

## Sloan Network Encyclopedia Entry

---

### Personality Traits of Workers and the Work-Family Interface (2007)

**Authors:** Alyssa Friede Westring, DePaul University - Department of Management  
Ann Marie Ryan, Michigan State University- Department of Organizational Psychology

**Date:** September 10, 2007

#### Basic Concepts and Definitions

*What is personality?*

Personality has been defined as “an individual’s characteristic patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms - hidden or not - behind those patterns” (Funder, 2001, p.2). In other words, personality reflects differences in how individuals think about and react to situations. For many years, personality assessment has been used by researchers and practitioners to predict and explain numerous work-related outcomes. For example, personality has been shown to be related to job performance and job satisfaction (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002).

A number of different personality traits have been examined in relation to work outcomes. The most popular typology of personality traits is the Big Five traits (extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience; McCrae & John, 1992). Extraversion refers to being sociable, assertive, and talkative (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Emotional stability reflects neuroticism and is characterized by anxiousness, depression, and insecurity (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Agreeableness refers to friendliness. Agreeable individuals are considered good-natured, cooperative, and tolerant (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Conscientiousness refers to being dependable, careful, and hard-working (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Finally, openness to experience includes the characteristics of being imaginative, curious, and open-minded (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

The Big Five is useful for thinking about how personality may influence individuals’ experiences (e.g., their experiences of work-family conflict and positive spillover) because it provides a comprehensive framework that incorporates important and relatively broad personality traits. The bandwidth-fidelity dilemma in personality assessment refers to the question of whether broad traits (e.g., negative affectivity, Big Five) are more useful for prediction than more narrow ones (e.g., dependability, dominance). While some researchers have advocated strongly for the use of broad measures (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996), others have advocated for theoretical matching of more narrow traits to specific, narrower criteria (Schneider, Hough & Dunnette, 1996). Thus, while the Big Five and other broad traits are likely useful for predicting broad outcomes (like work-family conflict and positive spillover), there may

also be value in developing theory to match more specific traits with narrower criteria (e.g., relating dependability, a facet of conscientiousness, to time-based work interference with family).

### *Mechanisms linking personality, work-family conflict and positive spillover*

In recent years, researchers have begun to consider whether individual differences in personality might be related to experiences of work-family conflict and positive spillover. Before delving into empirical findings regarding these relationships, it is important to consider the mechanisms that may link personality to work-family conflict and work-family positive spillover. Based on a theoretical model of the relationship between personality and stress developed by Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) and more recent research that builds upon that model, we describe four main mechanisms that may link personality to the work-family interface (Friede & Ryan, 2005).

1. Differential Exposure: There is evidence to suggest that personality affects the environments that individuals choose and create for themselves (Diener, Larson, & Emmons, 1984). Personality may influence whether individuals select and experience challenging or supportive environments (e.g., family-friendly work environments, a job with flexible hours, a supportive spouse). These environments may make it easier or more difficult for employees to manage the demands of work and family, thus influencing their experiences of work-family conflict and work-family positive spillover (Friede & Ryan, 2005).
2. Differential Reactivity: Additionally, research suggests that personality influences how individuals react to situations. In other words, even when two individuals encounter the exact same situation, their personalities will influence how they perceive those situations (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Therefore, personality may influence whether individuals perceive their work and family lives as stressful or manageable and whether they perceive work and family as conflicting or enriching one another (Friede & Ryan, 2005).
3. Use of Coping Strategies: Coping is defined as efforts, both cognitive and behavioral, used to deal with events that are appraised as stressful (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Coping strategies may be problem-focused (which rely upon identifying the problem and seeking out solutions) or emotion-focused (attempting to alter emotions regarding the problem; Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999). Research has shown that the use of problem-focused coping is associated with decreased work-family conflict (Aryee et al., 1999). Personality may affect the use of coping strategies in two different ways. *First, personality may influence which coping strategies individuals choose to use* (e.g., Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998). Individuals with different personality types may select different coping strategies and these coping strategies may be more or less effective in avoiding work-family conflict and promoting work-family positive spillover. *Second, personality may affect how effectively individuals implement the coping strategies that they choose*. Even if two individuals cope with work-family challenges using the same strategy (e.g.,

problem-focused coping), personality may influence how effectively each individual implements that coping strategy to avoid work-family conflict and achieve work-family positive spillover (Friede & Ryan, 2005). Additionally, coping strategies may influence the extent to which experiences of work-family conflict result in negative outcomes for individuals (e.g., poor mental and physical health). When individuals experience equivalent levels of work-family conflict, some people may more effectively cope with that conflict, thus avoiding the potentially harmful effects of such conflict (Kinnunen et al., 2003).

