

144
25

ROLE STRAIN, COPING, AND STRESS AMONG DUAL-CAREER
HUSBANDS AND WIVES

by

Nancy Joy Wanamaker

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Family and Child Development

APPROVED:

Gloria W. Bird, Chair

Rosemary Blieszner

Lawrence H. Cross

Howard Protinsky

Michael J. Sporakowski

July, 1986

Blacksburg, Virginia

Role Strain, Coping, and Stress Among Dual-Career

Husbands and Wives

by

Nancy J. Wanamaker

Gloria W. Bird, Chair

Family and Child Development

(ABSTRACT)

The relationship among role strain, coping, and stress was quantitatively assessed using responses from 190 dual-career husbands and wives. Cluster analysis of stress scores resulted in the adoption of a six-cluster solution. MANOVA on role strain confirmed a significant effect by Cluster, $F(15,455)=8.92$, $p=.001$. Post hoc analyses indicated that Cluster VI had significantly lower scores from all other clusters on all three role categories: marital, professional, and parental. Cluster I had significantly higher scores than Cluster V and VI on all three role strain categories. MANOVA on coping strategies confirmed a significant effect by Cluster, $F(35,709)=1.95$, $p=.001$. Although individuals in this sample reported low to moderate strain and stress, significant variation existed within the sample. Individuals experiencing the lowest strain and stress employed two coping responses most often, Delegating Responsibility and Cognitive Restructuring. The results are explained with regard to stage of career and family development and child care concerns.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to several people for their assistance in the completion of this study:

Dr. Gloria Bird for sharing so generously her expertise, guidance, insight, time, and energy;

Dr. Lawrence Cross, Dr. Michael Sporakowski, Dr. Rosemary Blieszner, Dr. Linda Thompson and Dr. Bud Protinsky for their support and guidance as graduate committee members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Role Strain, Coping, and Stress Among Dual-Career

Husbands and Wives

Theoretical Background	1
Previous Literature.	4
Methods.	12
Results.	15
Discussion and Conclusion.	17
References	25
Appendix	29
Tables	31
Appendix A. Literature Review	34
Appendix B. Methodology	58
Appendix C. Instrument	71
Appendix D. Correspondence	80
Appendix E. Vita	87

One of the more frequently mentioned characteristics of dual-career families is the high degree of stress inherent in the lifestyle (Bebbington, 1973; Price-Bonham & Murphy, 1980; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976; Skinner, 1980). Yet, no systematic approach has been adopted to define or assess the process by which individuals in dual-career families adapt to the normative life strains empirically identified as tension producing (Epstein, 1971; Heckman, Bryson, & Bryson, 1977; Holmstrom, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). The present study describes this adaptive process as involving a source (role strain), mediators (coping responses), and outcomes (stress). Although aspects of role strain, coping, and stress have been investigated independently (Bebbington, 1973; Bird & Bird, 1986, Bird & Ford, 1985; Epstein, 1971; Heckman, et al., 1977; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Holmstrom, 1973; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Poloma, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976), no prior research has examined the relationships among them in dual-career families.

Theoretical Background

For this research the source of stress is role strain, the difficulty experienced as a result of fulfilling the simultaneous demands and expectations of multiple roles (Goode, 1973; Sieber, 1974). Behavioral and cognitive coping responses are assumed to be mediators between role strain and resultant stress; serving to prevent, avoid, or

control emotional distress. Stress is conceptualized as an adaptational outcome equivalent to the emotional tensions existing after coping responses have been used to mediate role strain.

Hill's (1949,1965) ABCX formulation has been the foundational model for family stress research (Walker, 1985). The components of the model include: the hardships of the situation or the event itself (A), family resources (B), and the family's definition of the event (C), as determinants of the crisis (X).

The process of adaptation to normative life strains among men and women in dual-career families is not easily accommodated by this model. The hardships of the lifestyle are continuous, undramatic strains, not events. Recent studies on stress and coping have challenged the domination of the event approach to the study of stress, providing support for chronic strains (Billings & Moos, 1984) and daily hassles (Kanner, Coyne, Shaefer, & Lazarus, 1981) as better predictors of psychological symptoms than life events. In the dual-career lifestyle strain is constant rather than an occurrence which upsets a homeostatic state and produces disorganization. It is further differentiated from a crisis event in that the choice of the stressful lifestyle is usually deliberate (Bebbington, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976).

Contrary to the Hill model which views B (family resources) and C (definition of event) as separate conceptual components, in this research coping is viewed as comprising both resources and responses. Pearlin and Schooler (1978) refer to resources as those personal characteristics (e.g., self-esteem, mastery) upon which individuals rely to help them meet role demands and expectations. Coping responses, behavioral and cognitive, serve to prevent, avoid, or control emotional distress (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). Many theorists consider Hill's (C) factor, family's perception of the seriousness of the event to be a cognitive coping response (Lazarus, 1966; Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; Reiss & Oliveri, 1980).

Hill's model combines A, B, and C to determine X, the crisis. Since the strains among dual-career families have been conceptualized as continuous, the outcome is more likely to result in symptoms of stress rather than crisis. In an effort to clarify the ABCX model, McCubbin and Patterson (1983) addressed this issue and included (d) the resulting stress, in their discussion. Although stress, a demand-capability imbalance, is distinguished from crisis, the inability of the family to restore stability, stress as an outcome is not included in the Double ABCX model. The model remains an event-initiated process resulting in crisis.

Previous Literature

The literature reviewed focuses on studies that utilized samples identified as dual-career whose description of respondents was similar to that of the present research. For this study, dual-career families are defined as those in which both husband and wife pursue careers and at the same time establish a family life with at least one child. Career refers to those occupations which are highly salient personally, have a developmental sequence, and require a high degree of commitment (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969, 1976, 1978).

Role Strain

Role strain results from fulfilling the simultaneous demands and expectations of multiple roles (Goode, 1973; Sieber, 1974). The origin of the demands and expectations has been used to classify role strain. Demands which originate as a result of conflict between the family and other societal institutions have been categorized as external. Expectations which arise within the family have been classified as internal (Bebbington, 1973; Holmstrom, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976; Skinner, 1980).

Although role strain has been described in a variety of ways in previous literature on dual-career families, all classifications stem from the benchmark work published by the Rapoports (1971). Role overload was the first of the strains they described. Overload occurred when each spouse

lacked time and energy to effectively manage all responsibilities. Domestic tasks were typically handled as overtime. A second strain concerning personal identity and self-esteem resulted from discontinuities between early gender-role socialization and current wishes or practices. Difficulties referred to as role-cycling arose when individual career cycles did not mesh with one another or with the developmental cycle of the family. These three strains: overload, identity, and role-cycling, have been categorized as internal strains (Bebbington, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). In a review of literature on strain experienced in dual-career families, Skinner (1980) expanded the Rapoports' (1971) original delineation to include family characteristics which referred to the difficulty of childrearing without extended support systems.

The Rapoports (1971,1976) also described strains between the family and other social institutions. Normative sanctions or dilemmas referred to discrepancies between one's personal norms and the prevailing social norms about appropriate role behavior. Problems in developing and maintaining social networks were another strain. These strains, social network and normative sanctions, along with the constraints of the occupational structure (Holmstrom, 1973), were categorized as external (Skinner, 1980).

The first decade of dual-career family research was primarily descriptive in nature (Holmstrom, 1973; Rapoport &

Rapoport, 1971, 1976). Only a few studies attempted to quantitatively assess role strain, also referred to as role conflict (Bird & Ford, 1985; Gilbert, Holahan, & Manning, 1981; Heckman, et al., 1977; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). Heckman and associates (1977) classified role strain into four categories, the largest of which was labeled career versus family conflicts. The following major themes identified this category: 1) restricted job mobility, 2) time and energy demands and lack of leisure time, 3) family versus job demands, 4) role conflicts, 5) feelings of competition and resentment, and 6) bringing problems home.

Bird and Ford (1985) investigated the sources of role strain among dual-career couples. Among husbands, two variables contributed significantly to role strain scores: age of youngest child and degree to which child care tasks were equally shared. The two statistically significant predictors among wives were number of children and salience of the parental role. Role strain was found to be significantly higher for wives than for husbands.

Internal and external strain has also been measured by role category. Research indicates that conflicts between professional and parental roles are especially stressful for mothers (Heckman, et al., 1977; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Johnson & Johnson, 1977). For example, Holahan & Gilbert (1979) investigated the conflict between four major roles: professional, spouse, parent, and self. The greatest

conflict appeared on the professional vs. self scale. Among the parent group, this conflict was matched by that of professional vs. parent and parent vs. self.

In a similar study, Gilbert, Holahan, and Manning (1981) assessed role conflict between professional and maternal roles. Elements of the roles were rated similarly by the 22 female parents. The content and focus of open-ended responses, however, consistently described demands and expectations of the maternal role, and not those of the professional role.

In summary, role strain originates as an expectation from within oneself, from another individual or group, or as a conflict between two roles of similar importance. The strains which emanate from outside the family or between it and other institutions have been categorized as external. Strains which originate within the family have been classified as internal (Bebbington, 1973; Holmstrom, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976; Skinner, 1980). Role strain has also been assessed by role category. Several studies have reported higher role strain among wives than husbands (Bird & Ford, 1985; Epstein, 1971; Heckman, et al., 1977), and greater role strain in the maternal role or between it and other roles (Gilbert, et al., 1981; Johnson & Johnson, 1977).

The present study builds on the theoretical framework established by earlier researchers. It expands the

quantitative assessment of role strain by measuring internal and external strain among men and women by role category: marital, professional, and parental.

Coping Responses

Coping is defined as any response to role strain which functions to prevent, avoid, tolerate, or minimize external and internal demands and conflicts among them (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980; Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). For example, several specific coping responses have been found to mediate role overload among dual-career men and women: organization, reapportioning tasks, hiring outside help, delegating responsibility, and lowering standards (Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1983; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). The pressures which result from role-cycling have been handled by establishing careers before beginning families, and limiting career aspirations (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). The dilemmas of identity and self-esteem have been managed through compromise, compartmentalization, and establishment of role priorities (Bird, et al., 1983; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Poloma, 1972). In response to the strains of parenting, women have generally subordinated their careers to those of their husbands in order to accommodate child rearing needs (Epstein, 1971; Holmstrom, 1973; Heckman, et al., 1977; Poloma, 1972). More recent studies indicate, however, that men are assuming more responsibility for child care than in

the past (Bird & Bird, 1986; Gaddy, Glass, & Arnkoff, 1983). Coping mechanisms utilized in response to the external strains of normative sanctions include cultivation of friendships with other dual-career families, emphasis on the positive, minimal interaction with relatives, and maintaining a sense of humor (Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Poloma, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976).

