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**Basic Concepts & Definitions**

A compressed workweek schedule is one form of **flexible work arrangement** (see Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia entry, “Flexible Work Arrangements” [Rau, 2003]) in which employees work longer shifts for fewer days of the week rather than the traditional 8-hour workday 5 days a week. Most organizations with compressed work schedules have implemented what are commonly termed 4/10 or 9/80 schedules.

Under a 4/10 work schedule, the employee works a total of four 10-hour days during the week, exchanging longer work days for an extra day away from work. Most commonly, the extra day off comes on either a Friday or a Monday, thereby creating a longer weekend for the employee. Some organizations choose to make the compressed work schedule mandatory for all employees and close down completely on the fifth day, with the benefit of decreased overhead costs for the organization. For example, in August 2008, the State of Utah opted to implement a 4-day workweek with 17,000 state employees working Monday through Thursday. Such a program becomes mandatory for most employees because the office is closed on Fridays. Other organizations continue to offer extended-hour services for 5 days by providing a staggered day off for employees. For example, half of the organization's employees might have their day off on Monday while the other half are off work on Friday, thereby providing half-coverage on these 2 days and full coverage Tuesday through Thursday. The city of Birmingham, Alabama, instituted such an approach, citing an effort to decrease employee commuting costs as their major goal. This type of program can accommodate both a traditional schedule and a compressed workweek schedule. A similar approach rotates the non-working days—once a week, the employee has Monday off; the second week Tuesday is their day off; and so on. In this way, four-fifths of the employees are working on any given day, and the organization remains open 5 days of the week.

Another commonly used form of compressed workweek is a 9/80 schedule worked over a 2-week period. Under a typical 9/80 schedule, employees work 9-hour days Monday through Thursday and one 8-hour Friday and then have every other Friday off work. Under this scenario, half of the employees are off work each Friday, with all employees typically working the other 4 days of the week. Another form of 9/80 schedule is for employees to work 9-hour days Monday through Thursday and half-day on Fridays.
Organizations can choose to close down at noon with all employees working Friday mornings, or half of their employees might work Friday morning with the other half working Friday afternoons for full-day coverage. Some organizations prefer the 9/80 schedule because it allows organizations to maintain higher staffing levels yet still allows some off-time for employees. In addition, the 9-hour work day is considered more appealing than a 10-hour work day by some employees.

Other variations of compressed workweeks exist, but they are much less common. For certain organizations, particularly the health-care industry, a 3/36 schedule has proven very effective, with the employee working three 12-hour days and then having 4 days off work. Another option outlined in the Handbook on Alternative Work Schedules (U.S. Office of Personnel Management) is a 3-day workweek in which employees work for 13 hours and 20 minutes three days per week. For an organization considering a compressed workweek schedule, the wide variety of options allows the organization to select a schedule well-suited for its own needs and those of its employees.

Importance of Topic to Work and Family Studies

The study of compressed workweeks has value to work-family research, particularly since one of the important factors cited by organizations for implementing such a schedule is to improve employee work-life balance (Facer, Wadsworth, & Arbon, 2009). Research bears out this assumption, finding that employees on a compressed workweek experience higher levels of work-family balance when compared to those on a traditional schedule (Facer & Wadsworth, 2008). One reason might be that employees are better able to balance life in these two important domains by scheduling appointments and planning family activities on their day off. A caveat is that working longer days might decrease opportunities for employees to experience quality family time on a daily basis, thereby potentially creating a negative impact on one’s work-life balance.

Social support has been defined as “social interactions or relationships that provide individuals with actual assistance or with a feeling of attachment to a person or group that is perceived as caring” (Hobfoll & Stokes, 1988, p. 499). Social support is negatively related to work-family conflict (see Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia entry, “Work-Family Role Conflict” [Hammer & Thompson, 2003]) (Wadsworth & Owens, 2007) and positively related to work-family balance (Marcinkus, Whelan-Berry, & Gordon, 2007). Formal alternative work schedule programs are often seen by employees as a form of organizational social support (Dixon & Sagas, 2007), while informal or “as-needed” alternative work schedule programs are seen as an outward expression of supervisor social support (Allen, 2001; Ryan & Kossek, 2008). Previous research on compressed workweek schedules does not distinguish between formal and informal programs, and my literature review located no research that compares employee experience and satisfaction with informal versus formal compressed workweek programs. There is research on formal
and informal organizational support that might add to our understanding of compressed work schedules. Behson (2005) compared the impact of informal organizational support (defined as job autonomy, manager support, and concern about career impact) and formal organizational support (work schedule flexibility and work-family benefit availability) and found that informal organizational support has a much stronger link to decreased stress, work-family conflict, and turnover intentions and increased job satisfaction. It might follow that informal compressed workweek programs provide stronger benefits for employees.