4. Indirect Influences: It is also possible that personality influences other aspects of one's experiences, attitudes, or choices that, in turn, affect experiences of work-family conflict and positive spillover. In other words, personality may influence work-family experiences and perceptions in an indirect way.

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

There is a growing recognition that personality is important to consider as a predictor of work-family conflict and positive spillover. To date, research has primarily focused on environmental antecedents of work-family conflict and positive spillover (such as job autonomy, supervisor supportiveness, work-family climate, and family-friendly policies and practices; Friede & Ryan, 2005). In addition to studying characteristics of the environment that influence individuals' work-family experiences, it is also important to understand the characteristics of *individuals* that influence their ability to manage the demands of work and family. Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, and Brinley (2005) argue that the role of individual differences, such as personality, in experience of work-family conflict and positive spillover is an important topic area that merits additional research. Furthermore, understanding whether and how personality influences work-family conflict and positive spillover is an important step in designing interventions to help individuals and organizations manage the demands of work and family. It's interesting to note that a number of doctoral dissertations have been conducted on this topic in recent years, although their findings have not been published in peer reviewed outlets and thus are not included in the review below (most recently, Andreassi (2007), Pratt (2006), Shafiro (2005), and Smoot (2005)).

### **State of the Body of Knowledge**

#### *The Big Five*

Here, we review empirical research linking the Big Five personality traits to the work-family interface. Wayne, Musisca, and Fleeson (2004) found that as a set, the Big Five explained 15% of variance in work-to-family conflict and 13% of variance in family-to-work conflict (above and beyond the effects of control variables). With regard to work-family positive spillover, the Big Five explained 7% of variance in work-to-family positive spillover and 8% of variance in family-to-work positive spillover (above and beyond the control variables; Wayne et al. (2004)).

Individuals who are more conscientious reported less work-to-family conflict and less family-to-work conflict in the studies conducted by Bruck and Allen (2003) and Wayne et al. (2004). Kinnunen et al. (2003) only found this relationship for family-to-work conflict whereas Rantanen et al. (2005) only found this relationship for work-to-family conflict. Conscientiousness was positively related to work-to-family positive spillover but was unrelated to family-to-work positive spillover in the Wayne et al., (2004) study.

Individuals with greater emotional stability also reported less work-to-family conflict and less family-to-work conflict (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004). Rantanen et al. (2005) only found this relationship for work-to-family conflict while Kinnunen et al. (2003) did not find a relationship between emotional stability and work-family conflict in either direction.

Further, Kinnunen et al. (2003), Rantanen et al. (2005), and Wayne et al. (2004), found that agreeableness was negatively related to work-to-family conflict, but not family-to-work conflict. Bruck and Allen (2003), on the other hand, found agreeableness to be negatively correlated with all types and directions of work-family conflict except behavior-based conflict. Agreeable individuals reported greater family-to-work positive spillover, but not work-to-family positive spillover (Wayne et al., 2004).

Extraversion and openness to experience were not found to be related to either direction of work-family conflict by Bruck & Allen (2003), Rantanen et al. (2005), or Wayne et al. (2004). Kinnunen et al. (2003), on the other hand, found extraversion and openness to experience to be negatively related to family-to-work conflict. Extraversion was positively related to both work-to-family and family-to-work positive spillover (Wayne et al., 2004). Openness to experience was positively related to work-to-family positive spillover, but was unrelated to family-to-work positive spillover (Wayne et al., 2004). Note that Bruck and Allen (2003) did not examine the relationship between the Big Five and positive spillover (See also Gryzwacz and Marks (2000) for an additional investigation of the relationship between emotional stability, extraversion, work-family conflict, and work-family positive spillover for men and women).

### *Negative Affectivity*

Researchers have also examined the relationship between negative affectivity, the tendency to experience negative emotional states (Watson & Clark, 1984), and work-family conflict. Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1993) found that individuals higher in negative affect reported higher work-family conflict, as well. Providing a more specific examination of the types of work-family conflict, Bruck and Allen (2003) found that negative affectivity was positively correlated with all types/directions of work-family conflict except behavior-based conflict. Echoing these findings, Stoeva, Chiu, and Greenhaus (2002) found higher negative affectivity to be associated with greater work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict and Carlson (1999) found higher negative affectivity to be associated with greater time-, strain-, and behavior-based work-family conflict.

