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Basic Concepts and Definitions

Although the majority of work-family field research has been conducted in Anglo-Saxon countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada (Poelmans et al., 2003), work-family research is undertaken in other countries as well. This approach of collecting data on work-family issues in a specific country or region, using existing (i.e., North American) conceptual models has proved fruitful, with studies completed in a multitude of individual countries. However, cross-national research, which compares two or more countries in the same study, is more rare. Testing existing models in different contexts is helpful in advancing our understanding of work-family issues across the globe, but actually comparing countries in the same study should prove even more useful. To date, only a few studies have employed a cross-national perspective, collecting data in two (e.g., Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000) or more countries (e.g., Spector et al., 2007; Spector et al., 2004; Hill, Yang, Hawkins, & Ferris, 2004). With the expectation of increased interest in this stream of research, and given the rate of globalization and prevalence of organizations operating in more than one country, it is helpful to take an assessment of the current status of the field, with special attention to the methodologies used. Such research may also provide useful information for other groups such as multinational organizations and policy makers.

As is true with cross-national research, difficulties arise when attempting to compare different nations, countries or cultures. But as work-family researchers are increasingly looking to investigate work-family issues in novel geographic areas, it is worthwhile to assess how cross-national research has been conducted up to this point and to identify promising methodologies for future cross-national work-family research. As such, this entry will identify the methodologies used by researchers conducting cross-national work-family field survey research, as well as existing work-family databases useful to work-family scholars interested in cross-national research. This entry is not comprehensive in that it does not include areas such as political science or economics. Finally, we identify future research and practical applications.
Cross-national work-family studies are studies that collect data in two or more countries or regions. Although culture has been defined differently by researchers in different disciplines, it broadly refers to the shared values and practices associated with a specific group or category. Given this, using “country” as a proxy for “culture” is not always correct. Rather, cross-cultural studies investigate differences among members of different cultural groups. In light of these differences, we will refer to studies conducted in two or more countries as cross-national to more accurately describe this type of work-family survey research. Furthermore, within the vast field of work-family research, this entry will focus on studies relating to the intersection of work and family (e.g., work-family conflict, work-family enrichment), as these studies are most abundant.

Importance of Topic to Work-Family Studies

Individuals’ work-family experiences are bound to differ across countries, not only because of differences in cultural value sets, but also because of variation in national policies, employment opportunities, and family structures. Even within larger geographic regions, individual countries have their own set of governmental policies (or lack thereof) regulating work and family time, access to state-supported dependent care and other family-supportive services, or tax incentives for married couples to equally participate in all areas of life (e.g., work and home domains). Furthermore, the knowledge on work and family generated in the U.S., U.K., and Canada will not reach its full potential unless its generalizability is tested elsewhere (Poelmans, O’Driscoll, & Beham, 2005). Given the considerable interest in cross-national work-family research, it is necessary for scholars to consider current methods and how measures are developed or translated. This will aid the field in advancing in a more systematic fashion. Work-family cross-national research should be of practical help to multi-national organizations as well as policy makers.

State of the Body of Knowledge

In this section, we will first discuss challenges with this type of research before moving on to reviewing methods used.

Sampling

The major challenges with conducting cross-national research involve methods of data collection and analysis. Specific challenges include gaining access to participants in multiple countries, finding roughly equivalent samples if one wishes to conduct comparative research, and ensuring that the meaning of the items stays as close as possible to their intended meaning when translated into the local language.
Realizing the shortcomings of single-country studies—and the difficulty in obtaining data from multiple 
countries—some researchers have formed international research teams for the purpose of studying work-
family experiences cross-nationally. For instance, Spector, Cooper, and colleagues have undertaken a 
large research effort to collect global data relating to managerial stress, including work-family issues. Data 
was collected from 2,487 managers across 15 samples and were placed into three groups according to 
region (Spector et al., 2004). Five samples were from English-speaking Anglo countries: Australia, 
Canada, England, New Zealand, and the U.S. Three were Chinese samples: Hong Kong, People’s 
Republic of China, and Taiwan. Finally, seven samples were from Latin American countries: Argentina, 
Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay. The authors designed the original survey and 
recruited global partners; some original partners recruited additional partners. To recruit study 
participants, multiple methods were used. Methods included collecting data from organizations, 
contacting members of professional management organizations and asking them to participate, and 
recruiting practicing managers who were taking college courses.

