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Basic Concepts & Definitions

Often individuals feel constrained in their usage of work/family policies. An organization may intend to structure and define policies that will assist work/family balance. However, if this message is communicated in an unsatisfactory way or delivered in a hostile departmental climate, the perceptions of the individuals may be that the policy is not usable. Susan Eaton (2003) labels this construct perceived usability. She found that some employees did not feel free to use the policies they theoretically enjoyed. Even when valid and well-structured policies/programs existed, the usability of these policies was significantly hindered when individuals felt that using these policies would inhibit their career (Eaton, 2003).

Many factors contribute to this gap, including personal preferences (Wallace, 1997), economic factors (Cantor, et al, 2001), family demographics (Pyle & Pelletier, 2003), personal values (Philipson, 2002), career orientation (Carlson, Derr & Wadsworth, 2003), life-stage (Moen, 2003) and organizational characteristics (Han & Waldfogel, 2003). Many factors weave through work/family management strategies thus the construct of perceived usability is complex and multi-layered.

Importance of Topic to Work-Family Studies

Work/family policies are important factors for workers, but simply putting policies in place is not meeting the conflicting demands that workers have identified. Often work/family options are left to employee choice. Unfortunately that choice has often been linked to marginalization of those employing their right to use available policies. When work/family policies are employed individuals indicate that their position seems to lack the power it did before, their opinion lacks the muster and their career has lost its original impetus (Avery & Zabel, 2001; Bailyn, 1993; Williams, 2000).

By furthering our understanding of factors that negate the perceived usability of work/family policies and thereby explore the link between utilization and marginalization we can begin to remove the barriers in
place. Without this exploration we are left with ineffective policies that force individuals to choose between work and family instead of finding ways they can complement one another.

This construct is also of importance to organizations as the motivation behind work/family policies and programs is often to increase productivity, commitment and retention. Eaton (2003) found that the perception of the usability of work/family policies is even more important than the presence of formal or informal policies for the desired outcomes of commitment and productivity. When employees found policies to be usable the perceived productivity for all employees was higher (Eaton, 2003). Understanding the construct of usability will assist our understanding of how to foster a climate that welcomes policies that are mutually beneficial for the employee and the organization.

"Usability" is a concept that requires further study to be validated and precisely measured. However, it has potential to enhance the precision with which researchers measure the true availability of policies, and add an aspect to organizational climate research that is experiential for a variety of employees at different levels and different jobs. Again, this construct of usability can also be applied to work/family policies beyond those that offer flexibility such as child-care programs, elder care benefits and others. Still, further research in this area has yet to be engaged.

State of the Body of Knowledge

Utilization:

A Work Trends (1999) study found that 88% of those surveyed cite balancing of work and family as very or extremely important. This ranked higher than job security, quality of working environment, and relationships with co-workers and supervisors.

However, there remains a disjunction between the proclaimed need and utilization of policies that are put in place to address the need. In another recent survey of working women, it was found that 59% never asked their employer for flexible work arrangements, since they assumed the answer would be no and their careers would be harmed by asking (Golden, 2000). Other researchers concur with these statements as they have found that even when formal policies exist, there are low utilization rates (Wharton & Blair-Loy, 2002; MacDermid et al., 1999); and even when the policies are well-designed for their given situation, utilization remains weak (Han & Waldfogel, 2003; Varner, 2000; Finkel, Olswang & She, 1994). Individuals are often not taking advantage of these policies for fear of career repercussions down the road (Williams, 2000; Judiesch & Lyness, 1999; Bergmann, 1986). Some possible reasons for this observed gap between policy development and policy usage are outlined below.
**Life Stage:**

"The work-family interface in dual-earner couples consists of fluid, ever changing relationships: his job changes, her job changes, their family changes, and they both grow older [if not wiser]" (Moen, 2003, p. 9). The commitments associated with a couples' place in life can greatly impact their work/life strategy. This impact changes as responsibilities are adjusted throughout the life-span. It is a dynamic process of development and change as one moves from early career stages through mid-career and late-career. Typically families are growing and changing, an important factor to consider in the work/life analysis (Moen & Sweet, 2003). These various stages of life impact the strategies employed to achieve balance of work and family and will thus influence the perceived usability of work/family policies.

**Career Orientation:**

Career orientation is an issue that has been understudied in the area of work/family. It is very important to assess the internal career orientation of the individual to gain additional insight into the rationale behind their strategy development. Recently Carlson (2003) and her colleagues took a look at internal career orientation and how that played out in the multi-dimensional world of work/family. Her classifications are helpful to our discussion and are quickly reviewed here. She has five classifications as follows:

1. **Getting ahead** - This orientation is characterized by upward mobility, seeking promotions within the status system.

2. **Getting secure** - Individuals with this orientation are focused on long-term job security. So promotions and career success are aimed at respect, loyalty and lifelong employment.