State of the Body of Knowledge

In recent years, workers have voiced general dissatisfaction with the traditional 40-hour workweek. Olmsted (1983) observed that a general drive toward new work arrangements was triggered by a number of different factors, including “increased female workforce participation, new lifestyles, an increase of single-parent or two-paycheck households, new relationships between education and work . . . [and] the aging of the workforce” (p. 479). He also notes that employees today want to have input on how, when, and where they work. Furthermore, Best (1980) found that most workers would choose an increase in free time over a modest increase in pay. It is because of attitudes like these that organizations have sought to accommodate their employees’ desires by providing alternatives to the traditional 5/40 workweek.

Compressed workweek schedules have been adopted by an increasing number of organizations, both public and private, over the past several decades (Pierce & Dunham, 1992). One recent report found that 37% of organizations have compressed work schedules (Society for Human Resource Management, 2008). According to the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), industries with the highest prevalence of compressed workweeks were health (57%), government (45%), and nonprofit services (45%). Recent research in the public sector found that 46% of cities offer compressed work schedules to their employees (Facer et al., 2009). A status report on workplace flexibility (Galinsky, Bond, & Hill, 2004) found no significant difference in accessibility to a compressed workweek schedule by gender, parenthood status, earning level, or industry (manufacturing versus service). There were two areas of demographic difference: managers/professionals and younger employees were more likely to be given an option to work a compressed schedule (Galinsky et al., 2004). Further information on the impact of compressed workweeks is provided from the employee perspective, and then from the perspective of the organization.

Employee Perspective

A review of the literature suggests several potential benefits for employees in addition to the work-family
balance previously mentioned. For example, compressed workweeks can decrease transportation costs for the employee (Pierce, Newstrom, Dunham, & Barber, 1989), providing a benefit for the employee but also for society as a whole. Employees participating in a compressed workweek schedule commute one less day of the week, resulting in a decrease in commuting costs. They may also leave home and work before or after peak traffic hours, thereby decreasing traffic congestion (Hung, 1996). For both of these reasons, the employees’ total commute time is reduced, thereby increasing their personal time (Sundo & Fujii, 2005).

**Job satisfaction** (see Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia entry, “Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment” [Williams, 2004]) is another employee benefit of compressed workweeks (Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Neuman, 1999; Facer & Wadsworth, 2008). In addition, employees participating in a compressed work schedule report greater levels of job autonomy (Pierce et al., 1989) and decreased levels of anxiety and stress (Ivancevich, 1974).

The major drawback for employees is the longer workday. While it might appear intuitive that longer working hours would have negative outcomes, such as increased work-family conflict (Bond, 2004; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999) and physical symptoms (Sparks, Cooper, Fried, & Shirom, 1997), there is also research suggesting that longer working hours are associated with positive outcomes, including good physical health and decreased psychological distress (Barnett, 1998). Another line of research has looked carefully at the extended work hours common in the nursing industry and found greater levels of satisfaction, less emotional exhaustion, and decreased absenteeism for those working 12-hour shifts (Stone et al., 2006). Interestingly, further research has found a substantial increase in errors and fatigue when nurses work overtime beyond their 12-hour shift (Rogers, Hwang, Scott, Aiken, & Dinges, 2004; Scott, Hwang, & Rogers, 2006). Similar results have been found in other industries, suggesting that fatigue increases and employee productivity decreases when employees work longer than 12 hours at a time (Monk & Folkard, 1992).

**Organizational Perspective**

As mentioned previously, decreased commuting time is a benefit to the employee; it can also serve as a benefit for organizations, as longer commutes yield increased stress, health complaints, absenteeism, and tardiness and decreased performance (Costa, Pickup, & DiMartino, 1988), all of which negatively impact the organization. Similarly, job satisfaction is an employee benefit that can provide benefit to the organization, as job satisfaction is related to decreased turnover rates and improved recruitment (Boswell, Boudreau, & Tichy, 2005). Satisfied employees are less likely to leave their jobs, thereby saving recruitment and training costs for the organization. Furthermore, talented employees are likely to be drawn to organizations where employees are satisfied (Shipman, 2006).
Compressed workweeks offer several other potential benefits for the organization. One such benefit is increased productivity (Baltes et al., 1999; Facer et al., 2009; Ronen & Prims, 1981). When employees work fewer days, they spend less time on daily set-up and clean-up tasks. One department for a large bank reported that following a change to a compressed workweek schedule, they experienced a tremendous morale boost, a turnover rate reduced to zero, many employees with perfect attendance records, and a reduction in processing time for mortgage approvals from 8 days to 3 days (Walsh, 2001).