As reported by Spector et al. (2004), the authors proposed and found a stronger positive relationship 
between hours worked and work-family pressure (e.g., sources of stress originating at work and at home) 
for individuals living in individualistic regions than for individuals in collectivistic regions. The authors 
suggest that the relationship may reflect different views of time. In individualistic regions, work is seen as 
impeding on family, while those in collectivistic regions view work as improving family.

The second phase of the data collection included additional measures relating to work and family. For this 
study, a common survey was distributed to partners who were responsible for data collection in their 
home country. The target was to obtain survey data from at least 200 managers from each country and 
for the sample to be as representative as possible. Ideally, each study participant was to be employed by 
a different organization, thereby representing diverse industries. Some participants were recruited using 
emails or were randomly selected from a sample of websites. Others were recruited through a snowball 
sample approach (implemented by posting invitations on discussion lists and through colleagues). In both 
cases, data were collected via a web-based survey. Participants for the second phase of the study 
included 5,270 managers from 20 country samples. The countries were classified into four clusters: (1) 
the Anglo country cluster (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the U.K., and the U.S.), (2) Asia (Hong Kong, 
Japan, Korea, China, and Taiwan), (3) East Europe (Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, and Ukraine), 
and (4) Latin America (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, and Puerto Rico).
Research findings from the second phase have been published by Spector et al. (2007). In brief, positive relationships were found between work demands and work interference with family, as well as between work interference with family and turnover intentions and job satisfaction. In addition, these relationships were found to be stronger in individualistic countries than in collectivistic countries.

When conducting comparative research across countries, researchers need to be able to attribute differences found to the different countries—rather than to rival hypotheses. Are the differences found truly based on the different countries, or based on something else, such as different selection methods or differences in the samples (Brislin et al., 1973)? To ensure true country differences, the researcher can match the samples in the study. Due to the great difficulty and costs associated with gaining access to matched samples, few such work-family studies have been conducted.

In a rare study using matched job samples from the U.S. (n = 187) and Mexico (n = 150), Posthuma, Joplin, and Maertz (2005) compared the strength of the relationship between inter-role conflict (both work-family and work-personal) and turnover intentions. To rule out alternative (non-country) explanations, these authors used matched samples of employees employed by retail grocery stores. The employers had been matched on the characteristics of physical size of the store, number of employees, work environment, types of products sold, and structure of managerial control (p. 171). Even though single-country studies of work-family conflict and turnover intentions have shown this to be a significant relationship in the U.S., based on the importance of family in the Mexican collectivistic culture, it was predicted that this relationship should be stronger in Mexico than in the U.S. Surprisingly, this effect was not found.

One way to mitigate the issue of equivalent samples is to collect data via a single organization or company. Hill, Yang, Hawkins, and Ferris (2004) did just that. Using data from employees of IBM in 48 different countries, these authors proposed and found that a given model of the work-family interface would apply across these 48 countries as clustered into four regions. Their results showed that the proposed model did fit, suggesting a “transportable” model rather than individualized model for each country or region. Although the magnitudes of the paths somewhat differed, the directionality of the relationship showed remarkable consistency. Furthermore, the existing magnitude differences were statistically small. The four regions included: (1) East (e.g., China and Singapore), (2) West “developing” (e.g., Mexico and Poland), (3) West “affluent” (e.g., Australia and Sweden), and (4) West-US. In brief, findings included the result that an increasing number of family roles were related to increased levels of family-to-work conflict. Also, it was found that work appears to have a more harmful impact on family-across regions-than the reverse (that is, family impacting work).
Measurement Strategies

