



Sacred Heart
UNIVERSITY

Sacred Heart University
DigitalCommons@SHU

WCBT Faculty Publications

Jack Welch College of Business & Technology

8-14-2002


Identity Theory

Stephan Desrochers

Jeanine K. Andreassi
Sacred Heart University

Cynthia A. Thompson

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/wcob_fac

 Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Desrochers, Stephan; Andreassi, Jeanine K.; and Thompson, Cynthia A., "Identity Theory" (2002). *WCBT Faculty Publications*. 255.

https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/wcob_fac/255

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jack Welch College of Business & Technology at DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in WCBT Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact santoro-dillond@sacredheart.edu.

*This Encyclopedia Entry was part of the former Sloan Work and Family Research Network which is no longer in operation.

Sloan Network Encyclopedia Entry

Identity Theory (2002)

Authors: Stephan Desrochers, Ph.D., Berger Institute for Work, Family and Children, Claremont McKenna College; and Jeanine Andreassi and Cynthia Thompson, Ph.D., Zicklin School of Business, Baruch College, City University of New York

Date: August 14, 2002

Basic Concepts & Definitions

Identity theory is a microsociological theory, which links self attitudes, or identities, to the role relationships and role-related behavior of individuals. Identity theorists argue that the self consists of a collection of identities, each of which is based on occupying a particular role (Stryker, 1968; Stryker & Burke, 2000). Identities can be defined as one's answers to the question "Who am I?" (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). Many of the "answers" (e.g., "I am a father") are linked to the roles we occupy, so they are often referred to as "role identities" or simply, "identities." For example, familial identities might include those of spouse or parent and occupational identities might include those of accountant or salesperson. In turn, these role identities are said to influence behavior in that each role has a set of associated meanings and expectations for the self (Burke & Reitzes, 1981).

The concept of identity *salience* is important in identity theory because the salience we attach to our identities influences how much effort we put into each role and how well we perform in each role (Burke & Reitzes, 1981). According to Stryker (1968), who originated identity theory, the various identities that comprise the self exist in a *hierarchy* of salience, where the identities that are ranked highest are most likely to be invoked in situations that involve different aspects of the self. Stryker gave the example of a former New York mayor who decided not to run for another term of office in order to maintain favorable relationships with his sons. At the time, the mayor's account was met with disbelief by some. Stryker argued that those who did not believe the mayor's rationale most likely had a family identity that was low in their salience hierarchy.

Identity theory should not be confused with *social* identity theory, which emphasizes group process and intergroup relations rather than role behavior. Identity theory focuses on the self as comprised of the various roles an individual occupies (e.g., mother, friend, employee), while social identity theory posits that the groups to which people belong (e.g., political affiliation, Sierra Club member, nationality) can provide their members a definition of who they are (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). This entry will focus on identity theory, rather than social identity theory. Because of our focus is on identity theory as formulated

by Stryker and Burke, we do not review other sociological approaches to identity, such as identity *construction*, nor do we review the plethora of developmental and personality psychological perspectives on identity *formation*.

(For a discussion of sociological perspectives on identity construction, see Cerulo, 1997. Readers interested in theories of identity formation by Erickson, Marcia and other developmental and personality psychologists, as well as measures and methods used to test these theories, should consult the Society for Identity Formation website at: <http://srif.sdstate.edu/>.)

In addition to the distinction between social identity theory and identity theory, we should also note that there are two major "strands" of identity theory. Stryker's version emphasizes social structure and identity salience, whereas Burke's version emphasizes social-cognitive systems, identity maintenance processes, and the content of identity. For a more detailed discussion of the similarities and difference between these two, see Stryker and Burke (2000).

Measurement issues

A variety of research designs have been used to evaluate identity theory, including paper-and-pencil questionnaires (Burke & Reitzes, 1981; Cinamon & Rich, 2002; Minton & Pasley, 1996; Nuttbrock & Freudiger, 1991), questionnaires administered in telephone interviews (Reitzes & Mutran, 1994; Stryker & Serpe, 1982), structured interviews (Simon, 1995; Simon, 1997; Thoits, 1992), experiential sampling (Burke & Franzoi, 1988), as well as diaries and video analysis (Cast & Burke, 1999; Wickrama, Conger, Lerenz & Matthews, 1995). However, the majority of these studies relies on either written or telephone interview questionnaires.

