

37
52

ROLE STRAIN AND COPING AMONG DUAL-CAREER
MEN AND WOMEN ACROSS THE FAMILY LIFE CYCLE

by

Maureen H. Schnittger

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

Lawrence H. Cross

Shirley C. Farrier

Susan D. Molumphy

Michael J. Sporakowski

April, 1988

Blacksburg, Virginia

ROLE STRAIN AND COPING AMONG DUAL-CAREER MEN AND WOMEN
ACROSS THE FAMILY LIFE CYCLE

by

Maureen H. Schnittger

Gloria W. Bird, Chair

Family and Child Development

ABSTRACT

Differences in role strain and coping across five family life cycle stages were assessed using responses from 329 dual-career women and men. MANOVA on role strain confirmed a significant effect by gender. Women reported a significantly higher level of personal role strain than men. Coping strategy use differed significantly by gender and life cycle stage. Women utilized the coping strategies Cognitive Restructuring, Delegating Responsibility, Limiting Responsibility, and Using Social Support significantly more often than men. Dual-career men and women without children at home used Balancing Work and Family significantly less frequently than men and women with children. Respondents whose oldest child was under 6 reported less use of Delegating Responsibility than those with an oldest child age 13-18. Limiting Responsibility was used less by participants with children under age 6 than by those with older children. Bivariate correlational patterns for male and female respondents were similar across roles. The results are discussed from a family life cycle perspective.

H60 7-5-88

Dedicated to
my husband, Edward
my children, Elizabeth and Timothy
my parents, Elizabeth and Eugene Jaworski
I will always be grateful for their continuous
love, encouragement and support.

Acknowledgements

I want to express appreciation to my graduate committee Dr. Gloria W. Bird, Dr. Lawrence H. Cross, Dr. Shirley C. Farrier, Dr. Susan D. Molumphy and Dr. Michael J. Sporakowski. I am especially grateful to have had the opportunity to work closely with Dr. Bird. She provided the right blend of support and challenge in assisting me during this venture.

I want to recognize the assistance and encouragement I received from Betty Koball, a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Research. Her assistance with the computer analysis was invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
Role Strain	2
Coping	4
Family Life Cycle Stages	8
METHODS	
Subjects	11
Measurement	12
Data Analysis	14
RESULTS	15
DISCUSSION	17
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	25
REFERENCES	27
TABLES	33
APPENDIX	39
VITA	73

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Role Strain	33
Table 2. Summary of Multivariate and Univariate F Tests—Role Strain	34
Table 3. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Coping	35
Table 4. Summary of Multivariate and Univariate F Tests—Coping Strategies	36
Table 5. Intercorrelations between Role Strain and Coping	37
Table 6. Tukey HSD Comparisons	38
Table 7. Intercorrelations between Role Strain and Coping (Males)	59
Table 8. Intercorrelations between Role Strain and Coping (Females)	60

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. Literature Review	41
APPENDIX B. Methodology	56
APPENDIX C. Correspondence	61
APPENDIX D. Instrument	66

Introduction

Dual-career couples experience role strain (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976; Voydanoff, 1987) and use various coping strategies to alleviate the strain (Bird & Bird, 1986; Elman & Gilbert, 1984; Johnson & Johnson, 1977). Although studies have determined that couples with young children experience greater role strain and have identified coping strategies used more often by parents of preschoolers (Heckman, Bryson & Bryson, 1977; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979), none of the reviewed literature examines strain and coping from a family life cycle perspective. Yet, it would seem that as dual-career couples age and advance through the normal stages of a family life cycle, role strain experienced as well as coping strategies utilized would vary.

The purpose of this study was to further the understanding of role strain and coping in dual-career families by asking the following research questions: 1) Does level of role strain differ across role categories (marital, professional, parental, personal) by family life stage and gender? 2) Does choice of coping strategies differ by family life cycle stage and by gender? 3) Is there a relationship between level of role strain and use of coping strategies across role categories by gender?

Previous Literature

Role Strain

Role strain is the difficulty experienced as a result of fulfilling the simultaneous demands and expectations of multiple role obligations (Burr, Leigh, Day & Constantine, 1979; Goode, 1973). Role strain is often used synonymously with role overload or role conflict. Sieber (1974) clarifies this definitional problem by referring to overload as constraints imposed by time and to role conflict as the discrepancy in expectations irrespective of time. For this study, role strain is viewed as a result of both overload (time) and conflicts (expectations).