Coping responses have been categorized according to function: 1) those that change the situation, 2) those that control the meaning of the situation, and 3) those which manage stress symptoms (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980; Moos & Billings, 1982; Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). The present study focuses on the first two types. Category one includes such strategies as seeking information and advice, negotiation, and compromise (Moos & Billings, 1982). These strategies have been considered the most direct and effective in dealing with the source of the problem (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). Strategies which are less effective, but more commonly used, are included in category two. They include selective ignoring, positive comparison, and cognitive redefinition--accepting the reality of the situation, but restructuring it to find something positive (Moos & Billings, 1982).

Two studies have found that men in dual-career families use different coping strategies than women (Bird, et al., 1983; Johnson & Johnson, 1977). Use of some strategies,

i.e., organization, prioritizing, compromise, have been reported as significantly higher among wives than husbands (Bird & Bird, 1986; Bird, et al., 1983).

Although not specifically designed to assess dual-career coping strategies, Skinner and McCubbin (1982) developed the Dual-Employed Coping Scales (DECS) to measure coping behaviors in families where both spouses were employed in a job (versus a career). Four scales were reported: 1) maintaining, restructuring, and strengthening the family system; 2) procurement of support to maintain family roles; 3) modifying roles and standards to maintain a work/family balance; and 4) maintaining a positive perspective on the lifestyle and reducing tensions and strains. Results of assessing coping strategies with DECS among dual-career families have not been reported. The present study seeks to integrate the findings of previous dual-career studies with relevant coping literature in order to assess strategies used by women and men in dual-career families.

Stress

In much of the dual-career research it is not always clear whether the researcher refers to the source of the problem (stressor) or the result (stress). For example, the Rapoport (1971), used the term stress interchangeably with strain to indicate both the source of pressure as well as the result; stress mentioned as a result or outcome included

guilt, exhaustion, and anxiety. In a reexamination of the Rapoport data, Bebbington (1973) noted that the terms "stress" and "strain" are not synonymous, defining stress as the general response of an individual, or a system undergoing strain which is source specific. Bebbington hypothesized that maintaining the dual-career lifestyle depends on the acceptance of stress from a range of sources. In this study stress is conceptualized as a result or outcome equivalent to the emotional tensions existing after coping responses have been used to mediate role strain.

Johnson and Johnson (1977) reported that role strain, which was greatest in the maternal role, resulted in feelings of fatigue, emotional depletion, guilt, and being overwhelmed. Gilbert et al. (1981) investigated coping strategies for dealing with conflict between professional and maternal roles of women in dual-career families. Strategies were coded as role redefinition or role expansion. The group of mothers who attempted to redefine their roles rather than expand them, reported guilt feelings from perceived neglect of the maternal role.

Although Pearlin & Schooler (1978) did not specifically investigate dual-career families, they did investigate the efficacy of coping responses to continuous, undramatic strains which emerged from four social roles: spouse, economic manager, parent, and worker. Their indicator of stress was the reported experience of emotional upset--

being unhappy, bothered or upset, frustrated, tense, worried, neglected, relaxed, bored, and contented. In addition to the above items, parental stress included being emotionally worn out and unsure of self.

Although stress is a prominent feature of the dual-career literature reviewed, most studies have relied on descriptive data, and some have confused the source with the outcome when describing adaptive responses. None of the reviewed studies attempted to measure stress quantitatively. The present study adds to the literature by quantitatively assessing role-specific stress.

Although prior research has investigated role strain, coping, and stress, the relationship among these variables has not been previously examined among dual-career husbands and wives. No quantitative assessment of stress among dual-career families has been reported. This study quantitatively assesses stress by role category, extends the measurement of role strain, and incorporates coping responses identified as effective from previous literature.

Methods

Subjects

The data used in this study were collected from a purposive sample of 276 dual-career couples, 552 spouses, drawn from the Roanoke and New River Valley areas of Virginia in 1986. Initial contacts were made through professional organizations and personal networks.

Individuals who were contacted initially provided the names of other dual-career couples.

Each dual-career couple on the mailing list was sent two questionnaires, one each for husband and wife, along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and requesting their participation. Responses were received from 386 individuals, representing a return rate of 70% after three follow-up contacts. Because the purpose of the research was to study strain and stress by role category (marital, professional, and parental), only responses from those 190 parents, 95 couples, who were employed full time in careers and had at least one child living at home were used for the present study.

Thirty-four percent of the husbands and wives were between the ages of 26 and 36; fifty-two percent were between the ages of 37 and 46; the mean age was 40 years for husbands and 38 years for wives. A majority of the couples had been married more than 8 years; mean length of marriage was 13 years.

The average number of children in these families was two. Thirty percent of the couples had 1 child, 55% had 2 children, and 12% had 3 children. Fifty-one percent of the parents had a youngest child aged 1 through 5 years, 28% had a youngest child aged 6 through 12 years, and 18% had a youngest child aged 13 through 18.

Both spouses were engaged in professional-managerial occupations. Twenty-five percent of the wives had earned a doctoral degree or equivalent, 39% had a master's degree, and 33% had a bachelor's degree. Of the husbands, 36% had earned a doctorate or equivalent, 28% had a master's, and 31% had a bachelor's.

Men had been in their present position an average of 8 years. Women had been employed an average of 6 years in their present position. Forty percent of the wives and 57% of the husbands reported an individual income of between \$20,000 and \$40,000. Median family income was between \$55,000 and \$60,000.

Measurement

A survey instrument was constructed to include the three areas of investigation: strain, coping, and stress. A 7-point Likert-type scale was used on all items; response choices ranged from 1 to 7, "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

Role strain was assessed by the extent of agreement with 22 items designed to determine the experienced difficulty in meeting role expectations of spouse, professional, and parent (Bird & Ford, 1985). The internal consistency (coefficient alpha) of these items was 0.67, 0.60, and 0.66 respectively. The questionnaire included items similar to the following: "My relationship with my husband has suffered because we have so little time

together." Coding was reversed on relevant items so that all items were coded from low to high role strain.

Coping items were adapted from the Dual-Employed Coping Scales (DECS) (Skinner & McCubbin, 1982) and from other studies concerned with dual-career coping strategies (Bird & Bird, 1986; Bird, et al., 1983; Poloma, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). The instrument included such coping responses as "ignoring criticism about parents who both work". Ratings on the 44 coping items were subjected to principal-components factor analysis with varimax rotation. The intent of this procedure was data reduction. Only items loading .40 and above were retained. The first three items of each of the seven identified factors are presented in the Appendix.

Psychological stress items were derived from a review of the literature (Bebbington, 1973; Gilbert, et al., 1981; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). Twelve items assessed stress in each of the three role categories. The internal consistency (coefficient alpha) of these items was 0.87, 0.87, and 0.90 respectively. The instrument contained items similar to the following: "In general, when I think of myself as a parent, I feel guilty".

Data Analysis

Analyses were conducted in three phases. In the first phase, groups of respondents with similar scores on measures of stress were identified by submitting stress scores to a

hierarchical cluster-analytic procedure with iterative relocation (SAS Institute Inc., 1985). In the second phase, multivariate analyses of variance were used to differentiate among clusters on the three dependent measures of role strain. Finally, multivariate analyses of variance were used to differentiate among clusters on use of coping responses.

Results

Cluster analysis resulted in the adoption of a six-cluster solution. Group means on the three stress role categories and respective cluster sizes are shown in Table 1. Based on deviation from the sample mean for marital, professional, and parental stress, the six clusters were labeled high (H), medium (M), or low (L) in each role stress category.

Table 1 about here

Multivariate analyses of variance on strain confirmed a significant effect by cluster, $F(15,455)=8.92$, $p=.001$. Univariate tests showed that the groups differed on each of the three dependent variables: marital strain, $F(5,172)=15.72$, $p=.001$; professional strain, $F(5,172)=20.23$, $p=.001$; and parental strain, $F(5,172)=17.19$, $p=.001$. Tukey HSD comparisons between groups on each of the three dependent variables are indicated in Tables 2. An

examination of the means indicates that Cluster VI has significantly lower scores than all other clusters on marital, professional, and parental strain. Cluster I has significantly higher scores than Cluster V and VI on each of the three role strain categories.

Table 2 about here

Multivariate analyses of variance on coping response factors confirmed a significant effect by cluster, $F(35,709)=1.95$, $p=.001$. Univariate tests indicated differences between clusters on three of the seven coping factors: Cognitive Restructuring, $F(5,179)=4.31$, $p=.002$; Separating Work and Family, $F(5,179)=2.89$, $p=.016$; and Avoiding Responsibility, $F(5,179)=2.85$, $p=.017$. Tukey HSD comparisons among clusters on the three coping factors are indicated in Table 3. An examination of the means indicates that Cluster VI has significantly higher scores than Cluster I and II on Cognitive Restructuring. Cluster I has significantly higher scores on Avoiding Responsibility than Clusters V and VI. Cluster I has significantly higher scores on Separating Work and Family than does Cluster III.

Table 3 about here

Discussion and Conclusion

In general, this sample of dual-career wives and husbands reported moderate levels of strain and stress (See Table 1.). Although all coping strategies were used to some degree, Delegating Responsibility was employed most often. This factor incorporates a child rearing attitude which views children as partners in family responsibility. Rapoport and Rapoport (1971,1976) found that independence and self-reliance are highly valued in dual-career families. Children are encouraged to be self-sufficient as well as to contribute to household chores. Rather than attempt to meet all role demands, adult dual-career family members delegate responsibility to others. Although significant differences were not found among the clusters regarding use of this factor, it is noteworthy that clusters in general reported higher use of this coping strategy than any other. Avoiding Responsibility was the least used strategy. This is consistent with high personal standards as well as rigorous professional expectations of dual-career husbands and wives. Responsibilities may be delegated or limited, but typically are not avoided (Bird & Bird, 1986; Kanter, 1977).

