Introduction

The entire book advocates a multidimensional approach to achieving WLI which involves the society, organization, the individual, and the context of the individual. This chapter therefore dedicates to exploring how personality traits and specific behaviors influence the achievement of work–life integration. It is not to indict any personality type or trait, but to highlight the tendencies of some personality traits which can influence effective work–life integration, a requirement for the proper functioning of people. Personality is the totality of an individual’s “natural, and acquired impulses, habits, interests, sentiments and beliefs” (McKenna 2006, p. 200), that the individual projects to the outside world. It is assumed in this book that personality has both hereditary and environmentally determined components (Caspi et al. 2003; Bayley 1970). Personality is known to predict effectiveness in decision-making and other behaviors in a variety of situations (Caspi et al. 2003). Consequently, this chapter argues that since the achievement of WLI depends on behaviors adopted and enacted by individuals, personality is likely to be a contributor to effectiveness in achieving WLI.
Though the role employers play in facilitating WLI achievement is recognized and advocated, employees have preferences in how they define balance and the path to achieving such. These preferences are linked to personality differences that affect behaviors allowed and rejected by the individuals. Hence, Crosbie and Moore (2004) identified demands from work, personality, and the understanding of what constitutes balance as three issues that drive the inability of individuals to effectively integrate work and life roles. For instance, if balance is understood to mean equal allocation of time and other resources to work and life roles, then the behaviors allowed in integrating the roles will differ from when balance is understood to mean effectiveness in both domains. The former definition discourages tradeoffs while the latter allows it.

Unfortunately, despite the large number of studies on WLI, only a few incorporated the role of personality (Eby et al. 2005). The effect of personality on work–life integration arises from individuals’ preferences of work and life, perception of events in the work and nonwork domains, and the behaviors engaged by such individuals in managing the integration. For example, negative and positive affect personality types affect how individuals interpret stressful situations including work–life conflict, and this will invariably affect the coping behaviors allowed by the individual (Carlson 1999; Michel and Clark 2009; Stoeva et al. 2002). Individuals with high negative affect experience more stress than individuals with high positive affect (Judge et al. 1999; Kinnunen et al. 2003). Personality affects how individuals perceive the role of work and life in the entire life success spectrum, as well as the behavior enacted to either help or hinder WLI achievement. For example, Barrick and Mount (1991) and Wayne et al. (2004) found that certain individuals with conscientious personalities were able to manage work–life integration effectively. Work–life integration involves the management of behaviors of humans as they integrate work and life responsibilities, and personality has a major influence on the behaviors allowed or rejected in managing the integration (Viswesvaran et al. 2007; Zimmerman 2008).

Prior to discussing individual differences that affect WLI management, Self-Care behaviors are discussed. These behaviors make the management of personal and professional lives quite easy. For example, exercising keeps the physical body healthy and eliminates the negative
effects of stress. The authors, therefore, subscribe to the postulation that Self-Care behaviors have a direct effect on the work–nonwork interface and can moderate the relationship between individual differences and stress and work–life integration. This agrees with the work of Moazami-Goodarzi et al. (2015) which demonstrated that personality influences behaviors, feelings, and perceptions, consequently influencing the work–life interface. Hence, in analyzing the outcomes of personality in WLI management, the effects of personality traits, core-self evaluations, individuals as segregators and integrators, and Self-Care behaviors are considered (Cunningham and De La Rosa 2008; Noor 2002; Rotter 1966).

**Self-Care Behaviors**

Work–life integration involves reducing conflict and increasing facilitation, and certain studies have found a direct relationship among individual differences, work–life conflict, and work–life facilitation (Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999; Michel and Clark 2013; Moazami-Goodarzi et al. 2015; Pandey and Shukla 2018). However, only a small variance in the variables was explained by this direct relationship. For instance, the Big-five personality traits accounted for moderate variance of .15 and .18 for conflict and facilitation respectively (Michel et al. 2011). The study by Judge et al. (2016) which placed Self-Care behaviors as moderators of the relationship between individual difference and the work–nonwork interface explained more variance. Hence, the authors believe that a better model explaining the role of individual differences in the management of the work–life interface and work–life integration is in Fig. 8.1.