The total set of role obligations is unique for each individual, and the difficulty in meeting role demands is normal (Goode, 1973). Conflict occurs with the simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures, indicating that compliance with one set would make it more difficult to comply with the other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

The structural constraints and incentives of the work environment in early career stages usually result in high career commitment and long hours spent on career-related tasks (Kanter, 1977). These early years of career establishment appear to create minimal role strain for early childless couples (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976). However, adding the parental role to career and marital roles, elicits feelings of satisfaction as well as feelings of role

overload and conflict (Barnett & Baruch, 1980). At this time, career plans may be altered as work and family demands compete for scarce time and energy resources (Faver, 1984). Dual-career couples with young children report significantly more role strain and stress than other dual-career parents with women indicating higher strain than men (Bird & Ford, 1985; Guelzow & Bird, forthcoming).

Research has shown that conflicts between professional and parental roles are stressful for dual-career mothers (Heckman, Bryson & Bryson, 1977; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). Addition of the parent role provides increased conflict with other life roles (Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). For example, Nicola (1980) found that husbands say career interest intrudes on fathering roles while wives state that parenting interferes with career roles. Wives also report that parental roles and career roles conflict with marital roles. As the number of children and importance of parental role increases, so does the degree of role strain for dual-career women (Bird & Ford, 1985; Holmstrom, 1973; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971; Voydanoff & Kelly, 1984).

Bird and Ford (1985) found that dual-career fathers who report having a young child and sharing child-care tasks experience significantly higher levels of role strain than other fathers. Garland (1972) reported that dual-career males feel strain in attempting to find free time. Men in Gilbert's (1985) study indicated experiencing role conflict

centered around wanting to support spouses' careers, be involved in family and home care yet, at the same time, wanting to prioritize personal goals.

In summary, there is documentation that dual-career women and men have difficulty meeting multiple role demands; however, most of the research has focused on the early parenting years or reported results based on total sample variations without distinguishing by more discrete categories such as by gender, or life cycle stage. The results from this study may help to fill that gap in the literature.

Coping

Coping is any response to role strain which functions to prevent, avoid, tolerate or minimize demands and conflicts among them (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). Hall (1972) proposed a model of coping with role conflict consisting of three approaches. Type I coping, structural role redefinition, is the attempt to alter external, structurally imposed expectations. It involves dealing with the objective reality of the situation instead of subjective perception or feelings. Type I coping typically reduces experienced overload and conflict between the individual and others. Behaviors included in this style of coping are: utilizing role support, role integration and eliminating role activities. Type II coping, personal role redefinition, is changing one's perception and expectations of behavior relative to a

given role. Examples include setting priorities, changing attitudes toward roles, and eliminating roles (Voydanoff, 1987).

Type III coping, reactive role behavior is an attempt to meet all of the role expectations, assuming that the demands are unchangeable and must be met. This style of coping implies a passive manner of dealing with conflict and "would probably represent considerable strain on a person's energies, since they involve attempting to do everything demanded" (Hall, 1972, p. 480). Behaviors indicating a Type III style of coping are working harder, attempting to plan and organize better or using no conscious strategy.

Hall (1972) found that there were no consistent trends in the type of strategy used as a function of life stage, rather individuals used strategies depending on life situations (i.e., jobs, family attitude). Although Hall's concepts were first used to describe college-educated women who managed multiple roles, his descriptions of coping behavior remain applicable to dual-career families (Sekaran, 1987).

Some past research, though not specific to life cycle stages, does provide evidence of methods of adaptation in dual-career families. Bebbington (1973), for example, notes that "stress optimization", the acknowledging of dual-career stress as inevitable and preferable to the stress of alternative life-styles available, is a means of adaptation for

these couples. Although there is no single coping strategy so effective that its use alone insures the ability to fend off all stressful consequences of strains (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978), dual-career research has identified several successful coping behaviors.