Cross-national studies are commonly criticized for utilizing culturally insensitive measurement techniques (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002). To minimize potential problems, most cross-national studies use a process of back-translation (Brislin, 1980). That is, each measure is translated from English into the second language by one bilingual speaker, and another bilingual speaker then translates that version back into English. Finally, this back-translated version is cross-checked against the original English version. If necessary, to ensure that the translated version is comparable to the English version, adjustments can be made as needed. Back-translation can help measures to be equivalent both functionally and culturally. Functional equivalence means that the instructions and instrument will elicit the same target behavior (Greenfield et al., 2006). Cultural equivalence considers how respondents will interpret a given direction or test item and develops items that tap the same cultural meaning for each cultural linguistic group (Alonso et al., 1998). Taken together, these areas of equivalence can increase validity of cross-national measurement instruments (Peña, 2007, p. 1256). Most cross-national work-family studies employ the back-translation technique, including studies by Yang, Chen, Choi, and Zou, (2000) and Wang, Lawler, Walumbwa, and Shi (2004). These studies utilized back-translation for the conversion of Chinese and English items.

A field study is a non-experimental way of uncovering relationships in real-life situations. Considering the nature of work-family issues, most studies are classified as field studies. Field studies can be focus groups, interviews, or survey (questionnaire) studies. It has been noted that a large majority of existing work-family research has relied on cross-sectional survey methods (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007), and cross-national work-family research is no exception. Indeed, a great majority of cross-national work-family research employs this method. This type of data collection is relatively cheap and provides fewer time constraints. A much smaller number of studies have employed, for instance, interviews.

In their study of 23 female managers from Germany and 25 from the U.S., Peus and Traut-Mattausch (2008) used semi-structured interviews to collect data, which was then analyzed using a grounded theory approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The impetus for the research was the fact that while 37 per cent of management positions in the U.S. are held by women, only 26 per cent of managers in Germany are women. This is surprising, the authors argued, given the extensive governmental support provided in Germany compared to the meager federal support for work-family balance existing in the U.S. The interviews revealed that German women did not receive support from either their organizations or from their managers. The authors’ conclusion was that legislation may not be enough to ensure work-family balance; organizations and managers need to go over and beyond what is required by law. Additionally, certain societal norms—such as the fact that German women perceive daycare as harmful to their children—
were evident from these interviews. These perceptions prevent German women from concurrently pursuing both high-level careers and family.

It has also been noted that the work-family field would benefit from expanding beyond the individual-level of analysis (Casper et al., 2007). In a rare study, Joplin, Shaffer, Francesco, and Lau (2003) employed both qualitative (focus group interviews) and publicly available archival data to investigate macro-level influences (categories included economic, social, technological, and legal) in relation to work-family issues in five countries/regions: China, Hong Kong, Mexico, Singapore, and the U.S. Building on these data, the authors created a framework emphasizing macro-level variables, which could guide future cross-national work-family researchers.

A study that incorporated both of the above issues—utilization of qualitative data and expansion beyond the individual level of analysis—was conducted by Lewis and Smithson (2001). These authors investigated young Europeans’ perceived entitlement regarding work and family. Their approach was to use in-depth interviews collected via focus groups, to better expose differences in local contexts. This qualitative data was collected using semi-structured interviews from 312 individuals in five countries (Sweden, Norway, Portugal, the U.K., and Ireland); a total of 70 different focus groups were conducted. Using focus group data provides group-level data rather than individual-level data.