### *Other Personality Traits*

Carlson (1999) examined the relationships between Type A behavior and the three types of work-family conflict (see Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Individuals with Type A personalities are ambitious and involved in their work (as compared to more laid-back Type B personalities; Carlson, 1999). Carlson (1999) found that Type A personality was unrelated to time-based work-family conflict and strain-based work-family conflict (when controlling for control and role variables; Carlson, 1999). Unexpectedly, individuals higher in Type A personality traits reported less behavior-based conflict (when controlling for control variables and role variables; Carlson, 1999). On the other hand, Burke (1988) found that individuals higher in Type A behavior reported greater levels of work-family conflict.

Sumer and Knight (2001) examined the relationship between attachment styles and experiences of work-family conflict. Broadly, Sumer and Knight (2001) found that individuals with a preoccupied attachment style (characterized by a desire to be linked with a partner, low self-esteem, and high esteem of others), experienced the greatest amount of family-to-work conflict. Individuals with a secure attachment style (characterized by a high self-esteem and high esteem for others) experienced the greatest amount of family-to-work and work-to-family positive spillover (Sumer & Knight, 2001).

Noor (2002) investigated the effects of locus of control on work-family conflict. Locus of control is the extent to which individuals believe that they are in control of the events that happen in their life. Noor (2002) found that individuals with an external locus of control (those who attribute the causes of events in their lives to factors other than themselves) reported experiencing more work-family conflict.

### *Mechanisms linking personality to work-family conflict and positive spillover*

Some researchers have directly tested the mechanisms that link personality and work-family conflict and positive spillover. For example, Stoeva et al. (2002) investigated the mechanisms linking negative affectivity to work-family conflict by focusing on experiences of stress in the work and family roles. They argue that one possible relationship between these variables is that negative affectivity will result in greater job stress and greater family stress. Greater job and family stress are, in turn, expected to result in greater work-family conflict. This argument draws upon the *differential exposure*, *differential reactivity*, and *indirect influence* mechanisms above. The study conducted by Stoeva et al. (2002) supported the notion that role stress mediates the relationship between negative affectivity and work-family conflict. In other words, the authors found that one mechanism by which personality influences work-family conflict is through its effects on stress in the work and family roles. Andreassi (2007) reported evidence that another mechanism by which personality influences work-family conflict is through its influence on the extent to which passive coping strategies were used.

Stoeva et al. (2002) also suggest that negative affectivity may moderate the relationship between job and family stress and work-family conflict. In this case, the same level of perceived job and family stress is expected to more strongly influence the work-family conflict of individuals high in negative affectivity than those low in negative affectivity. This argument draws upon the *differential reactivity* linking mechanism and could also potentially be related to the *use of coping mechanisms* link because individuals high in negative affectivity may not cope as effectively with job or family stress, thus experiencing greater levels of work-family conflict than those lower in negative affectivity. Stoeva et al. (2002) found that their moderation argument was supported for family-to-work conflict but not for work-to-family conflict. In other words, given the same levels of family stress, individuals high in negative affectivity reported greater levels of family-to-work conflict than individuals with lower negative affectivity.

Additionally, some researchers have examined whether personality moderates the relationship between work-family conflict and outcomes such as health and well-being. *Differential reactivity* and the *use of coping mechanisms* explain the nature of these predicted relationships. Kinnunen et al. (2003) found, for example, evidence that the negative effects of work-to-family conflict on job exhaustion and depression were stronger for less emotionally stable fathers. Rantanen et al. (2005) found that women who were high in negative affectivity were more vulnerable to the negative effects of work-family conflict on depression. Additional researchers have examined similar types of questions (e.g., Grandey and Cropanzano, 1999; Noor, 2002).

### *Summary*

The research linking personality to the work-family interface has primarily focused on the role of negative affectivity and the Big Five personality traits. This research suggests that individuals higher in negative affectivity experience greater work-family conflict. Furthermore, it is important to note that emotional stability and negative affectivity are related constructs and individuals higher in negative affectivity tend to also be less emotionally stable. Therefore, it is not surprising that negative affectivity tends to be associated with greater work-family conflict whereas emotional stability tends to be associated with less work-family conflict. The mechanisms linking emotional stability to work-family conflict and positive spillover are likely to be the same as those mechanisms described above that link negative affectivity to positive spillover. Overall, the link between negative affectivity (and thus emotional stability) and work-family conflict is the strongest and most consistent relationship found in the research on personality and the work-family interface. This echoes substantial findings which link greater negative affectivity to stress, more broadly (e.g., Watson & Pennebaker, 1989).