Poloma (1972) outlined four strategies used by the dual-career women, 1) defining dual-career patterns as favorable, 2) establishing priorities among roles, 3) compartmentalizing work and family roles, and 4) compromising career aspirations. Elman and Gilbert (1984), using reports from a sample of women with preschool children, found increased role behavior to be the most widely used coping strategy. This behavior "involves efforts by the individual to do it all, by working harder and more efficiently" (Elman & Gilbert, 1984, p.324).

Harrison and Minor (1978), reported that structural role definition was the coping strategy used to deal with conflicts between wife and worker roles and personal role redefinition was used when the conflicts were between the roles of mother and worker. This sample of black, worker and professional women all had children under the age of 18 years.

Studies show that dual-career women also manage strain within the family by using such coping strategies as prioritizing, compartmentalizing and compromising (Amaka & Cross, 1983; Bird & Bird, 1986; Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1983;

Holmstrom, 1973; Poloma, 1972). For example, some women consciously leave work problems at the office to separate or compartmentalize work and family roles. Others, prioritize needs and compromise standards to reduce strain at home. Many manage by negotiating increased sharing of the weekly household tasks (Bird & Bird, 1986; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976; Skinner, 1980).

Bird, Bird, and Scruggs (1983) examined coping strategies of dual-earner couples and found that men used organization more often to cope with role strain while women chose the strategy compartmentalization to a greater extent. Skinner and McCubbin (1982) found, in their sample of dual-employed families, that men utilized coping patterns that allowed them to maintain a positive perspective on the lifestyle and reduce tensions. The pattern included behaviors that attended to personal needs (i.e., planning time to exercise). Dual-career husbands in the Bird and Bird (1986) study utilized the coping strategy of compartmentalization to reduce role strain. Gilbert (1985) found that dual-career men used increased role behavior more often than other coping strategies. These men, especially if they were in the early stages of the career and family life cycle, did not view structural or societal changes as an option. Men married over 10 years reported frequent use of strategies that alter or change the source of conflict (i.e., personal role redefinition). Instead of arguing with wives about

division of household tasks, they viewed task sharing as a part of the dual-career lifestyle.

Conflicts between personal and societal norms are minimized when dual-career couple members are supportive of and empathetic toward each other (Bird & Bird, 1986; Kater, 1985). This supportive relationship extends to friends and other couples living a similiar life-style. Dual-career couples form friendships with other dual-career couples perhaps as a means of validating their life-style (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976; Skinner, 1980). Bird & Bird (1986) suggest that friendships serve to insulate dual-career couples from some societal expectations, thereby keeping their role strain at a moderate level.

To summarize, reviewed research indicates that dual-career women and men utilize a variety of coping strategies to manage role strain. Although studies have identified the preschool years as a time when both women and men feel the greatest role strain and have attempted to identify efficacious coping attempts by role category and by gender, there has been no close examination of differences in coping strategy utilization across life-cycle stages.

Family Life Cycle Stages

Family life cycle is a term that has been used for many years in reference to the succession of critical stages through which the typical family passes during its life span (Aldous, 1978; Glick, 1977). The family life cycle, used as

a frame of reference, affords a longitudinal view of family life (Duvall & Miller, 1985). Life cycle stages provide a means for researchers to place in categories families that are experiencing similiar events, facing similiar crises and attempting to accomplish similiar developmental tasks (Mattessich & Hill, 1987). Rodgers (1973) explains that the focus of this developmental analysis is on processual not chronological time. He states "These periods are identified not because they occur during the same chronological era in all families, but because they have a distinctive role structure which separates them from other periods in the family career" (p. 48). Each stage represents a point when the family must also initiate different behavior patterns (Trost, 1974). During the life of the typical family, important changes occur not only in the composition but also in other measurable characteristics of the group. Family life cycle variables provide a way to map the impact of the supply and demand of both stressors and coping resources in the family (Voydanoff & Kelly, 1984).

Proponents of family life cycle theory, differ in the number of stages identified as necessary to adequately describe the family life cycle; yet, "most methods for determining family life cycle stages use the age of the oldest child for the operational purpose of demarcating stages" (Mattessich & Hill, 1987, p.444).