Among the clusters considerable variation exists in perception of strain, utilization of coping responses, and resultant stress. The remainder of this discussion will focus on the most frequently observed differences, those between Clusters I and VI. When clusters were labeled

according to group mean scores on the three categories of psychological stress (marital, professional, and parental), Clusters VI and I were the only groups to be labeled low and high respectively, across all three categories. Cluster VI also reported significantly lower levels of strain in all three role categories. Cluster I, which reported the highest stress scores, also had significantly higher role strain scores than Clusters V and VI, the clusters reporting the lowest stress scores. Clusters I and VI, then, are noteworthy in their opposite scoring on role strain and stress.

Although no significant differences on demographic variables were found between Cluster I and VI, examination of demographic characteristics provides clues to reported differences in strain and stress. Individuals in Cluster VI are members of established families; at a mean age of 42, they have been married an average of 14 years. They have an average of two children, the youngest of whom is a middle-years child. High career importance was reported as well as the highest (among other clusters) number of years employed in their present position. Fifty-three percent of the individuals in Cluster VI reported a family income between \$70,000 and \$90,000 or above.

In contrast, members of Cluster I are in the stage of the family life cycle where stress is reportedly highest, young parents with two or more children under 6 years old

(Skinner, 1980). Seventy-four percent of these parents are between 31 and 40 years old, having been married an average of 11 years. The majority have at least two children, the youngest under 6. Fifty-four percent of the individuals in Cluster I reported a family income between \$60,000 and \$90,000 or above.

When Clusters I and VI are compared, three demographic characteristics are of particular interest: age of youngest child, years in present position, and family income. Although financial resources can certainly be used to minimize pressures, it would appear that child care concerns and career demands are critical factors contributing to cluster uniqueness. Dual-career women and men are likely to experience the greatest strain and stress during that stage of the family life cycle when children are under 6, a time when children are most demanding of and dependent on adults for fulfillment of needs.

Childrearing concerns were cited as the major source of role strain in past studies, especially for mothers (Bird & Ford, 1985; Gilbert, et al., 1981; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971). Although financial resources can be used to meet children's physical needs, guilt and anxiety may result from a perceived failure to meet emotional needs. Gilbert et al., (1981) commented on dual-career mothers who may have cognitively resolved conflict between the professional and parental role, but

still react at an emotional level. Bird & Ford (1985) found that dual-career fathers who share child care report greater levels of strain when their children are young. Not only are these young parents concerned with rearing children, they are also attempting to establish themselves in careers. During the early years of career development, meeting organizational demands requires more time and energy than at later stages (Holmstrom, 1973). Although members of these two clusters have been married approximately the same number of years, individuals experiencing the highest levels of strain and stress have younger children and have been in their present position fewer years which means greater potential for strain during the critical years of beginning career development. It appears, then, that dual-career families with young children are likely to experience greater strain and stress than at other stages of the family life cycle, despite availability of coping resources and responses.

Use of coping responses may offer other clues to why these groups report extremes in strain and stress. Cluster VI used Cognitive Restructuring significantly more than Clusters I and II. This factor includes items which function to control the meaning of life strains (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). Cognitive strategies which frame the strain positively and focus on advantages rather than disadvantages are included. Although not viewed as direct a

strategy as behavioral responses, Cognitive Restructuring was one of two coping factors which discriminated between the two groups reporting the highest and lowest stress levels, Clusters I and VI.

From the beginning of the stress process, individuals in Cluster VI may have an advantage by virtue of the manner in which demands and expectations are perceived. To a large extent the threat posed by a situation is determined by the way an experience is recognized and the meaning that is attached to it (Lazarus, 1966). The stimulus which initiates coping responses and resultant stress is cognitively neutralized and, therefore, not perceived as threatening.

Perhaps Cognitive Restructuring is useful to these individuals because they have the advantage of surviving the early child bearing years and are now in established and financially rewarding careers which they value highly. Having been married to the same spouse a number of years, they have the advantage of past experiences with dual-career strains, a history of positive feedback. They are "survivors" who have established a routine of dealing with family-career problems.

Conversely, Cluster I reported the second lowest use among clusters of Cognitive Restructuring. Perhaps this group of young parents has not yet arrived at a point where they believe that their lifestyle is better because they are

both employed; they may be experiencing more disadvantages than advantages, especially with conflicting child care and career concerns. Cognitively, husbands or wives may perceive themselves as better parents because they work, but emotionally they may feel guilty, anxious, or frustrated. High standards for child rearing combined with problems associated with finding adequate child care may contribute to low use of this strategy. If family needs conflict with career demands in an intense and constant manner, these husbands and wives cannot easily cope by believing that they are better parents because they have careers.

The second coping response which differentiated Cluster VI from Cluster I was Avoiding Responsibility. Cluster VI had the lowest mean score on this factor indicating that this was not a useful strategy in mediating role strain. This factor includes such strategies as postponing tasks and finding legitimate excuses to avoid responsibilities. Individuals in Cluster VI indicated a reluctance to use excuses or family responsibilities to avoid involvement in less favored obligations. In the professional work environment diligent attention to task accomplishment is expected, and failure to comply often has immediate consequences (Kanter, 1977).

In contrast, Cluster I which reported the highest levels of stress and strain, indicated the heaviest use of this coping factor. Avoiding Responsibility may be a coping

strategy these individuals are compelled to employ. Postponing tasks and using legitimate excuses, although stress producing, may be necessary protective responses. Regardless of coping strategies employed, level of spousal support, or financial resources, there are likely to be more responsibilities at work and at home than can be managed efficiently. Avoiding some of the responsibilities may be the only means of gaining relief at this stage of the family life cycle, and yet, the consequences are higher levels of strain and stress.

In conclusion, the present study has made two unique contributions to the dual-career literature: 1) it has quantitatively assessed stress and found that variation in stress scores provides a meaningful way of categorizing and explaining behavior; and 2) it has investigated the relationships among role strain, coping, and stress and empirically testified to their importance to theory development in the area of adaptation among dual-career women and men.

References

- Bebbington, A. C. (1973). The function of stress in the establishment of the dual-career family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35, 530-537.
- Billings, A. G., & Moos, R. H. (1984). Coping, stress, and social resources among adults with unipolar depression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 877-891.
- Bird, G. W., & Bird, G. A. (1986). Strategies for reducing role strain in dual-career families. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 16, 83-94.
- Bird, G. A., Bird, G. W., & Scruggs, M. (1983). Role-management strategies used by husbands and wives in two-earner families. Home Economics Research Journal, 12, 63-70.
- Bird, G.W., & Ford, R. (1985). Sources of role strain among dual-career couples. Home Economics Research Journal, 14, 187-194.
- Epstein, C. F. (1971). Law partners and marital partners: Strains and solutions in the dual-career family enterprise. Human Relations, 24, 549-564.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 21, 219-239.
- Gaddy, C. D., Glass, C. R., & Arnkoff, D. B. (1983). Career involvement of women in dual-career families: The

- influence of sex-role identity. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 388-394.
- Gilbert, L. A., Holahan, C. K., & Manning, L. (1981). Coping with conflict between professional and maternal roles. Family Relations, 30, 419-426.
- Goode, W. J. (1973). A theory of role strain. In W. J. Goode, (Ed.) Explorations in social theory(pp. 97-120). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heckman, H. A., Bryson, R., & Bryson, J. B. (1977). Problems of professional couples: A content analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 323-330.
- Hill, R. (1949). Families under stress. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hill, R. (1965). Generic features of families under stress. In H. J. Parad (Ed.), Crisis intervention: Selected readings (pp. 32-52). New York: Family Service Association of America.
- Holahan, C. K., & Gilbert, L. A. (1979). Conflict between major life roles: Women and men in dual-career couples. Human Relations, 32, 451-467.
- Holmstrom, L. L. (1973). The two-career family. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Johnson, C. L., & Johnson, F. A. (1977). Attitudes toward parenting in dual-career families. American Journal of Psychiatry, 134, 391-395.

- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- ✓ Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4, 1-39.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). The family stress process: The Double ABCX model of adjustment and adaptation. Marriage and Family Review, 6, 7-37.
- Moos, R. H., & Billings, A. G. (1982). Conceptualizing and measuring coping resources and processes. In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), Handbook of stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects (pp.212-230). New York: The Free Press.
- Pearlin, L. S., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19, 2-21.
- Poloma, M. M. (1972). Role conflict and the married professional woman. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a sociology of women (pp. 187-197). Lexington, MA: Xerox.
- Price-Bonham, S., & Murphy, D. C. (1980). Dual-career marriages: Implications for the clinician. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 6, 181-188.

- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1969). The dual-career family: A variant pattern and social change. Human Relations, 32, 3-30.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1971). Dual-career families. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1976). Dual-career families re-examined. London: Martin Robinson.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1978). Dual-career families: Progress and prospects. Marriage and Family Review, 1, 1-12.
- Reiss, D., & Oliveri, M. E. (1980). Family paradigm and family coping: A proposal for linking the family's intrinsic adaptive capacities to its responses to stress. Family Relations, 29, 431-444.
- SAS Institute Inc. SAS User's Guide: Statistics, 1985 Edition. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc., 1985.
- ✓ Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. American Sociological Review, 39, 567-578.
- Skinner, D. A. (1980). Dual-career family stress and coping: A literature review. Family Relations, 29, 473-480.
- Skinner, D. A., & McCubbin, H. I. (1982). Coping in dual-employed families: Spousal differences. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Washington, DC.
- Walker, A. J. (1985). Reconceptualizing family stress. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47, 827-837.

