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The structure of the American family has undergone tremendous change in the last three decades. People are marrying later -- the median age at first marriage for both males and females is the highest this century -- and the proportion of men and women in their early thirties who have never married has doubled since 1960 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, 1986). The rate at which these marriages are dissolving is also at an all time high -- 66 percent, according to a recent study (Minneapolis Star Tribune, 1989; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, 1986). Partly as a consequence of these trends, the number of children living with only one parent has almost tripled. In 1986, twenty-four percent of all children under 18 years of age lived with only one parent, compared to 9 percent in 1960.

Not only has the structure of the family changed, the work characteristics of American families have changed as well. Where once only the husband worked outside the home to provide economic support for the family, today, more often than not, both spouses work outside the home. In fact, of the 42 million married couples with earnings, an estimated 26 million are dual-income families, whereas 16 million
couples are supported by only one partner (Spain and Nock, 1984). Furthermore, among married women, the most rapid increase in labor force involvement has been among mothers with children under the age of six. By 1982, 49 percent of married mothers with children under six were in the labor force, and there is little reason to believe the trend will reverse in the near future (Population Reference Bureau, Inc., 1983).

It is understandable, then, that considerable time and effort have been devoted to the study of the changing American family in an effort to document, and ultimately explain, the changes occurring both within the family and in society as a consequence of these changes. Focusing on issues such as these, contemporary researchers have assumed that as more women become wage-earners, both they and their spouses will face what is termed "conflicting demands" as they try to simultaneously fulfill all the role expectations associated with their positions as spouse, parent, and worker. Of special interest to researchers focusing on the potential for work and family conflict has been the dual-career family. Not only does it represent a rapidly emerging family form, but it is one which is being shown to contain the potential for substantial conflicts between work and family roles. In fact, much of the literature on such families has dealt with role conflict and role strain and has assumed that there is just not enough time or energy for dual-career couples to be both highly committed to their work and highly committed to their family.

Unfortunately, the research to date on dual-income families, while interesting and informative, is flawed in at least two major
respects. First, researchers have assumed that energy/time are by definition scarce resources. However, this assumption has never been empirically tested to ascertain its validity. Second, nearly all the work done implicitly assumes conflict between work and family roles is inevitable. Again, this assumption has not been subjected to empirical evaluation.

As a result of these unvalidated assumptions, alternative explanations of the cause or causes of the role conflict between work and family roles have been ignored. Furthermore, exceptions to the "norm", that is, individuals who have successfully combined work, marriage, and family with no perception of role strain or conflict have been ignored, rather than subjected to empirical evaluation to try to understand why there is no perception of role strain or conflict. Thus, the literature on the role conflict among dual-career and dual-income couples suffers from severe conceptual and logical problems.

A. Statement of the Problem

The present study seeks to address these issues. First, the existence of role conflict will be treated as an empirical question, and not just assumed to exist. Second, energy/time will be treated as concepts subject to empirical test and evaluation, rather than assumed to be scarce resources.

This investigation will take the form of a critical experiment, in which two hypotheses about role conflict -- scarcity and expansion -- will be tested against one another. The scarcity hypothesis postulates that a real conflict exists between work and family roles due to the
scarcity of time and energy. In other words, given the constraints of a twenty-four hour day and a limited supply of energy, only so many roles may be performed without an individual feeling stressed by the multiple demands being made upon his or her time and energy. The counter hypothesis -- the expansion approach -- treats human energy as an abundant, rather than scarce, resource. According to the expansion hypothesis, role conflict results from a culturally patterned system of over- and under-commitments. Roles to which an individual is highly committed will be performed, often at the expense of the performance of roles to which the individual is undercommitted. Thus, the crucial factor in explaining the occurrence of role strain or conflict is commitment.

Given that time and energy are generally found for the performance of roles to which the actor is committed, the expansion hypothesis argues that it is level of commitment, not the availability of time and energy, which determines whether or not a role is performed. In other words, role conflict is only an excuse used to avoid negative sanctions for the minimal or non-performance of roles to which an individual is undercommitted.

In American society, great value is placed on the roles associated with work and family. In fact, these are two of the most highly valued positions in American society. And, since both members of most married couples perform both -- work and family -- sets of roles, it seems reasonable to investigate the potential for role conflict between the roles associated with work and family.
Thus, for the purposes of this research, role conflict will be studied by focusing on the interaction of work and family roles. Given the above discussion, the general research problem for this study can be stated as follows: Is role conflict the result of an actual shortage of time and energy (i.e., is the scarcity hypothesis true)? Or is role conflict the result of an undercommitment to roles in the work or family (i.e., the expansion hypothesis)?

B. Justification for the Study.

The justification for this study rests on two characteristics of the current role conflict literature. First, the research to date has assumed that conflict between work and family roles is inevitable. It is the position taken here that the role conflict in dual-earner families should be treated as an empirical question, and thus one open to investigation, rather than as merely an assumed result of combining work and family roles. This study provides such an empirical test by investigating the nature of the perceived role conflict reported by dual-income participants.

Second, few, if any, empirical studies of role conflict in dual-earner families exist. Most of the research on work and family conflict has focused primarily on case studies of selected groups of professional couples (see for example the work of Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969, 1971, 1976, 1980; Fuchs-Epstein, 1971; Poloma, 1972; Bird, 1979; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Hunt and Hunt, 1982), and has not controlled for the degree of role conflict or role strain experienced by other types of families (e.g. dual-earner and single-earner families). This study will
not focus solely on the perceived role conflict of such select professional couples, but will include a broad range of family types.

In sum then, this research will contribute to current knowledge and understanding of the nature of the relationship between work and family role demands by subjecting an assumption about role conflict to empirical investigation, and by broadening the investigation of role conflict to include a broad range of family types.

C. Organization of the Study.

This report will be organized in the following manner. First, a review of the literature relevant to role theory and its application to the field of work and family will be summarized. Second, the methods employed to gather and analyze the data set for this particular research project will be described. Third, the results and findings of the research will be presented. And finally, the report will conclude with a presentation of the summary of findings and a discussion of the results.
CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

The research examining the perceived role conflict between work and family builds implicitly upon the assumptions of two different approaches to role theory. These two approaches—the scarcity approach and the expansion approach—will be described in this chapter. In addition, research into work and family role conflict will be summarized, and will be employed to illustrate how each of these two approaches to role theory has been grounded in real-world observation. However, before discussing these two approaches to role theory, it is first necessary to define the key theoretical concepts employed.

A. Theoretical Definition of Key Concepts

Crucial to a careful analysis of the perceived conflict between work and family roles is a clear and precise specification of the meaning attached to the concepts of role, position, role conflict, and role strain. Following are the theoretical definitions of the central concepts of this study.

1. Position, Role, and Role-Set

For the purposes of this research, a position (or "status"), will be defined as a "location of social space, a category of organizational membership" (Coser and Rosenberg, 1976:275). Since a position brings with it a set of culturally prescribed rights and duties, a position carries with it an image of exemplary behavior, a model of collective expectations (Linton, 1936).

A role is defined here as the performance of actions expected of a particular position; it is the part of a position which involves
"function, adaptation, process" (Levinson, 1976:251). Thus the concept of position is related to the concept of role in that "role" is the dynamic aspect of a position. The difference between the two is, quite simply, that a position is occupied, while a role is performed.

It should be noted that each social position generally involves not a single role, but a set of roles. Merton defined role-sets as complements of role-relationships in which persons are involved by virtue of occupying a particular social position (Merton, 1957a).

2. Role Strain and Role Conflict

Role strain and role conflict are two concepts crucial to any analysis of work and family. Role strain will be defined here as felt difficulty in meeting given role demands (Goode, 1960:485), while role conflict will be defined as an inability to reconcile the role expectations among or between a set of positions (see Turner, 1982:358).

B. Two Approaches to Role Theory

At present, two very distinct approaches to role theory dominate the investigation of the interrelationship between work and family. Those two approaches are known as the scarcity approach and the expansion approach.

1. The Scarcity Approach

Researchers studying marriage, work, and the family have
generally applied a "scarcity" approach to human energy. This approach presumes human energy is a scarce resource which is "used up" in the performance of daily activity. Sociologists employing a scarcity approach draw upon either the drain theory, which "...assumes that our reservoir of energy is precariously small, something akin to a mud puddle that can readily drain away or dry up altogether," or the spending theory, which likewise implies that humans have but a tiny amount of energy that can be expended completely (Marks, 1977:922). Given that energy is a scarce resource it is theorized there is a high probability there will be a felt difficulty in managing the demands of a multiplicity of competing roles.

Probably the first sociologist to link the scarcity approach to multiple role theory was Goode, who, in 1960, argued that "...the individual's total role obligations are over-demanding."(485). By this, he meant that demands exceed the energy (time) available to fulfill role obligations. To capture and conceptualize the result of these over-demanding role obligations, he developed the concept role strain -- the felt difficulty in meeting given role demands. For Goode, role strain is a normal part of everyday life. Given the normality of the strain among and between role demands, Goode felt the individual's problem "...is how to allocate his energies and skills so as to reduce role strain to some bearable proportions" (1960:485). It

\[\text{According to Marks (1977), energy has generally been treated as a prime term requiring no explanation. This treatment has resulted in conceptual confusion, as two other concepts -- time and commitment -- have been confused with energy, and used interchangeably with it.}\]
is the same problem Goode adds, the individual "...faces in his economic life: he has limited resources to be allocated among alternative ends" (1960:487). Role strain is solved either by making a series of "role bargains" in which the individual attempts to demand as much as possible and perform as little as possible, or by avoiding certain roles altogether (Goode, 1960:495).