3. **Getting free** - In this orientation individuals are not seeking upward mobility, rather they want freedom. They will seek out autonomy, loose supervision and responsibility for outcomes.

4. **Getting high** - This is an orientation that is driven by excitement, action and passion for the activity. This individual will be in the center of the activity.

5. **Getting balanced** - This orientation is focused around balancing three forces: work, relationships and self-development. They will focus on different aspects of their life at different stages, but overall seek balance for a life-time between the various spheres (Carlson et al., 2003).

This orientation or focus will impact their willingness to sacrifice personal life for success in their work life. It will also help to understand why in a given context some individuals are very conflicted regarding their ability to balance various aspects of life, and other individuals are very satisfied with their situation and why they employ certain strategies. Orientation will also impact the perception of policy availability.
**Program Structure and Flexibility:**

Another issue of importance is the way policies are structured, in particular the amount of flexibility available in the job context and relevant policies. Policies are often categorized into two main approaches, segmentative policies and integrated policies (Grandey, 2001). Segmentative policies provide the employee with the ability to deal with family demands but continue to focus on work. An example of this may be sick childcare, which allows the employee to find someone to watch their sick child while they are at work. The ideology behind the policies would lead you to expect a decrease in turnover, a decrease in absenteeism and an increase in work performance. However, the few empirical studies provide ambiguous evidence for these claims. A few studies found a positive correlation (Perry, 1982; Auerbach, 1990) and others did not (Milkovich & Gomez, 1976; Kossek & Nichol, 1992).

The second type of policies are integrative, allowing employees to restructure their work to focus on both the demands of work and family (Grandey, 2001). When the worker has control over the schedule they often perceive that they are better able to mesh their work schedule with the needs of their family (Tausig & Fenwick, 2003). However, by doing so, the lines between work and home become blurred. One would expect that workers who have more control over their work hours would feel more positive about the organization, have lower turnover rates and less work/family tension. The research in this area is very policy driven and the results have typically met the expectations of the programs (Daltan & Mesch, 1990; Kim & Commpagna, 1981; Nollen & Martin, 1978; Pierce & Newstrom, 1983; Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981; Lee, 1983; Dunham, Pierce & Castendenada, 1987; Rothausen, 1994; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). The philosophy of policy development will affect perceptions surrounding usability.

**Bias Avoidance:**

The construct labeled bias avoidance by Drago & Colbeck (2002) is the act of engaging in behavior to hide or eliminate personal or family needs. Their recent study of faculty in over 500 postsecondary institutions found that approximately 75% of women and 50% of men engaged in bias avoidance behaviors. They broke down bias avoidance behaviors into two forms, narrow and broad. Narrow bias avoidance behavior "involves hiding and covering up caregiving commitments, regardless of work performance" (Drago & Colbeck, 2002, p 4). For example, calling in sick when you have to be home with a sick child.

Broad bias avoidance behavior is defined as limiting family commitments and caregiving responsibilities to provide the individual with more time for the employer (Drago & Colbeck, 2002). Examples include the decision not to partner, not to have children, delay having children or limiting the number of children (Drago & Varner, 2001). For example in a study at Penn State, Drago and Colbeck (2002) noted that during the period from 1992-1999 tenure track women faculty had an average of .57 children, while the
tenure track men averaged .95 children. In that same period, the proportion of multi-child family for tenure track women was 19 percent. More significant to the discussion of bias avoidance was the fact that out of 500 faculty who became new parents while employed at Penn State, only 7 faculty members took leaves. All of these leaves were taken by women (Drago, Crouter, Wardell & Willits, 2002).

Workers often employ strategies to balance work and family that do not include utilizing policies available to assist them. The perception is that the utilization of work/family policies may be viewed as raising the barriers to promotion.

**Organizational Climate:**

The literature supports the idea that a supportive organization climate is necessary in order to experience the benefits of the policies (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999; Solomon, 1994; Dunham, Pierce & Castenada, 1987; Cuyler-Gershenfeld, Kossek & Sandling, 1997). See entry on Work-Family Culture and Climate in this encyclopedia.

Climate is linked to work/life policies and their effectiveness. A brief description of the term climate is needed to further assess this connection. Organizational climate is a complex issue. It is defined by Tagiuri as follows:

Organizational climate is a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics [or attributes] of the organization (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968).

This definition implies that climate is part of the organization. Tagiuri emphasizes its subjective reality as a part of the experiential reality of the workers. This definition also states that this climate impacts the way the workers behave at work. This would include utilization of work/family policies. So climate is our shared understanding of what's valuable in an organization, if this understanding is internal, enduring, experienced by members, and affects their behavior.