The present study used the following five life cycle

stages, based on the early work of Duvall and Hill and most recently refined by Hill (1986) to help categorize whether role strain and coping strategies vary for dual-career men and women:

- 1) Establishment stage - (childless)
- 2) New parents stage - (oldest child 1 day to 5 years)
- 3) Family with school age child - (oldest child 6-12 years)
- 4) Families with adolescents - (oldest child 13-18 years)
- 5) Families with young adults - (oldest child over 18, not living at home)

Methods

Subjects

Data used in this study were collected from a purposive sample of dual-career couples, drawn from a mid-Atlantic state. Initial contacts were made through professional organizations and personal networks of the five-member research team. Individuals who were contacted initially provided the names of other dual-career couples. This process continued until a sample of 310 dual-career couples were located. Responses were received from 70% of the sample after three follow-up contacts. Data from the 329 women and men who reported being married and employed full-time in professional and managerial positions were used for the present study; 48% (158) were males and 52% (171) were females.

Fifteen percent of the men and women were between the ages of 24 and 35; 29% were ages 36 to 46; 48% were 47 to 56 years of age and 7% percent were over 56. Forty-two percent of the sample were married ten years or less; 37% were married between 10 and 20 years and 20% were married over twenty years.

The average number of children in these families was two. Twenty percent of the sample had no children; 22% had one child; 42% had two children; 14% had three or four children. Of the children living at home, 24% were between

the ages of 1 day to 5 years; 21% were 6-12 years old; 21% were 13-18 years of age. Fourteen percent of the children were over 18 years old and not living at home.

Twenty-eight percent of the subjects had earned a doctoral degree; 32% had a master's degree and 25% had a bachelor's degree. Seventy-four percent had been employed 10 years or less in their present position. Sixty-six percent reported a individual income of \$35,000.

Measurement

A seven point Likert-type response scale was used for each role strain and coping item; response choices ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Role strain was evaluated by the extent of agreement with 37 items designed to determine the experienced difficulty in meeting expectations in five role categories: marital, professional, parental, personal (Bird & Ford, 1985; Heckman et al., 1977; Holmstrom, 1973; Poloma, 1974; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971, 1976). The number of items assessing each category of role strain are : marital- (7), professional- (7), parental- (8), and personal-(7). The internal consistency (coefficient alpha) of these scales ranged from .60 to .74. Examples of questions include : marital- "My relationship with my wife has suffered because we have so little time together"; professional- "My work schedule is flexible enough to allow time off work to take care of

family needs"; parental- "My career interferes with my ability to be the kind of father I'd like to be"; personal- "Sometimes I feel like I never get a moment to myself". All items were coded from low to high role strain.

Coping strategies were assessed by 44 items adapted from the Dual-Employed Coping Scales (DECS) (Skinner & McCubbin, 1982) and supplemented with other items identified from a review of the literature concerned with coping styles of dual-career men and women (Bird & Bird, 1986; Elman & Gilbert, 1984; Poloma, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976). Ratings of the 44 coping items were subjected to principal-components factor analysis with varimax rotation. The intent of this procedure was data reduction and strategy identification. Only items loading .40 and above on each factor were retained. Seven coping strategies were identified: Balancing Work and Family, Cognitive Restructuring, Delegating Responsibility, Limiting Responsibility, Separating Family and Work, Avoiding Responsibility, and Using Social Support. Each coping strategy and sample items are presented in the Appendix.

The following questions were included in the demographic section to facilitate construction of family life cycle stages : "How many children do you have?" "What are the ages of children living at home?"

Data Analysis

Two, 2 (gender) x 5 (life cycle stages) MANOVAs were conducted to test for differences in the dependent measures role strain and coping strategies. Pearson (r) correlations were calculated to assess the relationship between coping strategies and role strain categories for men and women.

Results

Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics for the role strain variable broken out by gender and family life cycle stages. The MANOVA associated with these data is summarized in Table 2. Neither the main effect for life cycle stages nor the interaction effect was significant. The multivariate F test for gender was significant ($p < .01$) and followup univariate F tests revealed significant mean differences only for personal role strain. As shown in Table 1, the personal role strain mean score was 4.10 for males versus 4.50 for females. It is also clear from the means in Table 1 that the largest mean differences are between those in life cycle stage 2 (3.99 vs 4.73).

