



## Nonwork orientations relative to career: A multidimensional measure<sup>☆</sup>

Douglas T. Hall<sup>a,\*</sup>, Ellen Ernst Kossek<sup>b</sup>, Jon P. Briscoe<sup>c</sup>, Shaun Pichler<sup>d</sup>, Mary Dean Lee<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Boston University, USA

<sup>b</sup> Purdue University, USA

<sup>c</sup> Northern Illinois University, USA

<sup>d</sup> California State University, Fullerton, USA

<sup>e</sup> McGill University, Canada

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 16 July 2013

Available online 2 August 2013

#### Keywords:

Multi-dimensional work–life orientation

Community

Work–family

Family

Personal life

Nonwork

Career

### ABSTRACT

Although scholars typically assess an individual's nonwork role orientation relative to career as a unitary construct, we argue that a person's orientation toward nonwork roles is multi-dimensional. Drawing on a literature review demonstrating the need for improved constructs capturing changing relationships between career and multi-faceted nonwork orientations, and empirical data from three studies with samples at different career stages (early and mid-career), we use factor analysis and data from qualitative and longitudinal studies to develop three unique scales to assess a person's nonwork priorities relative to career orientations: family, personal life, and community service. There were generally positive relationships between the protean career scales and the new nonwork role orientation measures. Future research should move beyond a binary work–life or work–family models and include multi-dimensional measures of nonwork orientations relative to career.

© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Why multiple dimensions of nonwork experience are needed

A review of over two decades of work–family research concluded that the IO-OB literature has made little progress in advancing conceptions of the “nonwork” sphere in relation to career, noting the “virtual omission” of measures related to leisure or community (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bourdeaux, & Brinley, 2005, p.185). Eby and colleagues note that scholars over-emphasize the measurement of orientations toward and satisfaction with numerous aspects of the work role, but often perpetuate a unitary approach to assessing “nonwork” activities with a global measure. For example, a growing literature is developing under the guise of “work–life” conflict (cf., Bonn bright, Clay, & Ankenmann, 2000). Such prevailing language implies that the part of a person's life outside of work is one-dimensional; that everything outside of work is a single domain (nonwork, or “life.”).

We argue that life outside of work and career is indeed multidimensional. Measures need to be updated to better reflect the multiple role experiences of individuals as “whole people,” the role of the self in enacting core identities, and individual differences in the person's orientation to various life roles (Friedlander, 1994; Parker & Hall, 1992; Savickas, 2011; Super, Savickas, & Super, 1996). As Thoits (1992) and Hall (1972, 2002) indicate, individuals have multiple life identities related to

<sup>☆</sup> An early version of this paper with early data was presented to the symposium, “Putting work in its place,” Ellen Ernst Kossek, Chair. Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, 2004. The support of the Friedman Chair and the Executive Development Roundtable at Boston University, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, McGill University, and Michigan State University is gratefully acknowledged, as is the technical assistance of Betzaluz Gutierrez, Dana Truhe, Patti Collins and Rick Cotton.

\* Corresponding author at: Boston University School of Management, 595 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215, USA. Fax: +1 617 353 4878.

E-mail address: [dthall@bu.edu](mailto:dthall@bu.edu) (D.T. Hall).

different life roles, and when people are not working at their jobs, they are usually involved in multiple nonwork roles toward which they have different orientations in relation to the work career. Our constructs need to be refined to capture the fact that the management of the relationships between career and nonwork orientations are increasingly self-directed and less organizationally driven (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 2002). Richardson and Schaeffer (2013) call for an expanded meaning of care work to include “care of people (self and others), relationships, institutions and communities, and the physical world” (2013, p. 155). Boundary management across life roles often involves enactment of value preferences and self-managed prioritization for how individuals wish to allocate their time and energies among these multiple roles (Hall, 1972; Kossek & Lautsch, 2008; Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 2001).

Research on nonwork role orientations relative to career is important for several other reasons, as well. First, it is well documented that satisfaction and the ability to positively fulfill multiple role relationships are important not only for conserving resources in a way to buffer role conflicts and stress (cf., Hobfoll, 1989), but also for a satisfying overall quality of life (Kegan, 1982). Also, work–life satisfaction is a key factor affecting retention and committed performance in today’s organizations (Harrington & Hall, 2007).

More specifically, a critical aspect of one’s overall career experience is a person’s concern for nonwork roles. And by this, we do not mean the salience or importance of work in relation to nonwork roles (Super & Nevill, 1984) or the extent to which one’s career work is a central life interest (Dubin & Champoux, 1974). We assume here that work is a central life interest, and what we need to do is measure the degree of concern one has for other roles relative to career.

Second, measuring nonwork orientations with greater specificity will also help advance the work–life field, which is still plagued by wide variation in results for life and job satisfaction and work–life conflict (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Such variance often suggests that some unmeasured constructs are not being considered in measurement. The issue of bandwidth measurement for constructs to move from global to multi-dimensional measures is a common debate that needs to be incorporated into work–life measurement in many social science fields. As Cronbach and Gleser (1957) note, increased measurement specificity is necessary to ensure higher fidelity between specific antecedents and specific outcomes. Multidimensional measurement will help the work–life field better assess which nonwork roles are more closely related to specific career and work outcomes. One promising new measure by Keeney, Boyd, Sinha, Westring, and Ryan (2013) identifies eight nonwork domains that are linked to work–life conflict. This study adds to the literature by making the point that work interferes with many other nonwork domains beyond the family, from household management to time for friendships. Our current study concurs with Keeney and colleagues that it is important to broaden conceptualizations of work and nonwork conflict to other life roles beyond family. Our study focuses on career and nonwork identities that are most meaningful to the individual. Recognizing that priorities and perspectives can shift over the life course and vary for different age cohorts, we use samples of individuals from several age groups and include a longitudinal sample of individuals to investigate active self-regulation of nonwork priorities relative to career.