Studies also vary in terms of which aspects of identity they measure. Many have measured only the salience of identities. Some have measured the content, or self-meanings of identities (the set of beliefs that define an identity). But these approaches do not address the *reflexivity* of identities. Identities have been defined as *reflexively* applied cognitions about the self-in-role, meaning that our perceptions of our identities are influenced by what we think others think of us as we enact our various roles (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). This suggests that role identity should be measured in terms of *how I think others think of me as a* (father, mother, etc.). However, relatively few studies have measured identity in this manner (e.g., Cast & Burke 1999; Pasley, Futris, & Skinner, 2002). More often, research testing identity theory tends to measure identity in terms of individuals' self-contained evaluations. For example, identity salience is typically measured by asking respondents to rank which identities they would be most likely to tell others about (Stryker & Serpe, 1982; Nuttbrock & Freudiger, 1991), by asking them to choose which identity is most important to them (Lobel & St. Claire, 1992), or by simply asking respondents to complete Likert-type scales on the centrality of specific identities (Cinamon & Rich, 2002; Desrochers, 2002).

However, as noted by Marks and MacDermid (1996), individuals may have many roles that are salient, the possibility of which can be missed when they are asked to rank their roles (requiring them to choose which is "more" important) or to rate the importance of only a few roles (e.g., worker and parent). Similarly, the content of identities is usually measured by asking respondents what their identities mean to them (Minton & Pasley, 1996; Simon, 1995; 1997) without considering their perceptions of their significant others' views of their identities. As such, measures of the content and salience of identities often do not reflect their reflexivity.

Importance of Topic to Work-Family Studies

Research informed by identity theory has contributed to our understanding of the costs, benefits, and meanings of occupancy in work and family roles. One line of research examines whether differences in the number, type, and salience of roles occupied by men versus women can explain gender differences in distress that can result from combining work and family. Another line of research focuses on the meaning of work and parent identities. What follows is a brief discussion of early and recent efforts to apply identity theory to the study of work and family.

Early efforts to apply identity theory to work and family tended to do so in support of the role accumulation hypothesis (see entries on Role Stress/Strain and Work-Family Role Conflict). Because identities are believed to provide individuals with purpose and behavioral guidance, some have argued that self-esteem and other aspects of psychological well-being are enhanced by having more identities (Sieber, 1974; Thoits, 1986) and by being more strongly committed to all of them (Marks, 1977; Reitzes & Mutran, 1994). Thoits (1986), for example, found that multiple role identities reduced anxiety, depression, and distress. This argument is consistent with the focus of current "expansionist" and "role balance" perspectives (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Marks, 1977; Marks & MacDermid, 2001), which suggest that energy is abundant and expandable and that having multiple roles is related to higher self esteem and enhanced well being. However, research has shown that the relationship between self-enhancement and multiple role occupancy is complex, depending on gender and the quality of roles involved. (See the entry on Work-Family Role Conflict for more information on self-enhancement theory, and see Barnett & Hyde (2001) for a comprehensive review of this research.) Some have argued that, to the extent that identities conflict with each other, being committed to multiple identities can be stressful (Burke, 1991; Desrochers, 2002; Stryker & Burke, 2000).

Today, a growing number of researchers, including Simon (1995, 1997) and Pasley (Pasley et al., 2002) are examining the *content* of identities. Simon (1995) argued that work and family roles have different meanings for women and men. Based on in-depth interviews with 40 employed married parents, she found that the majority of men in her study viewed work and family roles as *interdependent* and overlapping, and did not report negative consequences (e.g., distress) from combining the two roles.

Specifically, economic support was perceived as "synonymous with being a good father and husband" (p. 186), thus allowing men to fulfill the expectations of their parental role by being the family breadwinner. Women, on the other hand, perceived the work and family role as *independent* such that when performing one role, they could not at the same time perform the other role. Only a minority of the wives perceived economic support as an important part of their role, while the majority reported feeling "pulled in different directions," "constantly needed" or "confused." However, Simon noted that for the five women who perceived work and family as interdependent, their incidence of psychological symptoms was no different from men's. In a later study, Simon (1997) examined the content of work and family identities in greater depth.

