Feminist scholars and social scientists make distinctions between sex and gender (Hawkesworth, 1997; Nicholson, 1994; Wiley, 1995). Sex refers to biological features, such as chromosomes, hormones, and reproductive organs; simplified, the categories for sex are "female" and "male." Gender refers to the set of culturally expected personality, behavior, and attitude attributes associated with being one sex or another in any given society, and is perpetuated through institutionalized gender symbolism and gender structures; categories for gender in many societies are "feminine" and "masculine" (Hawkesworth, 1997).

Gender or sex identity is the psychological sense of oneself as a woman/girl or a man/boy; often, but not always, females "feel like" women/girls, and males "feel like" men/boys. Gender or sex roles are socially expected behavior patterns determined by an individual's sex; these almost always differ across societies and there is often social censure for not conforming to notions of what is appropriate for a boy/man or girl/woman. Gender or sex role identity is the extent to which a person approves of and participates in feelings and behaviors deemed appropriate in society for her/his gender; that is, the extent to which a woman behaves in feminine ways, or a man in masculine ways (Hawkesworth, 1997; Nicholson, 1994; Wiley, 1995). It is important to note the differences in these concepts. For example, it is possible to have a clear sense of oneself as a woman (gender identity) yet not identify with and/or refuse to act according to prevailing notions of femininity (gender role identity; Hawkesworth, 1997).

Much gendering takes place in the context of family, where the feminine social ideals are what makes a "good mother" or a "good daughter" or a "good wife," and the masculine social ideals are reflected in notions of the "ideal father" or the "ideal husband" (Simon, 1995). With respect to gendered roles in the family, our society tends to define being a good wife and mother as being continually available for emotional nurturing of the husband, children and other dependents, assuming primary responsibility for the physical and developmental care of dependents, and being warm and welcoming, whereas our concept of a good husband or father is someone who provides economic goods to the family, and (secondarily) is a disciplinarian, authority figure, and plays with the children (Andersen, 1991; Cooper, 2000; Gerstel, 2000; Hochschild, 1989; Simon, 1995). In sum, although heterosexual couples conform to this norm to different degrees, women's roles in the family are socio-emotional, whereas men's roles are instrumental (Wiley, 1995).
Our society's expectations for "ideal worker " are also gendered. Businesses define the ideal worker through performance appraisals and promotion criteria as an employee who is aggressive, independent, single-mindedly devoted to the firm or the profession, non-emotional, and rational; these are masculine characteristics (Collinson & Hearn, 1994; Williams, 2000).

**Importance of Topic to Work-Family Studies**

Masculine family roles (i.e., provider) and the role of ideal worker are interdependent and complementary; however, feminine family roles (i.e., available nurturer) and the role of ideal worker are independent and conflicting (Simon, 1995). The ideal worker is almost constantly available to his (her) employer. This is consistent with being the family provider, but not with being the constantly available nurturer. Therefore, women generally experience roles that are incompatible, which raises the stress of pursuing work and family roles for women (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Simon, 1995; Sirianni & Negrey, 2000; Williams, 2000). Men who want to be more involved in the direct care of their children may experience this same conflict, plus additional censure at the workplace because not only do they not fulfill expectations for the ideal worker, they are also not exhibiting ideal masculine characteristics (Cooper, 2000).

Scholars have defined "work-family" as "the relationship between paid employment and commitment to kin" and as "individuals and family units, broadly defined, combining paid labor force participation (work) with family obligations" (e.g., Drago & Kashain, 2001). Nowhere in this basic definition of the field are gender differences mentioned. However, gender is fundamental to the study of work-family and to societal polices and programs related to work-family precisely because work and family roles in our society are predicated on gender expectations, as discussed above.

Social scientists have found that men and women who want to assume both work and family roles experience mental health and economic benefits when they do so (Kirchmeyer, 1992; McBride, 1990; Simon, 1995). Assuming dual roles may also lead to role overload and stress (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly, 1983). Virtually all research on the topic shows that women end up doing their paid jobs and the majority of the home-related work; this is the "second shift" faced by women when they get home from their full time jobs only to face another full time job in the home (Drago & Kashain, 2001; Hochschild, 1989). This is a contributory factor to the glass ceiling women face in corporate America (Catalyst, 1998; Williams, 2000).

**State of the Body of Knowledge**

Much of the gender role research and theory reflects assumptions that couples are heterosexual, married, and parents. In addition, discussions about gender and work-family experiences often reflect a white, middle-class reality. Individuals who identify as members of other ethnic groups, races, socio-economic classes, and sexual orientations may experience gendered work and family roles in ways that also reveal
class and race effects, as well as heterosexism (Wiley, 1995). For example, one gay and lesbian work-family link that is not often discussed is that if one is "out" to family members, that person is more likely to be out at work, and being out at work in turn has implications for work and life satisfaction and attitudes (Friskopp & Silverstein, 1995).