According to Goode, roles may be avoided through any of several techniques which include a) the delegation of certain roles to others, b) elimination of some role relationships, c) extension of some role relations (i.e. expanding some roles as an excuse for not fulfilling other role obligations), and d) barring others from initiating or continuing role relationships (for example, by hiring an appointment secretary to screen appointees) (Goode, 1960:486). The level of the individual's performance of each role is thus determined by his/her desire to perform a particular role and by the individual's perception of rewards or punishments for performing a particular role very well or very poorly (Goode, 1960:489).

While there have been recent modifications and elaborations to the scarcity approach (for a good discussion of the approach, see Marks, 1977), the basic assumption remains the same -- humans have a limited amount of energy/time with which to accomplish their social obligations. Thus, the scarcity approach to human activity sees the increasing complexity of social life (with the attendant increases in social roles) as inevitably and unavoidably leading to role strain and role conflict (Marks, 1977:923).
Not surprisingly, this approach has been applied to the specific situation in which work and family roles are combined. Marks notes in his review of the literature that there is "... a wealth of empirical work dealing with the conflicts between occupational roles on the one hand and familial and marital roles on the other, and this work is often grounded in a scarcity approach to human energy" (Marks, 1977:924). As an example of the prevalence of this approach, Marks cites Edgell's (1970:319) summary of the empirical literature in this area. In that summary, Edgell notes that "spiralist" professionals (people who combine a hierarchically-ordered career with residential mobility) in the child-rearing stage of the life cycle are faced with a choice between being "married" to their work or to their home and family. Individuals who attempt to perform both role sets will be subject to role conflict "... since any degree of commitment to one role will detract from his commitment, and chance of success, in the other, simply in terms of the availability of time and energy" (Edgell, 1970:320). Similar conclusions are drawn by Hunt and Hunt (1977, 1982), Lorber (1980), Veevers (1980), and Burgwyn (1981).

In general, it is assumed that the more roles to be performed, the greater the potential for role conflict. Because it is assumed that the greatest number of roles is found in those families where both spouses are involved in a career (as opposed to a job) and where there are still children living at home, a great deal of time has been spent studying dual-career families. The general feeling among these researchers is that the attempt to combine two careers with raising a
family will result in an increasing polarization of work from family. For highly educated men and women who are technically qualified to enter the career market, having a family will often mean scaling down aspirations and settling for a job instead of a career (Hunt and Hunt, 1982:503). That is, couples will be forced to choose between their careers or their family because of the tremendous demands (in terms of time and energy) of the careers upon each spouse.

It is also assumed that this conflict between work and family will be most strongly felt by women. The core of this argument is simply that in the past women who worked or pursued a career were expected to pursue a career path different from that of men. Women were not expected to commit themselves entirely to a career for the duration of their work life. Rather, career women were allowed (and expected) to follow career paths that were "slowly paced, often interrupted, and neither upwardly moving nor success-oriented, but (which recognized) their commitment to family responsibilities" (White, 1979:365; Poloma, 1972). In contrast, career women of today are increasingly expected to follow a career path similar to the career path followed by men. This trend is expected to result in a high level of perceived role conflict because demands for a high level of commitment to work roles is assumed to take time away from other role-sets. And because both spouses are exposed to demands for a high level of commitment to work roles, there is no one available within the family to handle familial demands the way they were when women were not active participants in the labor force.

If this argument is correct, changes in parenting should be
apparent. And, in fact, present day dual-career couples often report that parenthood poses a problem for them in terms of maintaining their careers, so much so that there is a growing trend among new dual-career couples to remain childless. While there is a general trend for smaller families, started later in life across the United States, current data indicate that the likelihood of family formation is declining, especially among highly educated men and women (Hunt and Hunt, 1982; Burgwyn, 1981; Lorber, 1980; Veevers, 1980).

2. The Expansion Approach

While the studies referenced above offer evidence in support of the scarcity hypothesis, they ignore the fact that there is always a minority of each sample studied who do not exhibit signs of role strain or role conflict. Given the existence of individuals who do not experience a scarcity of time or energy, it is apparent that the scarcity approach cannot be considered universally applicable, and that the apparent lack of time and energy felt by many is not due to some universal human condition (Marks, 1977:925). It is equally apparent that it cannot be assumed that all individuals undertaking a multiplicity of roles will experience role conflict. Role conflict must not be viewed as an underlying assumption, but rather as a construct subject to empirical investigation.

Taking note of this logical limitation to the scarcity approach, Marks (1977) developed a theory which could explain why some people experience role conflict while others do not. His first step was to refute the scarcity theorists' assumption that energy is a limited,
finite, commodity. He argued that, for the most part, sociologists have been guilty of going no further than trying to qualify energy as psychic, libidinal, or emotional (Marks, 1977:925). Unfortunately, since none of these are quantifiable definitions, research on this topic has been frustrated. However, by turning to the laws of physiology, Marks was able to define energy in a quantifiable way; he defined it as the biological production of energy. Defined this way, Marks was able to argue that "...under conditions of normal daily activity (that is, where food intake is adequate or the level of stress or exertion is not so great that glycogen reserves are exhausted and fat reserves used faster than they can be converted) then the energy potential of the body at any given moment is physiologically abundant rather than scarce" (1977:926). If it is true that energy is in fact an abundant resource, then the key questions to be answered by social theorists are a) under what conditions does energy become freely available for given activities, and b) under what conditions does energy become unavailable? (Marks, 1977:927). In answering these questions, Marks developed an approach to role theory called the expansion approach.

The underlying assumption of the expansion approach -- that is, that energy is an abundant resource -- can be traced back to Durkheim, who repeatedly asserted that individuals come away from social activity "...far more enriched and vitalized than when left to their own resources" (1953:91). Durkheim's work is important to the development of the expansion approach to role theory in two respects. First, he saw the human energy supply as both plentiful and expandable. Second, he
defined energy as a socio-culturally conditioned variable and not a biological fact. This position suggested that sociologists should look at both the social production of energy as well as its consumption (Marks, 1977:926).

The implications of this theory for the relationship between the work and family spheres of life are profound. If energy is, in fact, an abundant resource, it cannot be a lack of energy (and/or time) which results in the perception of role conflict. Consequently, the perceived role conflict reported by many must be a response to something other than a lack of energy (or time or any other term researchers have used interchangeably with that of energy).

It is precisely this issue that Sieber (1974) examines. And it is his questioning of the energy scarcity premise that led to his formulation of a theory of role accumulation. Referring to Merton's work on roles (Merton, 1957b), Sieber notes that role conflict refers to discrepant expectations irrespective of time pressures. He argued that Merton, Goode, and all the others that followed, assumed that role conflict resulted from the multiplication of roles. They had assumed that each new position brought with it a new role-set which increased the probability of confronting role-set members with contradictory demands and expectations, and which concurrently made an additional demand on the multiple-role holder's time. They further hypothesized that a number of mechanisms arose which help "...to articulate the individual's role system, thereby precluding or reducing tension and disruption" (Sieber, 1974:568).
Sieber argues that this line of reasoning is illogical because the need for the adaptive mechanisms is never empirically established. "It would be well to ask whether multiplicity of roles actually creates more strain than gratification, or more potential for disturbance than potential for stability..." (1974:568) before entering into discussions of mechanisms that combat role strain. To this end, Sieber (1974:569) developed a classificatory scheme which encompasses four positive outcomes of role accumulation: (1) role privileges, (2) overall status security, (3) resources for status enhancement and role performance, and (4) enrichment of the personality and ego gratification.

a. **Role Privileges**

Every role contains within it two kinds of rights - inherent rights, which are built into the role, and emergent rights, which arise from daily interaction with role partners. Inherent rights serve as inducements for recruitment to roles and the continuance of role performances. Emergent roles serve to guarantee role compliance, especially when the demands of the role are increased. The allotment of rights is contingent upon both the level of obligations and the adequacy of role performance (Sieber, 1974:569). With the exception of exploitative relationships, Sieber postulated that there is a tendency for rights to be adjusted to obligations. Thus, Sieber arrived at the generalization that the greater the number of roles (which are not inherently offensive), the greater the number of privileges enjoyed by the role (status) occupant (569). In other words, Sieber was arguing the more roles an individual had, the more gratification he/she received
from those roles.

b. Overall Status Security Through Buffer Roles

Multiple roles may also compensate for role strain through the provision of buffer roles, which provide a cushion against failure in some other sphere. These buffers (or alternatives) can often be sustained at little cost relative to the cost of role conflict or role strain. Once these buffer roles are established, they may often be sustained with little obligation. In fact, very little interaction may be required. "An occasional letter, a gift after a long absence, a ceremonial visit with relatives, or semi-retirement all keep role relationships alive as potential buffers..." (Sieber, 1974:574). In sum, Sieber argues that the maintenance of buffer roles is analogous to diversifying investments. Diversification of social investments through multiple roles allows the role accumulator to reduce the amount of time devoted to several role partners to almost zero without jeopardizing the full buffer potential of a relationship.

c. Resources for Status Enhancement and Role Performance

In addition to providing overall status security, multiple role partners provide a variety of incidental perquisites, or non-institutionalized by-products of social relationships. Examples of perquisites include recommendations or introductions to third parties who might advance one's career or other interests, free meals, clothing, or gifts of all kinds, sexual favors and access to potential mates, the use of company property for personal use, inside tips on investments, government contracts, and graft and bribes (Sieber, 1974:574). While the supply of
perquisites may be increased through better role performance, they are generally made available by virtue of the occupancy of a position. In this sense, both role privileges and perquisites are unearned. These benefits may also be invested in other roles, a possibility which provides for a net accumulation of benefits over the cost of meeting role obligations. They may also provide an avenue for increasing one's power base in society (Sieber, 1974:574).