Previous research has found that compressed workweeks are related to decreased turnover (Cohen, 1997) and absenteeism (Baltes et al., 1999; Ronen & Prims, 1981). One study found that 63% of workers using compressed workweeks were absent less often because of the compressed work schedule (Tombari & Spinks, 1999). Compressed work schedules can also lead to reduced leave usage, both annual and sick. Sick leave is conserved for actual sick days, because employees are able to schedule routine medical and dental appointments on their day off. Similarly, employees are more likely to plan vacations around their compressed workweek schedule, thereby decreasing vacation day usage.

In addition, organizations on a compressed work schedule typically provide extended hours of service for their customers/clients (typically 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on a 4/10 schedule, and 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on a 9/80 schedule), thereby providing increased customer service (Facer et al., 2009). And for those organizations that are closed down 1 day of the week, there are additional financial benefits. Specifically, the incremental energy usage for an additional 1 to 2 hours per day is much lower than the usage for a full additional day. For example, the city of Avondale, Arizona (with a population of approximately 76,000) expects to save ~$45,000 on electricity and ~$10,000 on janitorial costs annually by closing down on Fridays (McClendon & Simeri, 2009).

The biggest organizational drawbacks of compressed workweeks are related to difficulties with scheduling and decreased face time with employees (Facer et al., 2009). Both of these issues are intensified under a staggered compressed work schedule, in which not all employees are in the workplace at the same time. For organizations on such a schedule, both managers and employees need to be reminded of the importance of managing the scheduling difficulties and of providing other options for face time.

**Implications for Practice and Research**

*Logistical Issues*

Similar to employees attempting to balance work and family, many organizations are becoming concerned with their own kind of balance--that of balancing the financial bottom line with employee
satisfaction and morale. For some organizations, a compressed workweek schedule might be one part of the answer. As organizations consider such a schedule; however, it is important to also carefully consider the potential impact of such a change.

During summer 2008, for example, gasoline prices and energy costs increased dramatically. Many organizations implemented compressed workweeks as one way to cut costs for the organization and its employees. Other reasons for making such a change include a desire to improve employee morale, support employee work-life balance, increase productivity, and extend business hours (Facer et al., 2009). In most instances, the purpose will be multipronged. For example, the State of Utah cited four purposes for their August 2008 change to a 4-day workweek; namely, environment, energy, extended services, and employees (www.dhrm.utah.gov). Establishing the purpose in a clear and concise way will help the organization successfully evaluate such programs.

Encouraging employee participation and input will help to alleviate some concerns prior to implementation. This might be done through focus groups, employee surveys, employee quality groups, or a pilot program. Latack and Foster (1985) found that employee participation in the decision to adopt a compressed work schedule was a predictor of positive attitudes toward the compressed schedule. This would suggest that organizations who allow employee participation in the decision making and process of implementing a compressed work schedule will find that their employees are more satisfied with work and also with their work-family balance.

Organizations will also need to consider the level of formality and flexibility they are willing to provide. Compressed workweeks are often a formal practice with established, officially approved organizational policies and rules (Eaton, 2003). For example, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management has prepared a Handbook on Alternative Work Schedules with details about the scope, expectations, payroll policies, and procedures for establishing and terminating a compressed workweek. In contrast, some organizations opt for a less formal procedure, with supervisors given discretion to allow a compressed workweek schedule on an individual basis (Eaton, 2003). Regardless of the level of formality, research suggests that organizations need to ensure that such programs are both available (the policy is “on the books”) and accessible (employees are allowed and even encouraged to use it) in order to provide any benefit for the organization and the employee (Budd & Mumford, 2006; Eaton, 2003).

Organizations also need to determine the level of flexibility within the program. When the entire organization is closed down for 1 day of the week, there might be little room for flexibility. However, under most compressed workweek options, organizations potentially have a wide range of flexibility in which they can allow all or some of their employees to participate. This flexibility can be managed centrally or by direct supervisors. To my knowledge, there are no data available on the prevalence or experience of
compressed workweeks that make possible comparisons by levels of formality or flexibility of the program.