Appendix

Partial Listing of Factor Items Measuring Coping Responses
(Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation: Item
Loadings Shown in Brackets)

A. Cognitive Restructuring

1. Believing that our family life is better because both of us are employed [.74]
2. Believing there are more advantages than disadvantages to our lifestyle [.72]
3. Believing that my career has made me a better wife than I otherwise would be [.71]

B. Delegating Responsibility

1. Encouraging our child(ren) to help out whenever possible [.77]
2. Encouraging our child(ren) to be more self-sufficient [.70]
3. Delegating tasks to other family members [.64]

C. Limiting Responsibility

1. Eliminating certain community activities [.74]
2. Cutting down on the amount of "outside activities" in which I can be involved [.66]
3. Cutting back on leisure activities [.60]

D. Balancing Work and Family

1. Limiting my involvement on the job--saying "no" to some of the things I could be doing [.54]

2. Reducing the time I spend at work [.50]
 3. Planning career changes around family needs [.48]
- E. Separating Work and Family
1. Planning ahead so that major changes at home will not disturb my career goals [.74]
 2. Making better use of time at work [.73]
 3. Separating my work life from family life so I can concentrate my effort on one area at a time [.49]
- F. Avoiding Responsibility
1. Postponing certain tasks until the pressure to do them subsides [.73]
 2. Finding legitimate excuses to keep from fulfilling obligations I dislike [.69]
 3. Using family responsibilities to justify not accepting more job responsibilities [.57]
- G. Using Social Support
1. Arranging for child care so my husband and I can spend time together [.58]
 2. Relying on extended family members for support and encouragement [.51]
 3. Making friends with other two-career couples [.50]

Table 1

Mean Stress Scores by Cluster

<u>Cluster</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>(M,F)</u>	<u>Marital</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Parental</u>	<u>Label</u>
I	34	(18,16)	48 (3.71)	47 (5.53)	50 (4.74)	H H H
II	22	(13, 9)	40 (5.31)	48 (5.98)	37 (6.49)	M H M
III	40	(16,24)	45 (7.50)	32 (5.81)	42 (6.26)	H M M
IV	17	(7,10)	33 (5.60)	36 (5.15)	49 (5.77)	M M H
V	48	(23,25)	30 (6.52)	35 (6.92)	30 (5.23)	L M M
VI	23	(15, 8)	21 (5.13)	24 (6.56)	22 (4.64)	L L L
<u>Sample Mean</u>			37	37	38	

Note: Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

Table 2

Tukey HSD Comparisons of Marital Role Strain Means

Means	3.757	3.293	3.165	2.901	2.642	1.948
I 3.757		.465	.593*	.856*	1.116*	1.809*
II 3.293			.128	.391	.651*	1.345*
III 3.165				.264	.523*	1.217*
IV 2.901					.259	.953*
V 2.642						.694*
VI 1.948						

Tukey HSD Comparisons of Professional Role Strain Means

Means	3.826	3.429	3.062	3.538	2.764	2.000
I 3.826		.397	.764*	.287	1.062*	1.826*
II 3.429			.366	.110	.665*	1.429*
III 3.062				.476	.298	1.062*
IV 3.538					.775*	1.539*
V 2.764						.764*
VI 2.000						

Tukey HSD Comparisons of Parental Role Strain Means

Means	3.750	3.287	3.275	3.598	2.720	2.131
I 3.750		.463	.475	.153	1.030*	1.619*
II 3.287			.012	.311	.567*	1.156*
III 3.275				.322	1.555*	1.145*
IV 3.598					.877*	1.467*
V 2.720						.590*
VI 2.131						

* $p < .05$.

Table 3

Tukey HSD Comparisons of Means on Cognitive Restructuring

	Means	5.001	4.970	5.405	5.178	5.559	5.813
I	5.001		.031	.404	.177	.558*	.812*
II	4.970			.435	.207	.589	.843*
III	5.405				.227	.154	.408
IV	5.178					.381	.635
V	5.559						.254
VI	5.813						

Tukey HSD Comparisons of Means for Avoiding Responsibility

	Means	4.081	3.864	3.779	3.867	3.395	3.284
I	4.081		.217	.306	.214	.686*	.797*
II	3.864			.089	.003	.468	.580
III	3.779				.092	.380	.491
IV	3.867					.471	.583
V	3.395						.111
VI	3.284						

Tukey HSD Comparisons of Means on Separating Family and Work

	Means	4.537	4.693	5.225	4.717	5.021	5.152
I	4.537		.156	.688*	.180	.485	.615
II	4.693			.532	.024	.328	.458
III	5.225				.508	.204	.074
IV	4.717					.305	.435
V	5.021						.130
VI	5.152						

*p<.05.

APPENDIX A
LITERATURE REVIEW

Appendix A

Literature Review

The purpose of the following literature review is to describe in greater detail those studies most pertinent to role strain, coping, and stress among men and women in dual-career families. This review begins with a study which did not investigate dual-career families, but is included because it provided the conceptual framework for the present investigation. Pearlin and Schooler (1978) defined coping as "any response to external lifestrains that serves to prevent, avoid, or control emotional distress" (p.3). Their analysis emphasized continuous, undramatic strains (conflicts, frustrations, and threats) that emerged from four social roles: spouse, economic manager, parent, and worker. Their indicator of stress was the reported experience of emotional upset, the extent to which subjects experienced symptoms of nongeneralized depression and anxiety. The Pearlin and Schooler definitions of role strain, coping, and stress are used as the organizational framework for the review which follows.

Role Strain

In previous literature on dual-career families, role strain has been conceptualized in a variety of ways. Although strain has been categorized by several different researchers, all classifications stem from the benchmark work published by the Rapoport (1971). Much of the

research on role strain has been descriptive in nature; only a few recent studies have assessed strain quantitatively (Bird & Ford, 1985; Gilbert, Holahan, & Manning, 1981; Heckman, Bryson, & Bryson, 1977; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979).

Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) defined dual-career families as those in which both husband and wife pursue careers and at the same time establish a family life with at least one child. Careers are defined as jobs which are highly salient personally, have a developmental sequence and require a high degree of commitment (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969). They identified five problems or sources of strain in their seminal work resulting from in-depth interviews with sixteen families.

Role overload was the first strain described. When each individual was actively involved in work and family roles, the total volume of activities increased. The result was overload, with domestic tasks handled as overtime. The second source of strain, normative dilemmas, referred to discrepancies between one's personal norms and the prevailing social norms about appropriate role behavior. Another source of strain concerned personal identity and self-esteem which resulted from discontinuities between early gender-role socialization and current wishes or practices. Problems in developing and maintaining social networks was a fourth source of strain. Extensive relationships outside the immediate family were seldom

maintained. Dual-career families often limited time and involvement with friends and kin. The final source of strain concerned role-cycling of career and family. Difficulties arose when individual career cycles did not mesh with the developmental cycle of the family. An additional source of strain resulted at transition points when restructuring of roles occurred. Strain also resulted when the developmental sequence of one spouse's career conflicted with that of the other (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971).

In a re-examination of the sources of strain, the Rapoports (1976) found their original delineation still relevant. They emphasized the positive as well as negative potential of strains: "they provide tensions that contain excitement as well as difficulty, zest to life as well as problems, and their resolution yields a feeling of accomplishment and creativity as well as relief from an irritant" (p.299).

Using the Rapoport's (1971) data, Bebbington (1973) reconceptualized the typology of sources of strain earlier identified by the Rapoports. Bebbington categorized stress as arising internally from work overload, dilemmas of identity, and role-cycling. Sources of strain which resulted from conflict with society as a whole were labeled external: social network dilemmas and discrepancies between personal and societal norms.

Of the early studies, Holmstrom's (1973) work focused the greatest attention on the external strain resulting from the constraints of institutions outside the family. Her conclusions were based on interviews with 20 two-career couples, ones in which women had professions in the humanities and sciences. She described three categories of structural and attitudinal barriers to the emergent pattern: the rigid structure of organizations and demanding nature of professions, the isolation of the small modern family, and the equating of masculinity with superiority. Her suggestions for change included fundamental redefinitions of the world of work and sex roles. Specifically she recommended promoting flexible work schedules, increasing the father's role in child rearing, and establishing child care centers.

In a review article of dual-career research, Rapoport and Rapoport (1978) noted that strains had been differently conceptualized by various researchers. These concepts included dilemmas, overload, normative, cycling, network, and identity (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976; conflicts between home and work expectations; barriers, domestic isolation and stereotypes (Epstein, 1971; Holmstrom, 1973), and problems such as domestic help and child care (Holmstrom, 1973).

Skinner (1980) adapted the Rapoports' (1971) delineation and expanded Bebbington's (1973)

internal/external dichotomy in a review of the literature on role strain in dual-career families. Although interactive in nature, for heuristic purposes, Skinner described internal strains as arising within the family and external strains as resulting from conflict of the family with other societal structures. She included overload, identity, and role-cycling issues, as well as family characteristics, e.g., difficulty of childrearing, as internal strains. External strains encompassed normative issues, social network dilemmas, and the occupational structure.

Several studies have examined the strains in dual-career families in which couples are involved in the same profession. Epstein (1971) investigated the unresolved strains incurred in 12 cases of husband-wife law partnerships. It is notable among the early studies because of the emphasis on the division of labor in the work place as well as the home. Subjects ranged from 40 to 60 years of age at the time of the interviews. Epstein concluded that none of the joint partnerships indicated much evidence of egalitarianism. Women assumed ancillary and routine activities at work and primary responsibility for home and family, priding themselves as "good mothers" as well as lawyers. Management of home and child care was perceived by all men in the study as the wife's primary responsibility. Women were not in any significant way aided by their husbands in the home sphere. Epstein described role

overload, career competition, and societal role norms as sources of strain.

Also investigating professional couples, Heckman, Bryson, and Bryson (1977) analyzed responses of 200 psychologist couples to a survey question asking them to delineate the most significant problems encountered as a professional pair. Comments were classified into four categories, the largest of which was career versus family conflicts. The following major themes identified this category: 1) restricted job mobility, 2) time and energy demands and lack of leisure time, 3) family versus job demands, 4) role conflicts, 5) feelings of competition and resentment, and 6) bringing problems home. Consistent with earlier studies (Epstein 1971; Holmstrom, 1973; Poloma, 1972) Heckman et al. (1977) found that women subordinated their careers to their family and to their husband's career. Women in this sample commented more often than men about role overload, identity issues, and social norms, strains initially described by the Rapoport's.

Poloma (1972) investigated 53 married couples in which the wife was actively engaged in law, medicine, or college teaching. The purpose of the study was to examine how professional women manage the seemingly conflicting demands of work and home and to compare those who experienced role strain to those who did not. She observed that women work in the professions, but do not have careers in the sense

that men do. As Epstein (1971) found in her investigation of married law partners, wives' professional involvement had less priority than their husbands' and their family. Poloma concluded that role conflict among professionally employed married women is "neither widespread nor very severe" (p. 197).