Given the possibility of increasing power, privilege, and perquisites by increasing the number of roles played, one's role system may be expandable to a degree hitherto unappreciated by role theorists. This possibility raises serious questions about "the finite sum of role resources" to which Goode referred (1960). Thus, while role accumulation may increase the probability of role conflict and overload, it may at the same time reduce the stress to which ego will be subjected by virtue of his or her rank and indispensability (Sieber, 1974:576).

d. Personality Enrichment and Ego Gratification

Finally, in addition to providing privileges, buffers, and resources, role accumulation may serve to enrich the personality and enhance one's self-concept. Tolerance of discrepant viewpoints, exposure to many sources of information, flexibility in adjusting to the demands of diverse role-partners are all potential benefits accrued by multiple role-holders (Sieber, 1974:576).

In sum, Sieber argues that social researchers should not look exclusively at the dysfunctions of multiple roles. Not all individuals are clamoring for ways to reduce the number of roles to be performed in
order to reduce perceived role conflict and strain. In fact, there is some evidence that those performing fewer roles experience greater role strain and conflict. Thoits (1986) found that, in general, women experience greater stress because they are more limited than men in the number of role "identities" that they may hold and perform. Thus, there is empirical support for the proposition that there are a number of positive outcomes that accrue from performing multiple roles. These positive outcomes may also be inferred from the demands of some categories of people that they be allowed to perform more roles. The demands for equality by American blacks and females reflect both a desire to be allowed to perform multiple roles and a demand to be released from social bondage to a single overarching status (e.g. race, sex) so that a full range of opportunities can be pursued and benefits accrued (Sieber, 1974:577).

Assuming it is true that multiple role involvement can expand an individual's time, resources, and energy, then why do many multiple role holders report a feeling of role strain and/or conflict? To understand this phenomenon, the individual's total range of commitments must be studied. That is, researchers must look at how individuals assess the importance of a given role in relation to their other roles (Marks, 1977:930). In discussing the relations among the roles, Marks argues they may take one of three forms:
(Type I) a system of equally positive commitments, in which anything one typically does is seen as just as good (worthy, important) as anything else one typically does; (Type II) a system of equally negative commitments, in which anything one typically does is seen as just as bad as anything else one typically does; and (Type III) a system of over- and under-commitments, in which one or more typical activities and roles are seen as better, more important, more worthy of one's efforts, etc., than any of one's other typical activity-clusters and roles\(^2\) (Marks, 1977:930).

It is the Type III form which will be examined here, for it is the most empirically common type. Here, the phenomenon of scarce time and energy should be quite commonplace. The expansion of time and energy is limited by one's over-committed interests. "No matter how much I might value my under-committed interests, my time and energy for them are always constrained by the fact that I have "better" or "more important" things to do..." (Marks, 1977:931). An enormous amount of time and energy is produced for the fulfillment of over-committed interests. The tendency, then, is for these over-committed interests to begin to encroach upon the time and energy produced for one's under-committed interests. To cope with all the demands for their time and energy, over-committed people will attempt to reduce their involvement in their under-committed roles. At the same time, they will attempt to avoid being held accountable for their minimal or non-performances. Popular appeals to the scarcity of time and energy are tailor-made to serve as culturally honorable excuses for the undercommitted (Marks, 1977:932).

\(^2\)It should be noted that in a Type III system, over- and under-commitments are not seen as positive and negative, respectively. Both the over- and under-commitments occur on the plus side of a person's commitments. However, the over-commitments have higher value than under-commitments.
These excuses are not appealed to nor honored at random; rather, those who use them and honor them refer to very particular cultural priorities and standards of adequate role performance. For example, in the United States middle and upper classes, where occupational work is more highly valued and rewarded than any other activity-cluster, scarce time and energy excuses typically will not be honored within work activities. Where culturally favored roles, such as work, are themselves differentiated into a hierarchy of presumed importance, those people holding the highest positions will have the least latitude for scarce time and energy excuses within that position. They will, however, have enormous power of appeal to these excuses outside of those positions. A doctor cannot be too tired to attend to an emergency, but he or she probably can be too tired for a great variety of marital and family activities. On the other hand, for the traditional housewife, whose daily activities are not even reckoned culturally as real work, there is little power of appeal to any excuse (Marks, 1977:932).

C. Research Hypotheses

Based upon the logic of the two approaches to the role theory and their application and linkage to work and family, two research hypotheses were formulated. The first, derived from the scarcity approach, may be stated as follows:

Hypothesis 1 (The Scarcity Hypothesis): The greater the number of roles to be performed by an individual, the greater the likelihood that the individual will report perceived conflict between those roles independent of the level of commitment to the roles.
The second research hypothesis, which draws upon the arguments of the expansion approach, may be stated as follows:

**Hypothesis 2 (The Expansion Hypothesis):** The greater the commitment to the roles performed by an individual, the lower the likelihood that the individual will report perceived conflict between those roles independent of the number of roles to be performed by the individual.

**D. Testing Procedure**

Since the two approaches call for opposite results from similar initial conditions, a critical test can be conducted. Given access to appropriate data, the results should allow the determination of which approach is best supported by the data and which approach is not. The procedures for conducting that test are described in Chapter Three of this thesis, and results are reported in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In order to test the two hypotheses described in the preceding chapter, data on perceived role conflict, the number of roles performed, and commitment to those roles is required. In this chapter, the procedures employed to obtain those data are described. Additionally, the procedures employed to test both hypotheses are discussed.

A. Research Design

Data for this study were gathered from residents of Brookings, South Dakota, by means of a mail questionnaire. Although information from a broader geographical area would have been preferred, the methods employed in sample selection, specifically initial contact by telephone, combined with limited resources precluded this possibility. Budget constraints simply did not allow for any long distance calls to perform the initial screening of potential respondents. However, even though the population was more circumscribed than would have been preferred, the diversity among the types of employment held by the population of working adults in Brookings (a diversity provided by institutions such as South Dakota State University, as well as numerous manufacturing industries) does lend itself readily to the test of the two hypotheses.

1. Units of Analysis

Given the research problem addressed in this study the population under investigation was all working adults and their spouses (if present) in Brookings, South Dakota.

2. Sampling Frame

The sampling frame for the study was the Brookings Area
Telephone Directory. Because 93 percent of all households in South Dakota have at least one telephone (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982:557), the telephone directory provided an adequate list of names from which a representative random sample could be drawn.

3. **Sampling Procedure**

Given the resources available, a sample size of approximately 700 principal respondents (plus an estimated 300-400 spouses) was deemed feasible. To obtain that sample, names were selected without replacement from the directory in the following manner. First, an estimate of the total number of listings in the phone book was determined by counting the number of listings on two pages, averaging the sum, and multiplying by the number of pages in the directory (excluding the yellow pages). Given the total number of listings, and the target sample size of 700 names, a one in fifteen sample rate was employed. All business or on-campus listings selected were replaced by alternately choosing the name directly above or below the non-eligible entry in order to reduce bias. (Campus listings were excluded for the simple reason that the majority of students living in the dormitories are not employed.)

Once a list of names was created, each potential respondent was contacted by telephone. The telephone survey was conducted during the months of June, July and August, 1986. The purpose of the telephone survey was to verify addresses and to gather information relative to the respondent's work and marital status. If the respondent was married, the name of the spouse was obtained and added to the sample.
Respondents who indicated that they and their spouses were both unemployed or retired were eliminated from the sample, as were all single unemployed respondents. Respondents who could not be reached by telephone were excluded from the survey. However, every attempt was made to contact all potential respondents throughout the duration of the telephone survey period.

The sample size upon which this study was based was 733 married adults where at least one of the two spouses was currently employed.