Third, there is a need for greater integration of the work–life and career literatures as these fields increasingly have some overlap with the workforce becoming more female: furthermore, economic, family (e.g. divorce, more dual career) and generational shifts make nonwork endeavors more and more salient. Given the many changes in the structures of career and family lives, and the strong concern for personal, family, and community activities by young Generation Y employees, compared to previous age cohorts (Kossek & Distelberg, 2009), we believed that it was important to include measures specifically assessing the importance of nonwork activities while maintaining involvement with career.

Taken together, all of these factors suggest that there is both a research and practical need to develop new measures that more specifically operationalize a multidimensional, yet parsimonious approach to nonwork–life orientations relative to career. The goal of this current paper is to develop multidimensional measures of nonwork orientations relative to career orientations and to consider implications for future research. Our research examines these new scales, their characteristics, reliability, and inter-relationships.

## 2. Overview of research approach

We first conducted a literature review to identify nonwork life orientations relative to career for construct development of our multi-dimensional measure. We then triangulated multi-methods (qualitative, quantitative and longitudinal data) from three empirical studies designed to build on one another in order to develop an instrument and examine how the subscales related to other key nonwork and career measures. For Study 1, we conducted two sets of interviews, over a five-year time period, with experienced working professionals (mostly high talent women) who had negotiated reduced-load alternative work arrangements to allow more time to pursue nonwork activities while still engaged in a career. This was a good sample to obtain qualitative data to understand the issue of nonwork priorities, as it comprised a focused population of individuals who actively reduced their career demands in order to pursue other life interests. Most of this sample could be considered baby boomers, primarily female professionals who were some of the first to be able to voluntarily choose flexible working arrangements such as part time work as a means to combine career and family.

Based on these interviews, we developed an instrument to assess three nonwork orientations relative to time spent on career activities. Study 2 replicates the findings of the first study in a broad sample of MBA students (Generation X & Y cohorts) from several universities. Study 3 was also conducted with a new sample of working MBA students from three universities to conduct statistical analysis to ensure the scale patterns identified in studies one and two were replicated in an unbiased sample in study three.

In the rest of this paper, we discuss the methods used in each study, test the reliability of three new nonwork orientations relative to career scales, and examine their relationships to one another. In order to explore the construct validity of these new measures we will also explore the relationships between them and certain aspects of work and life experiences. Overall, we will assess the relationships among the new nonwork life orientations and the protean career concept—that is the extent to which one is oriented toward being self-directed and values-driven in making career decisions (Hall, 2002.) Our assumption is that since contemporary careers for many people are becoming increasingly self-directed, some of this direction would entail planning for greater involvement with nonwork roles at the same time as pursuing a career.

### 3. Construct development: nonwork life orientations relative to career

Based on a review of the literature over the past decade, three orientations consistently appeared as nonwork foci relative to career: *family*, *community service*, and *personal life*. Below we define these constructs with supporting literature.

#### 3.1. Family

The need to care for family is a long standing concept in work–family research. It refers to caring for or involvement with spouses and children vis a vis the work role. Routhausen (1999) notes that the concept of family itself is multi-faceted and has expanded to include, friends, parents, siblings, and nonrelatives with whom we share deep ties.

Role conflict theory has long been the dominant paradigm used in studies to assess work–family relationships in studies (Eby et al., 2005; Hall, 1972). As a result, most work–life studies assess conflict with the family role as the main work–family issue assessed, and far fewer address the degree to which time for family is a priority relative to career orientation. The literature suggests that time for family and consideration for family needs are increasingly a major driving force in many individual's career decisions (Bailyn, 1993; Harrington & Hall, 2007). Measures need to better capture the reality that many employees place a high value on having a good fit between time for their career and time to be able to focus on family priorities and needs (Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999; Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005).

Drawing from above, we define the *Family* dimension as: the degree to which one attaches importance to family needs relative to one's career role. "Family" is defined as a spouse or unmarried partner, children, parents, or others with whom you share your life and/or home.

#### 3.2. Community service

Richardson (1993) was one of the first researchers to discuss the relevance of community service in relation to careers. Tilly and Tilly (1995) note that besides the paid labor market, individuals (often but not exclusively women) engage in many other productive but unpaid life roles that add value to society and self. These may include volunteer work for children's schools, churches, and nonprofit board memberships, and informal labor such as helping a friend or a neighbor. Similarly, Taylor (2004) calls for researchers to extend conceptual boundaries and not dichotomize work between public paid employment and private unpaid labor with the argument that such a division oversimplifies the complexity of contemporary work and nonwork social relationships. This work is consistent with calls by Voydanoff (2001) and Clark (2002) to develop new categories and language for communicating about relationships among community and work/life variables. Indeed, many corporations (e.g., Ford Motor) now increasingly allow employees time off from work during the work week to conduct community service. Given the growing interest in *Community Service*, we define this orientation as a high concern for being able to engage in service to the community where one lives at the same time one is pursuing a career. For people with this orientation, the opportunity to have time to be involved in the community will be important in making job and career choices (Voydanoff, 2001).

#### 3.3. Personal life

In the management field, as we suggested earlier, far more attention has been given to nonwork time that is spent in the family role, as opposed to time spent for self and on personal interests. Much of this research has focused on work–family conflict as an outcome, with less attention to career. Additionally, work–family conflict has had wide variation in the degree it has been predictive of key work outcome variables such as satisfaction, suggesting that perhaps there are some unmeasured variables not being accessed (cf., Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton, & Baltas, 2009).

Robinson and Godbey (1999) suggest that individuals increasingly are seeking time for life priorities relative to work. Indeed, as our review suggests one of the most common nonwork concerns is personal time to pursue personal interests (e.g., the arts, to going to school, friends, time for self, exercise, hobbies, etc.). Research by Sonnentag (2001) highlights the critical importance of taking time for self for the sake of mental health and effectiveness. Yet, Kossek and Lautsch (2008) found that many employees reported job creep into personal time, some referring to themselves as "job warriors," where they only had work in their life, and underdevelopment of other parts of self. They wanted time for themselves for other life interests.