State of the Body of Knowledge

Identity salience and work role performance

Lobel and St. Claire (1992) examined the effects of family responsibility and career identity versus family identity salience (i.e., the relative value placed on one's career) on the level of effort expended at work. As expected, those with a high level of career identity salience were willing to work harder and tended to receive higher merit increases than those with more salient family identities. Their results support the usefulness of career identity salience as a predictor of work effort for both men and women.

Identity salience and family role behavior

Identity salience among new mothers. Nuttbrock and Freudiger (1991) found that new mothers' structural commitment to the mother role (measured as the extent to which the quality of her social support changed as a result of childbirth) predicted personal sacrifice and acceptance of the burdens of motherhood, but only indirectly, through its impact on the salience of the mother identity.

Father identity salience and father involvement. Minton and Pasley (1996) found that aspects of the fathers' identity (competence, satisfaction, and investment in the father role) predicted his involvement after divorce. In a more recent study of married fathers who are raising children, Pasley, Futrix, and Skinner (2002) found that men who believe that their wives view them favorably as fathers tended to be more involved with their children. (To be more precise, Pasley et al. actually measured the psychological centrality of identities rather than their salience. For the purposes of this entry, we treated the two as the same. Although the two concepts are very similar, they are subtly different. For a detailed discussion of these similarities and differences, see Stryker and Serpe, 1994). These studies suggest that the growing literature on father involvement would be well served by giving greater attention to the salience of their parent identities.

Spouse identity and self-esteem. Cast and Burke (1999) found higher self-esteem among respondents whose husbands and wives "verified" their spousal identities. That is, when individuals' evaluations of their own identities as spouses were consistent with evaluations of themselves provided by their husbands and wives, they tended to have higher self-esteem than when there was disagreement. This also seemed to have long-term implications for their marriage. Greater spousal identity verification was associated with a lower likelihood of divorce or separation when re-interviewed years later.

Identity salience and the consequences of combining work and family roles

Role strain and psychological distress. Identity theory contributes to our understanding of the differences in distress levels of men and women who combine work and family roles. In 1992, Thoits proposed that gender differences in the salience or importance of role identities explain gender differences in distress when women and men engage in the same role (e.g., employee). She found that, overall, identity hierarchies were very similar across gender and marital status. For example, across gender and marital status, the three most salient identities were parent, spouse and friend. Although the hierarchies were strikingly similar, within each identity there were some gender and marital differences. The prediction that women would value roles based on primary relationships more highly than men (e.g., parent, spouse, friend, son/daughter) and that men would value roles based on achievement more than women (e.g., worker) was supported only among married participants. The reverse was found among divorced participants. In particular, divorced women ranked achievement-oriented roles (e.g., employee) higher than married women while divorced men ranked primary relationships (e.g., friend, son, relative) higher than married men. Contrary to expectations, psychological symptoms associated with a particular role did not depend on the position of an identity in an individual's salience hierarchy. The only difference found was that married men benefited more (e.g., experienced fewer psychological symptoms) than their wives from the employee role.

When Thoits examined the psychological effects of role combination, she found that when roles were perceived as *interdependent* (i.e., one role contributes to the other), the combination of the family and employee role was associated with lower distress levels. Divorced men with custodial and worker roles were significantly less distressed than other individuals whereas divorced women with a custodial role who did not work were significantly more distressed than other individuals. Similarly, married men experienced high distress when they were unemployed and low distress when they were employed. To explain these findings, Thoits suggested that, for married men and divorced men and women, the work role helps to fulfill the familial role as these roles are perceived as interdependent (i.e., because the individual is serving as the breadwinner of the family) (Thoits, 1992).

Work-family conflict. Cinamon and Rich (2002) found that married computer workers and lawyers whose career identities were more salient than their family identities, as well as those who rated both work and

family identities as highly salient, had higher work-family conflict than those who placed family above career. Rather than examining the pattern of salience, Desrochers (2002) treated the salience of career and parent identities as independent variables and examined the extent to which they predict work-family conflict. He found that parent identity salience, but not career identity salience, predicted conflict. Surprisingly, though, parent identity salience was negatively associated with conflict, such that greater importance attached to parenting, the lower the work-family conflict.