4. Survey Instrument

The survey form developed for married respondents contained nine pages of questions. (See Appendix A for a complete copy of the married respondents questionnaire.) This form was divided into thirteen major sections, which covered the following topics: (1) respondent's opinion about combining work and family, (2) family size (actual and intended), (3) past and current work history, with subsections for currently employed and currently non-employed respondents, (4) feelings about work, (5) respondent's opinion about considering or accepting a new job if their spouse did not have another job available, (6) the division of labor in the household, (7) degree of planning that occurred about marriage and childbearing, (8) feelings about how work affected the family, (9) feelings about family, (10) satisfaction with work and family, (11) educational background and experience, and (12) basic demographic data. The final section was a comments section.

The items included in the survey instrument were taken from indices and scales developed in previous research on work and family
(see Helmreich and Spence, 1978; Pendleton, Poloma, and Garland, 1980, 1982; and Yogev and Brett, 1985). Because some of the questions exhibited a gender bias, (that is, they were geared primarily towards female respondents and covered traditional female roles) many of the questions had to be rewritten to accommodate male respondents. However, every attempt was made to remain true to the original intent of the question.

For the most part, the sections tapping attitudes were made up of a series of questions with Likert-type responses (generally ranging from strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree). This format -- close-ended questions with ordered answer choices -- was deemed most appropriate for forming the multiple-item indices which would be needed in the analysis of the data.

Before sending the questionnaires out, the married respondent survey was pretested on a small group of faculty and married graduate students. Misspellings and difficult instructions were corrected at that time.

5. Mail Procedure

To enhance the response rate, the mailing of the questionnaire was divided into several phases, following the procedure outlined by Dillman (1978). First, the survey packet, which consisted of cover letter, questionnaire, and self-addressed, stamped return envelope, was mailed to all those included in the sample. Two weeks later, everyone received a postcard which both thanked respondents for returning the questionnaire and encouraged non-respondents to return their
questionnaire. About four weeks after the postcards were sent out, replacement surveys were sent to all nonrespondents (roughly one-half of the original sample). This final appeal resulted in an additional 20 percent gain in returned surveys. After adjusting for surveys returned blank, the final response rate was about 70 percent.

B. Analysis Procedure

Crucial to the testing of the two research hypotheses is information on (a) commitment to work and family roles, (b) the number of roles enacted by each respondent, and (c) perceived role conflict. In the following sections, the procedures followed to yield this information are discussed.

1. Index Construction Criteria

As noted earlier, many of the items which appeared on the various forms of the questionnaire had appeared in indices developed from, or used in, prior research. However, due to differences in sample composition (primarily the inclusion of men) none of these previously developed indices could be employed intact in this study. Thus, the procedures employed to develop the indices used in this study require description.

In general, each item selected for each index had to meet the following criteria. First, each item had to tap a characteristic which had been shown to be salient to the particular characteristic under study. Second, each item under consideration had to have been coded for a majority of the respondents. Third, the items had to meet the basic requirements for an index, that is, each item had to be statistically
significantly related at the α=.05 level with all other index items, and each item had to demonstrate at least a moderate level of correlation with all other items.

2. Work and Family Commitment Indicator Construction

Since a major factor in the test of the two hypotheses is the extent to which an individual is committed to the roles in his or her life, and since the major focus of this research is on family and work roles, it was necessary to develop an index of commitment to both work and family. To develop such an index, the first step was to develop two separate indices -- one to measure commitment to work roles, and another to measure commitment to family roles. The second step was to combine these two separate indices into a single index.

a. Commitment to Work Index

The test of the research hypothesis derived from the expansion approach to role theory required the development of an index able to measure the respondent's commitment to their work. Using the criteria outlined above, the items to be included as part of the work commitment index were chosen in the following manner. First, the responses to each item that had been included in the survey to measure work commitment were crosstabulated with the responses to all other such items. Four of the items examined were selected since they met the index criteria. The four items that were selected were: (1) "I would be a less fulfilled person without my experience of work", (2) "It is important for my satisfaction in life to have a job or career that brings recognition and prestige from others", (3) "I would keep working in my present job even
if I didn’t need the money", and (4) "My work is as important to me as my spouse’s work is to her/him". It is important to note that each of these items used has been shown in earlier studies to be a reliable indicator of work orientation. Item one was adapted from a career salience scale developed by Pendleton, Poloma, and Garland (1980, 1982). (The original question was worded as follows: "I would be a less fulfilled person without my career achievements". The question was rephrased in this survey to reflect the diversity of occupations in the sample.) Items two and four are taken from the "Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire" developed by Robert L. Helmreich and Janet T. Spence (1978:8,9). Item three came from a job involvement scale developed by Sara Yogev and Jeanne Brett (1985). It should be noted that the items selected for this study did not exactly replicate the work orientation and commitment items used in previous research, because the original items were taken from scales constructed to focus principally, if not entirely, on female respondents who occupied career type positions. Since the present research focuses on both females and males, and since it focuses on both workers with careers and those without careers, two different modifications were made to the items. First, questions were rewritten so that each item addressed both female and male respondents as much as possible. In this way, a great deal of the gender bias inherent in previously constructed research instruments was removed. Second, the orientation of the items was broadened to include non-career workers as well as career workers.

The index itself was constructed in the following manner. An
overall score on the index was calculated by summing the values for each of the four items (which ranged from 1 -- strongly agree to 5 -- strongly disagree) and then dividing the sum by the number of items used. In the case of a respondent who answered only three of the items, an index score was calculated using just those three items. However, if the respondent did not answer two or more of the items, the respondent was deleted from the analysis.

b. Commitment to Family Index

The second index created to test the hypotheses attempted to measure the respondent’s commitment to their family. Each item selected met the criteria already enumerated. Five items were selected for the index: (1) "I have had to limit the amount of time I spend on family activities", (2) "Although my spouse may assist me, the responsibility for domestic, childcare, and entertaining tasks is primarily mine", (3) "If my child is sick, I am more likely to stay home with him/her than is my spouse", (4) "I married someone who was willing to take primary responsibility for the family, allowing me more time for my work", and (5) "My work prevents me from attending all of my child’s activities".

As for the work commitment items, each item employed here had been shown in earlier studies to be a reliable indicator of commitment to family. Items one, two and three were adapted from indices developed by Pendleton, Poloma, and Garland (1980, 1982), and Yogev and Brett (1985). Item four was developed by combining items used by Pendleton, Poloma, and Garland (1980, 1982), and Yogev and Brett (1985) to measure commitment to family as it existed prior to family formation. And item
five was adapted from the work of Yogev and Brett (1985).

Again, it must be noted that the index items selected for this study did not exactly replicate the family orientation and commitment scales developed in earlier research efforts because the survey instruments from which those scales were constructed generally focused on female respondents who occupied career type positions. Thus, the same modifications were made to the family commitment items as were made to the work commitment items.

The family commitment index was constructed using the same procedure that had been used with the work commitment index. An individual's responses on the items were summed, and then divided by the number of items used. The one difference pertained to the way non-respondentss were handled. Since there were five items in this index, any respondent who had answered three or more of the items was included in the analysis. In other words, any respondent for whom information was missing on three or more of the items was excluded from the analysis.

c. Combined Work and Family Commitment Index

Once indices to measure both work and family commitment had been developed, it was necessary to combine the indices to form an indicator of commitment to both work and family. To accomplish this step in a way which would facilitate the testing of the hypotheses, the scores of each respondent on the two indices -- work commitment and family commitment -- were dichotomized to differentiate between high and low levels of commitment on the two indices. This was accomplished by dividing each
index at its midpoint. The scores for the work commitment index ranged from 1.00 to 4.75, with the former representing the individuals most committed to their work. Consequently, scores of 1.00 to 2.33 were assigned a label of high work commitment and scores of 2.34 to 4.75 were assigned a label of low work commitment. The scores for the family commitment index ranged from 1.00 to 4.60, with the former representing the individuals most committed to their family. High family commitment was assigned to scores of 1.00 to 3.40, and scores of 3.41 to 4.60 were designated low family commitment.

To create the combined work and family commitment indicator, commitment scores from both the work and family commitment indices were combined and assigned a value. A value of 2 indicated a level of high commitment to both work and family. Similarly, values of work and family commitment assigned a label of low were combined and assigned a value of 0, which indicated a level of low commitment to both work and family. Finally, cases where an individual exhibited high commitment to either work or family, but not to both, were assigned a value of 1, which indicated a moderate level of commitment to both work and family.

3. Number of Roles Indicator Construction

In order to test the research hypotheses, the respondents had to be differentiated in terms of the number of work and family roles each performed. Given the requirements of the analyses to be performed, the decision was made to develop a categorization scheme which combined both the work characteristics and the family life characteristics of the respondent and estimated the number of roles each respondent performed.
In constructing the categorization scheme, three components -- work status, marital status, and parental status -- were considered. The manner in which each factor contributed to the scheme is discussed next.

a. Work Status

For the purpose of this study, there were two crucial characteristics of work status -- employment and nature of the occupation. It was a simple matter to classify respondents as either employed, or unemployed. It was assumed for this study that employed persons hold more work roles than a non-employed person.

The second characteristic was the nature of the occupation. Clearly, occupations vary in terms of the number of roles to be performed as a part of the job. One way of differentiating between occupations with a large role repertoire and those which do not is to distinguish between professional/career and non-professional/non-career type occupations. Occupations considered to be professional/career are thought to be the most demanding in terms of expertise and obligations (i.e., numbers of roles which must be performed as a function of the occupation), while non-professional/non-career occupations are regarded as the least demanding.