Self-Care behaviors aim at making people healthy by “dealing appropriately with job demands and fostering healthy conditions” (Franke et al. 2014, p. 142). They are a group of behaviors which have negative relationship with work–life conflict, build well-being and help in achieving WLI. Examples include eating right and exercising regularly to keep the body in shape. In professional life, examples include prioritizing/planning work assignments and taking regular breaks at work.
These behaviors are multidimensional and have many facets (Godfrey et al. 2011); they are known to affect well-being, relieve the stress associated with multiple role involvement, and aid the achievement of balance in both professional and personal lives (Coster and Schwebel 1997; Goncher et al. 2013; Rupert and Kent 2007; Rupert et al. 2012). Since they are multifaceted, no single Self-Care behavior can reduce all the stress associated with multiple role involvement, hence, they must be combined with others to achieve WLI.

The concept of Self-Care is based on the premise that people are aware of the importance of their personal and professional lives, that they value good health and effectiveness in both lives and would act in positive ways to enhance overall well-being from both lives. When considered in WLI management, it implies that individuals who are aware of and value the effects of work–life integration on their health and well-being would act in positive ways to enhance both using Self-Care behaviors. Self-Care has been conceptualized using many typologies (Baker 2003; Collins 2005; Gantz 1990; Lee and Miller 2013; Myers et al. 2012). However, Norcross and Guy (2007) identified Self-Care behaviors as taking care of the physical body, building, and cultivating supportive relationships in and outside the work domain, psychologically or actually (unintentionally or intentionally) setting boundaries between the work and nonwork domains, restructuring maladaptive cognition, and creating a flourishing work environment. Personal Self-Care behaviors occur outside the work domain and they involve behaviors that foster
well-being through care of the physical body, such as eating healthy foods, keeping healthy relationships, and other behaviors. Professional Self-Care behaviors ensure balance and effectiveness in professional roles. These behaviors include taking regular breaks during work hours, and maintaining regular contacts with colleagues, prioritizing, planning, and other behaviors. Those who achieve work–life integration foster balance in their personal and professional lives through the adoption of Self-Care behaviors in both lives (Lee and Miller 2013). Self-Care behaviors have also been classified into four broad groups: interpersonal behaviors, intrapersonal support, personal development and support, and physical recreational activities. These behaviors are aimed at maintaining a balance between personal and professional lives to promote physical, mental, and spiritual well-being (Baker 2003). Thus, Self-Care behaviors are ultimately aimed at creating a balance in all aspects of a person’s life (personal and professional). Core self-evaluation (an individual difference variable) directly affects the use of Self-Care behaviors (conceptualized as the willingness & ability to manage work–life integration). Core self-evaluation (CSE) is positively related to Self-Care behaviors and negatively related to exhaustion (Koppe and Schutz 2019). This result shows that Self-Care behaviors are major tools in WLI achievement and that individual differences affect the willingness and ability of people to enact Self-Care behaviors. The next section discusses the various individual differences that affect the use of Self-Care behaviors and their roles in the management of WLI.

**Influence of Individual Differences on Work–Life Integration**

**Segregators, Integrators, and Work–Life Integration**

Segmentation and integration theory of work–nonwork interface can give rise to two sets of individuals depending on how intentionally or unintentionally they segregate or integrate the work and nonwork domains (Edwards and Rothbard 2000). While reviewing how individuals approach WLI management, Nippert-Eng (1996) identified two
types of individual behaviors labeled as segregators and integrators. The 
author found that 69% of the people studied were integrators. Segregators 
(either intentionally or unintentionally) draw a clear mental line of 
segregation between the work and nonwork domains. They act as though 
the line physically exists and thus shut off all work-related activities 
when they are out of the work domain and in other nonwork domains. 
For example, segregators will not take work assignments home, and if 
they do, would not work on them, with the rationale that the work 
and nonwork domains are different and have different role responsibili-
ties. Segregators work long hours far beyond the 40-hour week and still 
achieve balance because they shut off all work activities when they are 
not at work. In a COVID-19 environment where employees work from 
home with a blurred interface between the work and nonwork domains, 
segregators will be able to mentally shut off, thereby achieving balance.