With regard to other Big Five personality traits, conscientiousness and agreeableness were generally both associated with less work-family conflict. Perhaps conscientious individuals are more effective in coping with work-family challenges because they are able to plan ahead and work hard to manage conflicts between their multiple roles. Agreeable individuals value getting along with others and will

compromise their own interests to ensure harmony with others. It is possible, therefore, that agreeable individuals experience less work-family conflict because they work to create harmonious work and home situations.

Interestingly, extraversion was a predictor of work-family positive spillover, but not conflict. Extraverts tend to show more initiative and ambition (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001). Therefore, it is possible that extraverted individuals are more assertive and proactive in taking advantage of potential opportunities for positive spillover. Thus, while extraverts may not be able to avoid work-family conflict better than introverts, they may nonetheless be able to take advantage of opportunities for experiencing enrichment between their multiple roles.

Thus, the linking mechanisms described above can be used to help explain the empirical findings that relate personality to the work-family interface. The correlational relationships provide a starting point for thinking about how differential exposure, differential reactivity, the use of coping strategies, and indirect influences may link personality to work-family conflict and positive spillover. Importantly, the research conducted by Kinnunen et al. (2003), Rantenan et al. (2005), and Stoeva et al. (2002) provide empirical evidence that some or all of the linking mechanisms may relate negative affectivity to work-family conflict.

### **Implications for Research and Practice**

The relationship between personality and work-family outcomes has a number of important research implications. First, research summarized here suggests that relatively broad personality traits such as negative affectivity and the Big Five are useful for predicting work-family outcomes. Future research that extends the work of Stoeva et al. (2002) to help us understand the processes by which personality influences work-family outcomes would be valuable. For researchers who are interested in examining the relationship between other predictors (particularly those that are self-reported) and work-family outcomes, personality may be an important control variable to consider in the research design (because personality may be related to • and perhaps cause • both the key study predictors and outcomes). Research also is needed on interactive effects of personality and situational characteristics in exacerbating or alleviating work-family conflict. Finally, we noted the need for theory that links more specific personality traits with more specific work-family outcomes.

There are also a number of practical implications of the study of personality and work-family outcomes. Understanding the role of personality may be helpful for those who design or implement work-family policies or practices (at the organizational, community, or national levels). The findings presented here make it clear that individuals do not all perceive and cope with work-family conflict and positive spillover in the same way. Thus, a critical implication for practice is that the development of policies and practices should not be a “one size fits all” endeavor. Instead, policies/practices that allow for individual preferences and flexibility to be enacted are preferable. Policies/practices may have to be promoted, designed, and maintained in different ways for different individuals.

This research highlights the potential benefit of implementing training and development opportunities to teach individuals skills and coping strategies for balancing work and family. Individuals with particular personalities might be taught to use effective skills and coping strategies that they would not normally use because of their dispositions. Such training programs could also help people think about what policies and practices might be appropriate for them given their unique personality.

## References

Andreassi, J.K. (2007). What the person brings to the table: Personality, coping and work-family conflict. Paper presented at The Academy of Management, Philadelphia, P.A, August, 2007.

Andreassi, J. (2007). The role of personality and coping in work-family conflict: New directions. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 67(8-A), 3053.

Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., & Lo, S. (1999). Role stressors, interrole conflict, and well-being: The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 259-278.

Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 9-30.

Bolger, N. & Zuckerman, A. (1995). A framework for studying personality in the stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 890-902.

Bruck, C. S. & Allen, T. D. (2003). The relationship between big five personality traits, negative affectivity, type A behavior, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 457-472.

Burke, R. J. (1988). Some antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 3, 287-302.

Carlson, D. S. (1999). Personality and role variables as predictors of three forms of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 236-253.

Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., & Emmons, R. A. (1984). Person-situation interactions: Choice of situations and congruence of coping models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 580-592.



Eby, L., Casper, W., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 124-197.

Friede, A. & Ryan, A. M. (2005). The importance of the individual: How self-Evaluations influence the work-family interface. In E. E. Kossek and S. Lambert (Eds.). *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1993). Relationship of work-family conflict, gender, and alcohol expectancies to alcohol use/abuse. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 545-558.

Funder, D. C. (2001). *The personality puzzle* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Norton.