Lewis and Smithson acknowledged the limited generalizability of this method, but pointed to the strengths of such rich, qualitative data. Namely, it can provide deeper insights than those obtained via quantitative survey methods. These authors proposed and found that dissimilar welfare approaches differentially impacted the sense of entitlements regarding work and family support. Indeed, the data did suggest that young individuals in Sweden and Norway have a stronger sense of entitlement regarding support from the state and/or employer than individuals in Ireland, Portugal, and the U.K. This, the authors suggest, originates in the equality approach of the governments in Sweden and Norway, which is different from the traditional (marketplace solution) of work and family responsibilities found in the other countries.

Harvard and McGill Universities Professor Jody Heymann initiated a large-scale project employing both interviews and questionnaires to improve our understanding of—and improving the relationship between working conditions, family health, and well-being (Heymann, Earle & Hayes, 2007). As part of this Project on Global Working Families (http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/globalworkingfamilies/), researchers conducted more than 1,000 in-depth interviews of working families in Mexico, Botswana, Vietnam, the U.S., Honduras, and Russia. In addition, more than 55,000 closed-ended surveys were dispersed to households of Botswana, Brazil, Mexico, Russia, South Africa, the U.S., and Vietnam. For selection of additional data sources to represent public policies and demographic trends relating to work and family, sources were sought that contained accurate and relevant measures that were comparable across countries and over time. The project includes the following measures: The World Development Indicators...
With this project, Heymann and colleagues wished to convey “the feasibility of using existing data sources to conduct comparative research on a more diverse range of countries than has generally been conducted in the work-family research field” and “that conducting analyses on a truly global level is important for better understanding national-level policy and for all efforts to address global policy (Heymann, Earle, & Hanchate, 2004, pp. 266-267). Published findings from this research project (e.g., Heymann et al., 2004) suggest that populations who cannot afford to work extended hours are often forced to do so, including families with single parents. This research also showed that level of education has differing impact in different countries. For example, higher levels of education result in longer hours in paid work in Brazil and Vietnam, whereas the opposite is true in Mexico. Furthermore, this relationship is moderated by family structure in South Africa. As this research suggests, organizations and policy makers need to exercise caution when attempting to generalize findings from one region to other cultural regions.

Implications for Research and Practice

Research

As noted, most cross-national work-family research uses survey (questionnaire) methods. Future research could make better use of existing data that is readily available and comparable across countries. This method of research has become increasingly convenient as many quality databases are now available through the Internet, thereby increasing accessibility to large amounts of pre-collected data from almost anywhere in the world. Examples of online databases that are rich in information and open to public access are listed in Table 1.

To expand upon the usefulness of such databases, researchers involved in the previously described Project on Global Working Families created the Work, Family, and Equity Index solely based upon primary data sources that were already available from 177 countries. The index is a quantifiable measure that identifies the extent to which each respective country’s government is meeting the needs of working families on a comprehensive, global scale. Data used to create the index were labor codes and other labor-related legislation including acts and decrees governing working time, holidays and leave, and those protecting the rights of families (Heymann et al., 2007). The index is available online for other researchers and policy makers to utilize (http://www.globalworkingfamilies.org/).
Advantages of the archival research method are that the data cover an extensive breadth of political, social, and economic systems and the data are from primary sources, which increase confidence in reliability. Since much of the data is obtained via Internet resources, researchers are allowed the convenience to search and access data from many different locations. Although data mining of this magnitude is extensive and arduous, increased confidence in conclusions can be drawn due to the reputable nature of such primary data sources.

Now that many measures exist in multiple languages, future research should also focus on replication. If work-family researchers can yield the same results through repeated studies under dissimilar conditions, greater confidence can be placed in the robustness of the original conclusions (Pepitone & Triandis, 1987, p. 472). Cross-cultural psychology is especially important because many research findings are based on samples of a single culture, but if theories are to be tested or validated properly, work-family researchers should look to examine the same social behavior (1) of varied form and content, (2) across diverse situational contexts, and (3) across different samples of people (Pepitone & Triandis, 1987, p. 474). It may also be helpful for commonly used measures (e.g., work-family conflict, work-family enrichment) in the field of work-family study to be translated into additional languages. Collecting data in novel geographic areas will help researchers gain a better understanding as to the generality of these work-family constructs.