Holahan and Gilbert (1979) also examined role conflict and its correlates in 28 dual-career couples. Couples as a group reported a moderate level of conflict. Findings did not support the prediction of gender differences with regard to role conflict. Several correlate factors were cited for this result: high levels of career commitment on the part of both spouses, egalitarian marriages, and strong spousal support.

Poloma (1972) and Holahan and Gilbert (1979) all examined role strain, concluding that women did not report high levels of strain. In Poloma's 1971 study the reason seemed to be that women did not have high career aspirations, and were content to assume responsibility for home and family. Although the couples in Holahan and Gilbert's (1979) study also reported a moderate level of strain, a different set of contributing factors was in place. Attitudes and behaviors of this later sample were reportedly more egalitarian than those of couples studied early in the decade who advocated a traditional division of labor.

In a pilot study which included interviews with 28 dual-career families, Johnson and Johnson (1977) concluded that the greatest strain was in the maternal role. Because of high levels of marital adjustment and support from husbands, the source of strain was identified with child rearing, not the marriage relationship.

Bird and Ford (1985) investigated the sources of role strain among 69 dual-career couples. Internal role strain was viewed as primarily attributable to an overload of responsibilities from involvement in multiple roles. External strain originated as conflicts between personal and societal norms and resulted from pressure to comply with expectations of others: spouse, friends, colleagues, and employer. Role strain was assessed with 10 items designed to determine the experienced difficulty in meeting role expectations of career, parent, and spouse. The 10 items used to measure role strain factored into two dimensions which they labeled external and internal strain. Their empirical findings supported the earlier theoretical distinctions made by Skinner (1980) and Bebbington (1973).

Although the degree of role strain felt by wives was moderate (reflecting the nature of the sample, couples who had been married a number of years) role strain was found to be significantly higher for wives than for husbands. Among husbands, two variables contributed significantly to role strain scores: age of youngest child and degree to which

child care tasks were equally shared. The two statistically significant predictors among wives were number of children and salience of the parental role. This study made significant contributions to the literature by 1) quantitatively assessing role strain in dual-career couples, and 2) reflecting a change in attitudes and behavior of men in dual-career families from the initial descriptive studies reported a decade earlier. Apparently, as husbands participated more in child care, they reported greater role strain. As Rapoport and Rapoport (1982) noted in a discussion of research priorities, men may be doing more than "helping out"; they recommended that research be designed to determine the extent and nature of such role transitions.

In summary, research findings indicated that internal strain included overload, identity issues, role-cycling dilemmas, and family characteristics; external strain included normative issues, social network dilemmas, and the occupational structure (Epstein, 1971; Holmstrom, 1973; Poloma, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). Several studies have reported higher role strain among wives than husbands (Bird & Ford, 1985; Epstein, 1971; Heckman, et al., 1977; Holmstrom, 1973) and greater role strain in the maternal role or between it and other roles (Gilbert, et al., 1981; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; St. John-Parsons, 1978).

Coping Responses

As noted with regard to strain, research on coping strategies among dual-career families has been primarily descriptive in nature. Although Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) did not specifically address the coping strategies of dual-career couples, emphasizing the costs and benefits of the lifestyle instead; they described several responses to the strains outlined. The Rapoports concluded that there was some suggestion that dual-career families were particularly efficient at dealing with strain, hypothesizing that problem solving may involve more communication and more purposeful decision-making than in other family types.

The 16 couples they studied found various ways of managing overload, a prominent problem in all families studied. Satisfactory reapportionment of tasks was a coping strategy that helped alleviate overload. Hiring outside help and delegating responsibilities to children were also identified coping techniques. In addition, lowering standards of domestic living, (orderliness, cleanliness) was a method of coping with limited time and energy. As opposed to more conventional family types, the dual-career couple placed a greater emphasis on organization of time and energy, often deliberately arranging leisure time. Spousal support was cited as an important factor in managing overload of home, family, and employment responsibilities (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976).

In order to deal with the internal strain of role-cycling, the Rapoport and other researchers who followed, noted that dual-career couples established themselves occupationally before having children (Bebbington, 1973; Holmstrom, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). In order to accommodate the careers of both spouses, aspirations were often limited. The external strains of normative sanctions were avoided by associating with those supportive of the lifestyle. All of the couples studied developed friendships which provided support and legitimation. Humor was also a response to the expectations of others; "'Most of the people around here think we're a bit mad' kind of attitude" (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, p. 290). Couples emphasized the positive elements of the lifestyle.

The family's definition of the situation has been cited as a coping strategy influencing the impact of strain (Burr, 1973). According to Bebbington (1973), dual-career couples accept the strain which accompanies their lifestyle because the traditional alternative (husband in a career, wife as homemaker) would not be acceptable. They come to view their problems as having both positive as well as negative aspects, but they focus on the positive.

Poloma (1972) described positive outlook, defining the situation in a favorable manner, as one of the four coping strategies used by the professional women in her study. She

interviewed 53 married couples in which the wife was actively engaged in law, medicine, or college teaching. Spouses were interviewed by the researcher separately and jointly. Along with emphasizing the positive aspects of the lifestyle, women established priorities; the family role was more important than the work role. Conflict was also minimized by compartmentalizing roles; work roles were viewed as separate from family roles. When it was necessary to make compromises between work and family demands, they were made in favor of demands at home.

Bryson, Bryson, Licht, and Licht (1976) were among the first researchers to quantitatively assess division of domestic responsibilities among dual-professional families. Data was collected in 1972 from the questionnaire responses of psychologist couples. Respondents were asked to estimate what percentage of responsibility for each of 11 domestic tasks was allocated to the husband, the wife, or to employed help or other. Equality was virtually nonexistent in all categories except "major purchases". Results indicated that professionally employed married women bear a greater share of responsibility for the performance of household activities than do their husbands.

Johnson and Johnson (1977) identified several techniques of tension management which were responses to the strain associated with child rearing. Role strain which was pervasive among wives, but not husbands, was dealt with by

giving priority to domestic roles, a strategy cited earlier by Poloma (1972). Mothers also used rationalization indicating that they considered themselves better mothers because they worked. Perhaps in order to compensate for divided time and energy between work and family, structured family activities were organized. Style of child rearing was also interpreted as a coping strategy: children were expected to be self-reliant and independent. A minimum of social contact with kin was used as a technique to exclude competing demands and to avoid normative sanctions. Men were found to utilize different strategies than women. Husbands mentioned techniques involving management principles of optimization and efficiency.

Gilbert, Holahan, and Manning (1981) investigated role conflict between professional and parental roles among 22 mothers in dual-career families. Two strategies for dealing with role conflict were compared: Role Redefinition and Role Expansion. Role Redefinition included strategies in which changes in demands occur, either internally or in negotiation with others. Role Expansion involved attempts to meet all role demands. The Role Expansion group attributed significantly higher legitimacy to the role demands of both the professional and maternal roles than did the Role Redefinition group. They also attributed significantly greater meaning to the maternal role.

In a later study investigating similar strategies, Elman and Gilbert (1984) assessed the coping strategies used by 97 dual-career mothers in managing conflicts between their professional and parental roles. Subjects reported a moderate level of role conflict ($M=4.2$, $SD=1.6$ in a 7-point scale). Five Likert-type scales were used to assess coping strategies. Three of the scales pertained to problem-focused strategies: Structural Role Redefinition, Personal Role Redefinition, and Increased Role Behavior. Two strategies were emotion-focused strategies: Cognitive Restructuring and Tension Reduction. The most highly utilized strategy was Increased Role Behavior ($M=5.2$) followed by Cognitive Restructuring ($M=4.4$). Increased Role Behavior involved attempts to meet existing role demands by increasing efficiency in order to get everything done.

Bird, Bird, and Scruggs (1983) investigated coping methods or "role-management strategies" utilized by dual-career couples. Their findings support the earlier insights of qualitative researchers (Holmstrom, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). Using self-administered questionnaires, these researchers measured the extent to which eight role-management strategies were used by husbands and wives in 38 career-earner and 69 dual-career families. The role-management strategies were measured by 23 items identified by previous researchers and theorists as potentially relieving time constraints and role overload.

Responses were factor analyzed yielding eight strategies: the legitimate excuse, stalling until pressures subside, compartmentalization, empathy, barriers against intrusion, reducing responsibilities, delegation, and organization. Empathy was the strategy used most often by husbands in dual-career families, and it was second to organization as the most prevalent strategy used by wives. Within dual-career families, the strategy of organization was utilized significantly more by wives than husbands.

In a later analysis utilizing data from the dual-career couples only, Bird and Bird (1986) reported that both spouses used compartmentalization to reduce internal role strain. In addition, husbands who compartmentalized career and family tasks, were also more likely to use protective barriers, i.e., arranging to be unavailable when working. For wives, external role strain was decreased as a result of the support received from husbands (empathy).

A study which examined division of domestic responsibilities, reflecting a trend toward increasing involvement of dual-career fathers in child care, was reported by Gaddy, Glass, and Arnkoff (1983). Participants were 70 women in dual-career families. Results indicated that women, regardless of employment status and egalitarianism of the marriage, spent significantly more time alone with their children than their husbands did. However, egalitarian husbands did spend more time with their

children than traditional husbands. Participants who reported a high number of masculine characteristics such as autonomy, orientation toward risk, individualism, and intellectual ascendancy, also tended to report a more egalitarian marriage with shared responsibility for household tasks and mutual concern for the career development of both spouses.

Using a sample of 166 couples, Bird, Bird, & Scruggs (1984) also examined overload with regard to sharing family tasks. The combined effect of four variables (sex-role orientation, role salience, income, and family type) on sharing of family tasks was assessed. Results indicated that different variables explain sharing of family tasks for husbands and wives. For wives, income and family type influenced increased sharing. For husbands, sex-role orientation, family type, and role salience influenced family task sharing. These results suggest that dual-career families depend to some extent on the use of task sharing as a coping strategy.

