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INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade an increasing number of married women are working outside the home. Data compiled by the U.S. Department of Commerce (1981) have shown a remarkable increase in married working women, from 36.4% of female workers being married in 1940 to 59.9% of female workers being married in 1980. 1980 reports have shown that a record number of wives are contributing significantly to their families' economic welfare (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1981). In addition, the 1970's have seen an upward surge in the rate of mothers with children under age 18 who have joined the labor force (Waldman, 1979). This has continued into the 1980's. Currently, 61.8% of wives in the work force have children 6 to 17 years of age, while 45% have children under 6 years of age (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1980a).

The reasons for this influx of married women into the labor force are many and varied. They include, among others, the growing socio-political status and role flexibility women are receiving as a consequence of the women's liberation movement (Hunt & Hunt, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1978a), as well as the desire for economic security during a period when such security is becoming increasingly more difficult to obtain (Bird, 1979; Mitchell, 1980). As a consequence of these conditions, two major types of work patterns have emerged: the dual-career family and the dual-worker family. Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) defined the difference between career and work in terms of the degree of personal commitment to employment (e.g., "jobs" are often taken for more purely economic reasons) and the continuity of employment (e.g.,
"jobs" typically lack clear developmental stages and accumulation of expertise, and are more prone to interruption). While research on both types of marital/work patterns has been quite sparse until relatively recently (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969, 1971), the majority of work done in this area has focused primarily on the dual-career pattern (e.g., Rice, 1979).

One reason for this appears to be the relatively unique nature of the dual-career lifestyle in terms of enhanced female economic and social status. Intrinsic in such a relationship is the potential for greater equity in the sharing of financial, domestic and childcare responsibilities. Until quite recently, such responsibilities have customarily fallen exclusively on wives (Garland, 1972; Holmstrom, 1972; Miller, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969, 1971; Rossi, 1969). A second reason for the greater focus on the dual-career situation may relate to the fact that much of the research in this area has been undertaken by individuals who are themselves part of a dual-career, as versus dual-worker, relationship. A third reason concerns the fact that the dual-career lifestyle brings with it some unique elements typically missing in the dual-worker relationship (or in those relationships in which one spouse has a career and the other works at a job). Such elements include conflicts over which career takes precedence at what times and adequate division of financial resources and capital (Hall & Hall, 1979; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Shaevitz & Shaevitz, 1979). These added stresses do appear to be offset, at least to some extent, by the potentially greater personal satisfaction derived by a career versus a job.
(Hopkins & White, 1978), the potential for earning a significantly greater combined wage, as well as the allocation of at least some (though typically not a major amount) of the domestic responsibilities to the husband (Beckann & Houser, 1979; Garland, 1972; Holmstrom, 1972).

Such benefits are typically not found in the dual-worker situation, where it is often the case that the wife is working because of economic necessity rather than by choice. The dual-worker situation has been found to be related to less satisfaction on the part of both partners in comparison with the dual-career arrangement (Klenke-Hamel, 1981; Staines, Pleck, Shephard & O'Connor, 1978). A number of other difficulties and constraints which do arise in the dual-career lifestyle, such as constraints on time and scheduling problems, also accompany dual-worker relationships (Lein et al., 1974). Given these potential problems, and the fact that the dual-worker pattern is far more numerous than the dual-career pattern, dual-worker families have become a relevant population for study. In point of fact, the two-worker family is on the verge of being the statistically dominant work pattern in the U.S. (Hayghe, 1976; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1978b; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1980b). Despite these large-scale demographic changes, research on dual-worker families remains limited.

Research on the Dual-Earner (i.e., Dual-Career and Dual-Worker) Family

While the number of studies focusing upon the dual-earner phenomenon has burgeoned within the past several years, the total amount of
research currently available is small (Klenke-Hamel & Kavanagh, 1981). The research has typically be of a sociological, correlational nature and, as mentioned earlier, has focused largely upon the dual-career pattern. Popular variables of interest have included job and marital satisfaction (Arnott, 1972; Bryson, Bryson, & Johnson, 1978; Bryson, Bryson, Licht, & Licht, 1976; Ridley, 1973; Rosen, Jerdee, & Prestwich, 1975), job-seeking experiences (Wallston et al., 1978), constraints of the dual-earner lifestyle (Hopkins & White, 1978; Rice, 1979), parenting attitudes and roles of dual-earner parents (Johnson & Johnson, 1977), and the psychological consequences of both spouses' educational and occupational status on dual-employment marriages (Burke & Weir, 1976; Hormung & McCullough, 1981; Rapoport, Rapoport, & Thiessen, 1974). A major finding that has emerged from this research is the increased amount of stress present in the dual-earner lifestyle (Bebbington, 1973; Holmstrom, 1972; Klenke-Hamel, 1981; Lubin, 1980).

Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) have identified several sources of stress which are intensified in the dual-earner situation. A major source of stress arises from the fact that dual-earner partners are required to perform a number of different roles for which they often do not have an adequate amount of time (Klenke-Hamel, 1981; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969, 1976; St. John-Parsons, 1978). Referred to as "work overload", it appears that this constraint affects dual-career and dual-worker couples alike. Work overload has been found to be particularly apparent for the woman. For instance, it has been found that working wives typically bear a disproportionate share of the burden for
housework and child care duties (Bryson et al., 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Schwartz & MacKenzie, 1977). This has been found to be the case even in dual-career marriages in which both partners are trained in a field (psychology) which is relatively accepting of the notion of male and female equality (Bryson et al., 1978).

It has been suggested that working women are often willing to accept non-traditional roles while their husbands are not (Hall & Hall, 1979). Garland (1972) and Paloma (1972) reported in their studies that in most cases marital adjustment for the couple was obtained by having the wife hold several jobs (e.g., career, household duties, childcare) while the husband held one. Many wives have reported dissatisfaction with this imbalance of role responsibilities, which causes a considerable drain on their time and energy (Hall & Hall, 1979; Klenke-Hamel, 1981).

Rapoport and Rapoport (1976) and others have stated that the degree of the wife's role overload, or inter-role conflict, depends upon a number of factors. These factors include the types of job demands the wife and her partner have, the couple's stage in the life cycle, number of children, the availability of domestic help and the couple's financial resources for purchasing such help, as well as the flexibility of the work schedules each partner has. For instance, if the wife is restricted to a 9 to 5 job, 5 days a week, with no options for more flexible scheduling of hours (e.g., flextime), inter-role conflict is more likely to arise (Klenke-Hamel, 1981). A major complaint reported by such working women is a general lack of time, compounded by a
lack of knowledge concerning ways of effectively managing that time (MacKenzie & Waldo, 1981; Silcox, 1980). Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) have suggested that effective time management is a critical factor in successful dual-earner relationships. It has been reported that time management difficulties in working wives often include a lack of experience in adequate organization and planning, goal-setting, problem-solving, and conflict resolution (Hall & Hall, 1979; Hopkins & White, 1978).

Another area of stress for the working wife stems from conflicts between what has been defined as the "traditional" woman's role in this society (i.e., the domestic, home-maker role), and her own, more deviant work/homemaker role (Klenke-Hamel, 1981). Such women have in the past reported feeling guilt and alienation for not conforming to the traditional female sex role (Epstein, 1971; Fogarty, Rapoport, & Rapoport, 1971; Hopkins & White, 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1977). In addition, they typically have had few societal models to turn to for guidance (Hopkins & White, 1978; Klenke-Hamel, 1981; Pospisil, 1976). More recently, working wives have had a new role model to contend with—that of the "superwoman" (MacKenzie & Waldo, 1981; Silcox, 1980). It has been suggested by several authors that the "superwoman" role model, with its emphasis on fulfilling all roles (e.g., worker, homemaker, mother) to perfection, has resulted in increased amounts of stress for the working wife (Shaevitz & Shaevitz, 1979; Silcox, 1980).

The attempt to fulfill several roles to perfection and the added stresses from the work environment itself, make the dual-earner
relationship a particularly stressful one for the wife (Pleck, 1977). In fact, it has been suggested that the increased risk of stress-related diseases such as heart disease (Hurst et al., 1976) in working women over the past 13 years may in part be a possible consequence of the dual-earner pattern (Klenke-Hamel & Kavanagh, 1981).

Another source of stress for dual-career couples identified by Rapoport and Rapoport (1969; 1976) is what they label as "social network dilemmas". Due to increased work/family role pressures, such couples often have less time for socializing, experiencing relatively restricted social lives compared to more traditional families (Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Klenke-Hamel, 1981; St. John-Parsons, 1978). Such a pattern has been suggested for dual-worker couples as well (Bird, 1979). Working couples also typically have several social networks to contend with. These networks spring out of each partner's work relationships as well as the network comprised of relatives and mutual friends (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976). As a result of these varied social networks, both partners have less time to spend in any one network. Often, a loosening of kinship ties is reported (St. John-Parsons, 1978). This situation may also create more stress and in addition result in insufficient "buffers" to deal with stress.

The Role of Social Support and Stress

The suggestion of a reduced amount of social support available to dual-earner families has important implications in terms of the stress generated by this lifestyle pattern. Recent research has investigated the possibility that an individual's interpersonal relationships (i.e.,
social supports) may help to "buffer" the individual from the pathogenic effects of stressful events (Andrews, Tennant, Hewson & Valliant, 1978; Boyce, 1981; Cobb, 1976; Dean & Lin, 1977). Cohen and McKay (1981), in their review of the research relevant to the buffering hypothesis, have pointed out the methodological limitations apparent in this body of literature. These include the inconsistent use of varying methods of data analysis in these studies, and the diversity of assessment devices used in measuring social support, stress and health outcomes. Taking these methodological shortcomings into account, there is actually little evidence for the efficacy of a broadly defined, unidimensional concept of social support in alleviating stress (Cohen, in press).

In contrast, Cohen and McKay (1981) reported a relatively consistent finding that an individual's perception of the availability of someone to talk to about one's problems (i.e., appraisal support) appeared to mitigate the negative health effects of stress. Self-esteem support (i.e., the amount of positive feedback available from the social environment) also appeared to be an effective buffer in two preliminary studies (Cohen & McKay, 1981). In contrast, tangible support (i.e., the delivery of material aid) was found to be an ineffective buffer in the several studies in which it was investigated (Paykel, Emms, Fletcher, & Rassaby, 1980; Schaefer, Coyne, & Lazarus, in press). Cohen and McKay (1981) concluded that co-workers appear to buffer job-related stress significantly better than family and friends.
Thus, using specific types and sources of support with the particular population being targeted appears to be an important consideration.

In addition to its proposed buffering effects on stress, social support has been cited as a useful vehicle in facilitating certain behaviors, including compliance with therapeutic regimens and instructions. Its effectiveness in increasing program attendance and adherence has been reported in the areas of medicine (Alderman & Schoenbaum, 1975; Dunbar & Stunkard, 1979), psychiatric/psychological care (Hand, Lamontagne, & Marks, 1974; Ley, 1976; Liberman, 1970), weight loss (Chapman & Jeffrey, 1979; Wollersheim, 1970), and exercise (King & Frederiksen, 1970; Massie & Shephard, 1971). It has been similarly found that the tendency of an individual to comply with a request increases with the number of individuals present (Gerard, Wilhelmy, & Conolley, 1968). This may be a result of the greater social pressure than can be brought to bear by a group of individuals. These reported influences of social support on compliance with instructions as well as on stress amelioration make it a potentially useful factor in the development and delivery of programs for stressed populations. In regard to this, several authors have suggested the use of social support in lessening the strains associated with the dual-earner lifestyle (Hall & Hall, 1979; Hopkins & White, 1978).

**Developing a Stress Management Program for the Working Wife**

In recent years, several types of stress management programs have been developed and delivered to a wide variety of populations
throughout the U.S. These have included university personnel (Frederiksen, Solomon, McClaren, & Bosmajian, 1979), college students (Koltuniak, 1982), insurance company employees (Frederiksen, Winett, & Riley, 1981; Solomon, 1982), and health care professionals (Steinmetz, Kaplan, & Miller, in press). In general, these programs, delivered in small group formats, have consisted of a number of different components, such as relaxation training, assertiveness training, health behavior modification, cognitive restructuring, and social support (Frederiksen, et al., 1979; Steinmetz et al., in press). The implicit assumption underlying such general, multi-component programs has been that at least one of the stress reduction techniques they contain will be effective in alleviating stress in the population chosen. While relatively few multicomponent stress management programs have been systematically evaluated, those that have been evaluated unfortunately have yielded equivocal or disappointing results (Frederiksen et al., 1981; Koltuniak, 1982; Solomon, 1981). One possible reason for these findings stems from the fact that the program participant is typically left to discriminate on his/her own the technique (or techniques) which will be useful given his/her particular circumstances. Participants may have difficulty doing this. In addition, they may experience what Lando, Shirley, and Gregory (1969) have referred to as "information overload" given the number of varied techniques they are exposed to in a relatively short period of time. The inability to utilize any of the techniques effectively may, as Lando et al. (1979) suggest, be a possible consequence of this, with weak results ensuing.
A third possibility concerns the actual efficacy of the different techniques, even when they are being employed correctly by the participants, in ameliorating stress in the particular population under study. Many of the techniques mentioned previously (with the exception of such techniques as relaxation; Riley, 1981) have undergone relatively little independent evaluation to determine if they are indeed effective in ameliorating stress. While the relative efficacy of each of these interventions may differ according to the population being studied, such matching of population with intervention has not at present occurred.

A fourth reason for such disappointing findings may involve the possibility that the individuals participating in the stress management program are not as homogeneous, in terms of specific stressors, as a group leader or experimenter may believe. For instance, while a stress management group may contain only undergraduate students, the types of major stressors each group member is currently experiencing may be quite different (e.g., interpersonal stressors, academic difficulties, physical complaints, family problems). If this is the case, group members are not as likely to perceive their situation to be like those of other members. This may result in a decrease in group support and other stress-reducing methods afforded by the group (Cohen & McKay, 1981).

**Applying a Marketing Perspective**

One method of addressing some of the limitations of prior efforts involves more specific tailoring of the stress management program to
the needs and goals of a clearly specified, more narrowly focused population. The tools for arriving at such a program can be found in the social marketing approach discussed by Frederiksen, Brehony, and Solomon (in press) and Frederiksen and King (1981). This approach emphasizes the importance of clearly defining both specific populations in need (i.e., market segmentation) and the types of interventions most suited to them. This can be accomplished using formative research techniques such as archival data searches, summarization of previous research findings, surveys, interviews, and pilot work. In this manner the most appropriate intervention techniques for the specific population under study can be determined.

The Problem of Measurement

Another area that needs to be investigated in light of the generally weak results found in previous stress management studies is the type of measures used to evaluate such programs. These studies have typically used global, broad-based measures of stress, with the implicit assumption that relatively short-term stress management programs will have a significant impact upon such measures (Frederiksen et al., 1981; Koltuniak, 1982; Solomon, 1981). Global measures of social support have similarly been used in studies comparing levels of stress and stress-related difficulties (Cohen & McKay, 1981). An alternative to the use of general measures is the implementation of a behavioral assessment and intervention approach (Ciminero, Calhoun, & Adams, 1977). This involves the targeting of discrete behaviors for change and the development of measures which can specifically assess those behaviors.
over time. While it is possible that global measures of stress may be affected by a stress management intervention (Frederiksen et al., 1979), it is far more likely that such short-term programs will bring about changes in specific, discrete behaviors (e.g., assertive behavior). Changes in such behaviors can in turn be posited as influencing stress levels. Thus, changes in the discrete behaviors can be viewed as "first-order" effects while changes in stress levels can be considered as more diffuse, "second-order" effects. Approaches assessing changes in first-order effects are deemed as potentially more useful than more general, second-order approaches to measurement, if the more general approach is used alone. This is because the utility of the specific intervention program may be more precisely ascertained and the potential influences of extraneous factors on the measures subsequently reduced with the emphasis on discrete, specific measurement. In addition, the "first-order" approach can be extended to the type of predictions made in a study. Such an approach would suggest that predictions be made concerning specific target behaviors rather than more general, diffuse constructs (e.g., stress). However, the focus on specific outcomes does not preclude assessment of more general measures.

**Purpose**

Given the dearth of information on the specific stressors affecting the dual-worker wife in general and such individuals in the social community in particular, a marketing approach was deemed as an appropriate tool for the assessment and eventual amelioration of stress in this population. However, the marketing approach used was not
open-ended, but rather primarily focused on time management skills, social support and stress in women from dual-earner families.

The present research had two functions. A first step involved a delineation of the parameters of stress, coping skills, and available social supports as described by working women in the local community. In particular, assessment of the dual-worker as compared with dual-career individual was considered to be important. Such evaluation would better clarify the similarities shared by the two populations in reference to stressors and supports, as well as assessing methods of intervening with the less-researched though more common dual-worker individual. As a second step, the information that was obtained was used to develop and systematically evaluate what appeared to be the most relevant interventions for reducing strain in women from dual-earner families.

**Dual-earner survey.** In order to better understand the specific needs of the local dual-earner population, a 72-question survey on problems and issues facing working wives was compiled by the present experimenter (see Appendix A). Relevant questions were obtained through preliminary interviews with working wives and from the available literature. Areas of inquiry included: demographic information; descriptions of the current work situation; descriptions of the current household situation; types of stressors at work and at home; and the types of social support experienced and preferred by the wife. In addition, information on the type of program preferred (e.g., time management, stress management, a support group) as well as logistical
aspects of such a program (e.g., preferred length, format, times, involvement of husband, and place for program delivery) was gathered.

A total of 90 surveys were distributed. Forty-five of the surveys were randomly distributed to married female clerical workers on the VPI&SU campus. Thirty-five of the surveys were distributed to selected married female administrators and faculty members at VPI&SU. These women were located through their affiliation with a professional woman's organization at VPI&SU, or through their acquaintance with affiliates of the organization. The remaining 10 surveys were distributed to female professionals working at a local social services agency. Thirty-six of the 45 surveys distributed to the clerical workers (or 80%) were returned. Thirty-eight of the 45 surveys distributed to the professional women (or 84%) were returned. Code numbers were used on the survey forms in lieu of names to protect the confidentiality of the subjects.

The modal age range for subjects in both groups was 26 to 35. All women in both groups had a high school education or greater. Eighty-two percent of the clerical workers had one or more children, as compared with 62% of the professional women.

Of the clerical workers, 86% worked 40 or more hours per week, while 79% of the professionals put in a comparable number of hours. The major reasons for working endorsed by the two groups reflected the job versus career differentiation described by Rapoport and Rapoport (1971). While the majority of the clerical workers (64%) reported that the most important reason why they worked was to make money, the
majority of the professional women surveyed (62%) chose personal fulfillment or advancement in their field as the major reason why they worked. While a little more than half of the professional women (57%) stated that they would prefer their work house to be more flexible, a little less than half of the clerical workers (46%) stated this preference. In terms of desiring more flexibility in where they worked (i.e., flexiplace), less than one-third of clerical workers (32%) preferred more flexibility, as compared with 57% of professional women.

When both groups were asked to report the major way in which demands from their work interfered with their present living situation, the most popularly-chosen response for clerical workers was: "I have difficulty efficiently managing the time that I have." The next most popular responses chosen by this group involved having too little time to spend with their children or spouse. In contrast, the most popular response chosen by professional women concerned the perception that the amount of work-related stress they experienced interfered with other aspects of their living situation. The second most-endorsed response for this group concerned having too little time to spend with their children.

When asked to choose the greatest stressor they experienced from the fact that both they and their spouses worked, the responses for the two groups were nearly identical. Of both groups, 32% reported the greatest stressor to be not having enough time to themselves. The next most chosen response for both groups (approximately 29% in each group) concerned having to complete the majority of the household and/or
childcare duties themselves. When asked to report the greatest asset stemming from the fact that both partners worked, the answers for the two groups again mirrored the differences typically attributed to having a job as versus a career. While 79% of the clerical workers chose "more money" as the greatest asset stemming from the dual-earner situation, only 41% of professional women did so. Another 38% from this latter group chose "being able to share similar experiences and understand each others' perspectives better" as the major asset.

Descriptions of the two major areas of conflict between the wife and her partner also reflected some differences between the two groups. The professional women most often chose "household duties (excluding children)" among the top two areas of conflict between themselves and their spouses, with "issues of managing time" the next answer most often chosen. In contrast, clerical workers most often chose "money issues" as the major area of conflict, with "issues of managing time" chosen second. "Household duties" was chosen third, perhaps reflecting the tendency of women working at jobs, as versus careers, to continue to consider such duties as falling within their province of responsibility regardless of the hours they spend working outside of the home.

In continuing the trend to endorse time management issues as an important area of concern, approximately 78% of both groups reported efficient management of their time as being somewhat of a problem or a significant problem for them. When asked where they would benefit most from increases in their time management skills, 79% of the clerical workers stated that they would benefit most in the home, while the
responses of the professional women were split fairly evenly between the home and the work situations.

Social support comprised another area of inquiry on the survey. Respondents were asked what kind of support they considered to be more important or desirable in their type of situation—tangible support (e.g., money, babysitting, assistance in getting assigned tasks done) or intangible support (e.g., advice, listening). Of the clerical women, 75% chose intangible support over tangible support, while 65% of the professional women chose intangible support. Additionally, when respondents were asked if they would like to get the opportunity to talk to others in a similar situation as theirs, approximately 64% of both groups answered yes.