Even though many cross-national (and cross-cultural) researchers endorse “universals”-the “psychological process[es] or relationship[s] which occur in all cultures (Triandis, 1978, p. 1)-there is some debate as to the actual existence of the “universality” of theories. Even if using rigorous empirical standards, possibly the only objective manner to answer this question is through replication. However, some researchers assert that generality may be achieved if several factors are considered. The proposal is that generality can be achieved with a high degree of confidence if factors under examination are common to all persons. For example, one may assume that if studying social behavior that is at least partially controlled by physiology, results are more likely to generalize. Factors based on physiology are more likely to be observed across settings, individuals, and even cultures due to the shared phylogenetic history of the human species as a whole.

To relate this to work-family research, essentially work and family represent a choice in which individuals must choose the proportion of how much time, resources, or responses are allocated for each (Reb & Bagger, 2010). The choice between work and family is a common dilemma, as most humans must engage in work in order to survive (whether it was hunting food in the early days of man or working in industrial factories during more modern times). Although types of working responses may differ, the function is the same: to produce the resources necessary for sustaining life. This may increase the
generality for findings of work-family research, given that individuals in both the past and present have had to choose how much of each resource (e.g. time) will be delegated toward obtaining more resources for survival, or for the caring of family members/children. Such choices are still present today, as parents increasingly confront the scarcity of time and work-family resources, given the exodus of women into the domain of paid work. This is a current problem in industrialized nations and is now present in developing nations as well (Heymann et al., 2004). Work-family researchers have not yet adopted the use of “universals” in their research (but see Hill et al.’s 2004 study), providing more opportunities and directions for future research.

The last factor to consider involving generality of results is when social behavior is strongly determined by features of social structures common to some or all societies under investigation (Pepitone & Triandis, 1987). Theoretically speaking, the generality of research is dependent upon the sample groups possessing comparable ontogenic learning histories with similar or even equivalent social contingencies. Many cultures are similar in their structure of status systems, power hierarchies, or gender roles. For instance, work-family conflict may be more likely to be present in societies that share similar gender roles in performance of work and home duties. Researchers examining women in societies that commonly consist of dual-earner couples may only observe the work-family conflict phenomenon in this type of social environment. In contrast, work-family conflict may not be experienced to the same extent by women of another culture in which time and resources are often concentrated exclusively in the home environment. Identifying specific cultural constructs—such as the differing value placed on work and family time in the U.S. and China, as researched by Yang et al. (2000)—becomes increasingly important for extending theory as well as testing it.

Overall, replication is vital to avoid the long-term effect of protecting hypotheses against falsification, as well as to advance our knowledge. However, “[r]elatively few hypotheses involve variables that are tied to biological substrates, or are rooted in common ecological features, or are based on social structures in all societies (Pepitone & Triandis, 1987, p. 476).” Due to the nature of the variables under study (especially from a cross-national perspective), researchers should focus on replication across different countries, occupations, economic climates, political and social states, and so forth. Only in this manner can our studies provide evidence for the validity of theories and constructs (Pepitone & Triandis, 1987).

As more studies are beginning to be conducted in new countries and regions, researchers can use innovative methodologies not commonly used in existing work-family research—for example, ethnography—to get rich qualitative data to guide theory building and hypothesis testing. At first glance, some may see ethnography and cross-national comparisons as contradictory methods to study multiple countries/regions. Ethnography focuses data collection in regard to individual cases (e.g., a single culture) whereas survey-based cross-national data collection is collected across two or more groups.
However, according to Darrah and Murphy (2009) “ethnography is especially valuable for tracing how macro-level trends are locally manifested and for relaying stories that contribute to civic discourse about social issues and policies,” making it an applicable method for work-family research. The drawbacks include increased cost of fieldwork, as well as consumption of time spent analyzing, interpreting, and organizing notes into a meaningful document. If these disadvantages could be overcome, this method would provide much-needed rich data on work-family issues in novel regions of the world. All things considered, each research method is informative and comparative in its own way; regardless of whether the comparison is explicit (cross-national) or implicit (ethnography) (Ember & Ember, 2001, pp. 1-3).