In summary, several coping strategies have been cited as responses to both internal and external strain as well as responses to the life-style in general. Dual-career couples have accepted the inherent level of stress which accompanies their way of life, viewing this alternative as more positive than other choices (Bebbington, 1973). The strain generated as a result of role overload has been mediated by several

specific coping responses: organization, reapportionment of tasks, hiring of outside help, delegating responsibility, and lowering of standards (Bird, Bird, & Scruggs (1983); Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). The pressures which result from role-cycling have been handled by establishing careers before beginning families, and limiting career aspirations (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). The dilemmas of identity and self-esteem have been handled through compromise, compartmentalization, and establishment of role priorities (Bird & Bird, 1986; Poloma, 1972). In response to the difficulties of rearing children, women have subordinated their careers to family needs (Bryson, et al., 1976; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Poloma, 1972). Later studies have also indicated that men are assuming more responsibility in child care (Bird & Bird, 1986; Gaddy, et al., 1983).

The coping mechanisms utilized in response to the external strains include cultivation of friendships with other dual-career families, limited social interaction with acquaintances and relatives, emphasis on the positive, and maintaining a sense of humor (Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976).

Two studies have found that men use different strategies from women (Bird, et al., 1983; Johnson & Johnson, 1977). Use of some strategies, i.e., organization, prioritizing, compromise, have been reported as

significantly higher among wives than husbands (Bird & Bird, 1986; Bird, et al., 1983).

Stress

Although stress has been mentioned in several studies (Bebbington, 1973; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976), it has often been used interchangeably with strain. It has not been clear whether the researcher refers to the source of the problem (stressor) or the result (stress). In this study stress is conceptualized as a result or outcome equivalent to the emotional tensions existing after coping responses have been used to mediate role strain. As was found with strain and coping, most studies have been descriptive; none have attempted to measure stress quantitatively.

In the original volume published by the Rapoports (1971), costs and benefits, strains and gains, were described. Although stress was used interchangeably with strain to indicate both the source of pressure as well as the result, stress which was mentioned as a result or outcome included guilt, exhaustion, and anxiety.

In a reexamination of the Rapoport data, Bebbington (1973) attempted to determine the reason couples adopted this lifestyle characterized by a high degree of stress. He noted that the terms "stress" and "strain" are not synonymous, defining stress as the general response of an individual, or a system undergoing strain which is source

specific. Bebbington hypothesized that maintaining the lifestyle depends on the acceptability of stress from a range of sources. He commented that stress is not "inevitably undesired" suggesting instead that the dual-career lifestyle may operate on the principle of "stress optimization", a balance between low stress (underinvolvement and boredom) and high stress (excessive demands) (p.535).

Johnson and Johnson (1977) reported that role strain, which was greatest in the maternal role, resulted in feelings of fatigue, emotional depletion, guilt, and being overwhelmed. Gilbert et al. (1981) investigated coping strategies for dealing with conflict between professional and maternal roles of women in dual-career families. Strategies were coded as role redefinition or role expansion. The group of mothers who attempted to redefine their roles rather than expand them, reported guilt feelings from perceived neglect of the maternal role.

Although Pearlin & Schooler (1978) did not specifically investigate dual-career families, they did investigate the efficacy of coping responses to continuous, undramatic strains which emerged from four social roles: spouse, economic manager, parent, and worker. Their indicator of stress was the reported experience of emotional upset; being unhappy, bothered or upset, frustrated, tense, worried, neglected, relaxed, bored, and contented. In addition to

the above items parental stress included being emotionally worn out and unsure of oneself. Occupational stress included similar items.

Although stress is a prominent feature of the dual-career literature reviewed, most studies have relied on descriptive data. Various emotional feelings have been used to describe stress. None of the reviewed studies attempted to measure stress quantitatively.

References

- Bebbington, A. C. (1973). The function of stress in the establishment of the dual-career family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35, 530-537.
- Bird, G. W., & Bird, G. A. (1986). Strategies for reducing role strain in dual-career families. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 16.
- Bird, G. A., Bird, G. W., & Scruggs, M. (1983). Role-management strategies used by husbands and wives in two-earner families. Home Economics Research Journal, 12, 63-70.
- Bird, G. W., Bird, G. A., & Scruggs, M. (1984). Determinants of family task sharing: A study of husbands and wives. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 345-355.
- Bird, G.W., & Ford, R. (1985). Sources of role strain among dual-career couples. Home Economics Research Journal, 14, 187-194.
- Bryson, R. B., Bryson, J. B., Licht, M. H., & Licht, B. G. (1976). The professional pair: Husband and wife psychologists. American Psychologist, 31, 10-16.
- Burr, W. (1973). Theory construction and the sociology of the family. New York: John Wiley.
- Elman, M. R., & Gilbert, L. A. (1984). Coping strategies for role conflict in married professional women with careers. Family Relations, 33, 317-322.

- Epstein, C. F. (1971). Law partners and marital partners: Strains and solutions in the dual-career family enterprise. Human Relations, 24, 549-564.
- Gaddy, C. D., Glass, C. R., & Arnkoff, D. B. (1983). Career involvement of women in dual-career families: The influence of sex-role identity. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 388-394.
- Gilbert, L. A., Holahan, C. K., & Manning, L. (1981). Coping with conflict between professional and maternal roles. Family Relations, 30, 419-426.
- Heckman, H. A., Bryson, R., & Bryson, J. B. (1977). Problems of professional couples: A content analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 323-330.
- Holahan, C. K., & Gilbert, L. A. (1979). Conflict between major life roles: Women and men in dual-career couples. Human Relations, 32, 451-467.
- Holmstrom, L. L. (1973). The two-career family. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Johnson, C. L., & Johnson, F. A. (1977). Attitudes toward parenting in dual-career families. American Journal of Psychiatry, 134, 391-395.
- Pearlin, L. S., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19, 2-21.
- Poloma, M. M. (1972). Role conflict and the married professional woman. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.),

- Toward a sociology of women (pp. 187-197). Lexington, MA: Xerox.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1969). The dual-career family: A variant pattern and social change. Human Relations, 32, 3-30.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1971). Dual-career families. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1976). Dual-career families re-examined. London: Martin Robinson.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1978). Dual-career families: Progress and prospects. Marriage and Family Review, 1, 1-12.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1982). The next generation in dual-earner family research. In J. Aldous (Ed.), Two paychecks: Life in dual-earner families. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Skinner, D. A. (1980). Dual-career family stress and coping: A literature review. Family Relations, 29, 473-480.
- St. John-Parsons, D. (1978). Continuous dual-career families: A case study. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3, 30-42.

APPENDIX B
METHODOLOGY

Appendix B

Methodology

This appendix describes in greater detail the research methodology utilized in this study. It begins with a description of the pilot investigation and proceeds to describe the sample, procedure, and one aspect of the data analysis, factor analysis of the coping items.

Pilot

Four graduate students under the guidance of Dr. Gloria Bird met regularly over a six-month period to develop the theoretical model and select the instruments required to carry out the research plan. A time line was established to facilitate effective administration of the Dual-Career Family Project.

A pilot study was implemented in November, 1985. The pilot included a sample of 14 dual-career couples similar to the identified population. Purposes of the pilot were to gain a general response to the questionnaire, to identify ambiguous or confusing terminology, and to determine adequate variance within response choices. As a result of pilot participant feedback, directions for completion as well as specific items were altered.

Sample

A sample of 276 dual-career couples, 552 spouses, was drawn from the Roanoke and New River Valley areas of Virginia. Operating from a purposive sampling framework,

this investigation utilized the strategic informant sampling method relying on the snowball technique of selecting respondents (Smith, 1981). The snowball technique was considered an appropriate sampling technique for this specialized population because of the difficulty of locating dual-career wives and husbands using random sampling methods. Initial contacts were made through professional organizations and personal networks. Individuals who were contacted initially provided the names of other dual-career couples. Demographic information is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Procedure

The instrument (See Appendix C) was constructed according to the Total Design Method (TDM) detailed by Dillman (1978). The questionnaire was printed as a booklet. It consisted of three 8"x 12" sheets of paper folded in the middle and stapled to form a booklet with cover, the dimensions of which are 6"x 8". The cover, designed to create a positive first impression, displayed the project title, Dual-Career Family Project, the study sponsor, Department of Family and Child Development, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and a graphic illustration. Each page of the questionnaire was typed and then photographically reduced. The booklet was reproduced on white paper. Every measure was taken to present an

attractive, well-organized questionnaire with a professional appearance.

A cover letter (See Appendix D) was prepared which appealed to the recipient of the mail survey in accordance with Dillman's (1978) Total Design Method (TDM). The TDM is based on convincing subjects that a problem exists that is relevant to a group with which they identify, and that their help is needed to seek a solution. The implied reward is the feeling derived when they have contributed to the solution of a problem faced by others like themselves.

A packet containing the cover letter, separate questionnaires for husband and wife, and two pre-addressed, stamped reply envelopes was mailed to each dual-career couple on the mailing list. One week after the initial mailing, a postcard was sent to all participants, thanking them for returning the questionnaire or urging completion by non-respondents (See Appendix D). A follow-up letter was sent 3 weeks after the original mailing to non-respondents (See Appendix D). Finally, 7 weeks after the original mailing, a second follow-up letter with replacement questionnaire and stamped, pre-addressed reply envelope was sent to anyone who had not returned the questionnaire (See Appendix D).

Responses were received from 386 individuals, representing a return rate of 70% after three follow-up contacts. The response rate was calculated as the

percentage of contacts with eligible respondents that resulted in completed questionnaires (Dillman, 1978).

Data Analysis

Responses on the 44 items concerned with coping strategies were factor analyzed to reduce and organize the data. The type of factor analysis used was principal factoring with iteration. This method of analysis extracts the number of factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.0. The varimax technique was used to rotate the axis orthogonally. The resulting seven factors are described as dimensions of coping strategies. Items which loaded equally on two factors, which loaded below .40, or which loaded negatively were omitted. The following items were omitted: 4, 28, 12, 31, and 14 (See Appendix).

References

- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley.
- Smith, H. (1981). Strategies for social research. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice-Hall.