Based on the preceding discussion, we define the *Personal Life* orientation as a focus on the time for oneself to pursue personal interests (e.g., hobbies, learning, the arts, and exercise), while at the same time engaging in a career.

We drew on these definitions to form items to develop a new measure of orientations to these three nonwork roles. Our approach in developing the multi-dimensional measure was to capture an individual's perceived importance of being able to

focus on three different types of nonwork activities relative to career. In this way, our items were designed to move beyond just experiences in different spheres of life (e.g., having a career, being a member of a family, engaging in time to pursue personal interests, or community service) to measure the value or importance placed on these other nonwork roles in relation to career (cf. Carlson & Kacmar, 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

#### 4. Method and results for cumulative studies

##### 4.1. Study 1: development of scale dimensions and measures

###### 4.1.1. Method: Study 1

To develop the scales mirroring the constructs identified in the literature, we relied upon two waves of interviews conducted five years apart examining the experiences of high-talent professionals from the U.S. and Canada who had negotiated with their employing organizations for reduced load work arrangements. The first wave of interviews, including 81 people in a broad range of industries, were conducted by Lee and her colleagues, who found that more and more corporations were incorporating non-standard work arrangements to accommodate valued employees, as well as to attract new employees who are likely to have an appetite for these new work forms (Lee, MacDermid, & Buck, 2000). Five years later, Lee and Kossek (2005) conducted a second wave of follow-up interviews with 68 of the original interviewees who made themselves available (84% of original sample). Their average age was 43. Eighty-eight percent were women, and 100% were parents. We interviewed these individuals to understand how they were spending their time outside of work and what they hoped to accomplish with that time. This sample allowed us to better understand the varieties of attention placed on nonwork activities relative to career, since this was a group of people who had actually acted on their values to restructure working time to reduce work hours and increase time for nonwork roles. Further, the use of longitudinal interviewing to examine nonwork orientations relative to career was advantageous since career interests can wax and wane over time.

Three main themes emerged from the interviews about how individuals thought about career decisions. One was a desire to have more personal time to pursue those activities that they found most meaningful. A second was the desire to have more time to be with their families. And a third was a desire to spend time working to benefit their communities. These became our a priori nonwork life orientations, and we wrote items for these three dimensions, informed by the interviews, and our review. We created the Career and Nonwork Orientation Survey to tap these three dimensions. This survey included items related to the protean career (Briscoe & Hall, 2003), but our main interest was better delineating and understanding nonwork career-related dimensions.

###### 4.1.2. Qualitative results: Study 1

The three nonwork orientations were defined as *Family*, *Community Service*, and *Personal Life*. Below we briefly discuss each of these theoretical constructs using illustrative examples from the interview data. The items used to assess each construct, definitions and reliabilities are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1**

The new nonwork orientation scales and scale characteristics (Study 1 and Study 2).

Scale	Definition	Number of items	Coefficient alpha	Scale items
Personal Life	A high priority to having time for self	3	.70 Study 1 .60 Study 2	1. Finding time for myself is important to my overall quality of life. 2. When a decision comes up that pits life balance against career success, life balance is most important to me. 3. When choosing between two career options, I tend to prefer the one that provides the best work/life balance. 4. In order to feel successful in my career, I must have other outlets for expression of my personal interests and talents.
Family	A high priority to family needs and how the career allows one to consider family needs/ priorities relative to the career role	6	.91 Study 1 .92 Study 2	5. My career decisions are made in terms of how they will affect my family. 6. Having a good fit between my work life and my home life is an important aspect of career success to me. 7. It is really important to me to consider my family's needs when making career plans. 8. My career plans are centered on my family's needs. 9. When I make a decision about my career, I consider how well the new situation would fit with my family priorities. 10. Having time for my family is a driving force in my career decisions.
Community Service	A high priority to have a career that allows time for community involvement or volunteering	4	.93 Study 1 .90 Study 2	11. It is important to me to have a job that allows me the flexibility to be involved in my community. 12. Making time to contribute to the well-being of my community is a priority for me. 13. I would really not want to have a job that did not allow me time to volunteer in my community. 14. I value being of service to other people in the community where I live.

Note. 5-point scale: 1 = to little or no extent, 2 = to a limited extent, 3 = to some extent, 4 = to a considerable extent, 5 = to a great extent.

*Personal life:* This scale reflects a strong concern for giving priority to finding personal time for oneself and being able to pursue personal interests in relation to career. As an illustration, here is how one person described what more free time would mean to her:

So [I would like to do] traveling, maybe doing some consulting work. I want to learn to play the piano, I mean, there are lots of these goofy things that I feel that I haven't had the time to do. To sort of reclaim my life a little bit later. Not reclaim it, I guess I have a life, but it is just a life right now where I am definitely in a mode of giving. And I think over time it will be nice to have time to slow down a little bit and not keep this pace.

*Family:* This scale reflects a high priority for family needs when one is making decisions about life and career. Time for family is a driving force in the person's career decisions, and he or she looks for a good fit between work life and home life. As one person described it:

I had a management job and I worked four days a week. .... And then when we get to the personal side, there were a bunch of things, I had a bunch of personal priorities that had to be dealt with at a family level, and a special needs kid, which is one of the big reasons I took the leave [which later evolved into a reduced load arrangement.]

*Community service:* This scale indicates a strong desire for service to the community and that having flexibility to be involved in the community will be important in making job and career choices. An example here would be an amateur pilot who works in the Civil Air Patrol:

I suppose my highest priority is I am in a U.S. Air Force Auxiliary organization called the Civil Air Patrol, which is actually search operations, ... where one does aerial searches for people who are missing in the mountainous areas or remote areas...I am an emergency officer, where when I get an emergency call I'll run the phone tree and get people, personnel involved. I'm also involved as a pilot in doing some of the search work... So this can be a very big commitment. If there is a search mission, suddenly it might be a call for as many personnel as possible to be available for a two-week period.