**Practice**

Considering the pervasiveness of multinational organizations in our globalized world, and the spread of North American organizations and their work practices, investigating the interface between work and family in countries and regions other than the Anglo region is crucial. With regard to work-family issues, we are witnessing challenges and opportunities that did not exist a few decades ago. For instance, North American organizations demand more hours worked than their counterparts in Europe, where many governments legislate on issues relating to work and family (e.g., vacation time or maternity and paternity leaves). Expatriates bring their families to a new home country where traditions, language, and policies are different.

Furthermore, work is being outsourced, and thus performed by low-wage workers, but still managed from the host country. Virtual teams from multiple time zones come together to work on a project. Given all this, organizations need relevant research addressing these issues. A call center employee in India does not face the same work-family issues as her counterpart in the U.S., and she is even further removed from the North American manager of the department to which she belongs. These individuals have different experiences and needs, including job security, affordable but good quality childcare, access to healthcare and benefits, and earnings potential. One policy set by home managers in the home country can mean different things to individuals in different parts of the world. Poster (2005) suggests that problems relating to implementation of internal organizational policies in a multinational organization are inherent to the design of the policy itself. A policy created in one area of the world may take on a drastically different meaning someplace else. Further cross-national research on work-family issues will benefit organizations operating outside the home country, as well as the organization’s employees.

**Conclusion**

Given the pace of globalization, and the fact that working parents around the globe face daily struggles to balance their work and family demands, the expansion of work-family research into non-Anglo countries
will most likely increase. As methodologically sound cross-national work-family research starts to accumulate, we will be able to test the generalizability of North American theories in different cultural contexts, as well as offer guidance with respect to work-family balance issues to multinational organizations and policy makers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Countries Included</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Date(s) Conducted</th>
<th>Topics Assessed</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Values</td>
<td>Most recent wave (2005-2008) included 56 global countries: Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Chile, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, United Kingdom, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Moldova, Morocco, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Romania,</td>
<td>Face-to-face interviews</td>
<td>1981-1984 wave, 1989-1993 wave, 1994-1999 wave, 1999-2004 wave, 2005-2008 wave</td>
<td>Demographic information, attitudes about: work, leisure time, conservation of the environment, public policy, religion, marriage, gender roles at work, gender roles at home. Confidence in: one’s government, political system, and country’s economy.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/">http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/</a></td>
<td>Data, questionnaire, and codebook are available for free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Quality of Life Survey</td>
<td>28 to 31 European countries depending on wave, including: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden,</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>2003 and 2008</td>
<td>Working conditions, working time, work autonomy, work flexibility, job quality, job satisfaction, unemployment, social standard, income satisfaction, making ends meet, work-life balance, quality of: state of the pension system, social services, satisfaction with health, state of health, satisfaction with health services, happiness, quality of education system.</td>
<td>Data, questionnaire, and codebook are available for free; however, the user must register with the U.K. data (UKD) archive organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Working Conditions Survey</strong></td>
<td>12 to 31 countries, depending on wave, including: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Malta, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, U.K.</td>
<td>Face-to-face interviews</td>
<td>1991, 1995, 2000, 2001, and 2005</td>
<td>Respondent age, sex, education, income, work and employment, marital status, parents, children, household composition. Work, working conditions, working time, flexible work, work autonomy, working conditions, working time, work obligations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edacwowe/en/frmShowGIW?v_id=4">http://www.edacwowe/en/frmShowGIW?v_id=4</a></td>
<td>Data, questionnaire, and codebook are available for free; however, the user must register with the U.K. data archive organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Survey on Working Time and Work-Life Balance, ESWT</strong></td>
<td>21 European countries, including: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, U.K.</td>
<td>Face-to-face interviews</td>
<td>2004 and 2008</td>
<td>Management questionnaire: childcare leave, early retirement, employee characteristics, establishment characteristics, flexibility, gender (care), job opportunities, long-term leave, overtime, part-time/full-time work, phased retirement, trade union, working time, workload. Employee questionnaire: flexibility, job motivation, job search, overtime, part-time/full-time work, retirement, retirement age, trade union, working time, work-life balance.</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.edacwowe.eu/en">http://www.edacwowe.eu/en</a> frmShowGIW_SES?v_id=3](<a href="http://www.edacwowe.eu/en">http://www.edacwowe.eu/en</a> frmShowGIW_SES?v_id=3)</td>
<td>Data, questionnaire, and codebook are available for free; however, the user must register with the U.K. data (UKD) archive organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euro-Barometer: Working Conditions</strong></td>
<td>12 European countries: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and</td>
<td>Face-to-face interviews</td>
<td>1985, 1991, 1993, and 1995</td>
<td>Includes: opinions and attitudes about work, working conditions, and government policy, activity, the hours they worked daily and weekly, and whether their work involved dangerous machines, high-speed activity, tiring positions, heavy loads, tight</td>
<td><a href="http://webapp.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/0002/studies?keyword=working+conditions">http://webapp.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/0002/studies?keyword=working+conditions</a></td>
<td>Questionnaire is free; data are only available to inter-university consortium for political and social research (ICPSR) member institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deadlines, short repetitive tasks, using computers, or working at night. Workers’ control of their tasks and rate of work, perception of sufficient training, information, tools, space, furnishings, and support to carry out their tasks. The responsibility of companies to ensure health and safety in the workplace. Opinions on role of governments and the European Community for prevention of accidents and illness.