The reasoning behind this assumption is based on the definition of profession/career. A professional/career occupation is one which requires at least a four-year college degree and is structured so that there exists a hierarchical job sequence through which an occupant may
pass (Wilensky, 1978:554). Non-professional/non-career occupations are defined as those which require no higher education training and which are not structured in a manner which allows the occupant to "climb the corporate ladder".

While there is no set categorical scheme for differentiating between professional/career and non-professional/non-career occupations, a common strategy employed is to assign professional and managerial occupations to the professional/career category, and all other occupations to the non-professional/non-career category (see, for example, Spain and Nock, 1984). That strategy was employed here.

Using the occupational classification distribution listing which appeared in the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) General Social Surveys 1972-84 Cumulative Codebook (Davis and Smith, 1983), individuals reporting they were unemployed, retired, a student, or a housewife or househusband were coded as unemployed. Individuals who reported their occupation as accountant, architect, computer specialist, engineer, farm management adviser, forester or conservationist, home management advisor, lawyer, judge, librarian, archivist, curator, mathematical specialist, life and physical scientist, physician, dentist or other related practitioners, nurse, dietician, or therapist, health technologist and technician, religious worker, social scientist, social and recreation worker, teacher (any level), engineering and science technician, writer, artist, entertainer, managers and administrator (including farm or ranch owners/managers), or military officer were coded as professional/career workers. All individuals reporting
occupations of sales, clerical and kindred workers, office machine operators, secretaries, craftsmen and kindred workers, mechanic or repairman, operative, laborer, or service worker, including private household, or military, nonofficer were coded as non-professional, non-career workers. Any individuals reporting they were employed, but who did not list an occupation was also placed in this category.

b. Family Status

Like work status, family status is made up of two key characteristics -- marital status and parental status. In this particular study all respondents were married. Respondents were also categorized as either a parent or non-parent. Based upon an analysis of the literature on work and family role conflict, it was assumed that marital and family characteristics would provide an adequate, although somewhat rough, indicator of the number of familial roles held by an individual. Based upon this assumption, married couples with no children at home were assumed to have fewer role obligations than married couples with children living at home.

c. Number of Roles Indicator

Considering the role obligations incurred as a function of work, marriage, and parenting status, six mutually exclusive categories were established. These categories, in descending order of the number of roles performed, were: (1) Married, with at least one child at home, with a career-type occupation, (2) Married, with at least one child at home, with a job (no career), (3) Married, with at least one child at home, currently unemployed, (4) Married, with no children at home, with
a career-type occupation, (5) Married, with no children at home, with a job, and (6) Married, with no children at home, currently unemployed.

4. Role Conflict Indicators

The final set of information necessary to test the hypotheses pertained to role conflict as experienced by the respondent. Although efforts were undertaken to develop such an index, they proved fruitless. No specific set of items met the criteria employed here for the development of an index. Because the development of an index was not possible, the decision was made to select individual items which best indicated perceptions of role conflict between work and family. The following criteria were used for that selection process. First, the item had to be non-sexist. This eliminated all questions which dealt only with the role conflict perceived by women who attempt to combine work and family. Second, the item must specifically reference possible conflicts between marriage and/or family life, and work. Third, each item selected as an indicator must have been used in prior research as an indicator of perceived role conflict. And finally, information for each of the items must have been coded for a majority of the respondents.

Eight variables met the standards imposed by the aforementioned criteria. These indicators are: (1) "It is possible for a husband and wife to take advantage of career opportunities AND have a successful marriage at the same time", (2) "I delayed marriage in order to establish myself professionally", (3) "I delayed having children until I was established professionally", (4) "I chose not to pursue a CAREER
in order to meet the needs of my family", (5) "My work has made me a better spouse than I would have been otherwise", (6) "My work has made me a better parent than I would have been otherwise", (7) "My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family", (8) "My work has suffered due to the responsibilities I have as a parent".

Items one, two, and three are adapted from similar items appearing in research published by Pendleton, Poloma and Garland (1980, 1982) and Yogev and Brett (1985). Items four, five, and six were adapted from the work of Pendleton, Poloma and Garland (1980) alone, while items seven and eight were adapted from the work of Yogev and Brett (1985).

C. Summary

With the creation of the necessary indices and indicators, it was now possible to move ahead with the test of the two hypotheses. The results of that test are presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA

As stated earlier, the purpose of this research is to test two hypotheses pertaining to role conflict between work and family role-sets. In this chapter, both the testing of those hypotheses and the results of those tests are described.

A. Statistical Techniques of Analysis

While both tests of significance and correlation coefficients were employed in the initial stages of the research, the actual tests of the hypotheses require only tests of statistical significance. Therefore, for the purposes of this research, chi-square tests of significance (a= .05) were used to evaluate the validity of the two hypotheses. Gamma correlation coefficients were employed as a means of estimating the strength of relationships found to be statistically significant.

B. Sample Characteristics

Before describing the results of the analysis of data it is desirable that the basic demographic characteristics of the sample be described. Following is a description of the sample in terms of such characteristics as sex, age, educational attainment, personal income level, and family income level.

1. Sex of Respondents

The respondents were almost evenly split between males and females. Of the 733 total married respondents, 382 were female (52.1 percent) and 351 were male (47.9 percent).
2. Age of Respondents

The cumulative age range for all married respondents was twenty years to seventy-seven years of age. Median age for the sample as a whole was fifty years. The age range among female respondents included in the sample was twenty years to sixty-nine years of age. The median age for females was fifty-one. Male respondents ranged in age from twenty to seventy-seven, with the median age being forty-eight.

3. Educational Attainment of Respondents

The majority of the sample had attended at least some college (156 respondents, or 21.3 percent of the sample). The specific breakdown for educational attainment follows. Seventeen respondents (2.3 percent of the sample) had attended one to eight years of grade school. Eleven (1.5 percent) had attended some high school, while one hundred forty-one (19.2 percent) had either graduated from high school or passed the G.E.D. exam. Seventy-three (10 percent) of the sample indicated they had graduated from a trade or vocational school, while one hundred eighty (24.6 percent) had graduated from college with a bachelor's degree. An additional eighty-seven (11.9 percent) had received a master's degree at the time of the survey, and sixty-four (8.7 percent) had earned a Ph.D. or other professional degree.

There was no great variation from this pattern at lower educational levels when the results were broken out by sex. However, at upper educational levels, male respondents were more likely to have completed college and gone on to earn a graduate degree than were female respondents. The range of responses, by sex, follows.
Among female respondents, eight (2.1 percent) had attended one to eight years of grade school only. The number was nine (2.6 percent) for males. Three females (0.8 percent) and eight males (2.3 percent) had attended only some high school, while eighty-seven females (22.8 percent) and fifty-four males (15.4 percent) had only a high school degree or its equivalent. Forty-four females (11.5 percent) and twenty-nine males (8.3 percent) had graduated from a trade or vocational school. An additional ninety-two females (24.1 percent) and sixty-four males (18.2 percent) had attended college, while one hundred one females (26.4 percent) and seventy-nine males (22.5 percent) had graduated from college with a bachelor's degree. Finally, thirty-eight females (9.9 percent) and forty-nine males (14.0 percent) had a master's degree, and seven females (0.5 percent) and fifty-seven males (16.2 percent) had earned a Ph.D. or other professional degree.

4. Personal Income

The median personal income level for the sample as a whole was $10,000 to $19,999 per annum. This level was slightly higher than that for South Dakota as a whole. The per capita income for the average South Dakota wage earner in 1985 was $8,553. The national per capita income figure for the same time period was $10,797 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988). Broken out by income level, the results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,999</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When personal income is broken out by sex, a tremendous earnings differential appears. The median personal income for women was less than $9,999 per annum, while the median personal income level among male respondents included in the sample was $20,000 to $29,999. This compares favorably to the median income level for South Dakota.

According to a research report prepared by Dr. Linda Baer and Dr. Ronald Stover, professors in the Rural Sociology Department at South Dakota State University, the median earnings for a male worker in South Dakota in 1980 was $11,281, while the median earnings for a female worker in 1980 was $5,449 (Baer and Stover, 1988). It is likely that the higher median income level found among male respondents included in the sample can be directly traced to the number of professionals employed by South Dakota State University, and to the number of male respondents employed in relatively high paying "industrial" jobs in the Brookings area.

The income distribution, by sex, follows. Among female respondents included in the sample, the following personal income distribution was found.