Other implementation considerations are how to calculate vacation and sick leave and holiday pay. For many organizations, employees accrue and use vacation and sick leave by the hour; the changes to such a system under a compressed workweek will be negligible. Typically, the more difficult problem for organizations is the usage of holiday pay. If an organization currently provides ten 8-hour holidays per year, will they want to provide ten 10-hour holidays per year, for an increase of 20 hours per employee per year? In addition, what will the organization do if the holiday falls on the employee’s day off? This might particularly become an issue for those organizations who have some form of staggered schedule in which not all employees are off work the same day. Making sure that employees are treated fairly will be an important consideration.

Organizations have often relied on anecdotal information to evaluate compressed workweek programs, but there exists only limited empirical research on the outcomes and experience of compressed workweeks as they might be applied to organizational variations such as size or industry sector. Instead, organizations should ensure that any evaluation is conducted in such a way as to provide data that will be beneficial in future decisions regarding the continuation or termination of such a program. In order to evaluate appropriately, organizations and researchers should carefully consider the criteria that will be used and ensure that these measures are tied to the purposes previously established. For example, some items that can be measured might include employee satisfaction, customer/client satisfaction, productivity, absenteeism, turnover, overtime usage, and energy costs.

Legal Issues

In addition to the logistical concerns, there are significant legal issues that must also be considered. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requires that overtime be paid to any employee who works over 40 hours per week. These requirements typically do not become problematic for employees on a 4/10 work schedule, because they continue to work a 40-hour workweek, but FLSA requirements can pose a problem for those on a 9/80 schedule with every other Friday off. Employees on this schedule work four 9-hour days one week (36 hours total) and four 9-hour days plus one 8-hour day the next week (44 hours total), thereby potentially resulting in 4 hours of overtime every other week. One caveat is that the FLSA allows organizations to establish the starting time for each pay period. In order to avoid overtime compensation, organizations on a 9/80 schedule can set their starting time as noon on Friday. In this way, the eight-hour Friday that is worked every other week is separated between the two weeks, resulting in a total of 40 hours worked per week and no overtime pay.
Further consideration is needed for state rules. Some states (e.g., Alaska, California, Colorado, and Nevada) require that organizations pay overtime to employees working any hours over eight in a given day. On the surface, these state laws create difficulties for any form of the compressed workweek schedule; however, most states allow exemptions for “approved” compressed workweek schedules. Generally, an exemption is allowed for union employees if the plan is part of a collective bargaining agreement. Approval can be more difficult to obtain for non-union employees, as illustrated by California state labor code, which requires that the organization provide a written notice to those impacted by the change, followed by a meeting with those employees to discuss the proposed schedule. Then a secret ballot election is held with at least two-thirds approval needed. The results must then be reported to the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement within 30 days, after which the newly approved schedule can be set into motion.

Another potential legal issue concerns the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which requires that employers make “reasonable accommodations” for employees with disabilities. An employee might have a disability associated with fatigue or other symptoms where a longer workday might be difficult. If the compressed workweek is optional for employees, such employees can “opt out” of the extended work schedule. When employers mandate that employees work to a compressed schedule, this becomes more difficult and will require that human resources (HR) professionals consider the impact of the longer workday on their employees and provide options for those who are unable to work extended hours.

In addition, organizations should consider the impact of compressed workweeks on employees of all ages. One of the benefits of compressed work schedules cited by organizations is the potential to attract and retain talented workers (Facer et al., 2009; Hewitt Associates, 2008). Many employees who are now entering the workforce are seeking opportunities to balance their work and family lives. From the perspective of a Generation X or Y employee, a compressed workweek schedule might be one way to obtain work-life balance, whereas older employees might see it more negatively. Clearly, the concerns of all employees need to be taken into consideration.

**Future Research**

Additional research is needed on the practice and experience of compressed workweeks. Specific information regarding employee perceptions, their actual experience with the compressed workweek, and its impact on factors such as work-life balance, job satisfaction, and health and wellness would be beneficial for both research and practice. Such research might replicate Galinsky et al.‘s (2004) research and compare results by gender, marital and parental status, age, job tenure, and industry. This line of research would also benefit from a longitudinal study, particularly to see if the benefits and drawbacks change over time either for employees or for the organization.
One major gap in the research is a comparison of informal versus formal compressed workweek programs and of mandatory versus optional compressed work schedules. In particular, research is needed to compare the impact of these differences on outcomes such as job satisfaction, work-family balance, and organizational commitment. In addition, further information is needed on “best practices” for organizations as they seek ways to cut costs and provide supportive workplaces. This will help organizations avoid implementing policies and programs that might actually increase work-family conflict for their employees. Research is also needed on the impact of compressed workweeks on other involved stakeholders such as supervisors, customers/clients, and unions.
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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 ...).

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.
About the Matrix

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 work-family 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**