from home will interfere with home life (Clark, 2002a; Rau & Hyland, 2002).

- **Mobile telecommunications technology and on-call work arrangements:** Technology such as laptop computers, cell phones and pagers can help in coordinating schedules and saving time; but to the extent that such devices keep work concerns almost constantly salient and accessible, they can lead to greater stress (Chesley, Moen, & Shore, 2001; Galinsky & Kim, 2000; Shamir, 1992).

- **Workplace culture:** Many organizations implement family friendly policies such as flextime because they help recruit better talent as well as increasing productivity and reducing absenteeism; but because middle managers often demand that employees work long hours, more for the sake of "face time" than productivity, they tend to extend the temporal boundaries of work time, cutting into family time (Hochschild, 1997). Thus, organizational culture and human resource management practices can impede or enable boundary work.

**State of the Body of Knowledge**

**Qualitative research.** Nippert-Eng's seminal study of employees at a U.S. research laboratory is a detailed qualitative analysis of the content and context of the experience of the work-home boundary. Her interviews and observations of home and work environments examined how people symbolically use self-relevant objects (e.g., calendars, keys, and reading material) and actions (e.g., conversation topics, commutes and taking phone calls) to carve out work-family boundaries. Her work demonstrates that boundaries are maintained through proactive boundary work, which is especially challenging for people who do a portion of their work at home. It also shows us that people differ in how they mentally draw the
line between work and family, with some favoring segmentation and others favoring the integration end of the continuum. Finally, Nippert-Eng’s study shows that this cognitive boundary is influenced by the structural characteristics of work and home such as the physical environment, the social environment, and the cultural assumptions tied to each of these domains.

Quantitative research. In one of the few studies to test work-family border theory, Clark (2002a) constructed measures of the perceived flexibility and permeability of employees’ work and family lives, seeking to find out which combination of flexibility and permeability would best help them balance work and family. She found that high flexibility and low permeability were associated with the lowest levels of work-family conflict. Findings from Rau and Hyland’s research suggest that this link between high flexibility, low permeability and low work-family conflict may be influenced by the preferences of workers. Based on boundary theory, Rau and Hyland (2002) posited that, compared to the standard 9 to 5 work arrangement, job applicants’ relative preferences for jobs offering flextime or those offering telecommuting would depend on their current levels of work-family conflict. Consistent with their hypotheses, Rau and Hyland found that applicants with higher work-family conflict preferred jobs that offered flextime, and those with low work-family conflict preferred jobs offering telecommuting. This suggests that the relationship between boundary characteristics (flexibility and permeability) and work-family conflict may vary with employees’ boundary preferences. These preferences and the fit between preferences and perceived boundary characteristics have received special attention in two recent studies. A study by Edwards and Rothbard (1999) has implications for boundary theory because they studied, among other issues, the extent of work-family segmentation in university employees. The findings revealed that how much segmentation employees preferred, and the fit between actual and preferred segmentation predicted well-being outcomes. They found that a “good fit” predicted greater well-being outcomes such as work and family satisfaction, anxiety and depression. Interestingly, they also found that those whose work and family lives were highly segmented, and who preferred it that way, had greater overall well-being than those who had low segmentation and did not value segmentation. A subsequent study by Kreiner (2002) examined this fit from the perspective of boundary theory. His study of university alumni replicated Edwards and Rothbard’s results by showing that a good fit between actual and preferred levels of segmentation was associated with greater job satisfaction and lower stress. He also found that the relationship between fit and stress is partially mediated by work-family conflict.

Research focusing on work-family blurring. Although work-family blurring is one possible consequence of highly integrated work and family roles (Ashforth et al., 2000), only a handful of studies have specifically measured this blurring. Desrochers (2002) has developed a three-item measure of work-family boundary ambiguity. Consistent with boundary theory, he found that greater work-family boundary ambiguity associated with greater work-family conflict, a greater number of work-family transitions made when doing paid work at home, and a higher number of hours spent doing paid work at home. Two other studies merit comment because they have collected both quantitative and qualitative data on perceived work-family
blurring. Hill et al. (1996) examined the impact of mobile telework on family life for workers at a large
corporation. They found that, compared to office workers, mobile teleworkers reported greater flexibility.
Some of the teleworkers reported that their families thrived as a result of this flexibility, but others
"reported that their families struggled because workplace and schedule flexibility blurred the boundaries
between work and family life" (p. 293). Although this study was not informed by boundary theory or work-
family border theory, the findings are consistent with the proposition that work-family integration can have
either positive or negative consequences for workers. Another study has similar implications. Ahrentzen
(1990) examined the way that home workers create spatial, behavioral, temporal and social boundaries,
as well as its implications for work-family role conflict and "role overlap"—a measure of the perceived
blurring of work and family role boundaries in three separate domains: time, space, and the "mind." She
found that when home workers maintained a separate work space with restricted access from others in
the home, rescheduled work and domestic activities, and added work-family transition rituals such as
exercise they experienced less work-family conflict. Boundary theory suggests that these activities are
types of "boundary work" that home workers actively pursue in order to maintain work-family boundaries.