*Protean career:* Besides the nonwork orientations relative to career, the survey included a preliminary version of scales designed to measure protean and organizational orientations (Briscoe & Hall, 2003), which were derived from earlier theory (Hall, 1976, 2002) and were later refined and reported in Briscoe, Hall, and De Muth (2006). The protean orientation scale used here had two subdimensions: *values-driven* and *self-directed*. *Values-driven* indicates a strong concern for making career decisions that are authentic and congruent with one's deeply held personal values. *Self-directed* reflects a strong concern for autonomy and personal control over career decisions. A third protean score employed here was the *Total Protean Score*, which was the average item score for all of the Self-Directed and Values Driven items. A high Total Protean score would reflect a very strong concern for exercising autonomy and following one's own passion in the context of the career (Hall, 2002; Shepard, 1984.)

#### 4.1.3. Quantitative results: Study 1

The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha) and all items for the newly-developed nonwork orientations relative to career scales are shown in Table 1. The Family dimension contained six items. No item was deleted, and the scale showed one of the highest reliability values with an alpha of .91 in Study 1. Likewise, all the original four items of the Community Service dimension scale were retained, and this last scale showed an alpha of .93. The Personal Life dimension was initially created with five items, two of which were dropped due to low loadings. We found a Cronbach's alpha of .70 for the 3-item scale in Study 1. (The protean values driven scale had an alpha of .78, the self-directed scale had an alpha of .69, and the total protean score had an alpha of .76.) In an effort to further explore both the reliability and validity of the scales, we computed intercorrelations among the new nonwork scales and with the career protean scales and the demographic data. These correlations are shown in Table 2.

#### 4.1.4. Correlations between nonwork orientations

The correlations show a strong positive relationship between the Personal Life and Family dimensions ( $r = .61, p < .01$ ). We also found that the Community Service orientation was positively related to Personal Leisure and Interests ( $r = .29, p < .05$ ).

**Table 2**

Correlations of career and nonwork orientation scales (n = 63) (Study 1).

	Self Directed	Values driven	Total Protean Score	Personal Life	Family
Self-Directed					
Values driven	.28*				
Total Protean Score	.73**	.86**			
Personal Life	.24*	.49**	.49**		
Family	.12	.34**	.31*	.61**	
Community Service	.10	-.03	.05	.25*	.20

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

Because study one had a sample size too small for factor analysis we planned to conduct an additional study to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis.

With the Study 1 sample of experienced managers, we found significant relationships among the nonwork dimensions and measures of protean career orientation (Briscoe & Hall, 2003). The Total Protean Orientation scale was positively related to the Personal life scale ( $r = .49, p < .001$ ), as were both of this scale's subdimensions, self-direction and values expression. The Total Protean Orientation was also positively related to the Family scale ( $r = .31, p < .05$ ).

However, of the Total Protean score's two separate subdimensions, only Values Driven was significantly related to Family ( $r = .34, p < .01$ ). The Community Service scale was not significantly related to any of the Protean Career Orientation scales.

#### 4.1.5. Relationships among demographic factors and nonwork and career orientation scales

Eighty-nine percent of Study 1 was female. Thus, gender comparisons must be viewed cautiously for this sample. However, gender was not related to either the career or the nonwork scales. We also did not find significant correlations between age and the protean career orientation or significant differences among age groups on the protean career in this sample. Similar results have been found in other samples, as well, that the protean orientation is not correlated with age or gender (Briscoe et al., 2006).

However, we did find some job tenure career relationships involving the nonwork scales. The longer the person had been in the current position, the more importance he or she attached to Personal Life ( $p < .05$ ). Also, there was a positive relationship between working reduced hours and the importance of Family ( $r = .34, p < .01$ ).

#### 4.1.6. Patterns of career and nonwork life orientations

To help bring these career and work/life dimensions to life, since in Study 1 we had longitudinal data and knew something of each person's life and career story, we now turn to people in our sample who represent particular patterns of career and nonwork life concerns.

#### 4.1.7. High protean and high family orientations

One participant with this profile had been in a middle management position working 80% of full-time in her large manufacturing company at the time of the original interview, but had resigned six months after returning from her second maternity leave, even though she received a promotion while working on a reduced-load basis and was able to maintain that arrangement in the new challenging position. She left her job and the company when she realized that the new job was taking more and more attention, leaving her less involved with her two small children. Furthermore, her second child was a colicky baby, and the babysitter was unable to deal with it, which would have meant finding a new sitter.

"I guess what it came down to was that the family is what is ultimately going to survive in the long term. And if I don't have a connection there in the long run, I'm going to really feel bad about that."

So she decided to quit and stay home for a while, which continued through the birth of a third child, and she is now at home, having been there for four years at the time of our second interview. However, she had very concrete and realistic plans about re-engaging in her career, and had decided that she wants either to go into consulting or to pursue a career in education, work that would be compatible with the high level of commitment and involvement she had with her family.

"If I don't do something right with family, with my own family, I won't be happy. So I think that has become crystal clear. My ego drive is much less. At least my need for fulfillment out of work has really, I think, come into check. And whether that is wisdom or that is just the choices I've made, I don't know. But whatever that is, that is where I'm at now."

What we see, then, is both of these strong orientations of hers at work here—protean career orientation (high in self-direction and in values orientation) and a strong family orientation. With her protean orientation she can focus on redirecting her path to suit her needs. And, with such a strong family orientation, those needs are to spend more time with her family. Thus, the result is that she has interrupted her career path temporarily so that she can be at home full time with her three young children.