Integrators struggle to separate their work and nonwork lives. They 
tend to remain active with work even when they are outside the work 
domain. They either work on the activities or think about the activi-
ties while in a nonwork domain. Even if integrators work the normal 
40-hour week, they will still struggle with achieving work–life inte-
gration because they tend to work at home or mentally connect to 
activities in the work domain while in the nonwork domain. Technology 
that enhances involvement in work activities outside the work domain 
makes the situation even worse. For example, integrators will attend to 
emails even when the mails are not urgent and can be postponed to a 
normal working day. Crosbie and Moore (2004) studied how working 
from home enhances WLI management, the results were however incon-
clusive. The authors concluded that some of those studies developed 
Self-Care behaviors which helped them to achieve integration, while 
others did not. Segregators were found to develop Self-Care behaviors 
more easily than integrators because the former could form a psycholog-
ical detachment while the latter could not because of actual psychological 
involvement in work activities. The authors, therefore, concluded that 
those who would gain the benefit of working from home must consider 
their “personality, skills and aspirations” (p. 230).

Segregators have high psychological detachment from work while at 
home, while integrators have low psychological detachment because they
are mentally involved with work while at home (Sonnentag and Fritz 2007). The Effort-recovery model (Meijman and Mulder 1998) stipulates that efforts at work lead to fatigue and psychological activation, and that to reduce these negative consequences and attain recovery, the individual must be physically out of and psychologically detached from the work domain to avoid the continuous drain of personal resources. Psychological detachment at work is the “individuals’ sense of being away from work activities” (Hartig et al. 2007, p. 579). Taking work home and working on or thinking about it while at home does not enable psychological detachment and will lead to poor WLI management because of poor recovery.

Those who struggle with achieving work–life integration despite the provisions made by their employers are always integrators. Sonnentag and Fritz (2007) recommended that such individuals must create detachments by stopping work while outside the work environment and avoid thinking of work while in other domains of life. One way to achieve this is through the Self-Care behavior of developing a to-do list which allocates appropriate time to both personal and professional activities and to ensure that the list is followed religiously. From the study of Bock (2014), Google helps integrators achieve psychological detachment by ensuring they do not take gadgets that would link them to work activities at home. The company also offers what is called an “Inbox purse” which does not allow emails on certain times and days. When assignments are planned and spread across dates, individuals can avoid the “rehearsal loop” which occurs when individuals are mentally involved in work activities while in nonwork domains.

Segregators achieve psychological detachment but run the risk of working long hours which may infringe on other nonwork activities unless they plan their activities. Integrators may work normal hours per week, but they run the risk of extending working hours per week because of involvement in an activity at home or the inability to psychologically detach from work activities while at home. Thus, both segregators and integrators have disturbing tendencies that individuals must recognize and work on with the support of their organizations to ensure minimization of negative tendencies while taking advantage of the positive ones. Insisting on being an integrator, for example, will make it difficult for
an individual to achieve WLI regardless of the level of support obtained from the organization. Bock (2014) recommended that employees must empty their thoughts on work activities before leaving the work domain to avoid the “rehearsal loop” associated with storing work activities in the brain.