Appendix

Factor Analysis of Coping Items

Factor	Item	Cognitive Restructuring	Loading
1	3	Believing that our family life is better because both of us are employed.	.74
	21	Believing there are more advantages than disadvantages to our lifestyle.	.72
	15	Believing that my career has made me a better wife than I otherwise would be.	.71
	37	Believing that my career has made me a better parent than I otherwise would be.	.70
	42	Believing my commitment to my career sets a good example for our child(ren).	.63
	13	Overlooking the difficulties; focusing on the good things about our family.	.54
	44	Believing it is important that I excel at both my career and as a wife and mother.	.46
	38	Ignoring criticisms about parents who both work.	.45
	11	Setting aside family time.	.42
	* 4	Ignoring comments about how husbands and wives "should" behave.	.34
	*28	Believing that, with time, combining my career with family life will get easier.	.33

Factor	Item	Delegating Responsibility	Loading
2	43	Encouraging our child(ren) to help out whenever possible.	.77
	40	Encouraging our child(ren) to be more self-sufficient.	.70
	36	Delegating tasks to other family members.	.64
	18	Encouraging frequent communication among all family members.	.53
	6	Setting priorities and doing the most important things first.	.43
	1	Becoming more efficient, planning and organizing my time.	.42
Limiting Responsibility			
3	8	Eliminating certain community activities.	.74
	30	Cutting down on the amount of "outside activities" in which I can be involved.	.66
	9	Cutting back on leisure activities.	.60
	22	Buying goods and services that save time.	.55
	5	Changing our standards of how well household tasks must be done.	.47
	7	Leaving some things undone around the house.	.44
	*14	Eating out more frequently.	.37

Factor	Item	Balancing Work and Family	Loading
4	2	Limiting my involvement on the job-- saying no to some of the things I could be doing.	.54
	19	Reducing the time I spend at work.	.50
	20	Planning career changes around family needs.	.48
	23	Having a schedule flexible enough to accommodate special needs and events.	.41
	41	Sharing more child care and household tasks with my husband.	.40
Separating Work and Family			
5	24	Planning ahead so that major changes at home will not disturb my career goals.	.74
	25	Making better use of time at work.	.73
	17	Separating my work life from family life so I can concentrate my effort on one area at a time.	.49
	35	Maintaining my health (eating right, getting enough sleep).	.44

Factor	Item	Avoiding Responsibility	Loading
6	34	Postponing certain tasks until the pressure to do them subsides.	.73
	32	Finding legitimate excuses to keep from fulfilling obligations I dislike.	.69
	33	Using family responsibilities to justify not accepting more job responsibilities.	.57
	29	Putting off tasks I don't have time to do.	.45
Using Social Support			
7	39	Arranging for child care so my husband and I can spend time together.	.58
	16	Relying on extended family members for support and encouragement.	.51
	10	Making friends with other two-career couples.	.50
	27	Believing that I need lots of stimulation and activity to be satisfied with my life.	.49
	26	Having good friends that I can talk to.	.47

*items omitted

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Dual-CareerHusbands and Wives

Length of Marriage	frequency	percenta
1-7 years	47	25
8-18	106	56
19-34	35	19

Number of Children

1	55	29
2	104	55
3	22	12
4 or more	9	5

Wives

Husbands

Age	frequency	percent	frequency	percent
26-36	39	41	25	26
37-46	46	48	54	57
47-59	10	11	16	17

Education

Less than BA/BS	4	3	5	5
BA/BS	31	33	29	31
MA/MS	37	39	27	28
Ph.D. or equivalent	23	25	34	36

aTotals are not always 100% due to rounding.

Table 2

Employment Characteristics of Dual-CareerHusbands and Wives

	<u>Wives</u>		<u>Husbands</u>	
	frequency	percent	frequency	percent
Individual Income				
less than 25,000	55	60	25	27
25,000-39,999	23	25	38	40
40,000-54,999	8	9	13	14
55,000-70,000 and above	6	6	18	19
Family Income				
less than 44,999	44	23	44	23
45,000-54,999	48	25	48	25
55,000-74,999	50	27	50	27
75,000-90,000 and above	48	25	48	25
Years Employed in Present Position				
5 or less	45	48	44	47
6-10	32	33	55	26
10 and over	18	19	23	23

Table 3

Demographic Data by Cluster

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
	f %	f %	f %	f %	f %	f % ^a
Gender Male	18 53	13 59	16 40	7 41	23 48	23 52
Female	16 47	9 41	24 60	10 59	25 52	21 48
Mean Age	38.51	36.67	38.08	41.00	38.90	42.33
Mean Number of						
Years Married	11.24	12.14	11.46	15.00	13.06	14.33
Mean Number of						
Children	1.97	1.90	1.84	2.47	1.75	1.81
Mean Age of						
Youngest Child	5.58	4.57	5.97	10.71	7.23	8.38
Mean Number of						
Years in	5.94	6.38	6.51	7.88	7.40	9.81
Present Position						
Career Importance	5.87	5.05	6.03	5.83	5.81	6.24
Mean Individual	30 -	30 -	30 -	40 -	30 -	30 -
Income	34,999	34,999	34,999	44,999	34,999	34,999
Mean Family	60 -	50 -	60,000	70 -	55 -	65 -
Income	64,999	54,999	64,999	74,999	59,999	69,999

af = frequency; % = percent.

APPENDIX C
INSTRUMENT

PART A

Considering your own experiences in a two-career family, circle the number from 1 to 7 which indicates how much you Agree or Disagree that each statement below describes your way of managing the dual responsibilities of employment and family life.

I manage family and career demands by:	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
1. Becoming more efficient, planning and organizing my time.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
2. Limiting my involvement on the job—saying "no" to some of the things I could be doing.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
3. Believing that our family life is better because both of us are employed.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
4. Ignoring comments about how husbands and wives "should" behave.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
5. Changing my standards of how well household tasks must be done.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
6. Setting priorities and doing the most important things first.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
7. Leaving some things undone around the house.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
8. Eliminating certain community activities.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
9. Cutting back on leisure activities.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
10. Making friends with other two-career couples.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
11. Setting aside "family time".	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
12. Hiring outside help to assist with household chores or home maintenance.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
13. Overlooking the difficulties; focusing on the good things about our family.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
14. Eating out more frequently.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
15. Believing that my career has made me a better husband than I otherwise would be.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
16. Relying on extended family members for support and encouragement.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
17. Separating my work life from family life so I can concentrate my effort on one area at a time.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>

	Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
18. Encouraging frequent communication among all family members.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
19. Reducing the time I spend at work.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
20. Planning career changes around family needs.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
21. Believing there are more advantages than disadvantages to my lifestyle.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
22. Buying goods and services that save time.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
23. Having a schedule flexible enough to accommodate special needs and events.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
24. Planning ahead so that major changes at home will not disturb my career goals.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
25. Making better use of time at work.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
26. Having good friends that I can talk to.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
27. Believing that I need lots of stimulation and activity to be satisfied with my life.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
28. Believing that, with time, combining my career with family life will get easier.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
29. Putting off tasks I don't have time to do.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
30. Cutting down on the amount of "outside activities" in which I can be involved.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
31. Believing that my career is one of the most important things in my life.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
32. Finding legitimate excuses to keep from fulfilling obligations I dislike.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
33. Using family responsibilities to justify not accepting more job responsibilities.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
34. Postponing certain tasks until the pressure to do them subsides.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
35. Maintaining my health (eating right, getting enough sleep).	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
IF YOU DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN <u>LIVING AT HOME</u> , PROCEED TO PART B.								
36. Delegating tasks to other family members.	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	

	SD							SA
37. Believing that my career has made me a better parent than I otherwise would be.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
38. Ignoring criticisms about parents who both work.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
39. Arranging for child care so my wife and I can spend time together.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
40. Encouraging our child(ren) to be more self-sufficient.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
41. Sharing more child care and household tasks with my wife.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
42. Believing my commitment to my career sets a good example for my child(ren).	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
43. Encouraging my child(ren) to help out whenever possible.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
44. Believing it is important that I excel at both my career and as a husband and father.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	

PART B

Another important purpose of this study is to learn more about the sources of stress in two-career families. Indicate how much you Agree or Disagree with each of the following statements. (Circle number)

I. MARITAL ROLES:

	SD							SA
1. Because of career demands, I find it difficult to be the kind of husband I'd like to be.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. My wife compares me favorably to the husbands of her friends.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. My wife understands the demands made on me professionally.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4. My relationship with my wife has suffered because we have so little time together.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. My work schedule is so demanding that I often neglect my share of the household chores.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. My wife and I experience conflict because of competition over our careers.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. I have had to compromise my career goals for the sake of my marriage.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	

II. OCCUPATIONAL ROLES

- | | SD | | | | | | | SA |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 1. Because of family demands, my productivity at work has suffered. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 2. My work schedule is flexible enough to allow time off work to take care of family needs. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 3. I have had to modify my career goals to accommodate my wife's career plans. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 4. Policies and procedures at work are supportive of two-career families. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 5. Managing the changing demands of my career, my wife's career, and everyday family life is a constant strain. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 6. I am under pressure to take on more job responsibilities than I can comfortably handle. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 7. I worry that I'm giving up too much of my masculine identity by being so involved with my family. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |

IF YOU DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME, PROCEED TO IV. PERSONAL ROLES.

III. PARENTING ROLES

- | | SD | | | | | | | SA |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 1. My career interferes with my ability to be the kind of father I'd like to be. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 2. I have as much patience with my child(ren) as I would like. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 3. My child(ren) resent my not being more available. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 4. My child(ren) compare me unfavorably to fathers of their friends. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 5. I am comfortable with the arrangements for my child(ren) while I'm working. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 6. My child(ren) think I expect too much of them. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 7. My wife feels I spend too much time with our child(ren) and not enough time with her. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 8. I have had to compromise my career goals for the sake of my child(ren). | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |

PART C

Next, we are interested in learning more about the feelings of gratification and reward as well as the more stressful feelings normally related to living in a two-career family. Please indicate how often each of the listed feelings describe your thoughts about your life in a two-career family. (Circle Number)

1. In general, when I think of myself as a HUSBAND, I feel:
- | | Never | | | | | | | Always |
|--------------------------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
| Supported..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Desired..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Inadequate..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Guilty..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Worried..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Appreciated..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Tense/Anxious..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Frustrated..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Understood..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Secure..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Taken Advantage Of..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Emotionally Drained..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
2. Overall, when I think of myself as a PROFESSIONAL, I feel:
- | | Never | | | | | | | Always |
|-------------------------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
| Competent..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Overwhelmed..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Frustrated..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| In Control..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Supported..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Taken Advantage Of..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Confident..... | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |

As a <u>PROFESSIONAL</u> , I feel:	Never						Always
Understood.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Appreciated.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Tense/Anxious.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Emotionally Drained.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Worried.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>

IF YOU DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME, PROCEED TO PART D.