Physical health. Wickrama, Conger, Lerenz and Matthews (1995) found that work satisfaction had a greater positive influence on perceived physical health for husbands than wives, whereas parental satisfaction had a greater positive influence on perceived physical health for wives than husbands. However, they were careful to point out that their sample of rural couples was more likely than an urban sample to favor traditional gender roles. Nevertheless, these findings clearly suggest that identity has implications not only for psychological well-being, but also physical well-being.

Identity salience and role segmentation/integration

Much of the recent theory and research on the issue of role segmentation and integration has been grounded in boundary theory (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996), an approach that is derived in part from identity theory (see entry on Boundary Theory). For example, Ashforth, et al. (2000) have focused on the blurring of roles that may occur when boundaries between work and family roles are permeable (e.g., receiving calls from home while at work) versus impermeable (e.g., personal calls are not allowed at work). With respect to identity salience, a stronger identification with a particular role may increase the likelihood that the role is integrated with other roles, and may increase the reluctance to exit the role. When roles are integrated, role blurring may result in more confusion and anxiety about which role should be most salient at a particular time. For example, an individual with a strong family identity at home may be unable to focus on his job when a child is at home sick. In contrast to role integration, role segmentation is associated with large discrepancies in role identities. The benefit is that each role is associated with a particular time and place, allowing an individual to immerse oneself completely in each role. The downside is that the contrast between roles makes it more difficult to transition between roles. For instance, an executive with a large discrepancy between the worker and family role may have trouble displaying nurture at home when he or she has worked all day. Ashforth et al. (2000) argued that the role segmentation-role integration continuum is important for understanding the degree to which employees will value organizational solutions to work-family conflict.

Implications for Practice & Research

The works we have reviewed have tended to support identity theory as formulated by Stryker and Burke. However, what seems to be lacking in the literature is an in-depth critique of identity theory (for example,

an anonymous reviewer argued that the theory is descriptive, taxonomic, and tautological, but we could find no published critique of the theory, other than a comparison with social identity theory by Hogg et al). We believe that this lack of scrutiny is one of the major challenges that identity theory must address. Another major challenge for identity theory is the problem of multiple identities (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Although we have reviewed studies that have examined the extent to which multiple role involvement is beneficial for psychological well being and whether identity salience is the reason for different distress levels among males and females, the effect of identity salience on work-family conflict has rarely been studied empirically (see Cinamon & Rich, 2002 and Desrochers, 2002 for exceptions). Despite these challenges, given the insights learned from identity research to date, researchers may want to use the theory as a framework for future hypothesis development and testing.

In terms of more practical implications, Friedman, Christensen and DeGroot (1998) suggested that managers should identify where work falls in the spectrum of an individual's priorities in life and experiment with the way in which work is done so that organizational performance is enhanced while time is created for an individual's personal pursuits. Indeed, if research supports the notion that individuals vary in preference for the degree to which role boundaries are segmented versus integrated, companies should not force individuals to blend work and family roles (e.g., working at home so that one can take care of children) without considering the individual needs of the workers (Ashforth et al., 2000). For individuals who prefer greater segmentation between work and family roles, for example, Ashforth et al. suggested that organizations should consider implementing practices that limit early morning or late afternoon meetings, weekend travel, and having employees check emails at home (Ashforth et al., 2000). For individuals who prefer greater integration, on-site childcare or telecommuting options may meet their needs.

References

Ashforth, B., Kreiner, G. & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 472-491.

Barnett, R. & Hyde, J. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, 56, 781-796.

Burke, P. J. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 836-849.

Burke, P. J., & Franzoi, S. L. (1988). Studying situations and identities using experiential sampling methodology. *American Sociological Review*, 53, 559-568.

Burke, P. J. & Reitzes, D. C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44, 83-92.