Big-Five Personality Traits and Work–Life Integration

Differences in human behavior in the work and nonwork domains are accounted for by differences in “personality, attitudes, intelligence, perceptions, motivations, and ability” (Wickramaaratchi and Perera 2016, pp. 53–56). Personality is the “individual pattern of psychological processes arising from individual characteristics” (Muindi 2016, p. 3). Personality is instrumental to the perception of the environment and this affects how the perceiver reacts to the environment (Kohler and Mathieu 1993), the centrality of work and nonwork roles, and how the roles are executed (Pandey and Shukla 2018). These perceptions have consequences on behavior and important work and nonwork outcomes (Allemand et al. 2008; Bacon et al. 2005; Klimstra et al. 2009; Muindi 2016). It has also been discussed that personality plays a significant role in an individual’s ability to perceive and manage work–life integration (Lin 2013; Malekiha et al. 2012).

The Big-Five personality traits have been studied in the management of the work–nonwork interface (Lin 2013). The traits discussed are extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness to experience (Wickramaaratchi and Perera 2016). Individuals with extraversion personality have the “tendency to be sociable, dominant, and have positive emotionality” (Michel et al. 2011, p. 193). Extraverts have positive emotions and would seek solutions proactively to manage the demands placed on them. Such solutions will enable them to develop personal and professional Self-Care behaviors which would help them to effectively manage work and nonwork demands. Individuals high in extraversion and positive emotionality would seek out proactive solutions in managing competing demands from various roles. Studies have shown
that extroverted individuals have high life satisfaction and seek and acquire resources for enhancing well-being (Cohn et al. 2009; Michel et al. 2011). Extraversion is linked to improved well-being which is a sign of achieving work–life integration (Diener and Lucas 1999; McCrae and John 1992).

Conscientious individuals are high in achievement, dependable, and organized (Michel et al. 2011). They are proactive planners and being organized, save resources for use in other domains. They pre-plan their strategies and develop coping mechanisms that may involve Self-Care behaviors such as seeking support and restructuring coping behaviors (Connor-Smith and Flachsbart 2007). Because they are organized, plan carefully, seek support when needed, and are good at managing time (Barrick and Mount 2001; Judge and Higgins 1999), conscientious individuals are effective in managing the work–nonwork interface to achieve work–life integration. Individuals high in agreeableness are “cooperative, compliant, trusting, kind, and warm” (Michel and Clark 2011, p. 193). Because of these qualities, they easily build support that can be used in situations of low internal resources. Such individuals are willing to adopt any Self-Care behavior such as support-seeking behaviors and utilize their numerous external contacts to handle demands arising from the work and nonwork domains (Connor-Smith and Flachsbart 2007). The agreeable personality trait is positively related to positive work–nonwork interface and negatively related to negative work–nonwork interface because such individuals experience success at work and receive support from other workers in their numerous networks (Zellers and Perrewé 2001; McCrae and John 1992).

Neuroticism is associated with high emotional instability, anxiety, and depression (Judge and Ilies 2002). Neuroticism has been linked to negative outcomes owing to poor emotional adjustment (Michel et al. 2011). This personality trait is associated with withdrawal behaviors and inability to develop solutions to the demands from the work and nonwork domains. Withdrawal behavior is not an aspect of Self-Care behavior hence, individuals high in neuroticism will find few solutions to handling work–nonwork challenges. Applying the Broaden-and-Build theory, those high in neuroticism cannot enlarge the stock of cognitive resources needed to function in a challenging environment.
(Watson and Pennebaker 1989). However, they have a high response to negative stimuli and since they do not have stored resources to handle and build coping mechanisms, they are affected by such stressful environments (Zellers and Perrewé 2001). Neuroticism is associated with high stress and increased conflict, which consequently affect WLI management (Devadoss and Minnie 2013). Individuals with the openness to experience are creative, willing to consider various options, sometimes go outside the conventional box to find solutions, and can transfer skills from one domain to the other (Devadoss and Minnie 2013; McCrae 1996). They consider wider perspectives and utilize more creative solutions in handling challenges. Individuals high in openness are associated with problem-solving coping mechanisms and consider stressful situations as challenging rather than a hindrance (Connor-Smith and Flachsbart 2007). The understanding of stress from a challenging or opportunity perspective will open such individuals to proactively seek Self-Care behaviors that would help them manage the stressful environment. Openness to experience is positively related to positive work–nonwork interface and negatively related to negative work–nonwork interface, which enhances the management of work–life integration (Michel et al. 2011). Composite Big-Five personality traits have also been found to positively affect work–life integration through a reduction in conflict and an increase in facilitation (Wickramaaratchi and Perera 2016).