#### 4.1.8. High protean and high community service orientations

As our correlational data indicate, this combination of concerns was not common, as these dimensions were uncorrelated. Yet this is still a work life and career pattern of some outliers. One participant with this profile is a manager for an engineering organization. With his protean orientation he has initiated several twists and turns in his career in this firm (which is very flexible and accommodating of employee interests), with a variety of assignments, generally lateral moves. He has been very enterprising and independent at strategizing with his wife how they could combine work with various community service activities. He describes a planning process they went through five years ago:

"And then...my wife and I...had sat down to do some strategic planning for our family. And we decided that we wanted to do something more with community service in mind. And we actually looked at various options, to moving back again to a developing country; I'd lived in Ghana and Kenya many years before and worked in Peace Corps type jobs... And we decided that...from the point of view of our children, we'd be better off staying where we are here...because this is an excellent place to raise kids." And we decided that we would look for opportunities to do community service either as part of a new job or in our spare time. So I checked around with the [company's] philanthropic group and looked for

opportunities to do community service work.... And it turned out that [the company] had a loaned executive program at one of the local school districts... which is very culturally diverse but socio-economically not so well off. ... [and the job involved] running a program which was catering to kids who were considered at risk....“And the work in the school district was incredibly satisfying. You were working with such a range of people from students and teachers to industry, people at all levels were coming to you, from your engineers, to CEO's, and I worked with some of the local politicians. You had an incredible variety of jobs.”

The amount of proactive analysis that this person put into this career planning process, along with his wife, shows the high autonomy and the values-driven nature of the protean orientation. And his prior work in Peace Corps type roles, as well as his major involvement as a mission pilot for the Civil Air Patrol (looking for downed aircraft) and other volunteer work such as Boy Scouts and church activities, illustrate his concern for community service. In fact, he has a strong sense that his three areas of involvement – work, family, and community service – form an important source of balance in his life:

“I believe very strongly that if you've got, say, three areas that are important in your life, and one or two of those areas have problems at that time, then at least you have got the other area to nourish you... You know...if my work is stressed, as long as my home life is going well, and my other nonprofit...activities, like Boy Scouts and some of the school's work that I do and this Civil Air Patrol, that balance is very important.”

#### 4.1.9. Summary of Study 1

Overall, from Study 1 we found that there are at least three specific nonwork orientations relative to career: personal life, family, and community service. We also found that there are some interesting variations in protean dimensions and in placing family needs and personal and leisure interests as a priority. Because Study 1 was too small in sample size to conduct factor analysis and also was a group in their 30s–50s, we conducted Study 2 to collect additional data to cross validate the scales on younger Generation X and Y samples.

#### 4.2. Study 2: Generation X & Y samples validation of nonwork life orientation scales

##### 4.2.1. Method: Study 2

The goal of Study 2 was to examine in more depth the strength and reliability of the newly established nonwork life orientation scales using additional age cohorts and samples.

We surveyed 275 MBA students in three large American universities. Two were state universities in the Midwestern U.S., and the third was a private university in the Northeast. The sample included both part-time and full-time students, and their ages ranged from 21 to 52, with most in their 20's and 30's. The mean age was 28, and only 41 students were over 30 years old. Ninety percent of the MBA sample was 32 or younger. Sixty-two percent were males, and 38% were females. Analyses included exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and correlation analysis.

##### 4.2.2. Measures and factor analyses

The measures for the career and work–life scales were the same as those used in Study 1. First, we conducted exploratory factor analysis on the work life scales, employing principal component analysis with Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization. As expected, this analysis yielded three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0.

All items loaded as expected, yielding clear factor structures for the three scales, Family, Community Service, and Personal Life. The final rotated factor structure is shown in Table 3. The rotation converged in 5 iterations. With the exception of items 8 and 32, which had loadings of .383 and .369, respectively, all other items had loadings greater than .600 on their appropriate factors. Overall, this analysis yielded a clear simple structure for the three scales.

Next we conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to further test this factor structure. Factors were allowed to covary. This model was subsequently respecified largely based on the model fit statistic and the magnitude of the correlations between the items and their hypothesized factors. The models were evaluated using Chi-square analysis, which specifies in the null hypothesis that a perfectly fitting model is being used (see Barrett, 2007, for a discussion).

The three factor model produced an overall “reasonable fit” for two of the three fit indices tested. The thresholds for a reasonable fit according to Kline (2005) are CFA > .9, SRMR < .1, and AGFI > .95. This model's fit index scores were: CFI = .930; SRMR = .076; and AGFI = .851.

##### 4.2.3. Scale reliabilities

The coefficient alphas for the three work/life scales in Study 2 are shown in Table 1. The Family and Community Service dimensions show strong reliabilities: .92 for Family, while Community Service was .90. Personal Life had a lower alpha, .60, (which prompted us to collect additional data in Study 3.)

##### 4.2.4. Summary and discussion of Study 2

Employing a larger sample, Study 2 found evidence of the same three factors as those found in Study 1, with new generational cohorts. Scale reliabilities were high for two of the scales, Family and Community Service. However, there were problems with the

**Table 3**  
Exploratory factor analysis results for Study 2, rotated component matrix(a).

	Component		
	1	2	3
v2	-.027	.066	<b>.765</b>
v22	.373	.032	<b>.753</b>
v29	.421	.074	<b>.681</b>
v32	-.135	.306	<b>.369</b>
v3	<b>.876</b>	.071	.139
v8	<b>.383</b>	.126	.676
v13	<b>.909</b>	.105	.098
v21	<b>.891</b>	.103	.060
v24	<b>.877</b>	.050	.182
v28	<b>.770</b>	.186	.351
v6	.174	<b>.853</b>	.105
v10	.127	<b>.899</b>	.054
v16	.102	<b>.850</b>	.152
v27	.062	<b>.859</b>	.048

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

third scale, Personal Life, which had lower reliability and items that cross-loaded on other factors. This raised the question of whether, in fact, we had three scales or two scales. In view of these issues with the third scale, we decided to write more items related to personal life to focus the construct to align with the time to pursue personal interests theme from study one's qualitative data and conduct a third quantitative study.

#### 4.3. Study 3: continued validation of scales and refinement of personal life orientation

##### 4.3.1. Method: Study 3

The total sample size for Study 3 was 484, collected from part-time (working) business students pursuing their MBAs at a Midwestern public university and a private Northeastern University. In the case of the Midwestern university some portion of the sample came from snowball sampling where students were asked to recruit 1–2 working acquaintances with at least two years of full-time work experience. Respondents were, on average, 34 years old. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the sample was male. Analyses for Study 3 included exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, reliability analysis and correlation analysis.