The final group of survey questions focused upon the type of program women in both groups would prefer in meeting their situational needs. About half of the women in each group stated that they would be interested in attending a program focused upon issues and concerns of individuals from two-income families. When asked about the major topic area that they would like covered in such a program, the most frequent response chosen by clerical workers was "the chance to meet and talk over my issues and concerns with individuals in situations similar to mine" (i.e., a social support concern). The learning of appropriate time management techniques was the next response chosen most often. The professional women split their responses fairly equally between receiving social support, learning time management techniques, and learning stress management skills. The most preferred scheduling of
such a program for both groups was once a week during their lunchtime. Nearly all respondents stated a preference for holding program sessions on the VPI&SU campus. When asked in what major format they would prefer that the program materials be presented, the majority of respondents from both groups stated a preference for an interactive group format.

Because the husband of a dual-earner family shares an important role in determining the stressfulness of that lifestyle for the family (Hall & Hall, 1979; Shaevitz & Shaevitz, 1979), it was considered preferable to have both partners attend such a program together. This is based on the suggestion by many researchers (Hall & Hall, 1979; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976) that many of the problems found in the dual-earner lifestyle (e.g., role overload, issues concerning household and childcare duties) typically require solutions that may call for at least some role redefinition and flexibility on the part of both partners. However, anecdotal evidence from other service-delivery programs in the Blacksburg, Virginia, area has pointed to the difficulty in obtaining attendance by both spouses concerned. When the present sample of women was asked whether they thought their partner would be interested in attending an educational/supportive program on dual-earner families, approximately 90% of women from both groups answered probably or definitely not. Meanwhile, 83% of the clerical women and 66% of the professional women who had stated an interested in attending the program reported that their partners would react "somewhat" to "quite positively" if they attended this type of program alone.
Conclusions from Survey Findings

While the survey findings were preliminary in nature, they did suggest several options for intervention with dual-earner individuals. First, women working at jobs reported the presence of potential stressors that appeared in many ways to be comparable to those experienced by career women. The sample of working women studied reported putting in as many hours on their job as did the career women, and in more cases had children to contend with. The working women also reported working for economic rather than personal reasons, which has been found to be related to less happiness on the part of both the wife and her spouse (Orden & Bradburn, 1969). While both groups endorsed time management issues as a source of strain and conflict for them, the non-career women tended to endorse these issues as an area of concern for them more consistently than did the career women. In addition, noncareer women stated a clear preference for time management skills which they could apply at home, perhaps reflecting the position that these women, more so than career women, perceived household duties as more clearly falling within their role as wife. These findings suggest that in many ways dual-workers have as great a need for programs aimed at reducing strain and conflict as do dual-career individuals.

Both the preferred program topics many of the respondents chose (including both time management skills as well as aspects of social support), and the type of program format most frequently chosen by both groups (i.e., an interactive group format), appeared to reflect a desire for more social support by these women. This finding is
consistent with data suggesting a reduced amount of support for such women (Johnson & Johnson, 1977; St. John-Parsons, 1978). The additional finding that the vast majority of women in both groups preferred intangible over tangible forms of support is consistent with Cohen and McKay's (1981) conclusion that tangible support in and of itself does not appear to be an effective buffer of stress.

While it is deemed preferable in many cases to attempt to intervene with both partners of a dual-earner couple, it is often not possible to do so. Frequently this is the case because marital stability has been achieved by having the wife continue to take major responsibility for the household/childcare duties (Garland, 1972; Paloma, 1972)—a role which husbands traditionally have refused to share (Bryson et al., 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1977). It has typically been reported that increasing the husband's role flexibility and involvement in domestic duties is difficult to achieve (Hall & Hall, 1979). Until broader-scale social and attitudinal changes begin to have a more significant impact on both male and female traditional sex-role behaviors, programs aimed at change on the part of both partners will remain difficult. The women surveyed in the present study uniformly reflected this difficulty in their perception that their spouses would not be willing to attend such a program. In lieu of obtaining attendance from both partners, a sizeable number of working women appeared willing to attend a program aimed at increasing their coping mechanisms through two major methods. The first method involved the teaching of specific skills (e.g., time management techniques), and the second involved the
facilitation of a supportive context in which to discuss dual-earner problems and issues.

Given these findings and the results from other available research, the following general predictions were made:

1. Women of dual-worker families who received instruction in specific time management skills would feel better able to cope with stresses emanating from role overload than dual-worker women who did not receive such instruction. It was predicted that the instructed women would be able to increase their involvement in high-priority activities compared to the noninstructed women.

2. Dual-worker women who received social support in the form of appraisal and self-esteem support from other dual-worker women would feel better able to cope with stresses transpiring from the dual-worker lifestyle than dual-worker women who did not receive an added amount of such support. It was predicted that if such support could be continued outside of structured group settings, its positive benefits, in terms of stress reduction, would be enhanced.

3. Dual-worker women who received instruction in specific time management skills as well as increased social support would feel better able to cope with specific stresses emanating from the dual-worker lifestyle than would women who received neither intervention. In addition, it was believed possible that women receiving both instruction and support would accrue
some added benefits in the form of increased self-efficacy and stress reduction compared with women receiving just one of the interventions. The literature suggests that this could stem from the possibility that social support would facilitate compliance with the instructions given, as well as from the possible additive effects of both interventions for reducing stress.

Given the previous discussion suggesting the utility of a more specific, behavioral approach to studying stress in this population, the following, more specific predictions were also made:

1. Women in the two conditions receiving a large amount of time management instruction during the program would report greater increases in the amount of time spent in specified high-priority activities (to be discussed in greater detail in the Method section) at posttest and follow-up than those women receiving minimal or no time management instruction.

2. Women receiving a large amount of time management instruction during the program would report greater self-efficacy for time management behaviors at posttest than those women receiving minimal or no time management instruction.

3. Women in the two conditions receiving a high degree of group support during the program would report a greater number of contacts with other group members during the program and at follow-up than those conditions receiving a minimal amount of group support during the program.
4. Because of the global, nonspecific nature of the two representative stress measures employed in the study and the relatively short-term nature of the program, change on these measures as a consequence of the interventions employed would be minimal.
METHOD

Pilot Study

A pilot study was undertaken to more clearly delineate the specific time management problems experienced in this population, to practice the delivery of both the time management instructions and social support procedures, and to test out the measures to be used. Six married, female clerical workers at VPI&SU who had indicated an interest in participating in an educational program on the previously described survey were recruited for this aspect of the study.

Participants met for seven sessions. The sessions included content areas to be used in the major study (see Procedures section). The formats of individual sessions were varied in terms of the amount of instruction given by the group leader and the amount of interaction encouraged among group members. The purpose of this was to give the group leader information concerning the best methods of differentiating between the three experimental conditions used in the major study (see Design section). The information gathered from this pilot major study (e.g., methods of encouraging social interaction and cohesiveness among group members, such as the exchange of phone numbers) was utilized in conducting the major study.

All measures to be employed in the major study (see Measures section) were used in the pilot, and appeared to be workable and sensitive to the interventions employed. Results from the pilot study indicated that the procedures used presented a viable means of intervening with this population. Changes on the measures from pre- to post-intervention
were found to be in the predicted direction, and participants anec-
dotally reported that they enjoyed the program and found it to be
helpful.

Upon concluding the pilot study, the major study was subsequently
initiated.

Major Study

Design

Given the predictions previously described, the design used for
the major study entailed four conditions. Condition 1 was used as a
waiting-list control. Participants' responses in this condition on
pre- and posttest measures were compared with those of the other condi-
tions as a control for time, extraneous environmental factors, and ex-
perimenter attention. A minimal instruction/minimal support condition
was considered as a possible control for the above influences, as well
as for the effects of simply participating in a group program regard-
less of content. However, due to the ethical problem involved in in-
viting participation in a group with minimally-structured goals and
objectives, as well as the practical difficulties involved in attempt-
ing to conduct such an unstructured group, the use of that type of con-
trol was not included.

Condition 2 (minimal instruction/high support) received a minimal
amount of structured instruction in time management techniques in the
context of a high degree of social support. Condition 3 (high instruc-
tion/minimal support) received in-depth instruction on time management
skills with minimal group support. Condition 4 (high instruction/high
support) received in-depth instruction in basic time management skills in the context of a high degree of group interaction and support. These conditions will be described in greater detail in the Procedure section.

Participants

The participants were 90 married women who volunteered to enroll in the study. Participants were recruited via ads in the local faculty/staff newsletter, flyers randomly distributed across the university, and through personal contact with the experimenter via workshops and the previously described dual-earner survey. All participants were currently working in classified employee positions at VPI&SU. Such positions were classified as "jobs" (as versus careers) using Rapoport and Rapoport's (1971) definition. This definition included the following stipulations: (1) The position was one that was typically taken for more purely economic than personal/professional reasons; (2) the position typically lacked clear developmental stages, accumulation of expertise, and the possibility for significant advancement; and (3) the position was more prone to interruption and discontinuation.

Out of the 90 women initially recruited, data from 56 were available for subsequent analyses. Demographic information on these latter participants is presented, by condition, in Table 1.

Setting

The study was conducted on the VPI&SU campus. For groups receiving both high amounts of group support and time management instruction (i.e., Condition 4—the Combination condition), the chairs in the room
were set up seminar-style around a long table. For groups receiving high instruction with minimal group support (i.e., Condition 3—the High Instruction condition), the groups were held in a classroom, with all chairs facing forward. For groups receiving high group support with minimal instruction (i.e., Condition 2—the High Support condition), the chairs were situated informally in a circle. The purpose of these different configurations was to make more salient the differences in amount of group support being emphasized across the three experimental conditions.

Measures

The majority of measures used in the present study were focused on the specific assessment of discrete targeted behaviors. The findings of the pilot study, though preliminary in nature, indicated that such specific measures were sensitive in reflecting changes as a function of the instructional program being delivered.

Time management measures. Two types of time management measures were employed. The first, a comprehensive, 23-item pre-post time management test (called the Information Inventory) was used to evaluate initial knowledge in this area as well as changes in knowledge as a function of the program. The inventory, compiled by the experimenter, included both multiple choice and fill-in-the-blank items. An example of an item was "List the first step stressed in good planning" (see Appendix B).

Second, participants in the three experimental conditions were given bi-weekly monitoring forms on which to monitor amount of time
spent in targeted high-priority activities. Participants were requested to complete these forms throughout the duration of the program (see Appendix C). As with all self-monitoring techniques, there was a potential problem with reactivity in using this type of measure (Emmelkamp, 1974; McFall & Hammen, 1971; Romanczyk, 1974). Because continuous self-monitoring of the target behavior has been suggested to lead to more reactive effects than more intermittent self-monitoring (Mahoney, Moore, Wade, & Moura, 1973), intermittent self-monitoring was used in the present study. In addition, the use of a control condition which self-monitored without receiving any other intervention was deemed as useful in helping to separate the reactive effects of the measure from changes in the measure occurring as a function of the interventions.

Reliability on the high-priority activities monitoring data was assessed using two methods. As one method, participants were asked, via phone calls made by undergraduate researchers blind to each participant's condition, to report the time they had spent in their two activities for the previous day (i.e., the day they had actually monitored the two activities). Of the calls attempted, 93% were actually completed. Reliability between these verbal and written reports was calculated using the formula (number of agreements/number of agreements + disagreements), with an agreement being scored if the participant's two reports were consistent within 10 minutes of each other. Reliability scored in this manner was found, across all four conditions, to
be .98 (range = .96 to 1.00). Such a reliability index has been considered to be quite strong (Kazdin, 1975).

As a second method, spouse reports, via phone calls made by undergraduate researchers, of the time the participant had spent in her two activities for the previous day (i.e., the day she had monitored the two activities) were collected. Of such calls attempted, 79% were actually completed. Because the husbands were simply giving estimates of their wives' behavior, and because some variability was introduced in attempting to define the wife's two activities clearly enough for the husband, a larger error interval was deemed appropriate. Using the formula (number of agreements/number of agreements + number of disagreements), agreements were scored if the husband's verbal report and the wife's written report of time spent were consistent within 30 minutes of each other. Reliability scored in this fashion was found, across all four conditions, to be .76 (range = .70 to .84). Such a reliability index, while not strong, was found to be comparable to similar reliability procedures used to corroborate written activity monitoring data (Winett & Neal, 1981). In their study of the effects of flexible work schedules on family time allocation, Winett and Neale (1981) found the correspondence of written monitoring data with spouse reports to be at a .69 agreement level. The overall reliability for spouse reports and the three other corroborating sources of reliability used was found to be .80.

Thus, the two reliability procedures used in evaluating the high-priority monitoring data indicated that the data were reliably reported.
Social support measures. All participants in the three experimental conditions were asked to record on a bi-weekly basis the number of interactions they had with other group members outside of the program session. In addition, they were asked to rate, on a 7-point scale, the general helpfulness of the interactions as well as the number of interactions which they themselves had initiated (see Appendix D).

Reliability on the Group Contact Sheets was determined by comparing the number of contacts a participant reported having with each of her group members on a particular day with the contacts the group members reported having with that participant on that same day. Using the formula (number of agreements/number of agreements + number of disagreements upon occurrence), reliability was found, across all four conditions, to be .54. The low reliability obtained with this measure appeared to stem, at least in part, from the difficulty in defining the term "contact" in a clear and precise manner. In particular, participants working in close proximity with other group members reported that they had difficulty keeping track of the large number of group member contacts they experienced throughout the day. Several reported anecdotally that they had at times stopped monitoring contacts because of this.

Because of the paucity of paper-and-pencil measures of social support that have been adequately evaluated psychometrically, the present experimenter chose two measures which had been shown to have some construct validity in similar experimental situations. The first measure was a 24-item general support scale, distributed to all
participants pre- and post-intervention. This measure was taken from LaRocco, House and French (1980). Frederiksen, Winett and Riley (1981) found that it was sensitive to changes in the amount of social support felt by women during their investigation of a multi-component stress management program. The General Support Scale measured the participants' perceptions of the amount of appraisal support they were currently receiving from several sources. For its use in the present study, these sources included the participant's immediate supervisor, her coworkers (excluding individuals in her stress management group), her spouse, friends and relatives, and, where applicable, individuals in her stress management group. The subject was asked to make her ratings on a scale of 1 to 4, where 1 signified "not at all" and 4 signified "very much" (see Appendix E).

The second paper-and-pencil social support measure used in the study, the Group Questionnaire, was given to participants in the three experimental conditions at pre- and post-intervention. This 7-item questionnaire was based upon a similar questionnaire used by King and Frederiksen (1980) in ascertaining the degree of group cohesiveness perceived by women who were assigned to small exercise groups. King and Frederiksen found the measure to be sensitive to differences in felt cohesiveness among jogging groups which successfully predicted subsequent group attendance. In the present study, participants were asked to rate, on an 8-point scale, various aspects reflecting group cohesiveness. These included degree of liking for other group members, desire to continue meeting with the group, and extent to which group
members felt that they knew each other and would feel comfortable contacting each other outside of group session (see Appendix F). The participants were asked to make their ratings on a scale of from 1 to 8, where 1 signified "not at all" and 8 signified "very much".

Self-efficacy measure. A measure based upon Bandura's self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1975) was developed by the experimenter. It focused upon relevant areas of distress for dual-earner women, as well as on specific behaviors deemed useful in coping with the dual-earner pattern (e.g., ability to prioritize and compartmentalize duties at work and at home; ability to be assertive, when necessary, with work personnel, husband). The proposed usefulness of this measure was based upon the research findings of Bandura (1975) and others (e.g., Chiauzzi & Heimberg, 1981; Bosmajian, 1982) that people reporting high self-efficacy for certain behaviors were more likely to execute those behaviors when given the opportunity than people reporting a lower amount of self-efficacy for those behaviors. A total of 55 items, developed from literature discussing the specific types of time management difficulties facing working wives (e.g., MacKenzie & Waldo, 1981; Silcox, 1980) were included. The measure was divided into two parts. On the first part, labeled the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet, the participant was asked to rate on a scale of from 1 to 7 the likelihood of being able to successfully perform each of the 55 activities listed. A rating of 1 corresponded to "not at all likely" and a rating of 7 corresponded to "extremely likely". Participants who did not have children were requested to darken in a 10 (i.e., not applicable) for the three
items pertaining to children (see Appendix G). The Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet was divided into five content areas. The first section was comprised of 14 items involving planning and organizing activities at work (e.g., "effectively prioritizing tasks at work in order of importance"). The second section was made up of 14 items addressing interpersonal and assertive abilities at work (e.g., "refusing what you consider to be unreasonable requests from your supervisor—e.g., a request to work overtime"). The third section contained 12 items focused upon planning and organizing activities at home (e.g., "pre-planning repetitive activities for an entire week, so that shopping and similar activities can be completed in one, instead of several, trips"). The fourth section contained 12 items addressing interpersonal and assertive abilities at home (e.g., "effectively delegating home tasks to your spouse as a means of easing your workload"). The fifth section contained three items addressing interpersonal/assertive abilities with one's children (e.g., "refusing what you consider to be unreasonable requests from your children"). Participants who did not have children were told to mark the items from this section as "not applicable". The Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet was distributed pre- and post-intervention.

On the second portion of the measure, labeled the Outcome Expectancy Rating Sheet, the participant was asked to rate the same 55 items in terms of the likelihood that successfully performing the activity would lead to desirable consequences. "Desirable consequences" were defined as "helping you to manage your time or helping you to better
cope with stresses at work or at home. A rating of 1 corresponded to "not at all likely" and a rating of 7 corresponded to "extremely likely" (see Appendix H). The Outcome Expectancy Rating Sheet was distributed at pretest. It was used to control for the possibility that differences across conditions in the perceived utility of performing the activities described on the questionnaire could influence other outcome measures.

Measures of stress. Two paper-and-pencil stress measures were used to assess any changes in stress from pre- to post-intervention. The first was the 25-item Stress/Mood/Productivity (S/M/P) Inventory used by Frederiksen et al. (1981). A similar inventory was found by Frederiksen et al. (1979) to be sensitive to changes in perceived stress levels following a multi-component stress management intervention. In the present study the inventory consisted of 14 physical symptom items, rated on a scale of from 1 to 10, nine mood-related items, rated on a scale of from 1 to 4, and two items evaluating perceived productivity, rated on a scale of from 1 to 10 (see Appendix I). To obtain a more accurate measure of physical symptoms and mood, participants completed the S/M/F Inventory on two consecutive days at pretest and on two consecutive days at posttest.

The second stress measure used was the Stressful Conditions Questionnaire developed by Steinmetz, Kaplan and Miller (in press). This 41-item scale consisted of a variety of stressful conditions that ranged from occupational stressors (e.g., "I spend my time 'fighting fires' rather than working to a plan"), to "self-talk" stressors which
unreasonable expectations a person might have of him/herself in job-related and other activities (e.g., "I am concerned over my ability to do everything I want to"), to social stressors (e.g., "I have difficulty saying what I feel"). Steinmetz et al. (in press) found the above questionnaire to be sensitive to changes following the delivery of a multi-modal stress management program, with decreases in total stress scores on the questionnaire significant at the .03 level. The participant was asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale, with 1 indicating a "never" response and 5 indicating an "always" response (see Appendix J).

**Attendance measure.** Attendance was taken at each session as one indication of the usefulness and/or appropriateness of the program for the participants.

**Weekend Activities Questionnaire.** This questionnaire was used to assess whether targeted activities as well as chores participants were engaging in on the weekends during the program were affected as a consequence of the program. It was comprised of three items evaluating the participants' weekends, and was administered following the second and third weekends of the program (see Appendix K).

**Post-program evaluation.** A 19-item program utilization questionnaire was distributed at the end of the program to evaluate the usefulness of the interventions (time management, social support) in reducing stress levels and in enhancing coping skills. It also evaluated the perceived effectiveness of the format in which the group sessions were conducted. Some items involved ratings on a 7-point scale, while
others allowed for more open-ended comments by the participant (see Appendix L).

**Post-program life events question.** This single yes/no item was given to participants at posttest to assess whether the participant had experienced any major stressful events since the start of the stress management program (see Appendix Q). It was believed that the experience of such events could influence a participant's participation in or response to the interventions.

**Follow-up phone interview.** A brief phone interview was conducted by the experimenter at follow-up to assess the approximate amount of time participants were currently spending on their chosen high-priority activities, as well as any contacts they had had with group members since the end of the program. These calls took place about 3 months after the last session. The purpose of the interview was to assess how well any changes in targeted activities and/or contacts which had occurred during the program had been maintained following the end of the program.

**Other descriptive measures.** Four secondary measures were given at pretest as a means of compiling further descriptive information on the population under study. They included the following:

1. A 19-item Demographic Sheet, compiled by the experimenter, which was used to gather basic demographic information from the participants (see Appendix M).

2. The Life Events Checklist (Rahe, 1972). This 42-item questionnaire provided an index of major life changes (stressors)
experienced by the participants within the 6 months preceding their participation in the program. It was employed to offer a further comparison among conditions on initial stress-related factors (see Appendix N).

3. The Parent Interview Schedule-R1 (adapted from Winette, Neale, & Williams, 1982). This 12-item questionnaire assessed the number of times over the previous week the participant had been engaged in a variety of domestic activities (e.g., cooking, vacuuming, paying family bills) (see Appendix O). The questionnaire represented an index of the amount of each participant's involvement in tasks at home. Such involvement indicated the extent to which her time at home was limited, and was also seen as potentially influencing her initial stress levels.