1. In general, when I think of myself as a <u>PARENT</u> , I feel:	Never						Always
In Control.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Inadequate.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Frustrated.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Appreciated.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Taken Advantage Of.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Tense/Anxious.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Overwhelmed.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Confident.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Understood.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Emotionally Drained.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Guilty.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Worried.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>

PART D

The following feelings of distress are commonly experienced by people as they cope with the ups and downs of everyday life. How often in the past week were you bothered by the following feelings?

	Never						Very Often
1. Feeling nervous or shaky inside	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
2. Having less tolerance for frustration	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
3. Feeling depressed	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>

2. Which one of the following best describes your racial or ethnic identification? (Circle number)

- 1 BLACK
- 2 SPANISH OR MEXICAN HERITAGE
- 3 NATIVE AMERICAN (AMERICAN INDIAN)
- 4 WHITE (CAUCASIAN)
- 5 ORIENTAL OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
- 6 OTHER (specify) _____

3. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

_____ level of education (years completed or degree)

4. For each time you've been married: How long did the marriage last? How old were you when the marriage began? Are you still married, divorced, or widowed (circle appropriate letter)?

	Length of Marriage	Age at Marriage	Still Married(SM), Divorced(D), Widowed(W)
First Marriage:	_____ Years	_____ Years	<u>SM</u> D W
Second Marriage:	_____ Years	_____ Years	<u>SM</u> D W
Third Marriage:	_____ Years	_____ Years	<u>SM</u> D W

5. Do you have any regular activities away from home besides those associated with your career or family responsibilities (e.g., evening courses, volunteer activities, hobbies, exercise classes). (Circle number)

- 1 NO
- 2 YES If YES, How many hours per week do you spend in these activities? _____ hours

IF YOU DO NOT HAVE CHILD(REN), PROCEED TO ITEM 10.

6. How many children do you have? _____ number of children

7. What are the ages of child(ren) living at home?

BOY(S) age age age age GIRL(S) age age age age

8. If any child(ren) listed in item 7 are from a previous marriage of yours, please circle the age of the child(ren).

9. Is it necessary for you to make regular arrangements for the care of your child(ren) while you are working? (Circle number)

- 1 NO
- 2 YES If YES, how is each child cared for? _____

10. In what kind of company, organization, or educational institution are you employed? (please be specific)

11. What is your occupation? (please be specific)

12. How long have you been employed in your present position? _____
Years/Months

13. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend at work? _____
hours

14. Approximately how many additional hours do you spend at job-related tasks while at home? _____
hours

15. How important to you is having a successful career? (Circle number)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not At All Important						Extremely Important

16. In 1985, what was your approximate income, before taxes? (please respond to both columns)

YOUR INDIVIDUAL INCOME

- 1 LESS THAN \$15,000
- 2 \$15,000 - \$19,999
- 3 \$20,000 - \$24,999
- 4 \$25,000 - \$29,999
- 5 \$30,000 - \$34,999
- 6 \$35,000 - \$39,999
- 7 \$40,000 - \$44,999
- 8 \$45,000 - \$49,999
- 9 \$50,000 - \$54,999
- 10 \$55,000 - \$59,999
- 11 \$60,000 - \$64,999
- 12 \$65,000 - \$69,999
- 13 \$70,000 AND ABOVE

FAMILY INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES

- 1 LESS THAN \$35,000
- 2 \$35,000 - \$39,999
- 3 \$40,000 - \$44,999
- 4 \$45,000 - \$49,999
- 5 \$50,000 - \$54,999
- 6 \$55,000 - \$59,999
- 7 \$60,000 - \$64,999
- 8 \$65,000 - \$69,999
- 9 \$70,000 - \$74,999
- 10 \$75,000 - \$79,999
- 11 \$80,000 - \$84,999
- 12 \$85,000 - \$89,999
- 13 \$90,000 AND ABOVE

(PLEASE SEE BACK COVER)

APPENDIX D
CORRESPONDENCE

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Family
and Child Development

Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-8299
(703) 961-4794 or 4795

Dual-Career Family Project

Dear Dual-Career Wife:

A recent trend in American family life is an increase in the number of families in which both husband and wife have full-time careers. Stress is sometimes created when work, family, and community interests compete for limited time and energy. Yet, there is little research-based information on specific coping strategies available to dual-career families who experience such stress. The purpose of our study is to examine the process of stress: its sources, mediators, and outcomes.

You are among a sample of dual-career couples being asked to assist with this research. Your responses will provide a unique contribution to the study of stress and coping in this emergent lifestyle. In order for the results to be truly representative, it is important that each questionnaire be completed independently and returned promptly. The time (approximately 25 minutes) that you take to complete the survey will be greatly appreciated.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaires have a code number for two purposes. The first is to identify husbands and wives as couples. The second purpose is for mail identification only. Your name will be checked off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned and will never be associated with your responses in any way.

We shall be most happy to answer any questions you may have. Please feel free to write or call.

Thank you for your assistance.

Project Coordinators:
Maureen G. Guelzow
Maureen H. Schnittger
Nancy J. Wanamaker

Gloria W. Bird, Ph.D.
Assistant Department Head
Family and Child Development

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Family
and Child Development

Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-8299
(703) 961-4794 or 4795

Dual-Career Family Project

Dear Dual-Career Husband:

A recent trend in American family life is an increase in the number of families in which both husband and wife have full-time careers. Stress is sometimes created when work, family, and community interests compete for limited time and energy. Yet, there is little research-based information on specific coping strategies available to dual-career families who experience such stress. The purpose of our study is to examine the process of stress: its sources, mediators, and outcomes.

You are among a sample of dual-career couples being asked to assist with this research. Your responses will provide a unique contribution to the study of stress and coping in this emergent lifestyle. In order for the results to be truly representative, it is important that each questionnaire be completed independently and returned promptly. The time (approximately 25 minutes) that you take to complete the survey will be greatly appreciated.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaires have a code number for two purposes. The first is to identify husbands and wives as couples. The second purpose is for mail identification only. Your name will be checked off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned and will never be associated with your responses in any way.

We shall be most happy to answer any questions you may have. Please feel free to write or call.

Thank you for your assistance.

Project Coordinators:
Maureen G. Guelzow
Maureen H. Schnittger
Nancy J. Wanamaker

Gloria W. Bird, Ph.D.
Assistant Department Head
Family and Child Development

Last week, two questionnaires were mailed to you seeking information about how dual-career couples cope with stress. If each of you have already completed and returned them to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, your prompt response will be very much appreciated. It is important that your questionnaires be included in the study if the results are to be truly representative.

If by some chance you do not have the questionnaires, please call me immediately, (703) 961-4791 or send me a note. I will mail another set to you.

Sincerely,

Gloria W. Bird, Ph.D.
1A Wallace Annex, Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Family
and Child Development

Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 - 8299
(703) 961-4794 or 4795

February 12, 1986

Dear Dual-Career Couple:

About three weeks ago I wrote to you requesting your participation in a dual-career research project. As of today we have not received a completed questionnaire from one or both of you.

The purpose of our study is to examine the process of stress: its sources, mediators, and outcomes. Your responses will provide a unique contribution to the study of stress and coping in dual-career families.

I am writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of dual-career couples, it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

Your names were provided by another dual-career couple. Please know that we understand your need for privacy. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. In no way will your responses be associated with your names.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, please call me immediately, (703) 961-4791, or send a note. I will mail another set to you.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Gloria W. Bird, Ph.D.
1-A Wallace Annex
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

GWB/mlm

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Family
and Child Development

Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-8299
(703) 961-794 or 4795

Dual-Career Family Project

March 12, 1986

Dear Dual-Career Couple:

Your assistance is important to the success of our study of stress and coping in dual-career families. If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire(s), please accept our sincere thanks and our apology for contacting you again.

The number of returned questionnaires is very encouraging. But, whether we will be able to describe accurately how dual-career couples cope with stress depends upon you and others who have not yet responded. Past experiences suggest that those of you who have not yet responded may hold quite different perspectives on stress and coping than those who have returned their questionnaires.

This is one of the first studies of this type ever conducted using a sample of dual-career couples. The usefulness of the results depends on how accurately we are able to describe the stress process among career couples. As we began this study we were very much aware of the time constraints facing families in which both spouses have careers. Yet, we were convinced that career couples would see the value of providing information useful to the ever-increasing number of families with similar lifestyles.

In case our other correspondence did not reach you, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. The time you take (approximately 30 minutes) to complete the survey will be sincerely appreciated. May I urge you to complete and return it before March 31.

We'll be happy to send you a copy of the results. Simply put your name, address, and "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope.

Thank you for your contribution to the success of this study.

Most sincerely,

Project Coordinators:
Maureen Guelzow
Maureen Schnittger
Nancy Wanamaker

Gloria W. Bird, Ph.D.
Assistant Department Head
Family and Child Development

VIRGINIA TECH

Department of Family
and Child Development

Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-8299
(703) 961-4794 or 4795

Dual-Career Family Project

March 12, 1986

Dear Dual-Career Wife:

Your assistance is important to the success of our study of stress and coping in dual-career families. If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire(s), please accept our sincere thanks and our apology for contacting you again.

The number of returned questionnaires is very encouraging. But, whether we will be able to describe accurately how dual-career couples cope with stress depends upon you and others who have not yet responded. Past experiences suggest that those of you who have not yet responded may hold quite different perspectives on stress and coping than those who have returned their questionnaires.

This is one of the first studies of this type ever conducted using a sample of dual-career couples. The usefulness of the results depends on how accurately we are able to describe the stress process among career couples. As we began this study we were very much aware of the time constraints facing families in which both spouses have careers. Yet, we were convinced that career couples would see the value of providing information useful to the ever-increasing number of families with similar lifestyles.

In case our other correspondence did not reach you, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. The time you take (approximately 30 minutes) to complete the survey will be sincerely appreciated. May I urge you to complete and return it before March 31.

We'll be happy to send you a copy of the results. Simply put your name, address, and "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope.

Thank you for your contribution to the success of this study.

Most sincerely,

Project Coordinators:
Maureen Guelzow
Maureen Schnittger
Nancy Wanamaker

Gloria W. Bird, Ph.D.
Assistant Department Head
Family and Child Development

APPENDIX E

VITA

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**