Implications for Practice & Research

As discussed earlier, integration/segmentation is not an either-or proposition, but a continuum. It is also
multifaceted, with underlying dimensions that include (but are not limited to) flexibility and permeability.
Furthermore, whether integrative work arrangements are beneficial or costly for employees may depend
on their boundary preferences, the extent of boundary work that they do, role conflict, and the fit among
them. Not surprisingly then, the relationships between integration and individual well-being are complex.
This complexity has implications for both future policy and future research on work-family integration.

To this end, researchers in this area are likely to make progress by taking an interactionist perspective.
Research suggests that individual preferences are important; however, it is also apparent that human
resource practices and organizational culture affect this fit process. Few studies have examined the
dynamics of preferences. It is plausible to suggest that individual preferences are likely to change over
time. These preference changes may relate to changes in job responsibilities or family responsibilities
such as child care. In addition, research should examine the social construction of cognitive categories of
meaning and its role in setting work-family boundaries. Greater attention also must be paid to the
measurement of boundary characteristics, including the flexibility and permeability of boundaries and the
perceived clarity or ambiguity of work-family boundaries. Another area worthy of further investigation is
coping mechanisms such as boundary transition rituals. Intervention research that tests different
transition strategies is likely to be helpful. Finally, contexts that are characterized by high levels of
integration such as telecommuting, home entrepreneurship, family business, and two or more family
members working for the same employer are likely to provide strong tests for boundary and border
thories. More research is needed to address these issues.
On a more practical level, human resource practices such as work-family programs should be offered in ways that allow employees to have control in managing their work-family boundaries. This may be especially important for telecommuters and other employees who bring some of their work home. Findings from contemporary research informed by either boundary theory or work-family border theory suggests that, while integrative work-family arrangements can help employees balance work and family life (i.e., by scheduling work around family demands, spending more time with family, or reducing weekly commuting time), if work and family life become so highly integrated that the work-family boundary is blurred, it can lead to negative consequences such as work-family conflict, stress, depression and dissatisfaction with both work and family life. Supervisors can help reduce the chance of this work-family blurring by respecting the schedules that employees set for telecommuting or flextime work or by being supportive of employees in terms of shifting schedules to accommodate family needs. Individual employees can also minimize this blurring; those with flexible work hours may need to maintain a fairly consistent schedule that allows for specific blocks of "family time", and those who work at home can minimize work-family blurring through boundary work activities such as discouraging family members and visitors from interrupting one's work, working only in a particular room of the home, and keeping work-related materials separate from non-work materials.

In conclusion, boundary theory and work-family border theory have important implications for both research and policy on work and family. These perspectives address the construction of work-family boundaries as a complex interplay between employees' strategies and preferences, the social contexts in which they are embedded, and both the idiosyncratic and cultural meanings attached to work and family. These theories chart an interesting and worthwhile course for researchers and practitioners alike to navigate.
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**Locations in the Matrix of Information Domains of the Work-Family Area of Studies**

The Editorial Board of the Teaching Resources section of the Sloan Work and Family Research Network has prepared a Matrix as a way to locate important work-family topics in the broad area of work-family studies. ([More about the Matrix ...](#)).

Concepts related to adult development are relevant to all of the "Individual" domains in the Matrix of Information Domains of the Work-Family Area of Study. In addition, theories of adult development are relevant to Domain F: Theoretical Underpinnings.