##### 4.3.2. Measures

The same Community Service and Family scales used in Study 2 to measure nonwork life orientations were used in this study. Because of the reasons mentioned above, the Personal Life Scale was reworked, with a sharper focus on time for self. We wrote more items that dealt with concerns for having personal time for self relative to career. We also phrased the new items in ways that resembled the wording in the items in the other scales (e.g., "Making time for pursuing personal interests is a big priority for me," which paralleled the community service item, "Making time to contribute to the well-being of my community is a priority for me.") We also deleted some items that had not loaded cleanly on one factor. In addition to the nonwork life scales, we used more refined and recent scales of the protean career orientation—the self-directed career management scale and the values-driven career orientation scale (Briscoe et al., 2006).

##### 4.3.3. Factor analysis

First, we conducted exploratory factor analysis on the nonwork life scales, employing principal axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization. Results indicated that several items were cross-loading with more than one factor. Having removed these items, this analysis yielded three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (1.95–4.39), and these factors explained 67.37% of the variability in the data.

All items loaded as expected, yielding clear factor structures for the three scales, Family, Community Service, and Personal Life. The final rotated factor structure is shown in Table 4. The rotation converged in 5 iterations. All items had loadings greater than .60 on their appropriate factors. Overall, this analysis yielded a clear simple structure for the three scales.

Next, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to further test this factor structure. Factors were allowed to covary. The models were evaluated using a variety of fit statistics (see Barrett, 2007, for a discussion). The three factor model produced an overall "good fit" to the data (see Hu & Bentler, 1995):  $\chi^2 = 253.50$ ,  $p < .01$ ; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .97; GFI = .94; AGFI = .91; SRMR = .042.

##### 4.3.4. Scale reliabilities

The items and the coefficient alphas for the three work/life scales in Study 3 are shown in Table 5, along with the means and standard deviations for each item. Each of the scales had high internal consistency reliabilities: .83 (Community Service), .85 (Personal Life), and .90 (Family).



**Table 4**  
Exploratory factor analysis results—Study 3.

Rotated factor matrix			
	Factor		
	1	2	3
Family 5	<b>.868</b>	.109	.066
Family 3	<b>.863</b>	.043	.096
Family 1	<b>.830</b>	−.082	.071
Family 4	<b>.803</b>	−.016	.102
Family 2	<b>.657</b>	.125	.114
Personal 5	.029	<b>.751</b>	.103
Personal 2	.010	<b>.731</b>	.102
Personal 1	.028	<b>.719</b>	.167
Personal 4	.042	<b>.710</b>	.094
Personal 3	.059	<b>.704</b>	.147
Community 4	.119	.158	<b>.809</b>
Community 2	.046	.165	<b>.773</b>
Community 3	.122	.101	<b>.707</b>
Community 1	.086	.122	<b>.616</b>

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Bold figures indicate items that load on this factor.

#### 4.3.5. Scale intercorrelations

The intercorrelations between the nonwork scales and the protean career scales and work–life satisfaction are shown in Table 6. The nonwork scales are correlated, but moderately, further supporting the distinctiveness of each factor. The total protean score and the values-driven scale were both positively and significantly related to the community service and personal life factors of the nonwork scales, but not the family scale. The self-directed dimension was positively correlated with the community service scale.

## 5. Discussion

In this paper, we have used cumulative studies, qualitative and quantitative data, including one sample where participants reflected on nonwork relative to career orientation over time, and multiple samples of different generations to illustrate the need for additional measures of three nonwork dimensions that capture how people combine productive careers with nonwork priorities. Taken together, the results of this study demonstrate that nonwork life orientation relative to career is multi-dimensional and should not necessarily be viewed dichotomously for all individuals. The study provided needed new language and constructs to measure and effect research and practice to reflect transforming workforces and career and family orientations in changing organizations.

### 5.1. New measures to capture nonwork orientation relative to career

Building on several studies, our Study 3 results indicate from exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, that we have created highly reliable scales for three nonwork dimensions relative to career. Scale reliabilities were high for all three scales,

**Table 5**  
The new nonwork orientation scales and scale characteristics—Study 3.

Item	Alpha	
C1	.83	I value being of service to other people in the community where I live.
C2		Making time to contribute to the well-being of my community is a priority for me.
C3		I would really not want to have a job that did not allow me time to volunteer in my community.
C4		It is important to me to have a job that allows me the flexibility to be involved in my community.
L1	.85	In addition to working or being with family, having time to participate in activities I personally enjoy is really important to me.
L2		Finding time for myself is important for my overall quality of life.
L3		Making time for pursuing personal interests is a big priority for me.
L4		Things don't feel quite right in my life when I have no time to devote to my personal interests.
L5		Time for self is just as key to my well-being as is time for work and family roles.
F1	.90	My career decisions are made in terms of how they will affect my family.
F2		Having time for my family is a driving force in my career decisions.
F3		It is really important to me to consider my family's needs when making career plans.
F4		My career plans are centered on my family's needs.
F5		When I make a decision about my career, I consider how well the new situation would fit with my family priorities.

**Table 6**

Intercorrelations among the career scales and the new work–life scales for Study 3.

	Protean Self Directed	Protean Values Driven	Total Protean Score	Community Service	Personal Life
Self-Directed	–				
Values Driven	.45**	–			
Total Protean Score	.87**	.83**	–		
Community Service	.19**	.19**	.23**	–	
Personal Life	.09	.20**	.16**	.29**	–
Family	–.04	.03	–.02	.21**	.09*

\*  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .01$ .

family, personal life, and community service. Overall this study shows the importance of clearly identifying the career context and nature of the sample when studying nonwork issues relative to career, as clearly there is sample variation in age and family and career development that may shape the findings and results.

### 5.2. The significance of the new measures of nonwork life orientations

As our studies found, there are at least three distinct concerns that people have about their activities outside of work, and it is important to have a method to tap these concerns. First, people want personal time for themselves, to develop their own interests, skills, knowledge, relationships, and other activities that they care about. This issue of development and time for the self has been under-represented in the work–life literature or the economics literature where time for self and domestic work have been combined into one category (Gronau, 1977).