The discussions above indicate that having four of the Big-Five personality traits will enhance WLI management through a positive relationship with positive work–life interface and reduction of conflict in the interface. Neuroticism has opposite relationships and makes work–life integration difficult. Whatever the level of support received from an organization and other WLI components, an individual's personality can make effective coordination of available resources difficult or otherwise. The first step in managing the situation, however, is in understanding one's tendencies and working to minimize their effects.
Core Self-Evaluation and Work–Life Integration

Core self-evaluation reflects the “fundamental assessments that people make about their worthiness, competence, and capabilities” (Judge et al. 2005, p. 257). It accounts for how individuals care for themselves including their health (Lanaj et al. 2012; Schütz 2001; Selecka and Vaclavikova 2017). The construct has four separate variables that capture individuals’ self-worth. These variables include self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. Self-esteem is the value an individual places on himself/herself implied in words such as by being “capable, significant, successful, and worthy” (Coopersmith 1967, pp. 4–5). Those with high self-esteem believe in themselves and are positive about themselves.

Self-efficacy indicates the belief of individuals on how well they can handle life challenges. There are two components namely, specific self-efficacy, which is the perception of being able to handle challenges in particular situations and areas of life, and general self-efficacy, which is the perception of being able to handle challenges across various situations and areas of life. Neuroticism is the inclination to have a negative outlook on life and to emphasize only negative outlooks on issues. Locus of control is an individual’s belief of what causes events in their lives and situations. Those with internal locus of control believe they have control and can handle any event in their lives. External locus of control is the belief that external factors are responsible for events in one’s life, and that the individual can do nothing about these factors. For example, a person with external locus of control will accept that work–life conflict is the outcome of factors external to him and for which he can do nothing about. A person with internal locus of control will see the conflict as a result of actions taken by him and which he can remedy through other actions. External locus does not believe that achieving work–life integration is possible, while internal believes it is and will do something to achieve it.

Studies that explore the relationship between CSE and work–life interface are scarce, and available studies handled only some of the
components of CSE (Pandey and Shukla 2018). A significant relationship has been found between neuroticism and work–life facilitation (Michel and Clark 2013; Rantanen et al. 2013). Individuals with high CSE are known to have high coping skills in the face of stress, and this enhances work–life facilitation. Positive self-evaluation is a resource based on the resource-demand model of stress that will help minimize the effects of stress in the work–life interface. High CSE predisposes individuals to accept new challenges and enhances their abilities to solve different tasks through an internal desire to acquire new skills that can enhance their problem-solving skills (Judge et al. 2016). The composite form of CSE has been established to affect work–life facilitation through distributive justice (Pandey and Shukla 2018). This study is a pointer to the role that the organizational environment plays in the effectiveness of CSE on the work–nonwork interface (Moazami-Goodarzi et al. 2015). CSE is linked to individuals’ motivation to be involved in multiple work and nonwork activities including the desire to manage work–life integration. Individuals with high CSE have high life satisfaction, attain challenging goals, and can achieve important goals in life. Since they have a high evaluation of their ability to face life challenges, they will likely persist in the face of daunting tasks such as managing work–life integration. Such individuals have a high expectancy that their efforts will achieve the desired goals, have fewer career plateaus, and report less stress (Judge et al. 1997, 2002). Individuals with high CSE can deal with social stressors, emotional exhaustion (Best et al. 2005; Boyar and Mosley 2007), and have less intention to give up on their preferred pursuit (Boyar and Mosley 2007). In a high organizational support environment, those with high CSE can elicit positive behaviors which help to reduce the negative effects of stress in the work–nonwork interface. High CSE individuals are more motivated in their jobs and more motivated to conquer their environment to enhance performance in the work and nonwork domains and are resilient in various life challenges (Bono and Judge 2003; Judge 2009). People with high CSE have a high ability to cope with external demands, have positive emotions (Scott and Judge 2009), and foster self-regulation that aids functioning in diverse levels of stressful environments (Judge and Bono 2001).
A pointer to how CSE can affect how individuals pursue and succeed in managing work–life integration is offered by the self-determination theory (SDT). The theory postulates that when individuals determine a goal to pursue, there is a high probability of pursuing such goals because they find them interesting and they have a high internal motivation to pursue the goals (Sheldon and Elliot 1999). SDT provides a link between personality, human motivation, and optimal functioning. Internal human motivations are powerful in shaping who we are and how we behave (Deci and Ryan 2012). It states that individuals have internal motivation which drives how they react to situations in their social environment. The internalization of the motivation needed to handle situations is enhanced by CSE. For example, those with high CSE believe in their abilities to successfully face life situations, hence they will proactively seek and acquire the skills needed to understand and manage their environments. Thus, when those high in CSE desire WLI achievement as an overarching goal and value the goal, they are likely to be motivated to develop internal capability including Self-Care behaviors which could make achievement of the goal possible.