Note: The domain areas most closely related to the entry's topic are presented in full color. Other domains, represented in gray, are provided for context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain A: Antecedent Descriptors</th>
<th>Domain B: Work-Family Issues and Experiences</th>
<th>Domain C: Covariates</th>
<th>Domain D: Responses to W-F Issues and Experiences</th>
<th>Domain E: Outcomes and Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Antecedents</td>
<td>Individual Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Individual Covariates</td>
<td>Individual Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Individual Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Antecedents</td>
<td>Family Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Family Covariates</td>
<td>Family Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Family Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Antecedents</td>
<td>Workplace Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Workplace Covariates</td>
<td>Workplace Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Workplace Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Antecedents</td>
<td>Community Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Community Covariates</td>
<td>Community Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Community Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Antecedents</td>
<td>Societal Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Societal Covariates</td>
<td>Societal Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Societal Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain F: Theoretical Underpinnings to All Domains**
Sloan Work and Family Research Network
Resources for Teaching: Mapping the Work-Family Area of Studies

Introduction

It was appropriate that the members of the Founding Editorial Board of the Resources for Teaching began their work in 2000, for their project represented one of the turning points in the area of work and family studies. This group accepted the challenge of developing resources that could support the efforts of teaching faculty from different disciplines and professional schools to better integrate the work-family body of knowledge into their curricula. The Virtual Think Tank began its work with a vision, a spirit of determination, and sense of civic responsibility to the community of work-family scholars.

A fundamental challenge emerged early in the process. It became clear that before we could design resources that would support the teaching of those topics, we would first need to inventory topics and issues relevant to the work-family area of studies (and begin to distinguish the work-family aspect of these topics from "non work-family" aspects).

The members of the Virtual Think Tank were well aware that surveying the area of work and family studies would be a daunting undertaking. However, we really had no other choice. And so, we began to grapple with the mapping process.

Purpose

1. To develop a preliminary map of the body of knowledge relevant to the work-family area of study that reflects current, "across-the-disciplines" understanding of work-family phenomena.

2. To create a flexible framework (or map) that clarifies the conceptual relationships among the different information domains that comprise the work-family knowledge base.

It is important to understand that this mapping exercise was undertaken as a way to identify and organize the wide range of work-family topics. This project was not intended as a meta-analysis for determining the empirical relationships between specific variables. Therefore, our map of the workfamily area of study does not include any symbols that might suggest the relationships between specific factors or clusters of factors.
Process

The Virtual Think Tank used a 3-step process to create the map of the work-family area of studies.

1. **Key Informants:** The members of the Virtual Think Tank included academics from several different disciplines and professions who have taught and written about work-family studies for years. During the first stage of the mapping process, the Virtual Think Tank functioned as a panel of key informants.

   Initially, the Panel engaged in a few brainstorming sessions to identify work-family topics that could be addressed in academic courses. The inductive brainstorming sessions initially resulted in the identification of nearly 50 topics.

   Once the preliminary list of topics had been generated, members of the Virtual Think Tank pursued a deductive approach to the identification of work-family issues. Over the course of several conversations, the Virtual Think Tank created a conceptual map that focused on information domains (see Table 1 below).

   The last stage of the mapping process undertaken by the Virtual Think Tank consisted of comparing and adjusting the results of the inductive and deductive processes. The preliminary, reconciled list was used as the first index for the Online Work and Family Encyclopedia.

2. **Literature review:** Members of the project team conducted literature searches to identify writings in which authors attempted to map the work-family area of study or specific domains of this area. The highlights of the literature review will be posted on February 1, 2002 when the First Edition of the Work-Family Encyclopedia will be published.

3. **Peer review:** On October 1, 2001, the Preliminary Mapping of the work-family area of study was posted on the website of the Sloan Work and Family Research Network. The members of the Virtual Think Tank invite work-family leaders to submit suggestions and comments about the Mapping and the List of Work-Family Topics. The Virtual Think Tank will consider the suggestions and, as indicated, will make adjustments in both of these products. Please send your comments to Marcie Pitt-Catsouphes at pittcats@bc.edu

Assumptions

Prior to identifying the different information domains relevant to the work-family area of study, members of the Virtual Think Tank adopted two premises:
1. Our use of the word "family" refers to both traditional and nontraditional families. Therefore, we consider the term "work-family" to be relevant to individuals who might reside by themselves. Many work-family leaders have noted the problematic dimensions of the term "work-family" (see Barnett, 1999). In particular, concern has been expressed that the word "family" continues to connote the married couple family with dependent children, despite the widespread recognition that family structures and relationships continue to be very diverse and often change over time. As a group, we understand the word "family" to refer to relationships characterized by deep caring and commitment that exist over time. We do not limit family relationships to those established by marriage, birth, blood, or shared residency.