Second, people also, of course, want to have time to be with their families, whether for care giving activities, engaging in rewarding family activities, or for other pursuits. There is no shortage of research on involvement in family activities (cf., Jacobs & Gerson, 2001). And third, people also have a concern for getting involved in their communities, for service, for contribution, for enjoyment, for citizenship, and for other interests. This is a critical issue for the development of healthy communities, as well of healthy families, and it, too, has received very little attention by work–life researchers (Voydanoff, 2001).

Of course, there are other types of activities that a person might care about outside of the work role, but these three were the most relevant to study participants' focus on career relative to nonwork priorities. Thus, these three scales could potentially broaden the dialogue and research on the interactions between work roles and personal pursuits beyond the work context. They can provide helpful language to individuals, perhaps aided by career counselors, as they construct their life stories and chart their futures (Savickas, 2011). We also believe three nonwork dimensions are parsimonious enough to be able to be incorporated in general career and managerial research studies, as well as in individual career planning.

Further, we believe that such scales will sharpen future research measurement of linkages between work demands and specific nonwork pursuits. Extant research may have conflated the role of family alone in competing with work demands. For example, the assessment of job demands linkages to nonwork demands will be clearer as to the cause of stress or enrichment. Not every interruption with work activity is a family demand. There are many nonwork interests interacting with the work role.

Identity research on the salience of work role vis a vis non work identities will also be enhanced. People have multiple identities and social groups, which with social media like Facebook seem to be growing every day. Our scales will help scholars better tap into the growing priorities and identities interacting with career orientations.

And finally, with the explosion of technology and other ways for work and nonwork to link and overlap, the scales will enhance future research on boundary management and engagement. Studies will be better able to assess linkages between self-regulation of boundaries and a person's priorities for specific nonwork orientations relative to career. There clearly may be more boundaries than simply the family boundary upon which employees and organizations are navigating the work–nonwork border in managing the synthesis of career and nonwork interests.

### 5.3. Relationship between career orientations and nonwork life orientations

While there has been previous research on each of these constructs separately, very little research has been done that looks at detailed relationships between specific dimensions of nonwork orientations relative to career orientations. Our main finding in this area is that the protean career orientation scales are significantly related to work/family concerns. Specifically, we also found that people with a strong protean orientation also show strong concerns for having time for nonwork involvements, although the nonwork scales linked to the career scales varied from study to study. The specific aspect of the protean orientation that was most strongly related to time for these extra-work engagements was a concern for values expression. Again, this makes sense, as family, self-development, and community contributions themselves are connected to some of a person's strongest personal values.

#### 5.4. Implications for practice to integrate the needs of employees and organizations

Our study suggests that an organization's task of providing an employee-friendly work environment is not limited to making room for family concerns and activities. This multidimensional view of nonwork orientation has the practical implication that employees also have other important personal concerns that they are trying to satisfy while pursuing a career: beyond the very important family concern. Additionally, and for many simultaneously, they have concern for their personal development (the whole self), and for contributing to their community. These concerns open up a wide range of performance-enhancing ways in which an organization could provide for employees to better balance career and private life. There is the potential of increasing alignment between employee and organizational interests to lead to stronger individual and organizational effectiveness.

In addition to more nonwork time, to help with time for self, the employer could support personal development with greater financial support for courses, workshops, and seminars beyond those that are career related. The organization could provide "lunch and learn" sessions on topics of interest, as determined by representative group of employees. Such a lunchtime series has been successfully organized by a staff member at Boston University, with topics such as buying your first house, preventing and dealing with stress, and book readings by local authors.

To help with time for community involvement, many organizations offer employees the option of spending a certain number of work days on community service projects (e.g., Habitat for Humanity home building, river cleanups). Values-driven companies, such as Timberland, Starbucks, and Wainwright Bank that are known for supporting community contributions of employees tend to rank high on the lists of best companies to work for and to be strong performers, as well. Timberland, for example, does not advertise for job openings; all of its hiring is word of mouth, and it has an excellent selection ratio.

#### 5.5. Needs for future research

Our study would be improved by having the scales validated on international samples (although we did include Canadians and U.S. participants in Study 1) and samples of additional generational groups.

We also would like to triangulate such validation with interviews to augment the quantitative data with the qualitative insights. For example, we would like to get additional examples of how different generations might socially construct "personal life," and how this orientation changes over the life span. We also think future research should study new human resource solutions to support multidimensional life interests, such as flexible organizational supports that enable the synthesis of new ways of working with new ways of living and engaging in multiple nonwork pursuits. As the debate about abolishing telework at Yahoo! suggests (Miller & Campbell, 2013,) organizations are still struggling with combining flexible work forms with career systems.

## 6. Conclusion

From our three studies it appears that there is empirical support for the three new nonwork life orientations that we have identified. First, our results support the idea that the concerns for time for personal life, family, and community service do, in fact, represent three distinct orientations related to different life roles. Thus, a person's orientation toward nonwork roles appears to be a multidimensional concept and not the unipolar alternative to work involvement that much of the work/life writings would suggest. Also, the three nonwork life scales have good factor structures and internal consistency reliabilities.

The correlations observed here among the nonwork life scales and other variables appear to provide some construct validation of the new scales. In both the older sample in Study 1 and the younger group surveyed in Study 3, people who have the strongest orientations to personal life are also people who are strongly values driven and protean. And in the older Study 1 sample (average age = 43), two of the protean scales (Values Driven and Total Protean Score), are linked to a high family orientation. Since most members of this sample still have children at home or dependent parents, it seems logical that the family dimension would be so relevant for them. Among the younger Study 3 sample (mean age = 34) all three of the protean measures are related to a strong orientation for community service, and community service does seem to be an important concern for the current generation of MBA students (Davis & Berdrow, 2008.)