4. The Parent Interview Schedule-R2. This 12-item questionnaire, adapted by the present experimenter from Winett et al.'s (1982) Parent Interview Schedule, assessed who the participant perceived as being ultimately responsible for the completion of a variety of household tasks (see Appendix P). It was felt that while a participant's spouse might actually be helping with some tasks, the participant could still be implicitly responsible for the task. Such responsibility was seen as having a potential effect on the participant's initial stress levels.
Procedures

Because findings from the dual-earner survey indicated that the majority of working wives preferred attending programs during their lunch hour, three of the six groups in the study (the six groups included two groups from each experimental condition) were scheduled during that time. Room restrictions on the VPI&SU campus dictated that two of the remaining groups be held at 5:00 p.m. and the third group at 7:00 p.m. The assignment of different group to the three experimental conditions was largely dictated by the type of room that was available at the above times. For instance, the groups that met at 12:00 noon on Tuesdays and Thursdays and at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays were automatically assigned to the High Instruction condition since only formal classrooms were available at those times. Two small seminar rooms were available at 12:00 noon on Tuesdays and Thursdays and at 5:00 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays. Consequently, groups that met at those times were assigned to the Combination condition. The remaining two groups, conducted on Mondays and Wednesdays at 12:00 noon and on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 7:00 p.m., met in larger seminar rooms and were consequently assigned to the High Support condition. Thus, it should be noted that assignment of different groups to the three experimental conditions was not random, and therefore may have affected the composition of the different conditions. For example, participants meeting at 5:00 or at 7:00 p.m. might have been more fatigued during their group sessions than those meeting earlier in the day, and thus less responsive to the interventions presented than earlier groups.
To help control for this, one of the two groups comprising each condition was able to be assigned to a 12 noon meeting time. The maximum number of individuals assigned to any group was 10.

Two experimenters, one female and one male, were used as group leaders. Each experimenter was assigned to conduct one group within each condition. The specific assignment of an experimenter to a particular group within a condition was determined randomly.

Participants were recruited as described earlier. Individuals who signed up alone were randomly assigned, when possible, to one of the four conditions described previously. Given the fact that social support, a major variable under investigation, could be strongly influenced by whether individuals were already having contacts with each other prior to the program, women coming from the same office or departmental area were targeted as a cluster. Upon matching clusters by the number of individuals they contained, clusters were, when possible, randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. About 75% of all individual participants and participant clusters were placed into conditions through such random assignment. The other 25% reported scheduling difficulties that barred their placement into particular groups (e.g., they could not meet at lunchtime; their transportation was limited after work hours; they preferred to be placed on a waiting-list given current scheduling difficulties which would be diminishing after several weeks). Because assignment to conditions was therefore not completely random, composition of the conditions may have been differentially affected. For example, participants willing to meet at
5:00 or at 7:00 p.m. might have had fewer children at home which they had to attend to, in comparison with those who could only meet at 12 noon. The presence of fewer children at home could in turn have an effect on participant stress levels or changes in activities irrespective of the program intervention they received. To assess such differences, a variety of demographic and descriptive measures were completed by all participants at pretest.

Orientation session. Upon assigning participants to groups, participants attended a 1-hour orientation session at their scheduled group time during the first week of the program. All participants were given a brief description of the purpose of the program (i.e., to help working wives to manage their stress). Participants in the three experimental conditions were then given an overview of what the program would entail. This was dependent upon the specific condition they were in, as follows:

Women in the Combination condition were informed that since a major stressor for many working wives concerned time management difficulties, they would receive specific instruction in methods of helping them to better manage their time. They were also told that social support both within and outside of the group could be a useful means for helping individuals deal with stress, and that group interaction would be strongly encouraged throughout the program. Group Contact Sheets were handed out and their use in monitoring contacts with group members outside of group sessions explained. Additionally, participants were given a description of how a "contact" was being defined by the
group leader (see Appendix R). Participants were then directed to introduce themselves and share something about themselves with the group. Following this, the potential usefulness of spending time in enjoyable or "high-priority" activities in ameliorating stress was discussed. Participants were asked to choose two enjoyable or relaxing activities for which they would like to increase their time. It was requested that at least one of the activities entail something that could be done on a daily basis. The group leader monitored the activities each participant chose to make certain that they were appropriate and reasonable given the scope of the program (e.g., participants were discouraged from choosing activities that would be unduly influenced by uncontrollable occurrences such as the weather or by another individual's schedule). Examples of appropriate activities included exercise, crocheting, reading, and playing with children. Once this was done, the group leader discussed the rationale for self-monitoring of the high-priority activities on a bi-weekly basis (i.e., to obtain feedback on how successful the time management techniques were in helping them spend more time in preferred activities). The forms to be used to monitor their activities were then explained to the group, and participants were requested to complete a form each Monday and Wednesday evening during the 4-week program.

Participants were additionally told that they would be receiving a phone call from an undergraduate researcher about once a week during the 4 weeks of the program as a means of obtaining reliability on their written monitoring reports. The fact that the participants' spouses
would, with their consent, also be contacted approximately once a week during the program as a means of obtaining further reliability on the time the participants spent in their high-priority activities was also discussed at that point. Participants then spent the rest of the session completing several of the pretest forms. In addition to a participant consent form (see Appendix S), they completed the Information Inventory, an S/M/P form and the Group Questionnaire. Given time constraints, instructions for the other pretest forms were reviewed with the participants and they were subsequently requested to complete and return these forms to the experimenter within 2 days.

Participants in the High Instruction condition were given information on the importance of time management in the same fashion as in the Combination condition. However, group interaction and group support were not stressed as potentially important factors in ameliorating stress. The group leader gave a perfunctory explanation of how to use the Group Contact Sheets, and participants were not encouraged to interact with each other. The rest of the orientation followed that received by the Combination condition.

For the High Support condition, evidence indicating the importance of group support and interaction with similar others in dealing with stress was emphasized. Group members introduced themselves early in the session and took turns "telling something" about themselves. The group leader explained that his/her role was to facilitate discussion among group members rather than to "lecture" to them. It was stressed that the group format was to be flexible, with a minimal agenda geared
to stimulate group discussion. The importance of contacting group members outside the group sessions was emphasized as well. When high-priority activities were discussed, it was stated that group members would take part in helping individuals to plan in their activities. Other aspects of the program (e.g., calls to husbands, forms) were explained in the same fashion as in the Combination condition.

Participants assigned to the Control condition met in one of two groups for their orientation during the same period as the three experimental conditions. The fact that they were on a waiting-list and would receive the program in 6 weeks was reiterated. The importance of obtaining information from them as a means for comparison both with the groups currently receiving the program as well as with their own responses after receiving the program was explained. They chose high-priority activities and completed the other pretest information in the same fashion as did the experimental conditions. The only forms which they did not receive were the Group Contact Sheets and the Group Questionnaire.

Beginning the following week, all experimental groups met twice a week during their scheduled time for 3 weeks (or, including the orientation session, seven sessions total). Each group session lasted for approximately 1 hour.

Session 2. Session 2, which followed the orientation session, focused upon an overview of stress and time management (see Appendix T). For the Combination condition, stress and its major causes in working women were discussed. Common misconceptions concerning time management
strategies were explored, and the importance of planning, social sup-
port, as well as knowing one's life values and priorities was stressed.
Group members participated in an in-session exercise whereby each par-
ticipant prioritized a variety of factors (e.g., family relations, job, 
education, etc.) in accordance with her own life values. Ways in which 
the high-priority activities that she had chosen reflected these values 
were discussed. Participants were then asked to pick one of their 
high-priority activities, and list ways that they were going to make 
time for that activity over the next week (e.g., watching less T.V.; 
moving several chores to one night). Group input was solicited con-
cerning this.

For the High Instruction condition, the same basic information was 
covered as in the Combination condition, but was reviewed in more de-
tail. The information was presented lecture-style, and group discus-
sion or interaction was not solicited or encouraged during this session 
(or any other sessions). The same in-session exercise was undertaken, 
but group members kept all responses to themselves.

For the High Support condition, Session 2 and all other sessions 
were conducted in the same manner. The group leader began the session 
by briefly explaining the general topic to be discussed during that 
 sucked (for Session 2 this was stress and its effects along with gen-
eral time management issues). He/she then presented the group with 
topical questions designed to stimulate group discussion. When ques-
tions were directed towards the group leader, he/she redirected the 
questions back to the group, giving as little specific information or
instruction as possible. Near the end of this second session the group leader, again in the context of stressing the importance of support from others, had each group member "buddy up" with another member she did not know well. Members were instructed to contact their buddy sometime during the next several days (via phone, interdepartmental notes, etc.) to see how she was doing. Because the experimenter had found in similar types of groups that individuals reported such contacts to be initially hard to do, the group leader discussed with the group some of the feelings that individuals typically experience when first making such contacts (e.g., embarrassment, shyness, rejection fears). Once individuals appeared more comfortable with undertaking these contacts, the group leader had each pair publicly commit themselves to one or more contacts during the week.

**Session 3.** Session 3 focused upon steps in planning and prioritizing, based upon the time management methods endorsed by Lakein (1973) (see Appendix U). Both the Combination and High Instruction conditions practiced making planning lists and prioritizing those lists during the session, and were given help and feedback (individually in the High Instruction condition and publicly in the Combination condition) by the group leader. Additionally, participants in the Combination condition underwent the same "buddying up" process that the High Support groups had undergone a session earlier. In the High Support condition, subjects discussed how the contacting of their buddies had progressed, with a continued focus on group interaction and support in the context of the session's general focus.
Session 4. At the beginning of Session 4, participants in all experimental conditions completed a Weekend Activities Questionnaire for the previous weekend. The major focus of this session was on defining and exploring "the Superwoman Myth" (i.e., the belief that the working wife must be the best or be perfect in all of her varied roles) (see Appendix V). Ways in which the myth fed into poor time management (e.g., its emphasis on perfectionism and overly-demanding expectations) were discussed. Participants in the Combination and High Instruction conditions were given a list of common self-defeating beliefs related to the Superwoman Myth (e.g., "I must be liked and approved of by everyone") with matching realistic alternatives next to each one (see Appendix W). These same two conditions were given a home exercise in which they were asked to choose one activity for which they tended to be perfectionistic. They were instructed to put a reasonable time limit on the activity, so that more time could be made for their high-priority activities. The Combination and High Support conditions participants were requested to give their buddies (and other group members, if they liked) a reminder about scheduling in their high-priority activities as well as being sensitive to influences from the Superwoman Myth.

Session 5. Session 5 focused upon other ways of tackling the Superwoman Myth, such as realistically evaluating feelings of guilt and saying no to unreasonable demands from others (see Appendix X). In the Combination and High Instruction conditions different ways of saying no were discussed. The assertive method of saying no was
role-played by the group leader and, in the Combination condition, rehearsed among group members. An outline of assertive beliefs (see Appendix Y) was handed out in the above two conditions. Additionally, subjects in these two conditions were asked to look for any situations in which saying no would be an appropriate means of freeing up more time for themselves. The Combination and High Support conditions were requested to remind group members about saying no when appropriate, and to talk over any difficult situations that arose outside of group sessions which involved saying no.

Session 6. At the beginning of Session 6, participants in all three experimental conditions completed a Weekend Activities Questionnaire for the previous weekend. This session focused upon methods of saving time at home (see Appendix Z). Methods of effective delegation were discussed. In addition, the Combination and High Instruction conditions were given a handout of "home tips" which had been suggested in the literature (MacKenzie & Waldo, 1981; Silcox, 1980) (see Appendix AA). Participants in these two conditions were asked to choose at least one time-saving suggestion from the handout which they would try to implement at home. Participants in the Combination and High Support conditions were directed to talk with group members both within and outside of the session about ways each had found of saving time at home.

Session 7. Session 7, the final session, focused upon ways of dealing with unwanted interruptions at home and work, as well as serving as a summary of the basics of good time and stress management. Any
questions were answered, and participants then proceeded to complete several posttest forms. These included the Information Inventory, the Program Utilization Form, an S/M/P Inventory, and the Group Questionnaire. Due to time constraints, the participants were given the rest of the posttests to take home, complete, and return within 2 days. Verbal comments and feedback were then solicited from group members, and the group leader reminded them that they would be contacted in about 10 weeks for a brief follow-up.

Collection of monitoring data. Five undergraduate researchers were utilized in making calls to participants and their spouses for reliability purposes, in addition to picking up the subjects' bi-weekly high-priority activity monitoring forms and, where applicable, Group Contact Sheets. The phone calls and pick-ups began during the orientation week and lasted through the week of the posttest. Each undergraduate had approximately one-fifth of the participants assigned to him/her for the duration of the program. The undergraduate researchers were blind to the specific condition that each participant was assigned to. Every Tuesday and Thursday during the program the researcher picked up from the participant's place of work the forms that were completed on Monday and on Wednesday. At the end of each pick-up day the researcher recorded, on a large chart, which forms he/she had been able to pick up and which he/she had not, and placed the forms in the participant's file. Approximately 94% of the forms were completed and returned.
Each researcher also attempted to contact, by phone, each of his/her participants and their spouses once during each week of the program. During the orientation week, the researcher called the participants and their spouses to introduce him/herself, explain the purpose of the call, and in the spouse's case, secure consent for the calls. Following that week the researchers placed calls on Tuesdays and/or Thursdays, and inquired about participant time spent in each of her chosen high-priority activities for the previous Monday or Wednesday. The number of participants and spouses who had been contacted each of these days was recorded on the large chart, and the information obtained from the call was placed into the participant's file. If a researcher was having particular difficulty contacting specific participants or spouses on Tuesdays or Thursdays, he/she was instructed to try to contact them for one more day (i.e., on Wednesday or Friday) before giving up. However, as noted earlier, 93% of calls to participants and 79% of calls to spouses were in fact completed.

Program for the Control condition. Following the posttest, participants in the Control condition were offered a stress/time management program similar to that which had been received in the Combination condition. The decision to offer them the Combination-style program was based on preliminary results as well as anecdotal reports from participants across the three experimental conditions.

Follow-up. Approximately 3 months after the posttest, participants who had completed the posttest (and, in the case of the Control condition, had also participated in the subsequent program offered to them)
were contacted via phone by the experimenter for a brief follow-up interview. The participants, the majority of whom were contacted on a Tuesday, were asked to estimate the amount of time they had spent in each of their two high-priority activities during the previous Monday. A Monday was chosen because that was one of the weekdays on which participants had monitored their activities during the program. Participants who had been able to maintain or increase the amount of time they were spending in their activities since the posttest were asked about the techniques they had been using to do so.

Originally, the experimenter had planned to have participants monitor their two activities at follow-up in the same manner that they had done during the program, in addition to completing several of the forms which had been completed at the posttest. However, because of the stated reluctance of the vast majority of participants to complete any more forms following the posttest, use of this method was precluded.
RESULTS

Assignment to groups resulted in a total of 20 participants being placed in each of the three experimental conditions and 30 participants being assigned to the Control condition. Three participants from the Combination condition, two from each of the High Instruction and High Support conditions, and eight from the Control condition did not appear for the initial orientation session and thus were not included in the study. When contacted, the majority of these non-attenders stated that they had scheduling conflicts which prevented them from participating.

Some participant drop-out occurred early in the program. A participant was labeled as a drop-out when she stopped attending sessions, and, when called by the experimenter, indicated that she would no longer be attending the program. Such drop-outs included 3 from the Combination condition, 6 from the High Instruction condition, 5 from the High Support condition, and 5 from the Control condition. Frequently stated reasons for dropping out included the following: Unexpected problems in scheduling (due to changes in work-related activities, transportation difficulties, etc.); illness (either experienced by the participant herself or by a participant's child); and annoyance at having to complete the relatively large number of forms handed out during the study. It is possible that such drop-outs were comprised of participants experiencing a somewhat greater degree of immediate stress than the remaining participants (or, in relation to completing the forms, less tolerance for questionnaires). However, the number of
drop-outs across all conditions was similar, resulting in minimal differential condition effects because of this factor.

As a consequence of the initial non-attendance and dropout rates, a total of 14 participants in the Combination condition, 12 from the High Instruction condition, 13 from the High Support condition, and 17 from the Control condition (total N=56) completed data that were available for subsequent analyses.

A one-way analysis of variance or of covariance for unequal Ns using the general linear model procedure (Goodnight, 1979) was used in analyzing differences between the four conditions on all variables except categorical variables and experimenter effects. For categorical variables, the chi-square statistic (Sall, 1979) was used. For experimenter effects a two-way ANCOVA was used.

**Descriptive Pretest Measures**

**Demographic variables.** Table 1 presents summary data for the 18 demographic variables assessed at the beginning of the program. The only significant difference found among the four conditions, using a chi-square test, concerned the specific type of job (U.S. Department of Labor, 1977) the participants were employed in on the VPI&SU campus, $X^2 (df=6) = 15.899, p < .01$. This difference appeared to stem from the fact that all participants in the High Support condition worked in clerical jobs, while some participants in the other three conditions worked at technicians or, as in the case of one participant in the Control condition, in a machine operator position.
Table 1

Demographic Information on Participants in Each Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Percentages, by Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No high school degree</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended undergrad. or</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business school but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did not graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad. or business</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from graduate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant's Job:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trade</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse's Job:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/managerial</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trade</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or retired</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Workforce:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Percentages, by Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Present Job:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or less</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of More Years Expected to Work:

|                       |         |         |             |             |
| Less than 5           | 6.67    | 13.33   | 6.67        | 7.14        |
| 5-10                  | 6.67    | 13.33   | 33.33       | 7.14        |
| 11-15                 | 20.00   | 13.34   | 6.67        | 7.14        |
| 16-20                 | 13.33   | 6.67    | 13.33       | 21.43       |
| 21 or more            | 53.33   | 53.33   | 40.00       | 57.15       |

Number of Years Married:

|                       |         |         |             |             |
| 2 or less             | 20.00   | 20.00   | 6.67        | 14.29       |
| 3-7                   | 13.33   | 20.00   | 26.67       | 14.29       |
| 8-12                  | 33.33   | 13.33   | 20.00       | 14.28       |
| 13-17                 | 26.67   | 20.00   | 13.33       | 21.43       |
| More than 17          | 6.67    | 26.67   | 33.33       | 35.71       |

Number of Children:

|                       |         |         |             |             |
| 0                     | 40.00   | 26.67   | 46.66       | 14.29       |
| 1                     | 13.33   | 40.00   | 6.67        | 28.57       |
| 2                     | 26.67   | 20.00   | 6.67        | 50.00       |
| 3                     | 20.00   | 6.67    | 20.00       | -           |
| 4                     | -       | 6.67    | 6.67        | -           |
| 5 or more             | -       | -       | 13.33       | -           |

Age of Youngest Child:

|                       |         |         |             |             |
| Toddler or younger    | 6.67    | 13.33   | 13.33       | 7.14        |
| Preschooler           | 20.00   | 13.33   | 6.67        | 7.14        |
| Grade school age      | 20.00   | 20.00   | -           | 21.42       |
| Middle school and up  | 13.33   | 26.67   | 33.34       | 42.81       |
| No children           | 40.00   | 26.67   | 46.66       | 14.29       |

Satisfied with Arrangements for Children:

|                       |         |         |             |             |
| Yes                   | 53.33   | 66.67   | 33.33       | 57.14       |
| No                    | 6.67    | -       | -           | 7.14        |
| Not applicable        | 40.00   | 33.33   | 66.67       | 35.72       |
Table 1 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Percentages, by Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Number of People in**
| **Household:**       |             |             |             |             |
| 2                     | 40.00       | 33.33       | 53.33       | 50.00       |
| 3                     | 13.33       | 26.67       | 26.67       | 14.29       |
| 4                     | 26.67       | 26.67       | 6.67        | 21.43       |
| 5                     | 20.00       | 6.67        | 13.33       | 7.14        |
| 6 or more             | -           | 6.66        | -           | 7.14        |
| **Family Income per Year:** |             |             |             |             |
| Less than $10,000     | -           | 6.67        | 6.67        | -           |
| $10,000-$15,000       | 6.67        | 13.33       | -           | 7.14        |
| $16,000-$20,000       | 13.33       | -           | 13.33       | 7.14        |
| $21,000-$25,000       | 26.67       | 26.67       | 26.67       | 7.14        |
| $26,000-$30,000       | 13.33       | 20.00       | 26.67       | 14.29       |
| over $30,000          | 40.00       | 33.33       | 26.66       | 64.29       |
| **Past Exposure to Time Management:** |             |             |             |             |
| No                    | 86.67       | 46.67       | 60.00       | 92.86       |
| Yes                   | 13.33       | 53.33       | 40.00       | 7.14        |
| **Number of Outside Activities per Week:** |             |             |             |             |
| 0                     | 21.43       | 20.00       | 6.67        | 7.69        |
| 1-2                   | 42.86       | 26.67       | 20.00       | 30.77       |
| 3-4                   | 14.29       | 13.33       | 40.00       | 30.77       |
| 5-6                   | -           | 6.67        | 6.67        | 15.39       |
| 7-8                   | 7.14        | 20.00       | 13.33       | 7.69        |
| 9 or more             | 14.28       | 13.33       | 13.33       | 7.69        |

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates a significant difference between conditions at the .01 level.
Other variables. Statistical analyses were also performed on the other descriptive pretest measures to further ascertain the initial similarity of the four conditions on variables that could have influenced outcome measures. No differences across conditions were found for any of the measures employed, including the Outcome Expectancy Rating Sheet, the Life Events Checklist, the Parent Interview Schedule-R1, and the Parent Interview Schedule-R2. Summary data, by condition, for these four measures are presented in Table 2. As indicated in the table, program participants had experienced more than a few stressful life events during the 6 month period prior to beginning the program. In addition, data from the Parent Interview Schedule-R1 showed that 50% or more of participants in all conditions were engaging in a variety of household tasks at a relatively high frequency (i.e., five or more times per week or per month, depending upon the task). Their strong involvement in tasks at home was also reflected by their responses to the Parent Interview Schedule-R2. The data presented in Table 2 indicate that 50% or more of participants in all conditions had ultimate responsibility for regularly completing a number of household tasks, ranging from washing clothes to paying bills. These findings suggest that the population of working women under investigation in the present study were similar to other working, female populations described in the literature (e.g., Bryson et al., 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1977), in terms of their involvement in domestic tasks.