A lot of the current writing on gender and work-family focuses on care work and dependency (e.g., Gerstel, 2000, Kittay, 1995; Reeves, 1994). When women entered the labor force in the 1960s and 1970s, much care work that had previously been done without pay by women now went to the marketplace in at least two ways. First, the availability of work-family programs to an employee depends on that employee's labor market status and the responsiveness of the employer to work-family issues. Second, much more care work is now being done by child care workers, teachers, elder care workers, nannies, and other paid care workers. Care work is historically and currently undervalued in the labor market, as is much "women's" work (Sirianni & Negrey, 2000). Another important focus is the inclusion of the study of fathering and men's care work. One interesting study finds that there is a category of men who are equal partners in fatherhood, however there are still many men who leave the primary care work to their wives, whether those wives are working outside the home or not (Cooper, 2000).

Some work-family leaders are rethinking the notions of the "ideal worker." Some companies are trying to change the notion that the ideal, or "promote-able," worker works excessively long hours (Catalyst, 1998; Williams, 2000). More research is needed on all these topics.

**Implications for Practice & Research**

In the last few decades, the way that women in society spend their time has fundamentally changed from spending time primarily in unpaid dependent care and homemaking activities to spending significant amounts of time in paid labor force participation. However, very little about the way jobs were designed or structured changed, nor did the fact that dependents still needed to be cared for and homes still needed to be created and nurtured. This may be due to the fact that businesses and individuals expect to have to modify their private lives, and don't often expect organizations to change (Williams, 2000). It is interesting to note that the primacy of work and the work organizations is pervasive. In almost all writing, this topic is called "work-family" not "family-work." Work comes first, as is even seen in Hochschild's (1989) title; the second shift refers to the care- and home- related work that comes after the first job.

In fact, it may take legislation to get organizations to change (Kelley & Dobbins, 1999). Business organizations have responded with some welcome programs and policies, however many of these policies have been criticized for being more work supports than family supports; that is, they free the worker from their family obligations (e.g., child care, emergency child care, concierge services) or rearrange existing work time (e.g., flextime, telecommuting) rather than freeing the worker up to fulfill their
family obligations personally. Therefore, we are still largely left with a situation in which jobs and career tracks that were fundamentally designed for a man who was what Joan Williams (2000) calls "supported by a flow of family work from the mother of his children (p. 8)" In other words, him doing his job as the ideal worker required his time at work, and her time at home, to support it. With the entry of women into the labor force, not only did he now not have as much of her flow of family work supporting his job, she also had no one to support her in her efforts to become an ideal worker.

Some observers have noted that the heterosexual nuclear family went through a fundamental shift from two people doing two jobs (one paid job, one unpaid job doing home- and child-related work) to two people doing three jobs (his paid job, her paid job, and the home- and child-related work), without corresponding fundamental shifts in the assumptions about what a job or career should look like, how long most jobs should take, what men should do in the home, and without major changes in the system of support for of dependent care workers (Christensen and Gormory, 1999; Cooper, 2000; Drago & Kashain, 2001; Kittay, 1995; Williams, 2000). Note again, even in this discussion, the assumption of married heterosexuality with children which excludes single parents, gay and lesbian parents, and people caring for dependents other than children (also see Robson, 1994 and Rothausen, 1999).

Employers' interest in work-family grew out of the movement of women into the workplace, but even more so from Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (CRA) of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of sex; in the late 1960s and early 1970s, in response to this legislation and laws that followed, employers implemented maternity leaves, and began to investigate other "benefits" for work-family (Kelly & Dobbins, 2000). Often, these programs were called "women's" programs or issues. After criticism that calling these issues "women's" left men out, some organizations began calling these programs and policies "work-family," and then "work-life," policies and programs, because these terms are perceived as being more gender- and parental status-neutral, respectively.

Thus, there has been a concerted effort on the part of employers to "de-gender" these issues, and some for admirable reasons. However, the ideal worker profile and most job designs still assume a man with a "flow of family work" from a woman, and within the family, women still tend to take on the majority of the (feminine gendered) house work and child rearing, and this is reinforced systemically within the family and in our work organizations. Thus, until we address the gendered nature of work-family directly, we have little hope of helping women advance equally in our workplaces or of resolving the tensions and challenges with which our changed social realities have presented us (Pitt-Catsouphes, 2001; Williams, 2000).
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**Other Recommended Readings on this Topic:**


**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: Antecedents 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
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 need & 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 1: Matrix of Information Domains (9/30/01)

<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