Tables 1 - 4 about here

Table 3 reports the descriptive statistics for the coping strategy variable by gender and life cycle stages. The MANOVA associated with these data is summarized in Table 4. The interaction effect was not significant however the multivariate F tests for gender and life cycle stages were significant ($p < .01$). The univariate tests indicate that use of the coping strategies Cognitive Restructuring, Delegating Responsibility, Limiting Responsibility and Using Social Support differ significantly by gender and use of the coping strategies Balancing Work and Family, Delegating Responsibility and Limiting Responsibility differ

significantly by family life cycle stage.

Table 3 shows the following total mean score differences: Cognitive Restructuring- 5.13 males, 5.46 females; Delegating Responsibility- 5.19 males, 5.66 females; Limiting Responsibility- 4.83 males, 5.24 females and Using Social Support 4.06 males, 4.65 females. With one exception (Cognitive Restructuring use by males in stage 3), females reported a higher use of the significant coping strategies in every family life cycle stage.

Table 5 displays the Tukey HSD comparisons of significant coping strategies by family life cycle stage. The mean scores of Balancing Work and Family indicate a difference between stages 1 and 5 (4.22, 3.97) and stages 2, 3, 4 (4.93, 4.91, 4.75). The mean scores of Delegating Responsibility differed between stage 2 (5.20) and stage 4 (5.66). Limiting Responsibility score differed between stage 1 (4.81) and stages 4 and 5 (5.27, 5.27).

Tables 5-6 about here

Table 6 presents the Pearson r coefficients with level of significance indicated for role strain and coping strategies by gender. Overall, the correlational data offer evidence of a relationship between level of role strain experienced by respondents in this sample and coping strategies utilized. Bivariate correlational patterns for male and female respondents were similar across roles.

Discussion

In general, women and men in this study reported moderate levels of role strain irrespective of life cycle stage, with women indicating a significantly higher degree of personal strain compared to men. Personal role strain reflects a sense of feeling generally overwhelmed. It incorporates a concern of not having time for oneself but also contains an element of wanting to do it all...and do it well. As one woman in the study noted "The greatest stress I feel centers around there not being enough time to do all I want. The only expandable time is that which I would save for myself". The attempts women make to balance multiple roles according to usually high self-instituted and culturally driven standards of performance can lead to role overload (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976; Sekaran, 1987).

As noted earlier, having children in the home, exacerbated personal role strain for dual-career women (Bird & Ford, 1985; Elman & Gilbert, 1984). Forty percent of the women in this sample have children under 12 years of age. Almost half of the women are under 45 years old, and based on career stages may either be in the establishment career stage or are reevaluating their career goals (Gilbert, 1985; Voydanoff, 1987). Women are frequently caught in the double bind of not wanting to sacrifice career for family and simultaneously preferring not to neglect family for career.

Although the women in this study appear to be successfully managing strain within the roles of spouse, parent and professional, balancing these roles while maintaining a sense of themselves is difficult. The level of personal role strain experienced by the women in this study is consistent with Gilbert's (1985) finding that men are less likely than women to feel stress as a result of role conflict and the conflict by men is not as likely to be at the expense of their personal identity or professional performance as it is for women.

The lack of differences in role strain across the five life cycle stages is at first glance surprising. Men and women in this sample have been able to contain the degree of felt role strain regardless of their position in the family life cycle. The answer to why and how this occurs can be found in the coping literature. The author believes that, as Pearlin (1985) and Folkman & Lazarus (1980) state, it is the manner in which individuals cope that mediates the consequences of life strain.

Women in this study, compared to men, cope by using Cognitive Restructuring, Delegating Responsibility, Limiting Responsibility and Using Social Support significantly more frequently to handle stressors. These coping strategies are representative of both structural role redefinition and personal role redefinition styles of coping behavior

(Hall, 1972; Voydanoff, 1987). Delegating Responsibility and Using Social Support are examples of structural role redefinition that reduces overload and conflict between the individual and those around him/her. Delegating responsibility, such as sharing household tasks and childcare, has consistently been reported to be a successful strategy for managing role overload in dual-career families (Bird & Bird, 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1977; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976). The hidden implication may be that household and childcare tasks are the woman's responsibility and she copes with her overload by "doling" out jobs or tasks.