Grandey, A. A. & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The conservation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 350-370.

Greenhaus, J. & Beutell, N. (1985). Sources and conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.

Grzywacz, J. & Marks, N. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 111-126.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 167-188.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. (2003). The core self-evaluations scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 303-331.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 530-541.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core self-evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 17-34.

Kinnunen, U., Vermulst, A., Gerris, J., Makikangas, A. (2003). Work-family conflict and its relation to well-being: the role of personality as a moderating factor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1669-1683.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 752-758.

- McCrae, R. R. & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 175-215.
- Noor, N. (2002). Work-family conflict, locus of control, and women's well-being: Tests of alternative pathways. *Journal of Social Psychology, 142*, 645-662.
- Ones, D. S. & Viswesveran, C. (1996). Bandwidth-fidelity dilemma in personality measurement for personnel selection. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*, 609-626.
- Pratt, A. (2006). Role of cognitive ability and personality factors in coping with work-family conflict. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 67(5-B)*, 2866.
- Rantanen, J., Pulkkinen, L., & Kinnunen, U. (2005). The big five personality dimensions, work-family conflict, and psychological distress. *Journal of Individual Differences, 26*, 155-166.
- Schneider, R. J., Hough, L. M., & Dunnette, M. D. (1996). Broadsided by broad traits: How to sink science in five dimensions or less. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*, 639-655.
- Shafiro, M. (2005). The effects of allocentrism, idiocentrism, social support, and Big Five Personality dimensions on work-family conflict. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 66(3-B)*, 1773.
- Smoot, S. M. (2005). The mediational role of coping in the relationship between personality and work-family conflict. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 66(4-B)*, 2317.
- Stoeva, A. Z., Chiu, R. K., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2002). Negative affectivity, role stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*, 1-16.
- Sumer, C. & Knight, P. (2001). How do people with different attachment styles balance work and family? A personality perspective on the work-family linkage. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 653-663.
- Watson, D. & Clark, L. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin, 96*, 465-490.
- Watson, D. & Pennebaker, J. (1989). Health complaints, stress, and distress: Exploring the central role of negative affectivity. *Psychological Review, 2*, 234-254.
- Wayne, J., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 108-130.

## 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.

<b>Domain A:</b> Antecedent Descriptives	<b>Domain B:</b> Work-Family Issues and Experiences	<b>Domain C:</b> Covariates	<b>Domain D:</b> Responses to W-F Issues and Experiences	<b>Domain E:</b> Outcomes and Impacts
Individual Antecedents	Individual Experiences	Individual Covariates	Individual Decisions & Responses	Individual Outcomes & Impacts
Family Antecedents	Family Experiences	Family Covariates	Family Decisions & Responses	Family Outcomes & Impacts
Workplace Antecedents	Workplace Experiences	Workplace Covariates	Workplace Decisions & Responses	Workplace Outcomes & Impacts
Community Antecedents	Community Experiences	Community Covariates	Community Decisions & Responses	Community Outcomes & Impacts
Societal Antecedents	Societal Experiences	Societal Covariates	Societal Decisions & Responses	Societal Outcomes & Impacts
<b>Domain F: Theoretical Underpinnings to All Domains</b>				

## 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](mailto: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)**

<b>Domain A:</b> Antecedent Descriptives	<b>Domain B:</b> Work-Family Issues and Experiences	<b>Domain C:</b> Covariates	<b>Domain D:</b> Responses to W-F Issues and Experiences	<b>Domain E:</b> Outcomes and Impacts
Individual Antecedents	Individual Experiences: Needs & Priorities; Problems & Concerns	Individual Covariates	Individual Decisions & Responses	Individual Outcomes & Impacts
Family Antecedents	Family Experiences: Needs & Priorities; Problems & Concerns	Family Covariates	Family Decisions & Responses	Family Outcomes & Impacts
Workplace Antecedents	Workplace Experiences: Needs & Priorities; Problems & Concerns	Workplace Covariates	Workplace Decisions & Responses	Workplace Outcomes & Impacts
Community Antecedents	Community Experiences: Needs & Priorities; Problems & Concerns	Community Covariates	Community Decisions & Responses	Community Outcomes & Impacts
Societal Antecedents	Societal Experiences: Needs & Priorities; Problems & Concerns	Societal Covariates	Societal Decisions & Responses	Societal Outcomes & Impacts
<b>Domain F: Theoretical Underpinnings to All Domains</b>				