**Personality Behaviors Associated with the COVID-19 Environment**

When there is a blurred interface between work and nonwork interface as in the COVID-19 environment where people work from home, the chances of people becoming workaholics is extremely high. Spears (2016) described four personality behaviors that have high tendencies to be excessively involved in work or nonwork domains, thereby making achieving work–life integration challenging. Spears insinuated that by exhibiting these behaviors, individuals can knowingly or unknowingly define their option of work–life integration which deviates from what is required for an effective lifestyle.

The planners are “extremely goal-oriented and very good at details” (Spears 2016, p. 2). They are highly organized in their work and personal lives and have a high tendency to work long hours while pursuing the perfection they desire. Unless the planner can offset the long hours
at work by using other resources, he/she will struggle with managing
the work–nonwork interface and thus be unable to achieve WLI. The
visionary behavior type “dreams” a lot and can see the bigger picture
than others. Because the visionary has a series of dreams and pursues
them with great passion, there is the tendency to spend long hours
trying to address the dreams. This may make achieving WLI difficult.
The analyzer/inventor mentally thinks of ideas and organizes them to
make meanings. The analyzer/inventor figures out how to make things
work. Because a lot of time is spent thinking of ideas, organizing them,
and making them work, analyzers/inventors act like workaholics and
often experience burnout. These tendencies can make managing the
work–nonwork interface and WLI difficult. Action takers need minimal
supervision and produce finished work. They are self-motivated and are
always involved in other nonwork pursuits where they can exhibit their
action taking roles. There is, therefore, the possibility of not being able
to coordinate the series of roles they take on in the work and nonwork
domains, and the possibility of spending many hours coordinating them.
This can also make WLI achievement difficult. The passion of the
neutralizers makes them heavily involved in their work and nonwork
lives. When such passions are not properly prioritized, coordinated,
and channeled, the management of the work–nonwork interface and
WLI become difficult. These personality behaviors are highly required
by organizations in the COVID-19 environment, but the work ethic
arising from these personality types poses challenges to WLI manage-
ment. Understanding these tendencies and planning for them will make
the avoidance of workaholic behavior possible. Planning and managing
may be enhanced when individuals can identify and mobilize Self-Care
behaviors that enhance personal and professional roles.