Less than $9,999 - 194 respondents (54.8 percent)
$10,000 - $19,999 - 104 respondents (29.4 percent)
$20,000 - $29,999 - 45 respondents (12.7 percent)
$30,000 - $39,999 - 7 respondents (2.0 percent)
$40,000 - $49,999 - 3 respondents (0.8 percent)
$50,000 - $59,999 - 1 respondent (0.3 percent)
$60,000 + - 0 respondents

The income distribution among male respondents was much more top-heavy than for female respondents. The income distribution for male respondents is reproduced below.
5. **Family Income Level of Respondents**

The median family income level for all respondents was $30,000 to $39,999. This compares to a median income level of $32,400 nationally, and $24,800 in South Dakota during the same time period (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1988). When broken out by income level, the following results were obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,999</td>
<td>45 respondents</td>
<td>(12.8 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>82 respondents</td>
<td>(23.4 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>99 respondents</td>
<td>(28.2 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>63 respondents</td>
<td>(17.9 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>19 respondents</td>
<td>(5.4 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>9 respondents</td>
<td>(2.6 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>6 respondents</td>
<td>(1.7 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>9 respondents</td>
<td>(2.6 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **Research Findings**

Briefly restated, the two hypotheses to be tested are:

**Scarcity Hypothesis:** The greater the number of roles to be performed by an individual, the greater the likelihood that the individual will report a perceived conflict among and between roles.

**Expansion Hypothesis:** The lower the level of commitment to the roles held by an individual, the greater the likelihood that the individual will report a perceived conflict among and between roles to which the individual is over-committed and under-committed.
Conversely, the higher the level of commitment to the roles to be performed, the less likely it is that the individual will report feelings of role conflict.

1. Test of the Scarcity Hypothesis

The scarcity hypothesis was tested by crosstabulating the number of roles held by an individual (indexed as either a "high" number of roles or a "low" number of roles) with the indicators of role conflict. The logic of the scarcity approach requires that there be a positive relationship between these two variables. Presented in Table 1 are the results of this analysis.

As can be seen in the data presented in Table 1, only one of the eight role conflict indicators is positively associated with the number of roles indicator. Four of the eight indicators were not statistically significantly related (at the p=.05 level) with the number of roles indicator, while the remaining three indicators were inversely related to the number of roles indicator. It is apparent, then, that there is little, if any, evidence supporting the scarcity hypothesis, and there is much evidence contradicting it.

While the scarcity approach did not explain the role conflict experienced by the respondents as a group, it was necessary to consider the possibility that gender differences were being masked. It may be, for example, the scarcity approach would apply to females, but not to males. Consequently, sex of respondents was introduced as a control variable. (See Tables 2 and 3.) The results of the crosstabulations were even more striking than were those in Table 1. Not one variable
Table 1. SIGNIFICANCE AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED FROM CROSSTABULATION OF THE ROLE CONFLICT INDICATOR WITH NUMBER OF ROLES INDICATOR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p &gt; .05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothcrmg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.
Bothcrmg - Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
Delaymar - Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
Delaykid - Delayed having children until established professionally
Nocareer - Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
Betspse - My work has made me a better spouse
Betparet - My work has made me a better parent
Awayfam - My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
Wrksufr - My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p &gt; .05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothcrmg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.
Bothcrmg = Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
Delaymar = Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
Delaykid = Delayed having children until established professionally
Nocareer = Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
Betspse = My work has made me a better spouse
Betparet = My work has made me a better parent
Awayfam = My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
Wrksufr = My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
**Table 3. SIGNIFICANCE AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED FROM CROSSTABULATION OF THE ROLE CONFLICT INDICATOR WITH NUMBER OF ROLES INDICATOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p≤.05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p≤.05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p&gt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothcrmg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.**
- Bothcrmg - Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
- Delaymar - Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
- Delaykid - Delayed having children until established professionally
- Nocareer - Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
- Betspse - My work has made me a better spouse
- Betparet - My work has made me a better parent
- Awayfam - My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
- Wrksufr - My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
indicator, for either sex, supported the scarcity hypothesis. This result provides additional confirmation that the scarcity hypothesis is not valid.

Finally, both level of education (i.e. less than a college degree and college graduate) and income level were introduced as control variables. The results of this analysis indicated that any relationship between these variables is purely spurious.

2. Test of the Expansion Hypothesis

As discussed in Chapter II, the logic of the expansion hypothesis implies that it is not the number of roles which is the most crucial determinant of the perception of role conflict. Rather, it is the level of commitment to the roles an individual performs. Those people highly committed to their roles will find both the time and energy to perform all their roles, while those not highly committed will not. It is these latter individuals who will perceive high levels of role conflict.

It follows, then, that a test of the expansion hypothesis should not focus on the number of roles to be performed. Rather, it should focus on the level of commitment to the roles to be performed. If, independent of the number of roles to be performed, low perceived role conflict is associated with high commitment to the roles, the expansion hypothesis will have received strong support. The absence of that association will constitute evidence that the expansion hypothesis is not valid.

Presented in Table 4 is information pertinent to the first stage
Table 4. SIGNIFICANCE AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED FROM CROSSTABULATION OF THE ROLE CONFLICT INDICATOR WITH LEVEL OF COMMITMENT INDICATOR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p &gt; .05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothcrmg</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.
Bothcrmg - Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
Delaymar - Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
Delaykid - Delayed having children until established professionally
Nocareer - Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
Betspse - My work has made me a better spouse
Betparet - My work has made me a better parent
Awayfam - My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
Wrksufr - My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
in the test of the expansion hypothesis. Summarized in Table 4 are the results of the crosstabulations between the eight role conflict indicators and the level of commitment to work and family roles (indexes as high, medium, and low levels of commitment).

As can be seen from an inspection of Table 4, five of the crosstabulations are in the expected direction, none are in the opposite direction, and three are not statistically significant. The Gamma values between the dependent and independent variables indicate a moderate level of correlation exists between these variables.

As was done for the test of the scarcity hypothesis, sex was introduced as a control variable in the test of the expansion hypothesis. Again, the results of this analysis are informative. For married females (see Table 5), there is support for the expansion hypothesis since four of the crosstabulations are both statistically significant and demonstrate a moderate-to-strong correlation. However, among male respondents (see Table 6), no statistically significant relationship was found. Clearly, this calls into question the validity of the expansion hypothesis, at least in terms of its applicability to both sexes.

One final test of the expansion hypothesis was performed. This last test introduced the number of roles indicator as a control factor in the relationship between the level of commitment and extent of perceived role conflict. If the expansion hypothesis is correct, the relationship between these two factors should not be affected. If it is invalid, the relationship will be diminished, if not entirely
Table 5. SIGNIFICANCE AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED FROM CROSSTABULATION OF THE ROLE CONFLICT INDICATOR BY LEVEL OF COMMITMENT INDICATOR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p &gt; .05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothcrmg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.
Bothcrmg - Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
Delaymar - Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
Delaykid - Delayed having children until established professionally
Nocareer - Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
Betspse - My work has made me a better spouse
Betparet - My work has made me a better parent
Awayfam - My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
Wrksufr - My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
Table 6. SIGNIFICANCE AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED FROM CROSSTABULATION OF ROLE CONFLICT INDICATOR BY LEVEL OF COMMITMENT INDICATOR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p &gt; .05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothcrmg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.
Bothcrmg = Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
Delaymar = Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
Delaykid = Delayed having children until established professionally
Nocareer = Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
Betspse = My work has made me a better spouse
Betparet = My work has made me a better parent
Awayfam = My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
Wrksufr = My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
Presented in Tables 7 and 8 are the results of this test. There is support for the expansion hypothesis among respondents with a high number of roles and who exhibit a high level of commitment to those roles (see Table 7). Four of the eight role conflict indicators demonstrate a statistically significant relationship in the expected direction. The remaining four are not statistically significant. However, none of the indicators exhibit a relationship in the direction opposite that predicted.

The results of the crosstabulations for respondents with few roles and a low level of commitment to at least one of the role-sets contained in their positions as worker, spouse and/or parent offer only minimal support for the expansion hypothesis. (See Table 8.) Six of the eight role conflict indicators are not statistically significantly related to level of commitment, when number of roles is added as a control factor. The remaining two indicators indicate a relationship in the predicted direction.

Again, when education and family income level were introduced as control variables, no significant relationships were found.

D. **Summary**

The results for the tests of the two hypotheses are at the same time both ambiguous and informative. On the one hand, there is virtually no support for the scarcity hypothesis. Clearly, this result calls into question the validity of the scarcity approach as the one and only explanation for the role conflict between work and family roles
Table 7. SIGNIFICANCE AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED FROM CROSSTABULATION OF THE ROLE CONFLICT INDICATOR BY LEVEL OF COMMITMENT INDICATOR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p&lt;.05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p&lt;.05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p&gt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothcmg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.
Bothcmg = Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
Delaymar = Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
Delaykid = Delayed having children until established professionally
Nocareer = Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
Betspse = My work has made me a better spouse
Betparet = My work has made me a better parent
Awayfam = My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
Wrksufr = My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
### Table 8. Significance and Correlation Coefficients Obtained from Crosstabulation of the Role Conflict Indicator with Level of Commitment Indicator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Role Conflict Indicator**</th>
<th>Relationship in Predicted Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Relationship in Opposite Direction (p ≤ .05)</th>
<th>Non-significant Relationship (p &gt; .05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothcrmg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaymar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaykid</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocareer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betspse</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betparet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awayfam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrksufr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gamma values are provided for statistically significant relationships. They are listed without signs, as some variables with a negative sign indicated support for the hypothesis, due to the wording of the question.