In addition, it was found that at pretest the four conditions did not differ significantly on any of the measures given at both pre- and
Table 2

Summary Data, by Condition, for the Outcome Expectancy Rating Sheet, the Life Events Checklist, the Parent Interview Schedule-R1, and the Parent Interview Schedule-R2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>High Support</th>
<th>High Instruction</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means for the Outcome Expectancy Rating Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score</td>
<td>213.36</td>
<td>210.21</td>
<td>191.54</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Organizing at Work</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/Assertion at Work</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>50.64</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>48.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Organizing at Home</td>
<td>52.40</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td>45.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/Assertion at Home</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>45.93</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>39.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/Assertive Abilities with Children</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Events Checklist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Life Events Checked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages for the Parent Interview Schedule-R1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Times Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooked main meal (past week):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washed Dishes (past week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacuumed rugs (past month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picked up around house (past month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>85.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaned bathroom (past month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought groceries (past month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid bills (past month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did family wash (past month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>86.66</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did household repairs (past month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>92.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised child's activities (past week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transported child (past week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who last took care of child during night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant did</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse did</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages for the Parent Interview Schedule-R2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whose responsibility is it to</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook main meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents share equally</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash dishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents share equally</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum rugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents share equally</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up around house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents share equally</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean bathroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>High Control</th>
<th>High Support</th>
<th>High Instruction</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buy groceries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay bills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do household repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise child's activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take care of child during night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equally</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>26.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
posttest. Pretest condition means for all of these measures are presented in Table 3.

**Attendance**

There were no significant differences found across the three experimental conditions for the mean number of sessions participants attended during the program. The mean number of sessions attended was 5.7 for the Combination condition, 5.4 for the High Instruction condition, and 4.4 for the High Support condition.

**High Priority Activities Monitoring Data**

For each participant, pretest and posttest means for the priority activity monitoring data were obtained by averaging across the first week (i.e., the orientation week) and the last week of the program, respectively. Only monitoring days when participants actually went to work were included for analysis. When a one-way ANCOVA was performed with pretest levels partialled out, a significant effect was found, $F (1, 41) = 8.13, p < .0002$.

A Tukey analysis revealed that at posttest both the High Instruction condition (adjusted mean = 55.01) and the Combination condition (adjusted mean = 76.49) were significantly greater than the Control condition (adjusted mean = 12.98). In other words, participants in the Combination and High Instruction conditions reported spending significantly larger amounts of time in their targeted activities at posttest than did participants in the Control condition. In addition, Combination participants reported spending significantly more time in their priority activities at posttest than did High Support participants
Table 3
Condition Means, Standard Deviations, and Minimum and Maximum

Values for Measures Completed at Both Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Pretest Min/Max</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Min/Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Activities</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>35.91 0-135</td>
<td>12.88 18.41 0-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>27.99 0-90</td>
<td>10.34 20.45 0-150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>18.51 0-45</td>
<td>51.92 46.61 0-158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>30.86 0-120</td>
<td>75.00 42.08 13-150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>3.30 2-13</td>
<td>5.20 3.78 0-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>3.15 1-13</td>
<td>9.38 3.48 4-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>3.93 3-16</td>
<td>16.92 4.27 10-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>3.46 2-14</td>
<td>17.54 2.70 13-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>173.73</td>
<td>43.26 115-263</td>
<td>171.07 41.37 98-243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>170.14</td>
<td>46.29 85-249</td>
<td>165.83 34.15 123-226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150.73</td>
<td>40.30 44-202</td>
<td>187.08 32.75 130-237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179.92</td>
<td>49.60 57-254</td>
<td>189.18 41.17 137-259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning at Work Efficacy Score</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.13</td>
<td>14.74 27-84</td>
<td>58.43 15.05 37-82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.36</td>
<td>12.56 33-76</td>
<td>58.00 10.40 39-71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>13.40 25-67</td>
<td>55.25 13.07 35-76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59.14</td>
<td>14.57 14-71</td>
<td>65.36 10.95 40-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertion at Work Efficacy Score</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>10.75 33-68</td>
<td>47.21 11.96 28-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>16.94 19-70</td>
<td>42.08 13.09 24-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>13.39 6-55</td>
<td>47.58 14.06 20-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>18.04 14-88</td>
<td>49.27 9.20 35-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning at Home Efficacy Score</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>16.91 0-71</td>
<td>32.64 18.80 0-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>14.63 16-65</td>
<td>31.33 10.97 10-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>13.15 11-62</td>
<td>43.75 10.98 26-58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>13.52 11-57</td>
<td>39.91 14.42 19-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertion at Home Efficacy Score</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>11.01 17-58</td>
<td>32.79 10.09 17-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>13.51 10-57</td>
<td>34.42 11.75 14-51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td>10.43 2-45</td>
<td>40.50 7.26 30-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td>14.27 15-63</td>
<td>34.64 14.99 15-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertion with Children Efficacy Score</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>2.60 5-13</td>
<td>10.11 3.44 5-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>5.10 2-17</td>
<td>7.90 4.18 3-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.29 3-18</td>
<td>11.00 3.81 7-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4.45 4-18</td>
<td>10.00 4.77 4-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Support Scale</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>2.96 4-15</td>
<td>10.50 3.61 4-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>3.48 3-15</td>
<td>10.62 3.80 4-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>4.38 3-18</td>
<td>7.85 4.58 2-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boss Support</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>4.10 5-19</td>
<td>11.79 3.42 7-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>3.35 4-16</td>
<td>10.23 2.77 5-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>2.02 6-16</td>
<td>11.08 4.34 2-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>4.13 4-17</td>
<td>10.00 5.00 2-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 3 (Cont’d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pretest Min/Max Values</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Posttest Min/Max Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support from Spouse, Relatives and Friends</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>6 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>5 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0 - 15</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>8 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>5 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support from Stress Management</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>0 - 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>3 - 21</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>6 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>4 - 22</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>4 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>5 - 31</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>1 - 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stress/Mood/Productivity Questionnaire**

| Total Score                    | Control     | 14 | 25.53        | 12.57| 10 - 61             | 24.71         | 14.21| 12 - 69               |
|                                | Hi Support  | 14 | 24.60        | 10.32| 15 - 48             | 23.86         | 7.93 | 7 - 33                |
|                                | Hi Instruct | 12 | 34.57        | 15.96| 12 - 69             | 23.42         | 10.36| 11 - 41               |
|                                | Combination | 13 | 25.07        | 9.39 | 8 - 40              | 22.58         | 11.98| 6 - 42                |
| Number of Physical Symptoms    | Control     | 14 | 3.56         | 1.41 | 1 - 6               | 3.00          | 1.51 | 1 - 6                 |
|                                | Hi Support  | 14 | 3.87         | 1.72 | 1 - 8               | 2.77          | 1.16 | 1 - 5                 |
|                                | Hi Instruct | 12 | 5.30         | 1.68 | 2 - 9               | 4.00          | 1.97 | 1 - 7                 |
|                                | Combination | 13 | 3.46         | 1.35 | 1 - 6               | 2.92          | 1.92 | 1 - 7                 |
| Severity of Physical Symptoms  | Control     | 14 | 10.09        | 7.62 | 1 - 28              | 9.39          | 10.67| 1 - 43               |
|                                | Hi Support  | 14 | 11.57        | 7.22 | 3 - 27              | 8.21          | 6.36 | 0 - 25                |
|                                | Hi Instruct | 12 | 19.50        | 10.91| 4 - 38              | 11.38         | 8.44 | 2 - 30                |
|                                | Combination | 13 | 9.13         | 5.67 | 0 - 19              | 7.04          | 7.48 | 0 - 24                |
| Stressful Conditions           | Control     | 14 | 73.00        | 13.91| 39 - 92             | 70.86         | 14.12| 34 - 92               |
|                                | Hi Support  | 13 | 74.73        | 11.25| 55 - 98             | 70.92         | 13.17| 51 - 98               |
|                                | Hi Instruct | 12 | 80.40        | 14.33| 56 - 107            | 74.67         | 13.24| 59 - 98               |
|                                | Combination | 13 | 74.00        | 11.74| 48 - 88             | 66.00         | 21.51| 9 - 92                |

*\( p < .05 \)

**\( p < .01 \)
(adjusted mean = 38.15). No other significant differences were found. The pre- and posttest means for all four conditions are presented in Table 3.

The mean number of minutes participants in each condition spent in their two high-priority activities across all 8 monitoring days are presented in Figure 1. As can be noted, baseline levels across the four conditions were quite similar. It appears that some reactivity to the monitoring measure may have occurred during the first 2 weeks (i.e., first 4 data points) of monitoring. However, following the second week the data "fan" out, with the difference between the experimental conditions and the Control condition continuing to widen through the last day of monitoring. This suggests the possibility that initial reactivity to the measure dissipated over time.

The most positive effect was seen in the Combination condition where the participants continued, with some minor variations, to increase their time in targeted activities over the 4 week intervention period. This pattern was mirrored in the High Instruction condition, though at a lower overall level. The High Support participants' pattern of time spent in activities across the 8 monitoring days remained consistently below that of the other experimental conditions after the third monitoring point. Unlike the other two experimental conditions, time being spent in priority activities in the High Support condition appeared to be leveling off at posttest. This, coupled with the lower overall level of responding in this experimental condition, indicates
Figure 1. Mean time reported for high-priority activities, by condition, during the pre-intervention, intervention, and follow-up periods.
the relative ineffectiveness of High Support alone in obtaining this type of behavior change.

Pre-post differences in the amount of time each participant spent in her two activities were evaluated to ascertain whether increases from pre- to posttest were consistent across members of a condition, as well as to determine whether the changes were relatively substantial in magnitude (i.e., 30 minutes or more). It was found that 77% of Combination condition participants increased their time 30 minutes or more; 38% of High Support condition participants increased their time 30 minutes or more; and 6% of Control condition participants increased their time 30 minutes or more. These data, therefore, indicate that more than three-fourths of the participants receiving the Combination program were able to make substantial increases in the amount of time spent in their high-priority activities. The High Instruction program was second in its effect on this behavior, with a little more than half of the participants indicating substantial increases in priority activities. The High Support program was found to be less effective, with less than half of its participants indicating substantial increases. Only one individual in the Control condition reported comparable increases in priority activities.

Information Inventory

When a one-way ANCOVA on the Information Inventory measure was undertaken with pretest as the covariate, a significant difference between conditions was found, $F(1, 46) = 65.35, p < .001$. A Tukey analysis showed that at posttest the High Instruction condition (adjusted
mean = 16.94) and the Combination condition (adjusted mean = 17.70), which did not differ significantly from one another, were both significantly greater than the High Support condition (adjusted mean = 8.30) and the Control condition (adjusted mean = 6.08). The High Support and Control conditions did not differ significantly from each other. In other words, participants in both the High Instruction and Combination conditions were able to increase their knowledge about time and stress management information, as measured by the Information Inventory, to a significantly greater extent than participants in the High Support and Control conditions. Pre- and posttest means for each condition are presented in Table 3.

Self-efficacy Measure

A one-way ANCOVA was performed on total scores obtained from the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet, as well as on scores from each of the five sections comprising this measure (i.e., the planning/organizing at work section; the interpersonal/assertive abilities at work section; the planning/organizing at home section; the interpersonal/assertive abilities at home section; and the interpersonal/assertive abilities with children section). Pretest scores were used as the covariate. A significant effect was found for the total scores obtained from the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet, $F (1, 44) = 3.31, p < .028$. A Tukey analysis revealed that the High Instruction condition (adjusted mean = 196.48) had a significantly higher mean total efficacy score at posttest than did the Control condition (adjusted mean = 167.04) and the High Support condition (adjusted mean = 167.03). No other
significant differences for total efficacy score were found. (The adjusted mean for the Combination condition = 188.67). Pre- and posttest means for all four conditions are presented in Table 3.

A significant effect was also found for the planning/organizing at home section of the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet, $F(1, 45) = 3.72, p < .018$. A Tukey analysis showed that the mean score on this section for the High Instruction condition (adjusted mean = 44.54) was significantly greater than that for the Control condition (adjusted mean = 32.13) and for the High Support condition (adjusted mean = 30.80). No other significant differences for the planning/organizing at home efficacy score were found. (Adjusted mean for the Combination condition = 41.09). Pre- and posttest means for all four conditions are presented in Table 3.

While no other effects from the other sections of the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet were found to be significant at the .05 level, a trend was found ($p < .07$) for mean scores on the planning/organizing at work efficacy section. The mean score on this section for the Combination condition (adjusted mean = 63.70) was somewhat higher than the mean scores for the High Instruction (adjusted mean = 58.87), High Support (adjusted mean = 58.23) and Control (adjusted mean = 56.38) conditions. Pre- and posttest condition means on all sections of the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet are found in Table 3.

Thus, it appears that participants in the High Instruction condition increased their expectancy of successfully performing time management behaviors the most as a function of the program, with
Combination participants showing the second largest increase. In particular, expectancies concerning planning and organizing behaviors appeared to have been impacted upon the most in these two conditions relative to the other two conditions.

Social Support Measures

Group contact sheets. Differences between mean number of outside group contacts occurring during the pretest week (i.e., the orientation week) and the posttest week (i.e., the last week of the program) were found to be quite small for all three experimental conditions. The actual posttest minus pretest differences were .85 for the Combination condition, .75 for the High Support condition, and -.19 for the High Instruction condition. Given the problems discussed previously concerning the Group Contact Sheet measure (e.g., low reliability), the data must be considered to be suggestive at best.

General support scale. A one-way ANCOVA on the section of the General Support Scale which assessed perceived support from the participant's stress management group revealed a significant effect, $F (1, 32) = 6.94, p < .003$. A Tukey analysis indicated that participants in the Combination condition (adjusted mean = 8.88) reported feeling a greater amount of support from group members at posttest than did those in the High Instruction condition (adjusted mean = 3.53). There were no other significant condition differences for this section of the scale. (Adjusted mean for High Support condition = 5.84). Pre- and posttest means for all three experimental conditions are presented in Table 3.
A significant effect was also found when a one-way ANCOVA was performed on posttest participant ratings of the amount of support they felt from their boss or supervisor, $F(1, 46) = 5.82, p < .0019$. A Tukey analysis showed that participants in the High Support condition (adjusted mean = 11.27) felt significantly more support from their boss at posttest than did participants in the Combination condition (adjusted mean = 8.16). (Adjusted mean for the High Instruction condition = 9.70; adjusted mean for the Control condition = 9.95). Pre- and posttest means for all conditions are presented in Table 3.

No significant effects were found when the sections of the General Support Scale focused upon coworker support and support from one's spouse, friends and relatives were analyzed. Additionally, no significant effects were seen when all four sections on the scale were combined to yield a total support score. Pre- and posttest means for conditions on these sections are presented in Table 3.

**Group questionnaire.** While posttest differences between conditions on the amount of group cohesiveness felt tended to reflect predicted differences (i.e., scores from the Combination and High Support conditions were higher than those from the High Instruction condition), no significant effects were found when a one-way ANCOVA was performed on posttest Group Questionnaire scores. Pretest was used as the covariate. Pre and posttest means for the three experimental conditions are presented in Table 3.
Stress Measures

Stress/mood/productivity inventory. A one-way ANCOVA, with pre-test levels partialled out, showed no significant differences between conditions at posttest. Pre- and posttest means for all conditions are presented in Table 3.

Stressful conditions questionnaire. As for the S/M/P Inventory, no significant differences between conditions at posttest were found on this second general measure of stress. Pretest was used as the covariate. Pre and posttest means for all conditions are presented in Table 3.

It should be noted that while there were no significant differences among conditions on either of the above two measures, both of these measures were found to be significantly correlated with other major measures. Such correlations will be discussed in a subsequent section.

Weekend Activities Questionnaire

The Weekend Activities Questionnaire was used to assess whether participants' weekends were becoming more stressful or crowded with household chores during the program. Such a possibility could occur if participants were not in fact managing their time more effectively but, rather, were simply leaving tasks that they had originally been doing during the week for the weekend. In addition, it was deemed helpful to assess in some way whether participants were engaging in any of their high-priority activities over the weekends.

Evaluation of the Weekend Activities Questionnaires completed by participants in the Combination condition showed that, concerning the
number of chores performed over the weekend, 37% of the participants reported that the number had decreased compared to weekends prior to beginning the program; 18% reported that the number of chores had increased compared to pre-program weekends, and 45% reported that the number had remained the same. Thus, 82% of the participants in this condition did not appear to be increasing the number of chores they "saved" for the weekends as a means of compensating for increases in relaxation time during the week.

When the Combination condition was evaluated in terms of number of high-priority activities occurring on the weekends, 41% reported engaging in more of such activities over the weekend compared to weekends prior to beginning the program; 9% reported doing less of such activities; and 50% reported doing about the same number of such activities. In addition, the Combination condition's mean overall stress rating for the two weekends reported on was found to be 2.86 on a 7-point scale, where 1 indicated "not at all stressful" and 7 indicated "extremely stressful". Therefore, weekends for this condition did not appear to become more stressful as a function of the program.

For the High Instruction condition, 42% reported a decrease in the number of chores performed over the weekend, 21% reported an increase, and 37% reported that the number remained the same. In sum, approximately 79% of participants in this condition did not appear to be moving more chores to the weekends during the program to compensate for increases in "free" time during the week.
In terms of the number of high-priority activities engaged in, 42% of High Instruction participants reported engaging in more of such activities over the weekends during the program, 16% reported engaging in less, and 42% reported that the number of such activities remained about the same as before the program. The mean weekend stress rating for this condition was found to be 3.2 on a 7-point scale. Thus, as for the Combination condition, weekends did not appear to become more stressful for High Instruction participants during the program.

For the High Support condition, 21% reported a decrease in the number of chores performed over the weekend compared with pre-program weekends, 29% reported an increase, and 50% stated that the number of chores remained the same. Thus, approximately 71% of participants in this condition did not appear to be moving more chores to the weekends during the program.

When number of high-priority activities engaged in over the weekends was assessed, 7% of High Support participants reported engaging in more of such activities over the program weekends than during pre-program weekends; 28% reported engaging in less of such activities; and 65% reported engaging in about the same number of such activities as prior to the program. The mean weekend stress level occurring during the program for this condition was 3.1.

Thus, like the other two experimental conditions, the majority of participants in the High Support condition indicated that their weekends were not becoming more stressful during the program. However, unlike the other two conditions, a larger percentage of High Support
participants reported decreases, as compared to increases, in the num-
ber of priority activities occurring over the weekend, as well as in-
creases, as compared to decreases, in number of chores being performed
over the weekends. This suggests that the program this condition re-
ceived was not as successful in teaching effective time management
skills as the programs received by the Combination and High Instruction
conditions.

Post-program Life Events Question

No significant differences were found when conditions were com-
pared on the number of participants who had experienced major stressful
events (e.g., illness in the family, out-of-town guests) during the
time period when the program was in progress. The percentage of par-
ticipants in each condition who stated that they had experienced a
major stressful event during the program was calculated. It was found
that 21% of Control participants, 46% of High Support participants, 33%
of High Instruction participants and 31% of Combination participants
reported experiencing such an event. Thus, approximately one-third of
the population being studied had experienced at least one major stress-
ful event during the time period when the program was in session.

Program Utilization Questionnaire

Responses on the Program Utilization Questionnaire, used to help
evaluate the program at posttest, indicated differences among the three
experimental conditions. When participants were asked if they noticed
any changes in felt stress from before they entered the program to
after completing the program, the mean response for the Combination
condition as "some improvement"; for the High Instruction condition it was between "slight improvement" and "some improvement"; and for the High Support condition it was "slight improvement". Participants in all three experimental conditions reported using planning and prioritizing strategies more often than support from group members to cope with their time management or stress-related problems. Such planning strategies were used more by the Combination and High Instruction participants than by the High Support participants.

In terms of the program sections which participants reported finding most useful in helping them manage their time, Combination and High Support participants indicated that the section on "exploring the Superwoman Myth" was most useful for them ($\bar{X} = 5.0$ and 3.60, respectively, on a 7-point scale). Meanwhile, High Instruction participants reported that the section on "planning and prioritizing" was the most useful for them ($\bar{X} = 4.58$).

When asked how useful the program sections were in helping them to reduce their stress, ratings across all three conditions tended to be somewhat lower. The Combination and High Support participants rated the section on "exploring the Superwoman Myth" as most helpful in reducing their stress ($\bar{X} = 4.50$ and 3.67, respectively) compared to the other sections. The High Instruction participants indicated that the "planning and prioritizing" section was the most useful in helping them reduce their stress ($\bar{X} = 4.17$).