The Disc Personality Type

Another personality type that can point to difficulties in achieving work–
life integration if not properly understood and controlled is the “DiSC”
personality type (PADRAIG Consulting 2020). The “D” style takes
Understanding and Evaluation of Self-Regulation

Individuals who are type “D” like to be organized in the work and nonwork domains, and this may keep them spending long hours on task execution. The “i” individuals are sensitive to others who work long hours and can be pressured to also work long hours. “S” individuals love to please others and so are always willing to ensure that others have what they need and want. They will work long hours to ensure that others are satisfied and successful. Even when the “S” person knows the need for WLI and desires to pursue it, their high compromising spirit will make them give up the pursuit to please others. The “C” individuals are independent workaholics, with high analytical skills and problem-solving abilities. They are usually heavily involved in detail, making them work long hours, prone to burnout and high levels of stress. Strengths and weaknesses are associated with each personality type. Their strengths are desirable, able to enhance organizational productivity and enhance interpersonal relationships. The differences in the types, however, affect how individuals perceive challenges in managing WLI, and the actions are taken. Hence, if the strengths and weaknesses are not understood and managed, the individual may be his worst enemy in achieving work–life integration. For example, the “S” person can live his life for others if he does not adopt the Self-Care behaviors that say “no” to demands from others.

Typology of Working Mothers’ Work–Life Balance Personality Behavior

Working mothers face unique challenges in the developing world due to their context of work and nonwork relationships. The traditional family structure mandates working women to be solely responsible for family chores even when they are involved at work. More so, organizations are not up to speed in developing family-friendly policies to help working mothers coordinate their work and nonwork activities. The situation is further aggravated in a COVID-19 environment where mothers work from home with their young children at home with them. In addition to these challenges, there are peculiar individual differences in
working women that can further aggravate the challenges of managing the work–nonwork interface. These differences include personality, interests, strengths, family values, hierarchical level in the organization, and extended family responsibilities. Brownlee (2015) in a study of 500 working mothers established how working mothers arrive at their unique philosophy and attitudes to WLI. The author categorized the women using the categories “willingness to Sacrifice/Say no” and “level of organization/intentionality.” Four categories of working women were identified using the above scales. The four categories are developed in Fig. 8.2.

The work–life balance personality characterized as “I will sleep when I am dead” has a high level of organization/intentionality and “low level of willingness to Sacrifice/Say No.” This is an individual who is highly organized in all she does. However, she finds it difficult to say no to jobs and sacrifice low priority jobs. The individual is characterized by the following:

- Runs on full capacity and does not like the presence of unfulfilled assignments
- She wants to do every job that appears in the work and nonwork domain because idleness is not part of her character

![Fig. 8.2 Working mothers’ work–life balance personality typology (Source: Adopted from Brownlee 2015)](image)
• She hates the creation of boundary between work and nonwork domains and sees those who create it as being lazy

Such an individual must recognize that relaxation is part of the strategy to manage work and nonwork challenges. If she can learn to prioritize and say no to less priority jobs, her excellent organizing ability will improve the achievement of work–life integration by reducing stress arising from the work and nonwork interface.

The “Rose-colored glasses” personality has low “level of organization/intentionality” and “willingness to Sacrifice/Say No.” This individual takes on all existing responsibilities but has no consistent organizing ability. Such an individual has the following characteristics that create stress:

• Takes on all tasks but is unable to see them to a complete state
• Does not say no to jobs since she has no way to prioritize and organize them
• Does not have a particular order of carrying out responsibilities since there is no priority order developed.
• Is always overwhelmed because she cannot say no to jobs and does not organize.

The individual must be organized consistently and must learn to “say no” to low priority jobs and work on important ones.

The “White flag” personality has a low level of “organization/intentionality” and a high level of “willingness to sacrifice/say no.” It appears the individual can prioritize assignments, selecting those to work on and those to “say no” to. The individual’s problem, however, is the inability to organize the selected assignments consistently. Hence, the individual is stressed because of the following characteristics:

• Fear of failure in the selected assignments because of the inability to organize them.
Learning how to prioritize and organize will ensure that the selected assignments are brought to completion. This will remove the fear of failure and associated stress.