**The following are abridged versions of the survey questions.

- Bothcrmg = Possible to successfully combine career and marriage
- Delaymar = Delayed marriage to establish self professionally
- Delaykid = Delayed having children until established professionally
- Nocareer = Chose not to pursue a career in order to meet family needs
- Betspse = My work has made me a better spouse
- Betparet = My work has made me a better parent
- Awayfam = My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family
- Wrksufr = My work has suffered due to my parental responsibility
reported by many dual-income families.

On the other hand, the results of the tests of the expansion hypothesis provide some qualified support for the hypothesis. While the expansion hypothesis received support from the results for female respondents, it received no support from the results for male respondents. And while the results for respondents with a high number of roles provides some validity for the expansion hypothesis, the results for respondents with few roles are generally inconclusive. Clearly, acceptance of the expansion approach to role conflict is contingent upon further investigation of the conditional support given by the data employed in this study. Assuming, for the moment, the data are valid, it is necessary to ask a) why the expansion hypothesis received support from the data for female respondents, but not the male respondents, and b) why the expansion hypothesis received support from those respondents with a high number of roles but not from those with a low number of roles. These questions will be explored in the next chapter.
A. Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study is quite straightforward, yet theoretically profound. The objective of the research has been to test two diametrically opposed approaches to role theory which propose to explain the nature of the perceived conflict reported by individuals who hold the positions of worker, and spouse and/or parent. The first of these two -- the scarcity approach -- asserts that the more roles to be performed by an actor, the greater the potential for conflict between those roles, either within or between role-sets. The level of commitment to those roles is, for the most part, considered to be irrelevant.

The second approach -- the expansion approach -- argues that it is the level of commitment to the roles to be performed, regardless of the number of roles to be performed, that determines whether or not a conflict between roles either within or between role-sets is felt. In cases where there is a perceived conflict between roles, expansion theorists hypothesize that the cause of the role conflict is not an actual lack of time, but a lack of commitment. As noted earlier, "abundant energy is 'found' for anything to which we are highly committed, and we often feel more energetic after having done it". Conversely, little energy is found "for anything to which we are uncommitted" (Marks, 1977:927).

Interestingly, neither of these approaches have been subjected to empirical test. This research provides such a test. The results of the tests of the research hypotheses derived from these two
approaches are also quite straightforward. There was no support for the scarcity hypothesis, even when sex was introduced into the analysis as a control variable. Thus hypothesis one was rejected.

There was, however, some support for the expansion hypothesis. While the results provided moderate support when the sample was considered as a whole, when sex was introduced as a control variable, the expansion hypothesis was supported only for women. It appears, then, that the expansion approach provides a viable explanation for the perceived role conflict experienced by females, but not for males. However, it is possible that the nature of questions asked about role conflict was inherently biased towards the performance of female roles. If so, this bias could mask the role conflict experienced by males in the performance of traditionally male roles -- such as upkeep and repair of the house and yard, and vehicles -- and could explain why no statistically significant relationship was found between role conflict and level of commitment to work and family roles.

The results were also mixed when the number of roles held by respondents was introduced as a control variable. Support for the expansion hypothesis was found only among respondents performing many roles. Among respondents with few roles, it is possible that the lack of roles to be enacted by the actor invalidates the indicators of role conflict and commitment utilized in this study. It would be difficult to measure conflict between roles when not all of the roles are performed. It is also difficult to measure level of commitment to roles which are not performed. This is a question which merits additional
study.

B. Implications of the Study

From a theoretical standpoint, this study is important for two reasons. First, the rejection of the scarcity hypothesis has profound theoretical implications for the continued research of the perceived conflict between work and family role-sets. It can no longer be legitimately assumed that it is only a lack of time which creates this discord between the role-sets of different positions held by an actor. The support for the expansion hypothesis, particularly for women and those performing many roles, indicates that greater emphasis should be placed on examining and understanding the mechanisms which create the conflict experienced by individuals performing both work and family roles. Second, from a practical standpoint, the results of this research are significant. Many researchers are currently offering "solutions" to the conflict between work and family role-sets based upon their acceptance of the scarcity approach. Job modification solutions such as flex-time, reduced hours, and job-sharing have all been offered as ways of curtailing the time crunch. And while these solutions may be perfectly acceptable for people who are more committed to performing familial roles and who do not need the additional income provided by a full-time job, they are simply not workable for people highly committed to work roles (no matter what the level of commitment to family roles).

Other types of solutions based upon the scarcity approach are also problematic. One example is the current emphasis on "time management". This development is especially ominous, for it allows
society to blame the individual for the conflict created by society's demand for high levels of commitment to both work and family. It is a blame the victim tactic since it implies that if the individual were more organized or more efficient he or she would not have any problems handling both work and family roles.

C. Limitations of the Study

This study is limited, as are many, if not all studies in this area, by the nature of the questions which ask respondents to ascertain levels of commitment and role conflict. One problem is the high level of gender bias built into the questionnaires. The vast majority of studies focus almost exclusively upon women, because it has been assumed that it is women who experience the greatest degree of conflict between work and family role-sets. Many studies have, at least inadvertently, supported this assumption. Why? Because the studies focus primarily on child care and household maintenance roles, roles traditionally held by women.

Researchers should be asking themselves what would happen if men were asked if they experienced a conflict between performing work roles and spending time with their children? Or between spending time with their wife or their children? Or between spending time with their wife or their children or maintaining the grounds to their home? Or maintaining the house? Or working on the car? If men were asked questions of this nature, it might be found that they experience a greater degree of conflict between work and family roles than current research indicates. These are the types of questions which must be
addressed in future research.

A second limitation of this study is its narrow geographic focus. Budget constraints mandated that this study focus on people residing in Brookings, SD. However, there was nothing in the frequency counts of the data to indicate that the Brookings population is non-representative of the population at large.

A third limitation arises from the use of a questionnaire. A questionnaire does not easily allow the researcher to probe for information about the distribution of roles among family members, nor the level of performance and commitment to those roles. Future examinations of the expansion hypothesis may benefit greatly from implementation of interview research, which might best probe for the information current questionnaires are unable to provide adequately.

D. Recommendations for Future Research

Given the shortcomings of the research to date, future research efforts should be directed at (1) providing additional tests of the expansion approach, and (2) overcoming the gender bias implicit in current research instruments. Until these shortcomings are addressed, and addressed adequately, the research findings to date must be viewed with great caution, and any generalizations drawn from them must not be accepted uncritically. And if the findings of this study are replicated and substantiated by other researchers, we may have to completely rethink our positions on why work and family conflict occurs, and how best to handle it.
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WORK AND FAMILY: A QUESTION OF PRIORITIES

Introduction

The American family is changing. In the past, husbands were employed outside the home and wives worked in the home. Today, in nearly fifty percent of all marriages, both husbands and wives are employed outside the home. Thus, these two-earner couples make up an important new type of family.

While there are many advantages to this new type of family, there are also new challenges. The purpose of this questionnaire is to help us understand how two-earner couples feel about their families and their work, and to understand how they are adjusting to the new challenges.

We would like to begin by asking for your opinion about combining a career and a family. For these questions a CAREER is defined as uninterrupted, full-time work with a high degree of commitment and desire for success.

**PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF YOUR RESPONSE.**

1. It is possible for a husband and wife to take advantage of career opportunities AND have a successful marriage at the same time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Married career women have the best of two worlds: professional employment combined with a full family life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. It is possible for a husband and wife to work in separate cities to maximize career possibilities AND have a successful marriage at the same time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Most single career women have greater opportunities to succeed than do married career women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In case of conflicting demands, the primary responsibilities of a career woman are to her husband and children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. If a career woman's husband feels threatened by her career, she should minimize her career achievements in order not to endanger their marriage.

7. I would recommend that any young woman considering a career complete her professional training before marriage.

8. Please indicate the age of each of your children in the space provided. IF NONE, WRITE "0".

9. How many of your children CURRENTLY live at home? IF NONE, WRITE "0".

10. Do you plan to have any (or more) children?

1 ... YES (IF YES) How many? ______
2 ... NO

11. Were you employed outside the home before you were married?

1 ... YES
2 ... NO

12. Were you employed outside the home after you married?

1 ... YES
2 ... NO

13. Did you reduce the number of hours you worked outside your home after you had children?

1 ... NO, NEVER HAD CHILDREN
2 ... NO, WORKED MORE HOURS PER WEEK
3 ... NO, WORKED SAME NUMBER OF HOURS (____ hours per week)
4 ... YES, WORKED FEWER HOURS PER WEEK
5 ... YES, QUIT WORKING
THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE GROUPED ACCORDING TO YOUR CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL STATUS. IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY IN THE LABOR FORCE (THAT IS, WORKING FOR PAY), PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 14-19. IF NOT, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 20 ON PAGE 4.

FOR PERSONS CURRENTLY IN THE WORK FORCE:

14. IF YOU QUIT YOUR JOB TO HAVE CHILDREN, ANSWER THIS QUESTION: How old was your youngest child when you returned to the work force?