2. It is important to examine and measure work-family issues and experiences at many different levels, including: individual, dyadic (e.g., couple relationships, parent-child relationships, caregiver-caretaker relationships), family and other small groups, organizational, community, and societal. Much of the work-family discourse glosses over the fact that the work-family experiences of one person or stakeholder group may, in fact, be different from (and potentially in conflict with) those of another.

Outcomes

We will publish a Working Paper, "Mapping the Work-Family Area of Study," on the Sloan Work and Family Research Network in 2002. In this publication, we will acknowledge the comments and suggestions for improvement sent to us.

Limitations

It is important to understand that the members of the Virtual Think Tank viewed their efforts to map the work-family area of study as a "work in progress." We anticipate that we will periodically review and revise the map as this area of study evolves.

The members of the panel are also cognizant that other scholars may have different conceptualizations of the work-family area of study. We welcome your comments and look forward to public dialogue about this important topic.

Listing of the Information Domains Included in the Map

The members of the Virtual Think Tank wanted to focus their map of work-family issues around the experiences of five principal stakeholder groups:
1. individuals,
2. families,
3. workplaces,
4. communities, and
5. society-at-large.

Each of these stakeholder groups is represented by a row in the Table 1, Information Domain Matrix (below).

**Work-Family Experiences:** The discussions of the members of the Virtual Think Tank began with an identification of some of the salient needs & priorities/problems & concerns of the five principal stakeholder groups. These domains are represented by the cells in Column B of the Information Domain Matrix.

- Individuals' work-family needs & priorities
- Individuals' work-family problems & concerns
- Families' work-family needs & priorities
- Families' work-family problems & concerns
- Needs & priorities of workplaces related to work-family issues
- Workplace problems & concerns related to work-family issues
- Needs & priorities of communities related to work-family issues
- Communities' problems & concerns related to work-family issues
- Needs and priorities of society related to work-family issues
- Societal problems & concerns related to work-family issues

**Antecedents:** Next, the Virtual Think Tank identified the primary roots causes and factors that might have either precipitated or affected the work-family experiences of the principal stakeholder groups. These domains are highlighted in Column A of the Information Domain Matrix.

- Individual Antecedents
- Family Antecedents
- Workplace Antecedents
- Community Antecedents
- Societal Antecedents

**Covariates:** The third set of information domains include factors that moderate the relationships between the antecedents and the work-family experiences of different stakeholder groups (see
Column C in Table 1).

- Individual Covariates
- Family Covariates
- Workplace Covariates
- Community Covariates
- Societal Covariates

**Decisions and Responses:** The responses of the stakeholder groups to different work-family experiences are highlighted in Column D.

- Individual Decision and Responses
- Family Decisions and Responses
- Workplace Decisions and Responses
- Community Decisions and Responses
- Public Sector Decisions and Responses

**Outcomes & Impacts:** The fifth set of information domains refer to the outcomes and impacts of different work-family issues and experiences on the principal stakeholder groups (see Column E).

- Outcomes & Impacts on Individuals
- Outcomes & Impacts on Families
- Outcomes & Impacts on Workplaces
- Outcomes & Impacts on Communities
- Outcomes & Impacts on Society

**Theoretical Foundations:** The Virtual Think Tank established a sixth information domain to designate the multi-disciplinary theoretical underpinnings to the work-family area of study (noted as Information Domain F).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain A: Antecedent Descriptives</th>
<th>Domain B: Work-Family Issues and Experiences</th>
<th>Domain C: Covariates</th>
<th>Domain D: Responses to W-F Issues and Experiences</th>
<th>Domain E: Outcomes and Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Antecedents</td>
<td>Individual Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Individual Covariates</td>
<td>Individual Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Individual Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Antecedents</td>
<td>Family Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Family Covariates</td>
<td>Family Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Family Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Antecedents</td>
<td>Workplace Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Workplace Covariates</td>
<td>Workplace Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Workplace Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Antecedents</td>
<td>Community Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Community Covariates</td>
<td>Community Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Community Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Antecedents</td>
<td>Societal Experiences: Needs &amp; Priorities; Problems &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Societal Covariates</td>
<td>Societal Decisions &amp; Responses</td>
<td>Societal Outcomes &amp; Impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain F: Theoretical Underpinnings to All Domains**