- Cast, A. D., & Burke, P. J. (1999). Integrating self-esteem and identity theory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Cerulo, K. A. (1997). Identity construction: New issues, new directions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 385-409.
- Cinamon, R. G., Rich, Y. (2002). Profiles of attribution of importance to life roles and their implications for work-family conflict. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 212-220.
- Desrochers, S. (2002). Predicting work-family role strain among business professors from their identity-based and time-based commitments to professional and parenting roles. *BLCC Working Paper #02-05*.
- Friedman, S. D., Christensen, P., & DeGroot, J. (1998). Work and Life: The end of the zero-sum game. *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec, 119-129.
- Hogg, M., Terry, D. & White, K. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 255-269.
- Lobel, S., & St. Clair, L. (1992). Effects of family responsibilities, gender, and career identity salience on performance outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*. 35, 1057-1069.
- Marks, S. R., & MacDermid, S. M. (1996). Multiple roles and the self: A theory of role balance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 417-432.
- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time, and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921-936.
- Minton, C., & Pasley, K. (1996). Fathers' parenting role identity and father involvement: A comparison of nondivorced and divorced nonresident fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17(1), 26-45.
- Nippert-Eng, C. (1996). *Work and Home*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nuttbrock, L., & Freudiger, P. (1991). Identity salience and motherhood: A test of Stryker's theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54, 146-157.
- Pasley, K., Futris, T. G., & Skinner, M. L. (2002). Effects of commitment and psychological centrality on fathering. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64, 130-138.
- Reitzes, D. C., & Mutran, E. J. (1994). Multiple roles and identities: Factors influencing self-esteem among middle-aged working men and women. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57, 313-325.

Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 567-578.

Simon, R.W. (1995). Gender multiple roles, role meaning, and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36, 182-194.

Simon, R.W. (1997). The meanings individuals attach to role identities and their implications for mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 38, 256-274.

Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance: The importance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 30, 558-564.

Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present and future of identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 284-297.

Stryker, S., & Serpe, (1982). Commitment, identity salience and role behavior: Theory and research example. In W. Ickes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.) *Personality, Roles, and Social Behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Stryker, S., & Serpe, (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 16-35.

Thoits, P.A. (1986). Multiple identities: Examining gender and marital status differences in distress. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 259-272.

Thoits, P.A. (1992). Identity structures and psychological well being: Gender and marital status comparisons. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55, 236-256.

Wickrama, K. Conger, R., Lorenz, F. & Matthews, L. (1995). Role identity, role satisfaction, and perceived physical health. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 270-283.

Other Recommended Readings on this Topic:

Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1989). Family ties: Balancing commitments to work and family in dual earner households. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 776-789.

Braun, O. L., & Wichlund, R. A. (1988). The identity-effort connection. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 24, 37-65.

Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1991). An identity theory approach to commitment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54(3), 239-251.

Kashima, Y., Foddy, M., & Platow, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Self and identity: Personal, social and symbolic*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCall, G., & Simmons, R. (1966). *Identities and interaction*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simon, R.W. (1992). Parental role strains, salience of parental identity and gender differences in psychological distress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 33, 25-35.

Stryker, S., & Stratham, A. (1985). Symbolic interaction and role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 1* (3rd Edition). New York, NY: Random House.

Thoits, P.A. (1991). On merging identity theory and stress research. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54, 101-112.

Tsushima, T., & Burke, P. J. (1999). Levels, agency, and control in the parent identity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62, 173-189.

Wiley, M.G. (1991). Gender, work, and stress: The potential impact of role-identity salience and commitment. *Sociological Quarterly* 32, 495-510.

Locations in the Matrix of Information Domains of the Work-Family Area of Studies

The Editorial Board of the Teaching Resources section of the Sloan Work and Family Research Network has prepared a Matrix as a way to locate important work-family topics in the broad area of work-family studies. ([More about the Matrix ...](#)).

Concepts related to adult development are relevant to all of the "Individual" domains in the Matrix of Information Domains of the Work-Family Area of Study. In addition, theories of adult development are relevant to Domain F: Theoretical Underpinnings.

Note: The domain areas most closely related to the entry's topic are presented in full color. Other domains, represented in gray, are provided for context.

| Domain A: Antecedent Descriptives | Domain B: Work-Family Issues and Experiences | Domain C: Covariates | Domain D: Responses to W-F Issues and Experiences | Domain E: 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 |
| 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 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)

| Domain A: Antecedent Descriptives | Domain B: Work-Family Issues and Experiences | Domain C: Covariates | Domain D: Responses to W-F Issues and Experiences | Domain E: 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 |
| Domain F: Theoretical Underpinnings to All Domains | | | | |