_________ YEARS OLD

15. IF YOU QUIT YOUR JOB TO HAVE CHILDREN, ANSWER THIS QUESTION: How many hours per week did you work when you first returned to the work force?

_________ HOURS PER WEEK

16. What is your current job title? Please include all job titles you currently hold.


17. Briefly describe the duties of your job(s).


18. Including all of your jobs, how many hours per week do you work?

_________ HOURS PER WEEK

19. Is your occupation now different from your occupation when your children were of pre-school age?

1 ... YES
2 ... NO
3 ... HAVE NO CHILDREN

IF YOU ANSWERED NO, OR HAVE NO CHILDREN, SKIP FROM HERE TO QUESTION 21 ON PAGE 4.

19a. If your occupation was different than the one you have now, briefly describe the TITLE and DUTIES of your former job:


(NOW GO TO QUESTION 21, PAGE 4)
QUESTIONS FOR PERSONS NOT IN THE WORK FORCE:

20. Do you plan to re-enter the work force?

1 ... YES
2 ... NO

IF YOU DO NOT PLAN TO RETURN TO THE WORKFORCE SKIP FROM HERE TO QUESTION 48 ON PAGE 8

20a. Approximately how old will your youngest child be at the time you re-enter the work force?

_______ YEARS OLD

20b. When you re-enter the work force, how many hours would you like to work?

_______ HOURS PER WEEK

THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS FOR YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT YOUR WORK.
PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF YOUR RESPONSE.

21. I would be a less fulfilled person without my experience of work.

1          2          3          4          5
STRONGLY AGREE       AGREE       NEITHER AGREE       DISAGREE       STRONGLY DISAGREE

22. I view my work more as a job than as a career.

1          2          3          4          5
STRONGLY AGREE       AGREE       NEITHER AGREE       DISAGREE       STRONGLY DISAGREE

23. I will stay overtime to finish a job related task, even if I am not paid for it.

1          2          3          4          5
STRONGLY AGREE       AGREE       NEITHER AGREE       DISAGREE       STRONGLY DISAGREE

24. It is important for me to get a job in which there is opportunity for promotion and advancement.

1          2          3          4          5
STRONGLY AGREE       AGREE       NEITHER AGREE       DISAGREE       STRONGLY DISAGREE

25. I would keep working in my present job even if I didn't need the money.

1          2          3          4          5
STRONGLY AGREE       AGREE       NEITHER AGREE       DISAGREE       STRONGLY DISAGREE
26. It is important for my satisfaction in life to have a job or
career that brings recognition and prestige from others.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
AGREE NOR DISAGREE

27. My work is as important to me as my spouse's work is to her/him.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
AGREE NOR DISAGREE

28. If I were to RECEIVE an exceptional job offer in a distant city,
I would not accept it unless my spouse was able to get a
suitable position.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
AGREE NOR DISAGREE

29. If I were to ACCEPT an exceptional job offer in a distant city,
I would not expect my spouse to accompany me unless he/she was
sure of a suitable position.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
AGREE NOR DISAGREE

30. If my SPOUSE were to ACCEPT an exceptional job offer in a
distant city, I would not accompany him/her unless I was sure
of a suitable position for myself.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
AGREE NOR DISAGREE

THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS ABOUT THE DIVISION OF LABOR WITHIN
YOUR HOUSEHOLD. PLEASE ANSWER AS IF YOU WERE CURRENTLY REARING YOUR
CHILDREN. IF YOU HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 36
ON PAGE 6.

CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF YOUR RESPONSE.

31. Although my spouse may assist me, the responsibility for
domestic, childcare, and entertaining tasks is primarily mine.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
AGREE NOR DISAGREE

32. I take more responsibility for meeting the daily needs of our
children than does my spouse.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
AGREE NOR DISAGREE
33. My work prevents me from attending all of my child's activities.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

34. I spend as much time doing things with my children as my non-working friends and neighbors.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

35. If my child is sick, I am more likely to stay home with him/her than is my spouse.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

36. I delayed marriage in order to establish myself professionally.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

37. I delayed having children until I was established professionally.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

38. I married someone who was willing to take primary responsibility for the family, allowing me more time for my work.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

39. I married someone with work aspirations similar to mine.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

40. I chose not to pursue a CAREER in order to meets the needs of my family.

1 2 3 4 5
STRONGLY AGREE NEITHER AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE
THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS FOR YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT HOW YOUR JOB AFFECTS YOUR FAMILY.

41. My work has made me a better spouse than I would have been otherwise.

1  2  3  4  5
STONGLY AGREE  NEITHER AGREE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE           NOR DISAGREE              DISAGREE

PLEASE ANSWER THE NEXT QUESTIONS AS IF YOU WERE REARING YOUR CHILDREN. IF YOU HAVE NO CHILDREN, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 48 ON PAGE 8. OTHERWISE, ANSWER THE REST OF THE QUESTIONS ON THIS PAGE.

42. My work has made me a better parent than I would have been otherwise.

1  2  3  4  5
STONGLY AGREE  NEITHER AGREE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE           NOR DISAGREE              DISAGREE

43. I would feel less fulfilled if I did not have a family.

1  2  3  4  5
STONGLY AGREE  NEITHER AGREE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE           NOR DISAGREE              DISAGREE

44. My work requires me to spend a great deal of time away from my family.

1  2  3  4  5
STONGLY AGREE  NEITHER AGREE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE           NOR DISAGREE              DISAGREE

45. My work has suffered due to the responsibilities I have as a parent.

1  2  3  4  5
STONGLY AGREE  NEITHER AGREE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE           NOR DISAGREE              DISAGREE

46. I have cut back on my work involvement in order to meet the needs of my family.

1  2  3  4  5
STONGLY AGREE  NEITHER AGREE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE           NOR DISAGREE              DISAGREE

47. I have had to limit the amount of time I spend on family activities.

1  2  3  4  5
STONGLY AGREE  NEITHER AGREE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE           NOR DISAGREE              DISAGREE
THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS ABOUT YOUR SATISFACTION WITH YOUR WORK AND FAMILY SITUATION.

48. How does your SPOUSE'S work influence your marital relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NEITHER BENEFICIAL HARMFUL</td>
<td>HARFUL</td>
<td>VERY HARMFUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. How happy are you with your marriage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY HAPPY</td>
<td>NEITHER HAPPY UNHAPPY</td>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>UNHAPPY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. If I had it to do over again, I would choose to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MARRY AND HAVE NO CHILDREN</td>
<td>NOT MARRY BUT HAVE CHILDREN</td>
<td>MARRY BUT HAVE NO CHILDREN</td>
<td>MARRY BUT HAVE FEWER CHILDREN THAN I HAVE NOW</td>
<td>MARRY AND HAVE THE SAME NUMBER OF CHILDREN I HAVE NOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. How important is your marriage to your satisfaction in life, IN COMPARISON TO YOUR JOB? My marriage is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE MOST IMPORTANT THING</td>
<td>MORE IMPORTANT THAN MY WORK</td>
<td>AS IMPORTANT AS MY WORK</td>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT THAN MY WORK</td>
<td>THE LEAST IMPORTANT THING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. What is the last year of school you completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 TO 8 YEARS</td>
<td>SOME HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR EQUIVALENT</td>
<td>TRADE OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOL</td>
<td>SOME COLLEGE</td>
<td>FOUR YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE</td>
<td>MASTER'S DEGREE</td>
<td>PH.D OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL DEGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. How many interruptions in your education have you had?

54. What was the reason(s) for the interruption(s)? IF NONE, LEAVE BLANK.
FINALLY, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF TO HELP INTERPRET THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY. WHERE APPROPRIATE, CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF YOUR ANSWER.

55. In what year were you born? ________________________

56. What is your sex?
   1 ... Female
   2 ... Male

57. What is your current marital status?
   1 ... MARRIED
   2 ... WIDOWED
   3 ... DIVORCED
   4 ... SEPARATED
   5 ... NEVER MARRIED

58. What was your total FAMILY income in 1985, before taxes?
   1 ... LESS THAN $9,999
   2 ... $10,000 TO $19,999
   3 ... $20,000 TO $29,999
   4 ... $30,000 TO $39,999
   5 ... $40,000 TO $49,999
   6 ... $50,000 TO $59,999
   7 ... $60,000 TO $69,999
   8 ... $70,000 TO $79,999
   9 ... $80,000 TO $89,999
   10 ... $90,000 TO $99,999
   11 ... $100,000 OR MORE

59. What was YOUR personal income in 1985, before taxes?
   1 ... LESS THAN $9,999
   2 ... $10,000 TO $19,999
   3 ... $20,000 TO $29,999
   4 ... $30,000 TO $39,999
   5 ... $40,000 TO $49,999
   6 ... $50,000 TO $59,999
   7 ... $60,000 TO $69,999
   8 ... $70,000 TO $79,999
We would like to give you the opportunity to add your own comments to this questionnaire. We are interested in any additional information you wish to share with us. Please use the space below to make your comments.

Also, please indicate whether you would like to obtain a copy of the results. If you wish a summary, please write your name and return address ON THE BACK OF THE RETURN ENVELOPE (NOT on this survey). We will see that you get a summary.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.