The “Yoga master” personality has a high level of “organization/intentionality” and “willingness to sacrifice/say no.” This individual can prioritize jobs to identify those with low priority and has a high level of organizing which is done consistently such that selected jobs are completed with minimal level of stress. The individual avoids stress through the following characteristics:

- Is highly effective in areas important to her in both the work and nonwork domains
- Can “say no” to jobs of low priority
- Identifies WLI issues and can request help in handling them
- Identifies the boundary between work and nonwork domains

The effectiveness of such individual is from four main things they do effectively: ability to prioritize important assignments, to organize consistently to effectively carry out selected tasks, to “say no” to low priority tasks to avoid overload, and willingness to identify issues that make WLI difficult and proactively seek for a solution.

The conclusion from these typologies is that no matter the level of support offered to working mothers by organizations or other sources, specific personality behaviors have extremely low tendency to achieve WLI due to the tendencies associated with them. Three effective tendencies can be identified namely, the ability to prioritize, organize, and “say no” to low priority tasks. These tendencies can be linked to personal and professional Self-Care behaviors. Working mothers who adopt multiple personal and professional Self-Care behaviors will have low levels of stress and high achievement of work–life integration.

**Conclusion**

The role of individuals in the multidimensional approach to managing work–life integration dominated the discussions in the chapter. This is
because individuals can be exposed to support from their organization and other components discussed in this book, but their differences will affect how they use the support and the level of success they will achieve. Some individual differences can be inimical to every attempt at achieving work–life integration if not properly understood and analyzed.

Before reviewing individual differences, the chapter reviews the role of Self-Care behaviors in the achievement of WLI. These behaviors are classified as personal and professional behaviors, and jointly help individuals handle personal and professional challenges to stay healthy and effective in role executions. These behaviors are discretionary and will depend on the individual’s willingness to identify and adapt them to improve well-being and to manage WLI. The chapter postulates a relationship between individual differences and Self-Care behaviors. This relationship has not been extensively studied in the literature. The chapter proposes that Self-Care behaviors will moderate the relationship between individual differences and work–nonwork interface to improve on the variance of the latter explained by the former.

The chapter reviews personality traits and core self-evaluation (CSE) as individual variables responsible for the ability to adopt Self-Care behaviors. In doing this, the Broaden-and-Build and self-determination theories were used to explain the relationship between personality traits and CSE respectively to work–nonwork interface. The personality traits reviewed include the Big-Five, segregators/integrators, and DiSC personality traits. The conclusion is that the personality traits are not inherently bad or good, but each has strengths and weaknesses which must be identified, leveraged upon, or managed to ensure the well-being and effectiveness of individuals. The chapter did not engage in traits nurture/nature controversies but took the approach that individuals must identify their dominant personality types and how to manage their tendencies to enhance their use of Self-Care behaviors in achieving WLI. The effects of the components of CSE and the composite variable were also discussed and how they enhance the development and use of Self-Care behaviors.

Working mothers were given special attention in the chapter because of obvious factors that make WLI management more challenging for them. The number of working mothers in the work domain has increased recently in the developing world. Despite this, the traditional family
structure in Africa still holds working mothers solely responsible for family chores. Secondly, organizations in Africa are not current in expanding available work–nonwork friendly policies required by working mothers. Four typologies of working mothers’ work–life balance personality behaviors were identified. Three of these topologies struggle to achieve WLI, while one is effective. The personality behaviors that struggle to achieve WLI failed to do four things: prioritize, organize, sacrifice, and “say no” to low priority tasks.

This chapter concludes that individual differences play a major role in the achievement of WLI. Individual differences can even become obstacles to how individuals identify and use organizationally provided policies aimed at WLI management. However, individuals are not helpless to their differences. What they must do is identify the tendencies associated with their difference, leverage on their strengths, and work on their weaknesses to enhance their well-being and achieve WLI. It is not the possession of personality difference that makes people fail at WLI management but not recognizing the consequences of such difference and how to maximize it to achieve effectiveness.
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