It appears, then, that these new nonwork life scales have potential to be useful in research on career and work/life decision-making. They describe a person's orientation or personal stance in relation to these important choices. They are not measures of behavior, but they can provide useful guides to what the person is thinking about as he or she decides how to behave and what path to follow. As such, they could have direct effects on personal intentions and goal-seeking behavior. And they also might serve as moderating variables, influencing the dynamics of the process of translating intentions and goals into action and career outcomes. We do not see these as mutually exclusive possibilities, and we would invite our research colleagues to help us learn more about just how these career and nonwork orientations operate, in the service of helping people find greater alignment in their work and home lives.

Overall, this study hopefully will spur organizations and researchers to update practice and measures to reflect the changing workforce, so that there is greater congruence between the life and career orientations of generations of workers and the design of employing organizations.

## References

- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold: Women, men and time in the new corporate world*. NY: Free Press.
- Barrett, P. (2007). Structural equation modeling: Adjudging model fit. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 815–824.
- Bonn bright, C., Clay, D., & Ankenmann, R. (2000). The relationship of workaholism with work–life conflict, life satisfaction, and purpose in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(4), 469–477.
- Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. (2003). Protean, boundaryless, and organizational career attitudes. Unpublished technical report, Department of Management, Northern Illinois University.
- Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T., & De Muth, R. L. F. (2006). Protean and boundaryless career attitudes: An empirical exploration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 30–47.
- Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). Work–family conflict in the organization: Do life role values make a difference? *Journal of Management*, 26, 1031–1054.
- Clark, S. C. (2002). Communicating across work/home border. *Community, Work & Family*, 5(1), 23–48.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Gleser, G. C. (1957). *Psychological tests and personnel decisions*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Davis, M. M., & Berdrow, I. (2008). Service science: Catalyst for change in business school curricula. *IBM Systems Journal*, 47(1), 29–30.
- Dubin, R., & Champoux, J. E. (1974). Workers' central life interest and job performance. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 1, 313–325.
- Eby, L., Casper, W., Lockwood, A., Bourdeaux, 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(1), 124–197.
- Friedlander, F. (1994). Toward whole systems and whole people. *Organization*, 1(1), 59–64.
- Gronau, R. (1977). Leisure, home production and work—The theory of the allocation of time revisited. *Journal of Public Economics*, 85(6), 1099–1124.
- Hall, D. T. (1972). A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college educated women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 471–486.
- Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in Organizations*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company.
- Hall, D. T. (2002). *Careers in and out of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harrington, B., & Hall, D. T. (2007). *Career management & work–life integration: Using self-assessment to navigate contemporary careers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *The American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Issues, concepts, and applications* (pp. 76–99). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jacobs, J., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families? Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and Occupations*, 1(28), 40–63.
- Keeney, J., Boyd, E. M., Sinha, R., Westring, A. J., & Ryan, A. M. (2013). From “work–family” to “work–life”: Broadening our conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(3), 221–237.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (2nd ed.) New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work–family conflict, policies, and the job–life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior/human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139–149.
- Kossek, E., & Lautsch, B. (2008). *CEO of me: Creating a life that works in the flexible job age*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Wharton School Publishing.
- Kossek, E., & Distelberg, B. (2009). Work and family employment policy for a transformed work force: Trends and themes. In A. C. Crouter, & A. Booth (Eds.), *Work–life policies* (pp. 3–49). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Kossek, E. E., Noe, R., & DeMarr, B. (1999). Work–family role synthesis: Individual, family and organizational determinants. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 10(2), 102–129.
- Lee, M. D., & Kossek, E. E. (2005). *Crafting lives that work: A six-year retrospective on reduced-load work in the careers & lives of professionals & managers*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Faculty of Management, McGill University.
- Lee, M. D., MacDermid, S. M., & Buck, M. L. (2000). Organizational paradigms of reduced-load work: Accommodation, elaboration, and transformation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1211–1226.
- Michel, J., Mitchelson, J., Kotrba, L., LeBreton, J., & Baltes, B. (2009). A comparative test of work–family conflict linkages. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 199–218.
- Miller, C. C., & Campbell, C. (2013). Yahoo orders home workers back to the office. *New York Times*, February 24, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/26/technology/yahoo-orders-home-workers-back-to-the-office.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>.
- Parker, V., & Hall, D. T. (1992). Conclusion: Expanding the domain of family and work issues. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and organizations* (pp. 432–452).
- Richardson, M. S., & Schaeffer, C. (2013). From work and family to a dual model of working. In D. L. Blustein (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Psychology of Working* (pp. 141–159). New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, J. P., & Godbey, G. (1999). *Time for life: The surprising ways Americans use their time*. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Rothbard, N., Phillips, K., & Dumas, T. (2005). Managing multiple roles: Work–family policies and individuals desires for segmentation. *Organizational Science*, 16(3), 243–258.
- Routhausen, T. (1999). Family in organizational research: A review and comparison of definitions and measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 817–836.
- Savickas, M. L. (2011). *Career counseling*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Shepard, H. (1984). On the realization of human potential: A path with a heart. In M. B. Arthur, L. Bailyn, D. J. Levinson, & H. A. Shepard (Eds.), *Working with careers* (pp. 25–46). New York: Center for Research on Careers, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University.
- Sonnentag, S. (2001). Work, recovery activities and individual well-being: A diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(3), 196–210.
- Super, D. E., & Nevill, D. D. (1984). Work role salience as a determinant of career maturity in high school students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 25(1), 30–44.
- Super, D. E., Savickas, M. L., & Super, C. M. (1996). The life-span, life-space approach to careers. In D. Brown, & L. Brown (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (pp. 121–178) (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, R. (2004). Extending conceptual boundaries: Work, voluntary work, and employment. *Work, Employment and Society*, 18(10), 29–49.
- Thoits, P. A. (1992). Identity structures and psychological well-being: Gender and marital status comparisons. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55, 236–256.
- Tilly, C., & Tilly, C. (1995). Capitalist work and labor markets. In N. Smelser, & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *The Handbook of Economic Sociology* (pp. 283–312). NY: Princeton University Press.
- Voydanoff, P. (2001). Conceptualizing community in the context of work and family. *Community, Work & Family*, 4(2), 133–156.