Additional ratings as well as open-ended comments solicited from all participants at the end of the program indicated that the majority
of High Instruction participants would have preferred a group format which allowed for more group interaction and discussion, while the majority of High Support participants, almost without exception, stated that they would have preferred a group format comprised of a larger amount of specific instruction from the group leader. Consistent with these findings, the majority of Combination participants commented that they were satisfied with their group format.

Finally, when asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the program, Combination participants had the highest ratings ($\bar{X} = 5.29$), with the High Instruction participants second ($\bar{X} = 5.16$), and the High Support participants third ($\bar{X} = 3.81$). This finding is consistent with the lowered ratings given by the High Support participants for the other items on this questionnaire.

**Follow-up Data**

**High-priority activity data.** The mean amount of time participants in each condition reported being engaged in their high-priority activities at follow-up was calculated to assess how well participants were able to maintain or increase posttest levels of targeted activities. This variable was chosen because of the marked differences it showed across conditions at posttest. In addition, such information on activities could, unlike other variables, be readily obtained via phone with a minimum of inconvenience to the participant. The mean for the day the participants were asked about was 76.92 minutes for the Combination condition (n=13), 56.82 minutes for the High Instruction condition (n=11), 43.46 minutes for the High Support condition (n=13), and
51.00 minutes for the Control condition participants who received the program (n=10). A comparison of these means with condition means found before and during the program is presented in Figure 1. Note that the follow-up means for each condition are quite similar to the condition means obtained at posttest. The relatively uncontrolled manner in which the data were gathered at follow-up tempers the conclusions which can be drawn from such data. However, they do suggest that maintenance of changes in time spent in targeted activities did occur.

Whether participants had reportedly remained the same or had increased or decreased the time spent in high-priority activities from posttest to follow-up was assessed by condition. In the Combination condition, 69% of participants reportedly increased the time they spent in such activities, 0% of the participants remained the same, and 31% reportedly decreased the time they spent in their targeted activities. In the High Instruction condition, 46% of the participants reportedly increased the time they spent, 27% remained the same, and 27% reportedly decreased the time they spent. In the High Support condition, 23% of participants reportedly increased the time they spent in their targeted activities, 38.5% remained the same, and 38.5% reported a decrease in the time they spent in their activities. In the Control condition, 90% of the participants reportedly increased the time they spent in their targeted activities, 0% remained the same, and 10% reportedly decreased the time spent in their activities from posttest to follow-up. It should be noted for the Control condition that at posttest
this condition had not yet received the program, while at follow-up it had.

Thus, it appeared that the majority of participants in all three experimental conditions either increased or maintained the time spent in their priority activities from posttest to follow-up. The Combination condition had the largest percentage of participants who reported increasing time spent in priority activities, with the High Instruction condition second. In addition, the vast majority of participants in the Control condition reported increases in targeted activities upon receiving the program, with their mean level at follow-up approximating that for the High Instruction condition.

Group contacts. Relatively few participants across all conditions reported having contacts with other group members between posttest and follow-up. In the Combination condition, five participants reported having at least one contact with another member (all were independently verified by the group members involved in the contacts). In the High Support condition one participant reported contacting another member, which was independently verified by that second member. Two such participant contacts occurred in the Control condition, and none occurred in the High Instruction condition. Thus, the number of participants maintaining contacts with other group members at follow-up remained relatively small.

Experimenter Effects

Effects of experimenter on the variables evaluated at both pre- and posttest were analyzed using a two-way ANCOVA, with pretest serving as
the covariate. Of the variables analyzed, three resulted in significant main effects for experimenter. One significant main effect found was for the posttest high-priority activity monitoring data $F(1, 31) = 5.70, p < .02$. On this variable, the mean for the female experimenter (Experimenter 1) was 72.0, while the mean for the male experimenter (Experimenter 2) was 45.6.

Another significant main effect found was for the total scores on the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet at posttest, $F(1, 27) = 7.04, p < .01$. The means for this variable were 187.8 for the female experimenter and 175.6 for the male experimenter.

The third significant main effect found was for the section on the General Support Scale focusing upon perceived posttest support from the participant's group members, $F(1, 29) = 8.32, p < .007$. The variable mean for the female experimenter was 7.3 while the mean for the male experimenter was found to be 4.5.

Thus, the above three significant effects indicated that groups led by the female experimenter had generally higher scores at posttest on their priority activity monitoring data, total efficacy ratings and group support ratings than did groups led by the male experimenter.

Correlations and Other Analyses Focusing Upon Stress, Social Support, and the Relationship Between Stress and Support

A correlational analysis was undertaken to assess which variables were related to stress and social support at pre and posttest. At pre-test the following significant relationships were found: (1) As the
number of stressful life events checked on the Life Events Checklist increased, so did the number of physical symptoms checked on the S/M/P Inventory ($r = .27, p < .03$), as well as the severity of the physical symptoms felt ($r = .41, p < .0008$), and the total stress score, as measured by the S/M/P form ($r = .37, p < .002$); (2) As the perceived amount of support a participant felt from her boss (measured by the General Support Scale) increased, her stress level, as measured by the Stressful Conditions Questionnaire, decreased ($r = -.39, p < .008$); (3) As the perceived amount of support a participant felt from her spouse, friends and relatives (measured by the General Support Scale) increased, her stress level, as measured by the Stressful Conditions Questionnaire, decreased ($r = -.58, p < .001$); (4) As the number of years a participant spent in her current job increased, her stress level, as measured by all four stress ratings evaluated, decreased (Stressful Conditions Questionnaire: $r = -.36, p < .003$; number of physical symptoms experienced: $r = -.38, p < .002$; severity of physical symptoms experienced: $r = -.40, p < .001$; total S/M/P score: $r = -.35, p < .004$); (5) As a participant's family income increased, her stress level, as measured by three of the stress ratings, decreased (number of physical symptoms experienced: $r = -.34, p < .006$; severity of physical symptoms experienced: $r = -.32, p < .009$; total S/M/P score: $r = -.27, p < .02$); and (6) as the perceived amount of support a participant felt from her spouse, friends and relatives increased, the total amount of self-efficacy she felt concerning time management-related behaviors (as
measured by the Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet) increased \((r = -0.40, p < 0.008)\).

The significant inverse relationship found at pretest between the perceived amount of support a participant felt from her boss and her reported stress level (as measured by the Stressful Conditions Questionnaire) was also found at posttest \((r = 0.32; p < 0.05)\). Similarly, the positive, pretest relationship between perceived amount of support from spouse, friends and relatives and total amount of self-efficacy experienced concerning time management-related tasks was also found at posttest \((r = 0.52, p < 0.001)\).

At posttest it was found additionally that as the amount of cohesiveness a participant felt from her stress management group (as measured by the Group Questionnaire) increased, the amount of time she spent in her two targeted activities increased \((r = 0.54, p < 0.001)\). Similarly, as the amount of cohesiveness she felt from her group increased, so did the total amount of self-efficacy she felt concerning time management-related behaviors \((r = 0.47, p < 0.004)\).

Finally, when a stepwise regression was performed (using the forward selection procedure; Goodnight, 1979b, p. 391), the best predictor of pretest stress levels (as measured by the Stressful Conditions Questionnaire) was found to be the total amount of perceived support the participant was receiving from all outside sources (i.e., the combination of boss support, coworker support, and support from spouse, relatives and friends on the General Support Scale). This regression is presented in Table 4. The only other variable that added
Table 4
Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Using the General Support Scale and Interpersonal/Assertion at Home Efficacy Scale as Predictors of Pretest Stress Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>$R^2$ increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Outside Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2524.264</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/Assertion at Home Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>547.382</td>
<td>0.061**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5975.524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9047.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001

**p < .037
significantly to this prediction was pretest levels of the "interpersonal/assertive abilities at home" efficacy scale (see Table 4). For both of these variables, their relationship to the stress variable was found to be in inverse one.

In summary, the amount of stress a participant reported having appeared to be highly related to the perceived amount of outside support she felt. Amount of outside support, particularly from spouse, friends and relatives, was also found to be highly related to a participant's self-efficacy concerning a number of work- and home-related tasks. In addition to outside support, perceived cohesiveness of the stress management group the participant was involved in also appeared to be strongly related to a participant's self-efficacy as well as the amount of time she spent in her two targeted priority activities at posttest.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to develop and evaluate specific procedures and measures for ameliorating stress in working wives. Preliminary research indicated that time management instruction and social support were two promising approaches for influencing stress levels in this population. Married women working in classified employee positions at a local university were assigned to one of four conditions in which they received either a large degree of time management instruction with a large degree of group support, a large degree of instruction with minimal group support, minimal instruction with a large degree of group support, or neither intervention (i.e., a waiting-list control). Major variables of interest included amount of time spent in two targeted high-priority activities, changes in self-efficacy for specified time management-related tasks, amount of support perceived both within and outside of the group setting, and changes in global measures of stress.

As predicted, women in the two conditions receiving a large amount of time management instruction during the program reported significantly greater increases in the amount of time spent in specified high-priority activities at posttest and follow-up than those women receiving no time management instruction. Women receiving a large amount of instruction also reported greater increases in their high-priority activities than women receiving minimal instruction (i.e., the High Support condition). Such increases reached statistical significance in the Combination condition. Follow-up data suggested that
changes in amount of time spent in high-priority activities were able to be maintained 3 months after the program ended. In addition, women receiving a large amount of time management instruction showed significantly greater increases in their knowledge of time and stress management factors than did women receiving minimal or no time management instruction.

These findings indicate that changes in "first-order" behaviors having a potential influence on stress levels (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971; Silcox, 1980) can occur through the use of specific instructional training. In contrast, the use of group support alone appeared to be a less useful technique in bringing about such behavior change.

As further predicted, women in the High Instruction condition reported greater self-efficacy for time management behaviors at posttest than women receiving minimal or no time management instruction. While not reaching statistical significance, the mean posttest self-efficacy score for women in the Combination condition approached that for the High Instruction condition, as compared with the other two conditions. In contrast to this measure, neither of the two non-specific stress measures employed in the study showed differential change across conditions at posttest. Such data provide evidence for the contention that the greatest impact of short-term stress management programs lies in their effect on specific behaviors rather than on global stress levels. The use of more specifically-focused measures is thus indicated.
Finally, women in the Combination condition reported receiving a significantly higher degree of group support during the program than the High Instruction condition. This provides evidence for the integrity of the social support manipulations in these conditions. However, while the two conditions receiving higher levels of group support during the program reported a somewhat greater number of contacts with other group members at posttest and followup than the condition receiving a minimal amount of group support, the actual changes in group contacts across the three experimental conditions was quite small and the reliability on the measure used was poor.

It should be noted that participants did not in general differ on the variety of demographic and other pretest measures evaluated at the beginning of the program. This indicates that differences at posttest were not due to such extraneous factors, but, rather, to the interventions presented.

The above results seem relevant to several issues. These include the specificity of the interventions and measures used in the area of stress management; the utility of a marketing approach for the development of such behavior change programs; as well as the influence of social support on the delivery and success of programs aimed at promoting behavior change and the amelioration of stress.

As discussed in the introduction, the present study differed from the majority of previous stress management studies undertaken in that global measures of stress were supplemented with measures focused upon discrete, "first-order" effects (e.g., changes in self-efficacy for
specific time management-related behaviors). It appears reasonable that such relatively short-term programs would have their greatest impact on more specific behaviors (e.g., time spent in targeted activities), which would in turn influence more general stress levels. The results from the present study lend support to this contention. The self-efficacy measure used showed differential changes across conditions while the global stress measures did not. However, results from the Program Utilization Questionnaire did indicate that, when asked to report on perceived stress as a function of the program, the experimental conditions did report somewhat different changes in stress which were congruent with the more discrete measures used. This suggests that while changes in stress levels large enough to be reflected in the more global stress measures used did not occur, smaller changes did. Such changes would appear to be more reasonable given the length of the program.

The targeting of discrete, relevant behaviors for change and measures sensitive in reflecting such change are important elements of the social marketing approach described earlier. Such an approach offers a systematic means of matching the "right" population with the "right" interventions so that the prospect of change can be enhanced. In the present study, the population under study was delineated, through preliminary research, as a population with specific, relatively homogeneous needs that had the potential for being impacted upon by the present investigator. That is, the two major needs defined by the individuals evaluated, time management instruction and intangible kinds
of social support, were needs that could potentially be met via programs developed by the present investigator. If, on the other hand, the individuals surveyed had designated tangible support as the factor of greatest importance for them (e.g., babysitting, carpooling), a different type of program would have been indicated. It would have been up to the investigator at that point to decide if such a program could indeed have been offered by him/her.

In addition to defining the type of program to be offered, the best methods of delivering that program (e.g., program format, place and time of delivery) were also assessed by the investigator prior to actual program delivery. The positive results accrued from the present study suggest that these and other aspects of the marketing approach previously mentioned can indeed be useful in developing a program relevant to populations with targeted needs and goals.

For the particular population in question (i.e., working wives), an added variable that appears relevant to take into account is the sex of the group leader. The present results indicate that a female leader may have a greater potential for impacting upon major variables of interest (i.e., time spent in priority activities, self-efficacy, perceived group support). A possible explanation for this may be that group members can more easily identify with a female group leader, and believe that such a group leader can better understand their specific stresses and issues. Anecdotal support for this was found in comments participants made to the experimenter at the end of the program.
While the delivery of a large degree of time management instruction alone appeared to have a strong effect in influencing changes in specific behavior and expectancy in the population studied, the role of social support in affecting change was less clear. The findings from the High Support condition strongly suggest that group support alone is less effective in bringing about substantial changes in behavior or self-efficacy than instruction alone. However, the combination of these two procedures leads to results that are less certain. On the one hand, the Combination condition participants rated their group experience as the most enjoyable and useful when compared with the other two experimental conditions. On the other hand, while the Combination condition showed the greatest increase in time spent in high-priority activities relative to the other conditions, this increase was not significantly larger than that shown by the High Instruction condition. In addition, the Combination condition showed less increase in self-efficacy from pre- to post-test (albeit not significantly less) than did the High Instruction condition. Taken together, these findings indicate that the major benefit in encouraging support among group participants is seen in their subsequent perceptions of how enjoyable and useful the program is, rather than in actual behavior change.

The fact that in other respects group support did not add appreciably to instructions in the present study is suggested by the follow-up data from the Control condition. While obtained through self-report and, thus, only suggestive, the amount of time in priority activities reported by Control participants at follow-up is more similar to that
from the High Instruction condition than from the Combination condition. This is the case even though the control participants received a Combination-style program. Anecdotal evidence has suggested that these follow-up self-reported differences between the Combination and Control conditions could have stemmed, at least in part, from stylistic differences among group members which influenced subsequent group interactions. For instance, in the Control group two members had interpersonal styles that were extremely aggressive, making group interactions at times reportedly uncomfortable for other members. Given such observations, more intensive investigation of how social competency differences among group members could influence subsequent group interaction and support is called for. The potential importance of this variable in influencing social support has been suggested by other investigators (e.g., Cohen & McKay, 1981; Cohen, in press).

The fact that group support did not have as great an impact on posttest measures as predicted could be due to reasons stemming from the actual manner in which social support was encouraged in the present study. While encouraged in the two conditions receiving support (resulting in significantly greater feelings of group support in the Combination condition compared to the High Instruction condition, and trends towards stronger feelings of support in the High Support condition), such support did not appear to transfer outside of group sessions. Certainly one difficulty with this variable stems from the reported impreciseness and poor reliability of the Group Contact measure used to assess such outside contacts. A more precise method of
assessing outside contacts is called for. However, anecdotal verbal reports from participants also indicated that such contacts were not being made outside of the group sessions. Interestingly, participants reported anecdotally that it was not that they were unmotivated to do so. Participants from both the High Support and Combination conditions reported that they wanted very much to contact other group members, but remained afraid to do so even after they began to feel more comfortable with the group. These women reported not knowing the best way of contacting members which would reduce their risk of feeling rejected if the member for some reason was unfriendly toward them. Such reports appear quite reasonable when one evaluates the manner in which the two experimental interventions were delivered. Conditions receiving a large amount of instruction were specifically taught methods of implementing time management strategies, and were given a chance to role-play them or observe the group leader doing so. In contrast, relatively little group time and attention was spent in teaching participants specific ways of contacting and interacting with group members outside of sessions. Given that a number of participants independently reported having difficulties doing so despite a desire to initiate contact, the assumption that individuals were competent to make such contacts with simply some encouragement from the leader may have been a fallacious one. It is quite possible that such individuals may require specific training in making contacts with newly acquainted individuals. Such training might need to address both behavioral as well as attitudinal aspects of contacts, since either could play a role in inhibiting
interpersonal interaction (Eisler & Frederiksen, 1980). One example of such an inhibiting attitude is: "The only individuals that should be told about difficulties I am having are members of my family." It does appear that making initial contact with other women outside of the work situation for the purpose of gaining support may be threatening, at least for some women. However, such outside supports do appear to be highly related, as indicated by both the current literature and present results, to decreases in reported stress.

In addition to the investigation of the most effective methods for stimulating outside contacts among group members, evaluation of other potential sources of support and how they are being utilized is needed. Analyses from the present investigation support findings from other studies (e.g., House & Wells, 1978) that higher levels of perceived social support are significantly related to lower levels of stress. In the present study, such support was comprised of boss and co-worker support, as well as support from spouse, friends, and relatives. Exploring methods of teaching individuals how best to utilize the sources of support potentially available to them, both within and outside of structured groups, appears to have merit as a potentially useful method of impacting upon stress.

Thus, it appears that a useful direction to take in creating more optimal stress management programs for working women, as well as other populations under stress, includes an emphasis on specificity of both interventions and measures. Such specificity can be derived through the application of a social marketing approach to behavior change. In
addition, the investigation of methods for helping individuals to create functional supports in their environment, as well as teaching them to better utilize those supports already available to them, would appear to be a worthwhile endeavor to pursue in delineating the best methods for impacting upon stress.
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APPENDICES
Dear Participant:

The present survey is designed to gather basic information from individuals who are a part of a dual-career or two-income family. We plan to use the information gathered in this survey in the development of a program specifically tailored to the needs and interests of dual-earner individuals in the Blacksburg area.

In order to ensure the confidentiality of your responses on this survey, your name will not appear anywhere on the question or answer forms. Instead, you will be given a code number which you will be asked to use on these forms.

In order to facilitate the tabulation of this survey, we will give you an opscan form on which to record your responses. Please use a #2 pencil in filling out this form.

We appreciate your time and effort in completing our survey. The information you provide will be quite valuable in helping us plan useful programs in this area.

Thank-you!

Sincerely,

Abby King, M.S.
Dual-earner Survey

*Please choose ONE response for each question; with Number 2 pencil, darken in the appropriate circle on the opscan provided to you.

*Please answer ALL questions.

Place the Code # given to you at the top of each page of this form.

*Note: For responses which require elaboration (e.g., "other" responses), please write your comments on this question form (not the opscan).

Demographics:

1) Sex:
   (1) Female
   (2) Male

2) Age:
   (1) 18 - 25
   (2) 26 - 35
   (3) 36 - 45
   (4) 46 - 55
   (5) over 55

3) Marital status:
   (1) Single
   (2) Married
   (3) Divorced or separated

4) Years of education:
   (1) through grade school
   (2) attended high school but never graduated.
   (3) graduated from high school.
   (4) attended undergraduate school but never graduated.
   (5) graduated from undergraduate school.
   (6) am currently attending graduate school (graduate program: ____________)
   (7) graduated from graduate school (Degree and program: ____________)

(Continue)
Code #: ____________ 2)

Work/School:

* Your official job title (or graduate degree program): __________________________

* Your Spouse's official job title (or graduate degree program): __________________________ (Put N.A. if not applicable)

5) You are currently:
   (1) working full-time
   (2) going to school full-time
   (3) working part-time (please note average hours per week: ______)
   (4) attending school part-time (please note average hours per week: ______)
   (5) other (specify: __________________________)

6) Your current position is that of a:
   (1) graduate student
   (2) clerical worker
   (3) office manager
   (4) tenured faculty member
   (5) untenured faculty member
   (6) administrator
   (7) maintenance worker
   (8) factory worker
   (9) other (specify: __________________________)

7) Years in workforce:
   (1) not applicable
   (2) less than 5
   (3) 5 to 10
   (4) 11 to 15
   (5) 16 to 20
   (6) more than 20

8) Years you have spent in present job/graduate program:
   (1) 2 or less
   (2) 3 to 5
   (3) 6 to 10
   (4) 11 to 15
   (5) more than 15
Code #: __________

9) How many more years do you expect to work? (if you are in school, then once you leave school)
   (1) less than 5
   (2) 5
   (3) 10
   (4) 15
   (5) 30 or more

10) Average number of hours worked per week in job/school:
    (1) less than 40
    (2) 40
    (3) between 40 and 50
    (4) between 50 and 60
    (5) more than 60

11) Do you feel that you put in too many, too few, or just the right number of hours at work or school?
    (1) too many
    (2) too few
    (3) just the right number

12) What is the major reason why you think you put in too many hours? (If you put in too few or just the right number of hours, please respond "not applicable")
    (1) not applicable
    (2) I tend to spend my work/study time inefficiently.
    (3) I am assigned to work too many hours given the amount of work I am required to do; I could do the same amount of work in less time.
    (4) I am not allowed to work efficiently, due to a large amount of interruptions from people around me.
    (5) other (specify: ________________)

13) What is the first, most important reason why you work/attend graduate school?
    (1) to make money.
    (2) to please my spouse.
    (3) to please my parents, relatives.
    (4) to advance myself in a field; to become successful in that field.
    (5) for my own personal fulfillment.
    (6) other (specify: ________________)

(Continue)
14) What is the second most important reason why you work/attend graduate school?
   (1) to make money.
   (2) to please my spouse.
   (3) to please my parents, relatives.
   (4) to advance myself in a field, to become successful in that field.
   (5) for my own personal fulfillment.
   (6) other (specify: ____________________________________________)

15) How satisfied are you with your present job/graduate program?
   (1) extremely unsatisfied.
   (2) somewhat unsatisfied.
   (3) slightly satisfied.
   (4) fairly satisfied.
   (5) very satisfied.