Please note: This is a hybrid description of the 1991 and 1993 studies. 1995 is not available online. The full descriptions can be found at:

http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/00026/studies/9696/detail#scope-of-study
| International Social Survey Program (ISSP): Work Orientations | Range of 11 to 32 countries, depending on year of survey, including: Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Flanders, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, | Mail survey, conducted by each country independently of each other | 1989, 1997 and 2005 | Employment arrangements, job characteristics, subjective experience of job, outcome of work, work-life balance, work centrality, and conflict in work relations. | Data, questionnaire, and codebook are available for free; however, the user must register with the ZACAT organization. | http://www.gesis.org/en/services/data/survey-data/issp/ |
| Europecan Union Labour Force Survey (EU LFS) | 6 to 33, depending on year of survey, including: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and U.K. | 1960, 1987, 1995, 2000, and 2002 | Occupation, professional status, supervisory responsibilities, involvement of the public employment office in finding job, full-time/part-time, reasons for part-time work, job permanency, contract, atypical working hours, working hours, working at home, paid or unpaid overtime, preferred working hours, information on second job, previous work experience, reasons for leaving last job, duration and reasons for search for employment, methods used for employment search, learning activities, level and field of education or training, purpose of learning activity, situation 1 year before survey, and income. | http://www.edacwowe.eu/en/frmShowGlW_SES?v_id=7 | Questionnaires and codebooks available for free; data are available to universities and research institutes inside the EU and only provided by means of research contracts. Other users need approval from the Committee of Statistical Confidentiality. |
| Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement (SHARE) | 12 to 15 countries, depending on wave, including: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Switzerland, and the U.K. | Face-to-face or proxy interview. | 2004, 2006/2007 and 2008/2009. | Employment status, occupation, health status, employment level, receiving education or training, income before social transfers, income after social transfers, amount of social transfers receiving (unemployment benefits, (private) pension, family-related allowances, housing allowances, sickness benefits, education-related allowances, disability benefits), tax, individual deprivation, and household deprivation. | http://www.edacwowe.eu/en/frmShowGIW_SES?v_id=2 | Questionnaires and data are available for free, but user must register with SHARE website. |
| European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU SILC) | 15 to 30 countries, depending on wave, including: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the U.K. | Face-to-face, telephone interviews, proxy interview, or self-administration of questionnaire under extenuating circumstances. | 2004, 2005, and 2006. | Employment status, occupation, health status, health insurance, education level, receiving education or training, income before social transfers, income after social transfers, amount of social transfers receiving (unemployment benefits, (private) pension, family-related allowances, housing allowances, sickness benefits, education-related allowances, disability benefits), tax, individual deprivation, and household deprivation. | http://www.edacwowe.eu/en/frmShowGIW_SES?v_id=9 | Questionnaires and codebooks are available for free; data are available to universities and research institutes inside the European Union and only provided by means of research contracts. Other users would need approval from the Committee of Statistical Confidentiality. |
Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, The Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Note that there are 16 countries listed; since there were different countries in each wave all the countries are included here.