Climate thus becomes the lens through which one filters organizational experiences. If workers sense a supportive climate then they will utilize policies that will support them in their attempt to balance work and family. If the climate is not one in which support is experienced, it does not matter what type of policies are in place; they will not be utilized, as the literature demonstrates. Even though climate is subjective in nature it is in fact a response to the actual characteristics of the organization. Reactions to those characteristics get played out in the effectiveness of organizational policies (Stringer, 2002).
Thus it is essential to have an understanding of organizational climate to interpret and understand the phenomenon of perceived usability. Although the two terms are distinct constructs they are very interrelated as perceived usability is directly derived from organizational climate.

**Perceived Usability:**

While consultants market "family-friendly" policies as a popular benefit, few scholars have demonstrated the mechanisms through which such policies function (or do not) to enhance firm performance (for exceptions, see Drago et al., 2000; MacDermid & Williams, 1997). While this incorporates various types of work/family policies, the focus in this section is the use of flexibility, as this is where the research has been done.

Flexibility as a construct includes much more than starting and quitting times. Many employees require flexibility to visit children's schools, take elders to the doctor, or take time off during a family emergency. Flexibility may also mean taking days off in return for working at non-standard times, or being able to work part-time temporarily at certain points in life (Moen, 1996).

Flexibility formally offered by the employer is insufficient as an indicator of flexibility available to the employee. Many employers limit flexibility to a small portion of the workforce or workday. When measuring formal flexibility policies, researchers should also seek informal ones. The culture of the workplace can determine whether work-family benefits are available and to whom; in some cases, using policies is discouraged or has negative career effects (Bailyn, 1993, Williams, 2000). Alternatively, supervisors can permit more flexibility than is formally allowed, encouraging employees to take time off unofficially, so that flexibility becomes invisible to higher-level managers (Eaton, 1999). This construct can be termed "informal flexibility."

Eaton (2000) proposes a distinct, more precise measure of available flexibility policies: the extent to which employees feel free to utilize such policies, whether formal or informal. She constructs a new measure in her study (Eaton, 2003), drawing on multiple workplace interviews in which employees discussed the lack of usability of policies that formally or informally permitted flexibility, but where daily practice discouraged it. Specifics differed, but the concept was the same: some employees did not feel free to use the policies they theoretically enjoyed. "Perceived Usability" is one way to understand whether flexibility policies that exist are meaningful to employees. It is distinct from informal policies, because it applies to each individual's view of his or her own comfort level with using policies, not to whether others can use them. Eaton shows that organizational commitment and self-reported productivity are significantly higher in cases where employees feel "free to use" the formal or informal policies, while these outcomes are smaller or non-significant in the case of the existence of policies alone.
Implications for Policy and Practice

This area of research is ripe with opportunity for additional study. We are just beginning to understand the connections among perceived usability and policy utilization. We can begin to claim that perceived usability of a policy impacts the way it is used by employees, but we do not fully understand this relationship. We must move forward to have a better understanding of the various factors discussed above and their link to individual perceptions, how those perceptions are derived from organizational experiences, and how they impact policy effectiveness.

The complexity of organizational climates can be overwhelming. Because climate is not an objective function of organizations, but rather a subjective set of perceptions, there may be a vast diversity of perceived climates within a single organization. A framework needs to be developed to sort the features of climates into a schema that is useful in grouping them in a comparable fashion. These groupings need to be useful not just to researchers in the field, but also to those in leadership positions within organizations (Stringer, 2002).

We need to engage in more qualitative studies to further our understanding of the experiences of those employing work/family balancing strategies. This exploration could help us develop a deeper understanding of the interaction of the key variables and how they contribute to the usability of policies.

We need to develop a more effective measure of productivity so we can gain a better understanding of how perceived usability, the "feeling free" to use the policy, impacts the organization. Further, managers need to identify ways to measure their own and their subordinates' performance in terms of redesigning work to make flexibility policies more "usable." Such metrics could include actual use of the policies compared to potential use, survey results on "perceived usability," and even focus group results on barriers to flexibility in the workplace.

In sum, usability is critical to the success of work-family integration and balance policies. If the policies exist, this does not mean that employees can or will use them. Ensuring that they feel comfortable doing so is essential to a successful program.
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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 ...).

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 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
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 workfamily area of study does not include any symbols that might suggest the relationships between specific factors or clusters of factors.

**Process**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcomes

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

Limitations

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

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

The members of the Virtual Think Tank wanted to focus their map of work-family issues around the experiences of five principal stakeholder groups:

1. individuals,
2. families,
3. workplaces,
4. communities, and
5. society-at-large.

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Individual Covariates
• Family Covariates
• Workplace Covariates
• Community Covariates
• Societal Covariates

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

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

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

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

Theoretical Foundations: The Virtual Think Tank established a sixth information domain to designate the multi-disciplinary theoretical underpinnings to the work-family area of study (noted as Information Domain F).
Table 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