16) How much stress do you feel at work as a consequence of your job/graduate school?
   (1) an extreme amount of stress.
   (2) an above-average amount of stress.
   (3) an average amount of stress.
   (4) a below-average amount of stress.
   (5) a minimal amount of stress.

17) How much stress do you feel at home as a consequence of your job/graduate school?
   (1) an extreme amount of stress.
   (2) an above-average amount of stress.
   (3) an average amount of stress.
   (4) a below-average amount of stress.
   (5) a minimal amount of stress.

18) What is the major source of stress from your job/schooling?
   (1) I have no stresses from my job/schooling.
   (2) a difficult supervisor or boss.
   (3) fellow personnel/students who are difficult to work with.
   (4) the fact that I have to commute to and from work/school.
   (5) the number of hours I have to work.
   (6) the times that I have to work (e.g., from 9:00 to 5:00 instead of being able to work or attend school earlier or later).
   (7) the fact that I have to do my work at the office or at school instead of being able to do it at home.
   (continued)
19) What is the **second major source of stress** from your job/schooling?
   (1) I have no stresses from my job/schooling.
   (2) a difficult supervisor or boss.
   (3) fellow personnel/students who are difficult to work with.
   (4) the fact that I have to commute to and from work/school.
   (5) the number of hours I have to work.
   (6) the times that I have to work (e.g., from 9:00 to 5:00 instead of being able
to work or attend school earlier or later).
   (7) the fact that I have to do my work at the office or at school instead of
   being able to do it at home.

20) What is the **major way** in which demands from your job or schooling interferes
   with or curtail your present living situation?  (Check only one)
   (1) The hours that I work/go to school are inconvenient in terms of taking care
   of nonwork-related activities (e.g., going to the bank).
   (2) I don't have enough time to spend with my children.
   (3) I don't have enough time to spend with my spouse.
   (4) I have difficulty efficiently managing the time that I have.
   (5) The amount of work/school-related stress I experience interferes with other
   aspects of my living situation.
   (6) I experience a lack of support from those around me.
   (7) other (specify: _________________________).

21) What is the **second major way** in which demands from your job/schooling interfere
   with or curtail your present living situation?
   (1) The hours that I work/go to school are inconvenient in terms of taking care
   of nonwork-related activities (e.g., going to the bank).
   (2) I don't have enough time to spend with my children.
   (3) I don't have enough time to spend with my spouse.
   (4) I have difficulty efficiently managing the time that I have.
   (5) The amount of work/school-related stress I experience interferes with other
   aspects of my living situation.
   (6) I experience a lack of support from those around me.
   (7) other (specify: _________________________).

(Continued)
22) What is the major method you currently use to deal with or diminish the stress you feel from work/school? (Remember, choose only one answer.)
(1) I don't use any particular method.
(2) exercise
(3) hobbies
(4) music
(5) talking with others.
(6) other (specify: ________________________)

23) How successful is the above method in reducing your work or school-related stress?
(1) not applicable
(2) extremely unsuccessful
(3) somewhat unsuccessful
(4) slightly successful
(5) fairly successful
(6) extremely successful

24) How happy or satisfied is your spouse with the fact that you are working/going to school?
(1) not applicable (I am currently not married)
(2) extremely unhappy
(3) somewhat unhappy
(4) slightly happy
(5) fairly happy
(6) extremely happy

25) What is your spouse's preference, in terms of your work/schooling?
(1) I am currently not married.
(2) prefers that I do not work/go to school.
(3) is satisfied with my present situation.
(4) would like me to advance immediately.
(5) would like me to advance sometime in the future.

26) Do you currently make more, less, or the same amount of money as your spouse?
(1) I am not currently married.
(2) I am not currently making money.
(3) I currently make more.
(4) I currently make less.
(5) I currently make about the same as my spouse.
Code #: __________

27) Is the above arrangement satisfactory to you?
   (1) not applicable
   (2) No
   (3) Yes

28) Is the above arrangement satisfactory to your spouse?
   (1) Not applicable
   (2) No
   (3) Yes

29) How flexible are your current work/school hours?
   (1) extremely inflexible (i.e., I have no control over my hours).
   (2) somewhat inflexible
   (3) slightly flexible (i.e., I have a small amount of control over my hours).
   (4) fairly flexible
   (5) extremely flexible (i.e., I can pretty well set my own hours).

30) Would you prefer your hours to: (choose one)
   (1) be more flexible
   (2) be less flexible
   (3) remain the same

31) If it were possible, would you want to do more of your work at home?
   (1) No
   (2) Yes

Household:

32) Number of years married to current spouse:
   (1) not applicable
   (2) two or less
   (3) three to seven
   (4) eight to twelve
   (5) more than twelve

(Continued)
Code #: ____________

33) Number of children:
   (1) 0
   (2) one
   (3) two
   (4) three
   (5) four
   (6) five or more

34) Age of youngest child:
   (1) not applicable
   (2) toddler
   (3) preschooler
   (4) grade-school age
   (5) junior high and up

35) Where is your youngest child while you work/attend school? (choose one)
   (1) not applicable
   (2) with my spouse
   (3) with a babysitter
   (4) day-care
   (5) preschool
   (6) grade school or up
   (7) a relative (specify: ____________________________)
   (8) he/she takes care of him/herself
   (9) other (specify: _____________________________)

36) How satisfied are you, in general, with the current arrangements for your children?
   (1) not applicable
   (2) extremely unsatisfied
   (3) somewhat unsatisfied
   (4) slightly satisfied
   (5) moderately satisfied
   (6) extremely satisfied

37) What kind of arrangement for your youngest child would you prefer?
   (1) not applicable
   (2) having my spouse watch them.
   (3) a baby-sitter
      (continued on next page)
(4) preschool
(5) day-care
(6) having a relative watch them.
(7) other (specify: ____________________________)

38) If you do not currently have children, do you plan to have them in the future?
(1) No
(2) Yes
(3) uncertain
(4) not applicable

39) What do you find to be the greatest stressor or difficulty arising from the fact that both you and your spouse work/attend school?
(1) not applicable
(2) not enough time to spend with my spouse.
(3) not enough time to spend with my children.
(4) having to do the majority of the household and/or childcare duties myself.
(5) not enough time to socialize with friends or relatives.
(6) not enough time to myself.
(7) I don't get enough support from others for working/attending school.
(8) other (specify: ____________________________)

40) What is the greatest asset stemming from the fact that both of you work/attend school?
(1) not applicable
(2) more money
(3) ability to share similar experiences and understand each others' perspectives better.
(4) being exposed to a wider variety of social contacts.
(5) other (specify: ____________________________)

41) What is the area around which the majority of conflicts between you and your partner arise? (choose one)
(1) not applicable
(2) career/work
(3) school
(4) money issues
(5) issues of managing time
(continued on next page)
Code 4: __________

(6) household duties (excluding children)
(7) children
(8) leisure/entertainment
(9) socializing with others
(10) other (specify: _____________________ )

42) Identify the second major area around which conflicts between you and your partner arise:
(1) not applicable
(2) career/work
(3) school
(4) money issues
(5) issues of managing time
(6) household duties (excluding children)
(7) children
(8) leisure/entertainment
(9) socializing with others
(10) other (specify: _____________________ )

43) Identify the third major area around which conflicts between you and your partner arise:
(1) not applicable
(2) career/work
(3) school
(4) money issues
(5) issues of managing time
(6) household duties (excluding children)
(7) children
(8) leisure/entertainment
(9) socializing with others
(10) other (specify: _____________________ )

44) How big of a problem is efficient management of your time for you?
(1) not at all a problem.
(2) somewhat of a problem.
(3) a significant problem.

(Continue)
45) Where would you benefit the most from increases in your time management skills?
   (choose one):
   (1) I would not benefit from increasing such skills.
   (2) at home
   (3) at school
   (4) at work
   (5) other (specify: ____________________________)

Support:

46) In general, how supportive is your spouse when it comes to your working/schooling?
   (1) not applicable
   (2) very unsupportive
   (3) somewhat unsupportive
   (4) slightly supportive
   (5) fairly supportive
   (6) very supportive

47) In general, does the kind of support you get from others tend to be tangible support (e.g., monetary, babysitting) or intangible support (verbal comfort, advice, listening)?
   (1) tangible support
   (2) intangible support
   (3) both kinds about equally
   (4) neither kind of support

48) In general, are you satisfied with the amount of tangible support (e.g., money, babysitting) you get from friends and relatives?
   (1) No
   (2) Yes

49) In general, are you satisfied with the amount of intangible support (e.g., advice, listening) you get from friends and relatives?
   (1) No
   (2) Yes

(Continue)
50) In general, are you satisfied with the amount of **tangible support** (e.g., assistance in getting assigned tasks done) you get from others at work/school?
(1) No
(2) Yes

51) In general, are you satisfied with the amount of **intangible support** (e.g., advice, listening) you get from others at work/school?
(1) No
(2) Yes

52) In general, what kind of support do you consider to be more important or desirable in your type of situation?
(1) tangible support (e.g., monetary, babysitting, assistance on tasks).
(2) intangible support (verbal comfort, advice, listening).
(3) neither kinds of support.

53) In general, do you tend to get **more support** from others concerning work/school-related issues or home-related issues?
(1) work/school issues
(2) home-related issues
(3) I get support for both about equally.
(4) I don't get support for either.

54) Do you feel that you have at least one other person that you can discuss personal problems or issues with?
(1) No
(2) Yes

55) Would you like to get the opportunity to talk to others who are in a similar work or school situation as yours?
(1) No
(2) Yes

(Continue)
56) Would you be interested in attending a no-fee program focused on issues and concerns of individuals from two-income families?
   (1) No
   (2) Yes

57) If such a no-fee program was offered, what is the major thing you would like to get out of it? (choose one)
   (1) I have no interest in such a program.
   (2) learning basic problem-solving skills applicable to a variety of situations.
   (3) learning appropriate time management techniques.
   (4) the chance to meet and talk over my issues and concerns with individuals in situations similar to mine.
   (5) learning appropriate stress management and relaxation skills.
   (6) other (specify: ________________________)

58) What is the second major thing you would like to get out of such a program?
   (1) I have no interest in such a program.
   (2) learning basic problem-solving skills applicable to a variety of situations.
   (3) learning appropriate time management techniques.
   (4) the chance to meet and talk over my issues and concerns with individuals in situations similar to mine.
   (5) learning appropriate stress management and relaxation skills.
   (6) other (specify: ________________________)

59) How many program sessions in total would you be willing or able to attend?
   (1) None
   (2) less than five
   (3) five
   (4) six to ten
   (5) more than ten
   (6) other (specify: ________________________)

60) How many sessions per week would you be willing or able to attend?
   (1) None
   (2) one
   (3) two
   (4) three

(Continue)
61) What time would be the best for you in scheduling such programs? (choose one)
   (1) None
   (2) lunchtime (my lunchtime is typically from _____ to _____).
   (3) right after work (approximate time: _______)
   (4) in the evening
   (5) over the weekend
   (6) other (specify:________________________________________)

62) What is the next most convenient time for you in scheduling such programs?
   (1) None
   (2) lunchtime (my lunchtime is typically from _____ to _____).
   (3) right after work (approximate time: _______).
   (4) in the evening
   (5) over the weekend
   (6) other (specify:________________________________________)

63) What conflicts or difficulties, if any, would keep you from attending such a program? (choose the most major one)
   (1) None, I'm just not interested in this type of program.
   (2) transportation difficulties.
   (3) scheduling difficulties.
   (4) problems with getting supervision for my children.
   (5) my spouse would not want me to attend.
   (6) I would not have any difficulties in attending.
   (7) other (specify:________________________________________)

64) I feel that an educational/supportive program on individuals from two-income families would be:
   (1) unnecessary
   (2) somewhat useful
   (3) extremely useful
   (4) useful, but not to me (please specify why:____________________)

65) Where would you prefer that such a program be held?
   (1) I'm not interested in such a program.
   (2) on the Virginia Tech campus

(continued on next page)
(3) near my apartment complex
(4) other (specify: ____________________________ )

66) In what major format would you prefer that the program materials and information be presented?
(1) I'm not interested in such a program.
(2) in written, booklet form
(3) using media (e.g., videotapes or cassette tapes), where I could view it alone.
(4) using classroom-type instruction
(5) in an interactive, group format
(6) using media (e.g., videotapes or cassette tapes), where I could view it in a group.
(7) other (specify: ____________________________ )

67) How do you think your partner would react if you attended this type of program?
(1) not applicable
(2) quite negatively
(3) somewhat negatively
(4) somewhat positively
(5) quite positively
(6) other (specify: ____________________________ )

68) Do you think that your partner would be interested in attending this type of program?
(1) definitely not
(2) probably not
(3) probably so
(4) definitely so

69) *If both you and your partner were interested in attending this type of program, would you prefer to be (choose one):
(1) not applicable
(2) in different groups, each group consisting of only one sex.
(3) in different, mixed-sex groups.
(4) together in the same group.

*In the space below, briefly state why you made your above choice:

(Continued)
70) Is your spouse currently (choose one):
   (1) not applicable (i.e., I am not currently married).
   (2) working full-time.
   (3) going to school full-time.
   (4) working part-time (please note average hours per week: ________)
   (5) attending school part-time (please note average hours per week:_______)
   (6) both attending school part-time and working part-time.
   (7) other (specify: __________________________________________)

71) Your spouse's current position is that of a:
   (1) not applicable
   (2) graduate student
   (3) clerical worker
   (4) office manager
   (5) tenured faculty member
   (6) untenured faculty member
   (7) administrator
   (8) maintenance worker
   (9) factory worker
   (10) other (specify: __________________________________________)

72) Would you like to receive a brief report summarizing the findings from this survey?
   (1) No
   (2) Yes

*What kinds of things (e.g., skills, resources) do you think are needed to cope successfully with two-income family situations? *Please feel free to write any other comments or thoughts you might have on the topic of this survey in the space below and on the back of this page:

Thank-you!
Information Inventory

1) According to present surveys, clerical workers typically identify their **biggest time-waster at work** as being: (choose one)
   a) worrying about all the things that have to be done at work and at home.
   b) telephone interruptions.
   c) lacking objectives, priorities and planning.
   d) interruptions by the boss or other coworkers.

2) According to present surveys, clerical workers typically identify their **second biggest time-waster at work** as being: (choose one)
   a) worrying about all the things that have to be done at work and at home.
   b) telephone interruptions.
   c) lacking objectives, priorities and planning.
   d) interruptions by the boss or other coworkers.

3) The biggest time-waster for homemakers, according to present surveys: (choose one)
   a) chauffeuring children and other errands
   b) ineffective delegation
   c) procrastination and indecision
   d) attempting too much at once

4) The basic difference between being **efficient**, and, preferably, being **effective** is that being **effective** involves: (choose one)
   a) knowing when to perform a particular job given the amount of time you have available.
   b) knowing how to do a job correctly instead of rushing through it.
   c) being able to meet your deadlines.
   d) being able to meet the expectations of those around you.

5) What is a **self-defeating belief**? (choose one)
   a) It is a belief we hold that we cannot possibly live up to.
   b) It is a negative thought focused upon others around us.
   c) It is a rational belief that we learned over a number of years.
   d) All of the above.

6) Name the **most popular myth** working wives find themselves believing, which often results in time management difficulties:

7) List one way of appropriately modifying or changing the above myth:

8) List one of the two basic questions which time management experts state is important to ask yourself in deciding how to manage your time:

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)
9) List the first step in good planning:

10) Briefly describe the method of prioritizing tasks or activities frequently preferred by time management experts:

11) Name the 3 steps involved in saying no while respecting the rights of the other person:
   1)
   2)
   3)

12) Name 2 of the basic rules involved in delegating tasks to someone else:
   1)
   2)

13) Describe a common self-defeating belief:

14) List 2 ways of minimizing phone interruptions at home:
   1)
   2)

15) List 2 ways of minimizing the amount of time spent in making phone calls at work:
   1)
   2)

16) You find yourself consistently feeling stressed when your workload (either at home or at work) increases and you feel incapable of handling it effectively. Name 3 specific methods you might use to help alleviate your stress in these situations:
   1)
   2)
   3)

*HI-PRIORITY ACTIVITY #1: ____________________________ SPECIFIC GOAL: ____________________________

*HI-PRIORITY ACTIVITY #2: ____________________________ SPECIFIC GOAL: ____________________________
Subject Name: ___________________    Subject Number: ______

Daily Priority Activity Monitoring Form

Priority Activity #1: ____________________________

Priority Activity #2: ____________________________

Day of the week: ___________    Date: ___________

* Record amount of time spent in each activity in the box next to the appropriate time slot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity #1</th>
<th>Activity #2</th>
<th>Activity #1</th>
<th>Activity #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6AM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>4PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7AM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>5PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8AM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>6PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9AM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>7PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10AM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>8PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11AM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>9PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon:</td>
<td></td>
<td>10PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>11PM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>12AM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PM:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1AM:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Group Member</th>
<th>NUMBER of Contacts you had TODAY with this Person</th>
<th>Specify the NUMBER of these Contacts INITIATED by YOU</th>
<th>In General, Specify How HELPFUL the Contacts were for you by choosing the NUMBER on the Scale below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Support Scale*

Please rate each statement and the items that follow by darkening in the appropriate number on the OPSCAN which corresponds to the scale for each item. BLACKEN IN only ONE Number for Each Item.

*BLACKEN IN a 10 if you are not currently enrolled in a stress management group when you are answering those items asking specifically about such groups.

A) How much does each of these people go out of their way to do things to make your work life easier for you?

1) Your immediate supervisor (boss)....

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all a little somewhat very much

2) Other people at work....
(excluding individuals in your stress management group)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all a little somewhat very much

3) Your spouse, friends and relatives....

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all a little somewhat very much

4) Individuals in your stress management group....

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all a little somewhat very much

B) How easy is it to talk with each of the following people?

5) Your immediate supervisor (boss)....

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all easy easy easy easy

6) Other people at work...
(excluding individuals in your stress management group)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all easy easy easy easy

7) Your spouse, friends and relatives....

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all easy easy easy easy

8) Individuals in your stress management group....

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all easy easy easy easy

C) How much can each of these people be relied on when things get tough at work?

9) Your immediate supervisor (boss)....

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all a little somewhat very much

* Adapted from Frederiksen, Winett and Riley, 1981.
Subject Name: ____________________________ Date: ___________

General Support Scale - continued

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) Other people at work....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding individuals in your stress management group)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) Your spouse, friends and relatives....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) Individuals in your stress management group....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D) How much can each of these people be relied upon when things get tough at home?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13) Your immediate supervisor (boss)....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14) Other people at work....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding individuals in your stress management group)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15) Your spouse, friends and relatives....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16) Individuals in your stress management group....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E) How much is each of the following people willing to listen to your personal problems?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17) Your immediate supervisor (boss)....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18) Other people at work....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding individuals in your stress management group)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19) Your spouse, friends and relatives....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20) Individuals in your stress management group....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>somewhat very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F) During the last two working days, how many times have you sought out a coworker about: (exclude individuals in your stress management group)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21) Personal problems....</td>
<td>![scale]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>once or three times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>once or twice</td>
<td>three times</td>
<td>four more times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G) During the last two working days, how many times have you sought out an individual in your stress management group about:

23) Personal problems....

24) Work-related problems....
Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________

Group Questionnaire

Please rate each of the following items by DARKENING IN the appropriate number on the OPSCAN which matches the number you would choose on the scale below each item. *DARKEN in only ONE number for each item.

1) In general, how well do you feel that you know the other members of your group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Not at all</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) In general, how much do you like the other members of your group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Don’t like</td>
<td>Like very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) To what extent would you like to continue meeting with the individuals in your group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) How important do you think meeting regularly with your group is in helping you manage your time and/or stress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Not important</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) In general, how comfortable would you feel contacting members of your group outside of group sessions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Not at all comfortable</td>
<td>Extremely comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How many individuals in your group did you know before this project began?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>none</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>six</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Please list the names of any individuals you know who are in either your group or in other groups that are a part of this project:

Thank-you!
Efficacy Expectation Rating Sheet*

Instructions
Please rate each of the activities described on the second Efficacy Behaviors List given to you on a scale of 1-7. 1 means that it is Not at All Likely that you could perform the particular activity well. 7 means that it is Extremely Likely that you could perform the particular activity well. Anything in-between would receive a 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.

**Simply DARKEN IN the appropriate number on the OPSCAN which corresponds to your rating of the activity on the Efficacy Behaviors List. Make sure that each of the activities has been rated on the OPSCAN.

*DARKEN IN a 10 on the OPSCAN for those items pertaining to children Only if you DON'T have children. Use the following scale as a guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Likely</td>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>Fairly Likely</td>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Chiauzzi and Heimberg (1980)
Efficacy Behaviors List

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Work:

1) Listing work-related tasks that need to be completed that day at the beginning of the day.

2) Effectively prioritizing tasks at work in order of importance.