Using Social Support, includes relying on family members for encouragement and making friends with other two-career couples (Poloma, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976; Sekaran, 1987). This pattern of coping involves obtaining emotional support as well as instrumental support. One woman noted "We use friends who are in similar situations as our support network. I think getting together with them is used to help reduce work related stress along with the stress produced by being the type of family we are". Because the dual-career lifestyle challenges traditional role assumptions about normative family functioning, spouse and friend support is crucial to effective coping (Gilbert & Rachlin, 1987). That women in this study report using this

strategy more than the men substantiates findings of other researchers (Bird & Bird, 1986; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976; Skinner, 1980).

Cognitive Restructuring and Limiting Responsibility are examples of personal role redefinition which involves changing attitudes toward and perceptions of role expectations (Hall, 1972). Other researchers have also found that Cognitive Restructuring reduces women's role strain (Elman & Gilbert, 1984; Poloma, 1974; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976; Wanamaker & Bird, forthcoming). Women using this technique define situations and events unique to the dual-career family pattern as being favorable compared to other alternatives. They believe that the benefits of the lifestyle outweigh the costs. Cognitive Restructuring allows for the validation of the dual-career lifestyle. Women, who may still receive conflictual messages about working full-time while being a parent, use this coping strategy as a means of reinterpreting the situation. In effect, these women shield themselves (and their families) by controlling the meaning of a problem (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978).

That women use Limiting Responsibility more often than men is consistent with their reported personal role strain; women are attempting to manage role overload by limiting involvement in the community, cutting back on leisure

activities and changing household standards. However the inability, even with its use, to contain feelings of strain indicates that the responsibilities being limited most likely are not the ones that make significant differences in reducing role overload and role conflict. Yet it is more socially and personally acceptable to cut back on community activities or leisure time rather than reduce time in child care or for spousal support.

Coping strategy use differed across life cycle stages. Men and women without children in the home (Stages 1 & 5) use Balancing Work and Family significantly less often than men and women in other stages of the life cycle. During Stages 1 and 5, dual-career couples negotiate or renegotiate spouse and professional roles. Without children at home there is less need to limit job involvement and less pressure to plan career changes around family needs. At these points in the life cycle, job flexibility is also less urgent. Prior to the birth of the first child, couples usually initiate a more equal division of household work that includes a higher proportion of shared tasks (Hood, 1983). After children have left home, feelings of overload are less often expressed. As couples become parents, some re-allocation of tasks and time typically occur (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). For this sample of dual-career men and women, Balancing Work and Family was significantly

different for every stage that included children under 18 years old illustrating that across the life cycle couples must continually integrate changing demands and re-establish priorities (Faver, 1984).

Participants in Stage 2 of the family life cycle reported significantly less use of Delegating Responsibility compared to respondents in Stage 4. Delegation involves another person being asked to carry out various role activities. Typically wives attempt to delegate some of the household responsibilities or child care to other family members, usually the husband or older children (Bird & Bird, 1986; Hall, 1972; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976). Not only are there more individuals in the home during Stage 4 to share the work but given the age of the oldest child (13 to 18), more responsibility for complex tasks could be delegated. As a male respondent noted "I think the key to successful dual-career families is for the husband and wife and children to share equally the family responsibilities. We are successful because of this".

Dual-career individuals in Stage 1 used Limiting Responsibility significantly less than those in Stages 4 or 5. Limiting Responsibility, a type II or personal role redefinition style of coping, involves establishing priorities and eliminating roles (Hall, 1972). Not having the role of parent, probably allows those in Stage 1 more

time to concentrate on spouse and professional roles with less need to reduce role responsibility. Men and women in stage 4 may reduce involvement in community activities and leisure pursuits as a means of having more time with the family. Adolescents, ambivalent about issues such as independence, may verbally express dissatisfaction with mother's employment. It may not be that they want her at home all the time, rather that they want her available. Parents often express a desire to spend more time with adolescents before they leave home.

Individuals in stage 5 may sense that there is no longer as much need to be competitive in career roles and there is now more freedom to limit other responsibilities as well. These women and men, aged 50-54, are probably established in professions and may now choose to realign how free time is spent. In addition, they may have the economic flexibility to purchase additional resources or support services.

The final research question addressed by this study asks: is there a relationship between level of role strain experienced and use of coping strategies across role categories for women and men in dual-career families? The answer is yes. Dual-career men and women who use Cognitive Restructuring report significantly less marital strain, professional strain and parental strain. Personal role strain is the most invincible to coping efforts.