<p>| Pew Global Attitudes Project | Up to 55 countries depending on the survey, including: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Bulgaria, Canada, | Face-to-face, telephone, Internet, or paper questionnaires (delivered in person or in the mail). | 2005-2009 for economically related surveys. | A series of worldwide public opinion surveys that assesses attitudes on a wide variety of subjects ranging from people's assessments of their own lives to their views about the current state of the world and important issues of the day. | <a href="http://people-press.org">http://people-press.org</a> | Datasets from January 1997 to present are available for free with registration with the Pew Research Center for The People &amp; The Press. |
| Chile, China, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, The Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian territories, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, |  |  |  |
| European Values Study (EVS) | 16 to 45 countries, depending on wave, including: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, East Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia Republic, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, The Netherlands, Northern | Face-to-face interviews | 1981, 1999, and 2008 | Ideas, beliefs, preferences, attitudes, values, and opinions about life, family, work, religion, politics, and society. | <a href="http://www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu">http://www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu</a> | Data, questionnaires are available for free with registration with ZACAT. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Questionnaire Availability</th>
<th>Data Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and Ukraine</td>
<td>12 to 20 countries, depending on wave, including: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.</td>
<td>Face-to-face interviews.</td>
<td>2001, 2002, 2006, 2008, and 2009</td>
<td>Attitudes regarding: understanding and satisfaction of democracy, economic reform, economic values, economic satisfaction, economic problems, trust in public institutions, trust in government, performance of government, identify in civil society, media usage, and community and political involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Americas Barometer</strong></td>
<td>11 to 23 Northern and Southern American countries, depending on wave, including: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Canada, and the U.S.</td>
<td>Face-to-face interviews</td>
<td>2004, 2006, and 2008</td>
<td>Measures democratic values and behaviors in the Americas using national probability samples of voting-age adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OECD Economic Survey</strong></td>
<td>56 global countries, including: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France,</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Every 1.5 to 2 years for all OECD member countries, plus some large countries that are not OECD members</td>
<td>Identifies the main economic challenges faced by the country and analyzes policy options to meet them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Global HR Challenges</td>
<td>Territories included: Africa, Asia, North America, South</td>
<td>Survey conducted by PriceWaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Impact of a major social, economic, or political event on work, ranking of top three issues of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Labor Survey</strong></td>
<td>33 global countries, including: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea (South), Malaysia, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Turkey, the U.K., and the Internet-based survey</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Freedom of association, the regulation of work contracts, employee benefits, and the prevalence of collective bargaining.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nber.org/papers/w11598">http://www.nber.org/papers/w11598</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households, Work and Flexibility Survey</strong></td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>8 European countries: U.K., Sweden, The Netherlands, Slovenia, Hungary, Czech Republic, Romania, and Bulgaria.</td>
<td>Face-to-face or telephone interviews</td>
<td>2001-2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<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
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 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