3) Accurately assigning differing amount of time to each task.

4) Breaking each task down into its basic components to aid in completing tasks.

5) Knowing when and how to re-prioritize tasks (i.e., make decisions as to which tasks are most important to do) given unexpected and changing work demands and time limits.

6) Systematically evaluating which tasks have been completed or not completed at the end of the day.

7) Setting realistic goals concerning the number and kinds of tasks to be completed each day.

8) Meeting supervisor-designated or personal deadlines on major tasks.

9) Meeting supervisor-designated or personal deadlines on minor tasks.

(TURN OVER)
Subject Name: ____________________________ Date: ________________ 2)

**Efficacy Behaviors List - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DARKEN IN THE appropriate number on the OPSCAN:**

10) Effectively handling *unexpected* tasks and interruptions at work so that they cause a minimum of disruption and/or stress.

11) Knowing when continuation of a particular task will result in *diminishing returns*, in terms of time and effort (i.e., avoiding being unreasonably perfectionistic).

12) Obtaining thorough, clear information concerning what your supervisor considers to be the important tasks and how he/she expects them to be done.

13) Arranging the work environment, within the limitations present, to reduce the potential number of interruptions that can occur (e.g., closing the door when working; asking people returning your phone calls to call during a designated block of time, if possible).

14) Handling phone calls effectively so that a minimum of time is wasted.

15) Focusing your attention and effort on work-related, rather than home-related, tasks when at work.

16) Scheduling in time during work hours for non-work-related activities (e.g., taking a child to the doctor) when necessary, with a *minimum* of guilt.

17) Asking *co-workers* for advice or information concerning work-related tasks.

18) Asking your *supervisor* for advice or information concerning work-related tasks.

(continued on next page)
**Efficacy Behaviors List - continued**

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19) Asking co-workers for advice or information concerning more personal or home-related matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Asking co-workers for help or favors concerning work-related activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Expressing negative feelings to co-workers in an appropriate manner when they do something that bothers you or interferes with your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Refusing what you consider to be unreasonable or annoying requests from co-workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Asking co-workers or other visitors if they wouldn't mind leaving your work space when your have work to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Letting your supervisor(s) know when you are not being given enough responsibility or tasks to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Requesting changes in your work environment (e.g., the addition of another phone) which you feel would be useful or necessary in improving your work and/or easing strains from work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Letting your supervisor(s) know when your work load or deadlines are becoming unreasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Refusing what you consider to be unreasonable or annoying requests from your supervisor(s) (e.g., a request to work overtime).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TURN OVER)
Subject Name: _______________________________ Date: ________________

Efficacy Behaviors List - continued

28) Expressing negative feelings towards your supervisor(s) in an appropriate manner when he/she does something that bothers you or interferes with your work.

At Home:

29) Listing home-related tasks (e.g., meal planning, cleaning) that need to be completed during the day before the beginning of that day.

30) Effectively prioritizing home-related tasks in order of importance.

31) Accurately assigning differing amounts of time to each task.

32) Setting small, reasonable goals at home (i.e., breaking each task down into its basic parts) to aid in completing each task.

33) Knowing when and how to re-prioritize tasks (i.e., make decisions as to which tasks are most important to do) given unexpected and changing home demands and time limits.

34) Pre-planning repetitive activities (e.g., meal planning, banking activities) for an entire week, so that shopping and similar activities can be completed in one, instead of several, trips.

35) Setting realistic goals concerning the number and kinds of tasks to be completed each day.

36) Meeting personal deadlines on major home-related tasks (e.g., spring cleaning; re-decorating a room).

37) Meeting personal deadlines on minor home-related tasks (e.g., mending clothes; ironing; doing a laundry).

(continued on next page)
Subject Name: ______________________ Date: ____________

Efficacy Behaviors List - continued

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Somewhat Fairly Extremely Likely Likely Likely

38) Effectively handling unexpected interruptions at home before they significantly disrupt preferred activities.

40) Effectively handling phone calls at home so that a minimum amount of time is wasted and stress levels are kept at a minimum.

41) Effectively focusing your attention on home-related, rather than work-related, activities when at home.

42) Taking a sufficient amount of time each day to relax or engage in leisure activities with the experience of a minimal amount of guilt.

43) Asking your spouse for advice or information concerning home-related tasks.

44) Asking friends or relatives for advice or information concerning home-related tasks.

45) Asking friends and relatives not living with you for actual help or favors concerning home-related activities.

46) Expressing negative feelings towards friends and relatives in an appropriate manner.

47) Expressing negative feelings toward your children in an appropriate manner.

(TURN OVER)
Subject Name: ____________________________ Date: ____________

Efficacy Behaviors List - continued

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Somewhat Fairly Extremely Likely Likely Likely

48) Expressing negative feelings toward your spouse in an appropriate manner.

49) Refusing what you consider to be unreasonable or annoying requests from friends or relatives.

50) Refusing what you consider to be unreasonable or annoying requests from your children.

51) Refusing what you consider to be unreasonable or annoying requests from your spouse.

52) Letting your spouse know when your workload at home is unreasonable.

53) Asking visitors to leave when you feel that an appropriate amount of time has passed.

54) Effectively delegating home tasks to your children as a means of easing your workload.

55) Effectively delegating home tasks to your spouse as a means of easing your workload.

Thank-you!
Outcome Expectancy Rating Sheet*

Instructions

Please rate each of the activities listed on the Efficacy Behaviors List given to you on a scale of from 1-7. 1 means that it would Not be at All Likely that performing the activity would lead to desirable consequences. 7 means that it would be Extremely Likely that adequately performing the activity would lead to desirable consequences. These "desirable consequences" would include things like helping you to manage your time or helping you to better cope with stresses at work or at home. Anything in-between would receive a 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.

*Simply DARKEN IN the appropriate number on the OPSCAN which corresponds to your rating of the activity on the Efficacy Behaviors List. Make sure that EACH of the items has been rated on the OPSCAN. Use the following scale as a guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Chiauzzi and Heimberg (1980)
APPENDIX I
I. Of the symptoms listed below, please put a check by the ones you experienced today and indicate the severity of each checked symptom by circling one of the numbers on the 10-point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom</th>
<th>Very mild</th>
<th>Very severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep disturbance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache (other than sinus)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backache</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle pain or tension</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash or hives</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flu and/or cold</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual difficulties</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomach distress</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortness of breath</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menstrual distress</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Here are some items about how people may feel. When you think about yourself today, how much of the time did you feel this way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>None or little of the time</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>A Good Part of the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I felt depressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt nervous.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt angry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I felt blue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I felt calm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I felt aggravated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt cheerful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I felt fidgety.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I felt irritated or annoyed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Circle the number that best describes your productivity for the day.

A. Quantity - how much did you accomplish today?

Very little: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Very poor: Excellent

B. Quality - what was the quality of what you accomplished?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
APPENDIX J
Stressful Conditions

Questionnaire

There are frequently day to day conditions which we find stressful. Go through them reading each one. DARKEN IN the appropriate number on the OPSCAN which matches the number you would choose on the scale next to each item.

*DARKEN IN only ONE number for each item.

1. I am uncomfortable meeting strangers .............................................. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I am uncomfortable speaking in front of a group ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I am concerned over my ability to do everything I want to .................. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Others I work with seem unclear about what my job is ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
5. I have difference of opinion with my supervisors ............................... 1 2 3 4 5
6. Other's demands for my time at work are in conflict with each other .... 1 2 3 4 5
7. I lack confidence in "management" .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
8. "Management" expects me to interrupt my work for new priorities ........ 1 2 3 4 5
9. There is conflict between my unit and other, I must work with ............ 1 2 3 4 5
10. I only get feedback when my performance is unsatisfactory .................. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Decisions or changes which affect me are made "above" without my knowledge or involvement .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I have too much to do and too little time to do it .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I feel overqualified for the work I actually do ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I feel underqualified for the work I actually do ............................... 1 2 3 4 5
15. The people I work with closely are trained in a different field than mine. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I must go to other departments to get my job done ............................ 1 2 3 4 5
17. I have unsettled conflicts with people in my department - (or family) .... 1 2 3 4 5
18. I have unsettled conflicts with other departments ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I get little personal support from the people I work with ..................... 1 2 3 4 5
20. I spend my time "fighting fires" rather than working to a plan ............. 1 2 3 4 5
21. I feel family pressure about long hours, weekend work, etc. ............... 1 2 3 4 5
22. I have self-imposed demands to meet scheduled deadlines ................... 1 2 3 4 5
23. I have difficulty giving negative feedback to peers .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
24. I have difficulty giving negative feedback to subordinates - (or children) 1 2 3 4 5
25. I have difficulty dealing with aggressive people ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
26. I have difficulty dealing with passive people .................................. 1 2 3 4 5
27. Overlapping responsibilities cause me problems ................................ 1 2 3 4 5
28. I am uncomfortable arbitrating a conflict among my peers .................. 1 2 3 4 5
29. I am uncomfortable arbitrating a conflict among my subordinates - (or children) .......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
30. I avoid conflicts with peers .......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
31. I avoid conflicts with superiors .................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
32. I avoid conflicts with subordinates ................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
33. Allocation of resources generates conflict in my organization .............. 1 2 3 4 5
34. I experience frustration with conflicting procedures ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
35. My personal needs are in conflict with the organization ..................... 1 2 3 4 5
36. I am bothered by my noisy environment ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
37. I have difficulty staying focused on a task .................................... 1 2 3 4 5
38. My wife (husband) makes too many demands on me ........................... 1 2 3 4 5
39. I have concern over my parents' health .......................................... 1 2 3 4 5
40. I have difficulty communicating with my children ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
41. I have difficulty saying what I feel ............................................. 1 2 3 4 5

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Weekend Activities Questionnaire

1) Compared to your weekends prior to beginning this program, did you do more, less, or about the same number of your high priority activities over the past weekend?

1) more
2) less
3) about the same number

2) Compared to your weekends prior to beginning this program, did the number of chores you performed over the past weekend decrease, increase, or remain the same?

1) decrease
2) increase
3) remain the same

3) How would you rate your past weekend, in terms of how stressful it was for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressful</td>
<td>Stressful</td>
<td>Stressful</td>
<td>Stressful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4)*Goal for high-priority activity #1 (daily goal, if possible):

5)*Goal for high-priority activity #2 (daily goal, if possible):

* If you made last week’s goal, you may want to set a new goal for the activity.
APPENDIX L
PROGRAM UTILIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DARKEN IN the appropriate number on the OPSCAN which corresponds to your answer to each item below. DARKEN IN only ONE number for each item.

1) Did you notice any changes in your felt stress from before you entered the stress/time management training to after you completed the training?

1) Much improvement
2) Some improvement
3) Slight improvement
4) It remained the same
5) Slightly worse
6) Somewhat worse
7) Much worse

2) How frequently did you use planning (e.g., making a "to-do" list) and prioritizing for managing your time?

1) More than once per day
2) About once per day
3) Several days per week
4) Once per week
5) Once every two weeks
6) At least once
7) Not at all

3) How often did you use support from group members to cope with your time management or stress-related problems?

1) More than once per day
2) About once per day
3) Several days per week
4) Once per week
5) Once every two weeks
6) At least once
7) Not at all

4) How useful did you find the section on planning and prioritizing in helping you manage your time? (Darken in one on the opscan).

1) Not at all useful
2) Somewhat useful
3) Moderately useful
4) Useful
5) Extremely useful
6) Not at all useful
7) Somewhat useful

5) How useful did you find the section on exploring the Superwoman Myth in helping you manage your time?

1) Not at all useful
2) Somewhat useful
3) Moderately useful
4) Useful
5) Extremely useful
6) Not at all useful
7) Somewhat useful

6) How useful did you find the section on delegation and other tips for the home in helping you manage your time?

1) Not at all useful
2) Somewhat useful
3) Moderately useful
4) Useful
5) Extremely useful
6) Not at all useful
7) Somewhat useful

(TURN OVER)
7) How useful did you find support from group members in helping you manage your time?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all somewhat moderately extremely
useful useful useful useful

8) How useful did you find the section on planning and prioritizing in helping you reduce your stress?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all somewhat moderately extremely
useful useful useful useful

9) How useful did you find the section on exploring the Superwoman Myth in helping you reduce your stress?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all somewhat moderately extremely
useful useful useful useful

10) How useful did you find the section on delegation and other tips for the home in helping you reduce your stress?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all somewhat moderately extremely
useful useful useful useful

11) How useful did you find support from group members in helping you reduce your stress?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all somewhat moderately extremely
useful useful useful useful

12) How satisfied were you with the way your group session were conducted (e.g., was there enough group discussion, information, etc.)?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all somewhat moderately extremely
satisfied satisfied satisfied satisfied

13) How satisfied overall were you with the stress/time management program?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all somewhat moderately extremely
satisfied satisfied satisfied satisfied

**Please answer the following questions in the spaces provided below:**

14) List two goals that you had for yourself when you first entered the stress/time management group:

1. 
2. 

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
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Program Utilization Questionnaire - continued

19) To what extent did the stress/time management training help you to **meet** your first goal?

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all helpful</td>
<td>somewhat helpful</td>
<td>moderately helpful</td>
<td>extremely helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) To what extent did the stress/time management training help you to **meet** your second goal?

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all helpful</td>
<td>somewhat helpful</td>
<td>moderately helpful</td>
<td>extremely helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) What did you **like** about the groups? (Continue on back if necessary)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

18) What **didn't** you like about the groups? (Continue on back if necessary)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

19) What could be **changed or improved**? (as well as any other suggestions or comments)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Thank-you!
APPENDIX M
Demographics Sheet

*Note: All of this information will be kept completely confidential.

1) Official Job Title: (specify) ____________________________

2) Spouse's official job title (or graduate degree program): (specify) ____________________________

*For each of items 3-19, DARKEN IN the appropriate number on the OPSCAN given to you:

3) Sex:

1) female
2) male

4) Age:

1) 18 - 25
2) 26 - 35
3) 36 - 45
4) 46 - 55
5) over 55

5) Years of education:

1) through grade school
2) attended high school but never graduated
3) graduated from high school
4) attended undergraduate school or business school but never graduated
5) graduated from undergraduate school or business school
6) am currently attending graduate school (graduate program: ____________)
7) graduated from graduate school (degree and program: ____________)

6) You are currently:

1) working full-time
2) working part-time
3) both working and going to school (please note the average number of hours per week that you work: ____________)

7) Years in workforce:

1) less than 5
2) 5 - 10
3) 11 - 15
4) 16 - 20
5) more than 20

8) Years you have spent in present job:

1) 2 or less
2) 3 to 5
3) 6 to 10
4) 11 - 15
5) more than 15
9) How many more years do you expect to work?

1) less than 5
2) 5 - 10
3) 11 - 15
4) 16 - 20
5) 21 or more

10) Number of years married:

1) 2 or less
2) 3 to 7
3) 8 to 12
4) 13 to 17
5) more than 17

11) Number of children:

1) 0
2) one
3) two
4) three
5) four
6) five or more

12) Age of youngest child:

1) not applicable (I don't have children)
2) toddler
3) preschooler
4) grade-school age
5) middle school (junior high) and up.

13) Age of second youngest child:

1) not applicable
2) toddler
3) preschooler
4) grade-school age
5) middle school (junior high) and up.

14) Are you satisfied with the current arrangements for your children during the day?

1) not applicable (I don't have children)
2) yes
3) no

15) How many people live in your household (include yourself, your spouse, children, relatives, etc.): (specify below)
16) Approximate current family income (i.e., your income + your spouse's income):

1) less than $10,000 per year
2) $10,000 - $15,000 per year
3) $16,000 - $20,000 per year
4) $21,000 - $25,000 per year
5) $26,000 - $30,000 per year
6) over $30,000 per year

17) Your current marital status is:

1) single
2) married
3) divorced, separated or widowed

18) Have you had any exposure to time management, outside of this project (such as through books, seminars or workshops, films, the media, etc.)?

1) No
2) Yes

*If Yes, please specify below what kind of exposure you've had:

*Please answer the following question in the spaces provided below:

Which of the following activities do you participate in at least once a week? Please check those activities which are appropriate, and for each activity checked put how many times a week, on the average, you participate in it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) church-related activities
| 2) after-work activities related to your job
| 3) activities related to your spouse's job
| 4) volunteer activities
| 5) social activities with friends
| 6) social activities with relatives
| 7) activities related to your child (e.g., PTA: other appointments)
| 8) running errands for others (e.g., for relatives, neighbors)
| 9) clubs, or organizations
| 10) Other obligations (specify:_________________________)

**19) Total the above times per week and darken in the appropriate # on the OPSCAN.
Life Events Check-List

Listed below are life events which happen to a great many people. On the Appropriate OPSCAN, please DARKEN IN a one (1) for any event listed below if it has happened to you in the last six months. For those events that did not occur to you, please DARKEN IN a two (2).

1) Being fired from work.
2) Beginning or ending school or college.
3) Death of a close friend.
4) Son or daughter leaving home (marriage, college, etc.)
5) Put in jail or other institution.
6) Had a vacation.
7) Husband or wife beginning or ending work outside the home.
8) Pregnancy of wife.
9) Changing to a different line of work.
10) Taking on a mortgage or loan greater than $10,000 (purchasing home, business, etc.)
11) Taking on a mortgage or loan less than $10,000 (purchasing car, TV, etc.)
12) Minor violations of the law (Traffic tickets, jay walking, disturbing the peace, etc.)
13) Changing to a new school or college
14) Marriage
15) Troubles with the boss.
16) Change in day-to-day habits (dress, manners, friends, etc.)
17) Death of a close family member.
18) Marital separation from husband or wife.
19) Marital reconciliation with husband or wife.
20) Outstanding personal achievement.
21) Change in residence (moving to a new address).
22) Gaining a new family member (through birth, adoption, older relatives, or friend).
23) Sexual problems or difficulties.
24) Major change in church activities (a lot more or a lot less than usual).
25) Foreclosure on a mortgage or loan.
26) Death of a husband or wife.
27) Major change in number of family get-togethers (a lot more or lot less than usual).
28) Retirement from work.
29) Major change in salary, income or money you have (a lot worse or better than usual).

(TURN OVER)
(Life Events Check-List - continued)

30) Major personal injury or illness.
31) Major change in your business or work (bankruptcy, merger, reorganization, etc.)
32) Major change in the number of arguments with husband/wife (alot more or alot less).
33) Major change in social activities (clubs, dancing, movies, visiting, etc.).
34) Troubles with inlaws (arguments, disagreements, etc.).
35) Divorce.
36) Major change in sleeping habits (alot more or alot less sleep, or change in part of day you sleep).
37) Major change in the place where you live (building a new home, adding a new room; apartment, home or neighborhood getting run down, etc.).
38) Major change in eating habits (eating alot more or alot less food, different meal hours or surroundings, etc.).
39) Major change in the health or activities of a family member.
40) Major change in duties at work (promotion, demotion, transfer).
41) Major change in usual kind or amount of recreation.
42) Major change in working hours or conditions (new shift, new place, new boss, etc.).

Thank-you.
APPENDIX O
Please circle the one best answer for each of the items below.

1) During the past week (or a "typical" week for you), how often did you cook the main meal of the day?
   1) 0 or 1 time
   2) 2 to 4 times
   3) five or more times

2) During the past week (or a "typical" week for you), how often did you wash the dishes or put them in the dishwasher?
   1) 0 or 1 time
   2) 2 to 4 times
   3) five or more times

3) During the past month (or a "typical" month for you), how often did you do the vacuuming of the rugs?
   1) 0 or 1 time
   2) 2 to 4 times
   3) five or more times

4) During the past month (or a "typical" month for you), how often did you do the "picking up" around the house (of clothes, newspapers, dishes, or other things that might have been laying around)?
   1) 0 or 1 time
   2) 2 to 4 times
   3) five or more times

5) During the past month (or a "typical" month for you), how often did you do the bathroom cleaning (i.e., scrubbing the sink, tub, toilet, and so forth)?
   1) 0 or 1 time
   2) 2 to 4 times
   3) five or more times

6) During the past month (or a "typical" month for you), how often did you buy the family's groceries?
   1) 0 or 1 time
   2) 2 to 4 times
   3) five or more times

7) During the past month (or a "typical" month for you), how often did you pay the family bills (e.g., wrote checks for rent or mortgage payments, car payments, credit or insurance payments, etc.)?

(continued on next page)

* Adapted from Winett et al. (1982)
(responses for question #7):

1) 0 or 1 time
2) 2 to 4 times
3) five or more times

8) During the past month (or a "typical" month for you), how often did you do the family wash?

1) 0 or 1 time
2) 2 to 4 times
3) five or more times

9) During the past month (or a "typical" month for you), how often did you do the minor household repairs such as repairing frayed cords, fixing broken furniture, painting, and so forth?

1) 0 or 1 time
2) 2 to 4 times
3) five or more times

*The following activities concern child care activities. Please omit these questions only if you don't have children (or if your children no longer live with you).

10) During the past week (or a "typical" week for you), how often was it your job to see to it that your child (or children) was (were) washed and dressed?

1) 0 or 1 time
2) 2 to 4 times
3) five or more times

11) During the past week (or a "typical" week for you), how often was it your job to see to it that your child (or children) got to where he/she (they) needed to go (e.g., to school, to the doctor, to athletic activities, to lessons, etc.)?

1) 0 or 1 time
2) 2 to 4 times
3) five or more times

12) The last time your child (or one of your children) woke up with something wrong during the night, so that someone had to go to him/her, who got up and did this?