Again, it appears that this type of role strain permeates so many aspects of the dual-career lifestyle that no one coping strategy can manage it. Women and men who cope by using Limiting Responsibility and Avoiding Responsibility have more strain in all role categories.

Summary and Conclusion

The present study used cross-sectional data to compare responses of dual-career women and men of different age groups at the same point in time. Thus, while examining role strain and coping across five life cycle stages, changes that may occur as these individuals move through future family life cycle stages cannot be addressed or predicted. However, some inferences can be made regarding differences among the men and women in this sample.

A salient finding of this study is that dual-career men and women experience no significant differences in levels of marital, professional, and parental role strain. Women, however, report a greater sense of personal role strain than do men. Coping strategies utilized by this dual-career sample seem effective in containing role strain to a moderate level. Women indicate using the coping strategies Cognitive Restructuring, Delegating Responsibility, Limiting Responsibility and Using Social Support more frequently than do men. This finding adds credence to past research which found that implementing a variety of strategies, some of which are examples of structural and personal role redefinition, is more effective in addressing the core of the problem and, therefore, in reducing strain or stress (Gilbert & Rachlin, 1987; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Pearlin & Schooler, 1978).

Use of coping strategies also differed by life cycle stage and again represented examples of both structural and personal role redefinition. Within life cycle stages, significant differences were found in use of strategies reflecting a sense of taking action. These dual-career women and men are assuming an active role in managing their life style. Although the demands of combining family and career may assume different forms at each stage of the family life cycle, it is possible to moderate the associated strain through use of identified coping strategies.

The present study represents a beginning in the process of identifying efficacious coping strategies by gender and life cycle stage across role categories. How individuals alter the use of coping strategies to fit the ever-changing nature of family is a key factor to studying successful adaptation. This research supports the concept that a family changes as it matures. It offers new insight into the strategies dual-career men and women utilize to confront these changes.

References

- Aldous, J. (1978). Family careers: Developmental change in families. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Amaka, E., & Cross, E. G. (1983). Coupling and careers: A workshop for dual career couples at the launching stage. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62, 48-52.
- Barnett, R., & Baruch, G. (1980). Toward economic independence: Women's involvement in multiple roles. In D.G. McGuigan (Ed.), Women's lives: New theory, research and policy (pp. 69-83). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for Continuing Education of Women.
- 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, 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.

- Bohen, H., & Viveros-Long, A. (1981). Balancing jobs and family life. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Burr, W. R., Leigh, G. K., Day, R. D., & Constantine, J. (1979). Symbolic interaction and the family. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. R. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family vol. II (pp. 42-111). New York: Free Press.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley.
- Duvall, E. M., & Miller, F. (1985). Family development. (6th ed.) Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Elman, M. R., & Gilbert, L. A. (1984). Coping strategies for role conflict in married professional women with careers. Family Relations, 33, 317-322.
- Faver, C. A. (1984). Women in transition: Career, family, and life satisfaction in three cohorts. New York: Praeger.
- 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.
- Garland, N. T. (1972). The better half? The male in the dual profession family. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a sociology of women (pp.199-215). Lexington, MA: Xerox.

- Gilbert, L. A. (1985). Men in dual-career families: current realities and future prospects. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gilbert, L. A., & Rachlin, V. (1987). Mental health and psychological functioning of dual-career families. The Counseling Psychologist, 15, 7-49.
- Glick, P. (1977). Updating the family life cycle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 5-13.
- 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.
- Greenhaus, J., & Beutell, N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. In B. Miller & D. Olson, (Eds.). Family studies review yearbook (pp. 299-319). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Guelzow, M., & Bird, G. (1986). Coping responses and psychological resources as mediators in the stress process for dual-career women. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hall, D.T. (1972). A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college educated women. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 471-486.
- Harrison, A., & Minor, J. (1978). Interrole conflict, coping strategies and satisfaction among black working wives. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 799-805.