1) I did
2) my husband did
3) somebody else did
APPENDIX P
This questionnaire is designed to find out who is ultimately responsible for the completion of typical household tasks in your family. By "ultimately responsible", we mean the person who is mainly to blame or at fault if a task is left uncompleted or is done incorrectly.

**Please DARKEN the One best answer for each of the items below on the appropriate OPSCAN given to you. DARKEN IN only ONE number for each item.**

1) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to cook the main meal of the day?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's (e.g., a housekeeper, relative, older child's, etc.) *(Please specify:___________________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

2) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to wash the dishes or put them in the dishwasher?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify:___________________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

3) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to vacuum the rugs?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify:___________________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

4) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to pick up around the house (e.g., clothes, newspapers, dishes, or other things that might be laying around)?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify:___________________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

5) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to do the bathroom cleaning?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify:___________________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

6) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to buy the family's groceries?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify:___________________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

*Continued on next page*
Parent Interview Schedule-R2 - continued

7) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to pay the family bills (e.g., write checks for rent or mortgage payments, car payments, credit payments, etc.)?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify: ______________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

8) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to do the family wash?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify: ______________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

9) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to do the minor household repairs (such as repairing frayed cords, fixing broken furniture, painting, and so forth)?
   1) mine
   2) my spouse's
   3) someone else's *(Please specify: ______________________)
   4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

*The following activities concern child care activities. Please omit these questions ONLY if you don't have children (or your children no longer live with you).

10) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to see to it that your child (or children) is (are) washed and dressed?
    1) mine
    2) my spouse's
    3) someone else's *(Please specify: ______________________)
    4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

11) Whose ultimate responsibility is it to see to it that your child (or children) get to where they need to go (e.g., to school, the doctor, lessons, etc.)?
    1) mine
    2) my spouse's
    3) someone else's *(Please specify: ______________________)
    4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

12) Whose ultimate responsibility is it, when your child (or one of your children) wakes up with something wrong during the night, to get up and go to him/her?
    1) mine
    2) my spouse's
    3) someone else's *(Please specify: ______________________)
    4) My spouse and I share this responsibility equally.

Thank-you!
APPENDIX Q
POST-PROGRAM LIFE EVENTS QUESTION

Please circle the appropriate response (yes or no) for the question below:

Have you experienced any major stressful events (e.g., injury to self or spouse, vacation, increase in arguments with spouse, etc.) since the end of this past February?

1) Yes
2) No

*If YES, please specify below what this stressful event (or events) has (have) been:

Thank-you!
Defining Which "Interactions" to Record on the Group Contact Sheet

*Please record an interaction with a group member on the Group Contact Sheet under the following circumstances:

1) When the interaction goes beyond what is considered to be a typical work-required or "business as usual" interaction. For example: If as part of your job you need to ask a particular group member to fill in a form or sign something because of her position at work, you would not record this interaction on the Group Contact Sheet.

On the other hand, if you needed advice concerning how to type a memo up, and went to a particular group member rather than other nearby workers, then you would record that interaction on the Group Contact Sheet.

2) Record contacts with group members that occur unexpectedly (e.g., running into someone at the drinking fountain), as well as those that either you or she initiates.

3) Record interactions that involve any members of your group. If there are several of you interacting together at one time, please record and rate your interactions with each group member separately on the Group Contact Sheet.

4) You do not have to record or rate group contacts that occur during the group sessions themselves. However, if your interactions with a group member or members before or after the group session consist of more than a "hello" or "goodbye", please record these interactions. For example, if you make plans to walk...
Defining "Interactions" - continued

over to the group session with another group member, please record the interaction that occurs on your way to group. Similarly, if after the group is over you approach a group member and ask her for advice, information, or share feelings with her, etc., please record this interaction as well.

5) For the interactions you record on the Group Contact Sheet, please fill out all items listed on that sheet. (Remember, it only takes a minute!)
1) Managing Stress in Working Women

Informed Consent Form

Purpose of this project:

I understand that the purpose of this project is to evaluate ways of reducing stress in working women. As part of this project several different groups will be conducted. I will be assigned to one group. Because current research indicates that there may be several different ways to alleviate stress in working women, the groups will in some cases differ from one another. A major focus of all groups will be on issues related to time management.

Procedures and measures:

I understand that my group will meet seven times over a four-week period, for approximately one hour each session. In addition, I will be contacted for one follow-up session approximately eight weeks after the end of my last group session to further aid in the evaluation of this project.

Portions of the first and last sessions and the follow-up session will be devoted to the completion of relevant forms and measures. These forms are necessary given the importance of evaluating this project in a scientific manner. I understand that all forms and materials I complete will be kept confidential, and that my name will never be associated with any written or oral presentation of this project without my written consent.

While it is possible that the group leader may audiotape some or all of the group sessions I will be attending, I understand that this is for the benefit of the group leaders only, and will be kept strictly confidential. All tapes will be erased at the end of the project.

As with many projects, it is a necessary part of this type of scientific endeavor to get information from a variety of sources. In addition, it is often preferable to get other family members involved when dealing with time and stress management concerns which may affect an individual. To this end, I understand that my spouse (or, if applicable, another household member) will be briefly contacted via phone by a research assistant on the average of about once per week during the project. The purpose of this brief contact is to gather information concerning the amount of time I have spent on specific activities which I have chosen. I am also aware that I also might be contacted via phone for similar purposes. I understand that this information will also be strictly confidential and will be limited to the topic area specified above.

Responsibilities, benefits, and risks:

I understand that my responsibilities will include coming to the group sessions, completing the forms given me, responding to brief phone calls from a research assistant, encouraging my spouse to respond to similar phone calls, and trying out things discussed during the group sessions, although I know that I am under no obligation to try everything.

It is anticipated that by attending and participating in the group sessions I may learn time management skills as well as other means by which to alleviate stress, although I understand that such benefits cannot be guaranteed.

I understand that this project is not designed to deal with problems of a (continued on next page)
Informed Consent Form - continued

**Clinical** nature. However, it is possible that issues may be brought up during group sessions which could sensititize me to situations at home or at work. I understand that if such problems arise I am free to discuss them with the group leader.

I understand that as a participant in this project, any questions I may ask will be answered as accurately as possible.

I further understand that I am free to discontinue my participation in this project at any time, without any type of penalty.

I have read the above description of this project, Managing Stress in Working Women, and understand my rights and responsibilities as a participant.

Participant's Name: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Witness' Name: ______________________________ Date: ____________

Participant's home phone number: ______________

Head of the Institutional Review Board: Milton B. Stombler; phone number: 961-5283.
APPENDIX T
1) Why time management to reduce stress?

2) The purpose of time management.

3) Differences between women in managing their time.

4) The key to controlling time: Planning
   a) of life values
   b) goal-setting
   c) of priorities
   d) of activities

5) The importance of being realistic in managing time.

6) Reasons why time management is different for women, as compared with men:
   a) working women's multiple roles
   b) Intangible time wasters - guilt and the Superwoman myth
APPENDIX U
Session 3
The Basics of Time Management

1) Planning - the "master key" to effective time management.

2) Steps in Planning:
   a) The First Step: Keeping a daily "to-do" list.

   b) Setting priorities:
      1) List all the things you have to do tomorrow.
      2) Prioritize your list using the ABC Priority System. Which activities are really important for accomplishing priority goals (i.e., A's) and which are not (i.e., C's)?
      3) Once you have the activities labeled as A, B, or C, look at the B activities. Which of these could qualify as A's and which are really C's?
      4) Think about scheduling your day to ensure adequate time to get your A activities accomplished.
      5) Important questions in establishing priorities:
         a) "What is the best use of my time right now?"
         b) "What will happen if I don't do this task?"

   3) Important tips for scheduling time and using it more efficiently: (Hall & Hall, 1979)
      a) Block out time for priority activities - either save a time slot in each day or set a day aside each week.
      b) Don't let anything interfere with this time.
      c) Use your time efficiently. Handle paper only once, don't keep reshuffling it.
      d) Learn to know your "prime time". When do you work best? Save it for priority projects.
      e) Try to be flexible. Always leave time in your schedule for emergencies or catching up.
      f) Plan time to relax. If you're exhausted, you won't be able to work effectively or efficiently.
      g) Learn to use transition time to get things done. (doing 2 things at once)
      h) Can you turn C activities into things that can be put off indefinitely?

4) Things to remember about planning:
   a) Planning is not the same as rigidity.
   b) It only takes a few minutes a day to plan.
   c) It is important to set realistic goals in planning.
   d) Allow time for the unexpected.

5) Dealing with Procrastination:
   a) Confront and evaluate your fears about doing a task.
   b) Set deadlines with yourself and others.
   c) Use the "baby step" method (take a task step by step)

6) Phone interruptions: Clerical workers' biggest time-waster at work.
   a) Tackling phone interruptions through planning.

7) Clerical workers' second biggest time-waster: Lacking objectives, priorities and planning!
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Session 4
Exploring the "Superwoman" Myth and how it feeds into Poor Time Management

1) What is the "Superwoman" myth?

2) Where the "Superwoman" myth comes from:
   a) the media
   b) family
   c) cultural expectations/traditional sex-roles
   d) schooling

3) How living up to the "Superwoman" myth wastes time:
   a) The difference between doing everything more efficiently (i.e., doing the job right), and, more preferably, doing less more effectively (i.e., doing the right job).
   b) It stresses perfectionism.
   c) It stresses overcommitment.

4) How to tackle the "Superwoman" myth:
   a) Doing things effectively.
   b) Becoming less perfectionistic:
      1) Exploring self-defeating (unrealistic) beliefs. Such beliefs can be stressful. Example: "I have to be perfect at everything I do".
      2) Setting up your priorities.
      3) Compromising.

   *4) Ask yourself the question: "What will happen if I don't do this to perfection?" "Are my fears realistic?"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Defeating Belief</th>
<th>Realistic Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One should be liked, or approved of, by almost everyone.</td>
<td>No one is liked by everyone. It's unrealistic to expect to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To be worthwhile, one must be competent in all respects.</td>
<td>One should not expect to be perfect in all respects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Things should always be the way we want them to be, and it's terrible when they aren't.</td>
<td>Things are not always the way we want them to be, but that's not the end of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A person's present and future behavior is irreversibly dependent on significant past events.</td>
<td>People can and do change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Every problem must have an ideal solution, and it's really bad when this solution is not found.</td>
<td>Many problems don't have ideal solutions. It's unrealistic to expect them to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Everything I do must automatically lead to an immediate payoff.</td>
<td>Only a small proportion of what I do leads to an immediate payoff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Individuals have little internal control over their personal happiness or misery.</td>
<td>We can exercise a great deal of control over our own happiness or make our misery worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If there is some possibility that something can go wrong, one should worry about it a great deal.</td>
<td>We should make reasonable preparations for adversity, but excessive worrying won't help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is easier to avoid than to face difficulties and responsibilities inherent in living.</td>
<td>In the long run, it's better to face difficulties and accept responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. People can't be trusted to make their own decisions.</td>
<td>I can facilitate other people's decision making, but I can't decide for them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X
Session 5

Tackling the "Superwoman" Myth - continued

1) Dealing with Guilt:
   a) Choosing your priorities.
   b) Looking at stressful self-defeating beliefs (i.e., irrational beliefs that we can't possibly live up to). Example: "I should be liked by everyone".
   c) Guilt over child care is typically needless.
   d) The importance of taking time to RELAX.

   1) Unwinding after work:
      a) Reduce preoccupation with undone tasks by organizing a list of specific things that you didn't get done today and plan time for these tomorrow or later in the week.
      b) Recognize second thoughts about things done as simply that. Don't dwell on them. Identify them quickly and move on to something else.
      c) If you really feel you made a bad decision or move, don't brood. Think instead about what you have learned from it.
      d) Try to focus upon the present instead of worrying about the past or the future.
      e) Preoccupation with tasks half completed can be draining. You can create a sense of completion for yourself by:
         1) dividing large tasks into parts.
         2) rewarding yourself for parts you have completed. Treat yourself!
   e) Saying No:
      1) Why it is difficult for women to say no.
      2) How it can be a time saver.
      3) 3 steps in saying no while respecting the rights of others:
         a) Let the person know you understand their situation (an empathy statement)
         b) Say no in a direct manner.
         c) Offer explanations and/or alternatives, if possible.
APPENDIX Y
ASSER TIVE BELIEFS

1) I am under no obligation to say yes to people simply because they ask a favor of me.

2) If I say no to someone and they get angry, that does not mean that I should have to say yes. (i.e., It's their problem.)

3) I have a right to say no even though I may inconvenience others.

4) I can still feel good about myself even though someone else is annoyed with me.

5) Standing up for myself over "small" things can be just as important to me as "big" things are to others.

6) The fact that I say no to someone does not make me a selfish person.

7) If someone doesn't do something I ask them to do, that doesn't mean I shouldn't have asked them in the first place.

8) Just because I have already agreed to do something doesn't mean I can't change my mind and say no.

9) Saying "no" to a friend probably won't make him/her dislike me forever.

10) People I care about might be disappointed when I don't do things that they want me to but that is not a catastrophe.

11) If I have to always do things I don't want to do just to get someone to like me, then I have to wonder if their liking me is really critical to my well-being.

12) Other people don't have magical abilities to know what I want if I don't tell them.

13) I may want to please people I care about but I don't have to please them all of the time.

14) Give, give, giving is not the be-all and end-all of life. I am an important person in this world, too.

15) If I refuse to do a favor for someone, that doesn't mean I don't like them. They will probably understand that, too.

16) I do not have to make myself responsible for solving others' problems and making them happy.

17) I can choose not to assert myself, and I can still feel good about myself.

18) The fact that other people might not say no does not mean that I shouldn't say no.

19) I have a right to enjoy what I am doing and to ask others to stop doing things that interfere with my enjoyment.
APPENDIX Z
Session 6

Saving Time at Home

1) Delegation:

* The biggest time-waster for women in the home is ineffective delegation.

a) Benefits of delegation
   1) as a stress reducer at home
   2) it can free up more time to be spent with the family
   3) as a source of family interaction and support

b) Barriers to delegating at home
   example: Reluctance in giving up our domestic role to others who may do the tasks differently than we do.

c) General rules of delegation.

d) Sources of help for the working wife.

e) Common problems with delegating in the home.

f) Delegating to children.

2) Other tips for the home.
APPENDIX AA
TIPS FOR THE HOME*

1) Organizational Tips:
   
a) Keep an appointment book and/or calendar for the home in a convenient place. (e.g., the kitchen).
   
b) Keep all bills in one place.
   
c) Use a simple filing system to keep all the legal and household-related documents in order and easy to locate.
   
l) Have folders for such categories of documents as personal documents, property records, financial records, insurance records, tax records, health records.

2) Cooking Tips:
   
a) Buy food in quantity. Organizing the week's menus ahead of time can cut down on extra trips to the grocery store. Also, never shop on an empty stomach!
   
b) Whenever possible in preparing meals, cook for several meals at once. You can freeze some for later use. (e.g., turkey, roasts, casseroles, spaghetti sauce, vegetables).
   
c) If you pack lunches daily, pack non-perishables the night before (e.g., cookies). Sandwiches can be made and stored in the freezer until needed.
   
d) Select a convenient store to shop in, and learn its layout.
   
e) Crock-pots (slow cookers) and food processors can be convenient.
   
f) Post the week's menu on the refrigerator; first one home starts dinner!
   
g) Food preparation in the morning: (keep it simple)
   
1) The blender breakfast: One egg, one small banana, orange juice, wheat germ and honey.
   
2) Instant breakfast mix.
   
3) Instant hot cereal with fruit.
   
4) Toaster breakfast: Pop tarts; frozen waffles; danish; muffins.
   
Add a glass of juice and coffee.
   
5) Egg and fruit breakfast: A hard-boiled egg (cooked the night before) with a piece of fruit is not only low in calories, but quick and nutritious.
   
h) Use "convenience" food without guilt (e.g., canned foods, etc.).
   
i) Eating out at fast-food places once in awhile, or bringing such food home (e.g., chicken, pizza) can be a real time-saver after a hectic day or before a busy evening.

3) Housecleaning Tips:
   
a) Divide cleaning into segments. For example, take 15-20 minutes each day on maintenance, with extra time devoted to your home one day a week.
   
b) Have all your cleaning materials in one box or pail.
   
c) Do something pleasant while you're cleaning—listen to music or bake.
   
d) Use two clothes hamper—one for whites and one for colored clothing. (Family members can separate their own clothes this way.)

*Adapted from MacKenzie and Waldo, 1981; Silcox, 1980.
(Tips for the home—continued)

e) Use the washing machine as a hamper for white clothes. Have family
members put all white laundry directly into the machine. This saves time
on presorting. Just wash a load when the machine is full.

f) Bed-making can be simplified by using a washable quilt or comforter,
placed over your sheets. They are especially convenient for children's beds.

William Keep a sponge under the soap in the bathroom, to avoid a messy soap
dish. (And remember that even young children can be taught to clean a tub
or sink.)

h) Clean around the tub during your shower.

i) While emptying the dishwasher or drainer, set the table for the next
meal.

j) Load the dishwasher after each meal, but only wash dishes once a day.

k) If space allows, put up hooks or pegs that are easily accessible for
the family to hang their outer-wear on (e.g., raincoat, hats).

l) Periodically go through your closets as well as kitchen cabinets and
get rid of things you don't use or need. This help to keep things neater.

m) Schedule chores so that major tasks fall on days when your schedule
away from home is lighter.

4) How to Save Grooming Time:

a) Schedule bathroom time for everyone in the morning so conflicts are
kept to a minimum (i.e., stagger the bathroom schedule).

b) Plan what you're going to wear throughout the week.

Some women put their complete outfit on one hanger when possible.
You can plan the children's wardrobe the same way. If you can't preplan
your wardrobe for the entire week, always decide the night before what you'll
wear.

c) Do any necessary sewing or ironing all at the same time.

d) Keep cosmetics and other supplies in a single location.

Separate clothes according to seasons of the year.

f) Permanents may be expensive, but save time. So do other short, easy-
to-care-for hairstyles.

g) Some women have even learned to exercise while showering!

5) For Other Household Chores:

a) Schedule your errands (dry cleaning, shoe repair, laundry) for one day
a week so that one family member, not always you, can become responsible for
everything.

b) When your must vacuum, dust, etc., pick one room per day. (Some sug-
gest cleaning one room completely, rather than several that are partly cleaned.)

c) Plan for large projects on weekends (e.g., Spring yard cleanup, cleaning
closets, garage cleanup, repairs-indoor, etc.). Designate one weekend a month
for a special work project. Make up a list and let entire family have a voice
in the choice.
1) Make a list of weekend trips that would be possible to take because of a completed work project or work weekend (a reward).

d) Remember, cleanup should be a family affair. Little children can help too, by carrying dishes to the sink, etc. (e.g., keep cleanup items at a convenient level for children to reach.)

1) Stock a lower refrigerator shelf with items you want to make accessible to children (e.g., milk, healthy snacks). Also, put a paper cup dispenser near the refrigerator.

e) Leave notes for others on the refrigerator door. You can also put change (for lunch money, etc.) in envelopes on the refrigerator door for children.
APPENDIX BB
Recommended Reading

Checklist for a Working Wife, by Marilyn Cooley (Doubleday/Dolphin).


Mary Ellen's Best of Helpful Hints, by Mary Ellen Pinkham and Pearl Higginbotham (Warner/B. Lansky Books).

P.E.T. - Parent Effectiveness Training, by Dr. Thomas Gordon (Peter H. Wyden).

Shower Power, by Helen Fleder (M. Evans).


The Two-Paycheck Family, by Caroline Bird (Rawson, Wade Publishers).


The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 1 of 2
The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 2 of 2
TOWARD MORE EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR ALLEVIATING STRESS:
THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONS AND SUPPORT IN INCREASING
PRIORITY TIME FOR WOMEN FROM DUAL-EARNER FAMILIES

by
Abby Cecile King

(ABSTRACT)

Specific measures and procedures for reducing stress in women from dual-earner families were developed and evaluated. Preliminary research indicated that time management instruction and social support were two promising approaches for impacting upon stress levels in working wives. Fifty-six married women working in classified employee positions at a local university were assigned to one of four conditions in which they received either extensive time management instruction with a large degree of group support (Combination condition), extensive instruction with minimal group support (High Instruction condition), minimal instruction with a large degree of support (High Support condition), or neither intervention (a waiting-list control). Major variables of interest included amount of time reported in two targeted priority activities, changes in self-efficacy for specified time management-related tasks, amount of support received both within and outside of the group setting, and changes in global stress measures. Reliability on time spent in targeted activities was assessed via phone interviews with participants' spouses and participants themselves. Women in both conditions receiving extensive instruction reported significantly
greater increases in such activities in comparison with High Support participants. Changes in time spent in targeted activities were maintained 3 months after the program ended. Both conditions receiving extensive instruction also reported a greater amount of self-efficacy at posttest than the two conditions receiving minimal or no instruction. In contrast, no significant differences among conditions were found on either of the two global stress measures. While there was evidence for the integrity of the group support manipulation, actual changes in group contacts were small for all conditions. Possible reasons for this were explored. In light of the strong inverse correlation found between outside support and stress, in-depth investigation of methods for helping individuals create functional supports as well as better utilize supports already available to them was suggested. The utility of emphasizing specificity of both interventions and measures in developing stress management programs for targeted populations was discussed.