- 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. (1986). Life cycle stages for types of single
parent families: Of family development theory. Family
Relations, 35, 19-29.
- 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.
- Hood, J. C. (1983). Becoming a two-job family. New York:
Praeger.
- 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.
- Kater, D. (1985). Management strategies for dual-career
couples. Journal of Career Development, 12, 75-79.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal
and coping. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Mattessich, P., & Hill, R. (1987). Life cycle and family
development. In M. Sussman & S. Steinmetz (Eds.),
Handbook of marriage and the family (pp. 437-469). New
York: Plenum Press.

- Nicola, J. S. (1980). Career and family roles of dual-career couples: women in academia and their husbands. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- Pearlin, L. (1985). Life strains and psychological distress among adults. In A. Monat & R. Lazarus (Eds.), Stress and coping an anthology (pp. 192-207). New York: Columbia University 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.
- 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.
- Rodgers, R. H. (1973). Family interaction and transaction the developmental approach. N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Sekaran, U. (1987). Dual-career families. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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.
- Trost, J. (1974). This family life cycle - An impossible concept? International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 4, 37-47.
- Voydanoff, P. (1987). Work and family life. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Voydanoff, P., & Kelly, R. (1984). Determinants of work-related family problems among employed parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 881-892.
- Wanamaker, N., & Bird, G. (1986). Role strain, coping, and stress among dual-career husbands and wives. Unpublished manuscript.

Table 1

Means and standard deviations for role strain by life cycle stages and gender

	<u>Life Cycle Stages</u>					T
	1	2	3	4	5	
<u>Males</u> (N=158)	N=30	N=35	N=33	N=34	N=23	
Marital						
M	2.81	3.04	2.96	2.86	2.64	2.89
SD	.60	1.00	1.09	1.00	.95	.95
Professional						
M	2.84	2.96	3.19	2.89	2.35	2.88
SD	.80	.90	.99	.99	1.06	.96
Parental						
M	---	3.05	3.26	3.21	---	3.16
SD	---	.82	.62	.99	---	.85
Personal						
M	4.34	3.99	4.25	4.05	3.77	4.10
SD	1.20	.86	.86	1.10	1.25	1.04
 <u>Females</u> (N=171)						
	N=34	N=40	N=35	N=36	N=22	
Marital						
M	2.69	3.08	2.89	2.75	2.60	2.88
SD	.85	.91	.95	1.00	1.09	.96
Professional						
M	2.98	3.04	2.95	3.13	2.82	2.99
SD	1.02	.71	.95	1.00	.81	.91
Parental						
M	---	3.12	3.14	3.05	---	3.08
SD	---	.91	1.00	.96	---	.95
Personal						
M	4.36	4.73	4.67	4.30	4.40	4.50
SD	1.10	1.08	1.23	1.24	1.09	1.17

Note. The differences in total N and family life cycle stages total indicates subjects who did not respond to items 6 & 7, part H-regarding children.

Table 2
Summary of Multivariate and Univariate F Tests associated
with the Role Strain Factorial Design

<u>Multivariate</u> Source	df	Approx. F	F Prob.
Gender	1	4.22	(<.0061 *
Life Cycle Stages	4	1.32	(<.2026
Interaction	4	1.13	(<.3299
Error	296		
<u>Univariate F Tests</u>			
Gender			
Marital	1	.31	(<.5777
Professional	1	1.12	(<.2910
Parental	1	.35	(<.5525
Personal	1	9.81	(<.0019 *
Life Cycle Stages			
Marital	4	1.72	(<.1465
Professional	4	1.84	(<.1209
Parental	4	1.05	(<.3827
Personal	4	.99	(<.4154
Interaction			
Marital	4	.14	(<.9654
Professional	4	.97	(<.4247
Parental	4	.22	(<.8818
Personal	4	1.24	(<.2951

*p (<.01

Table 3
Means and standard deviations for coping strategies by
life cycle stages and gender

	Life Cycle Stages					T
	1 N=30	2 N=35	3 N=33	4 N=34	5 N=23	
Males (N=158)						
Balancing Work & Family						
M	3.91	4.76	4.76	4.81	3.98	4.49
SD	1.15	.93	.96	.97	.84	1.04
Cognitive Restructuring						
M	4.90	5.05	5.35	5.12	5.25	5.13
SD	.81	.86	.65	.91	.75	.81
Delegating Responsibility						
M	4.92	4.88	5.29	5.43	5.47	5.19
SD	.92	.85	.88	.70	.96	.88
Limiting Responsibility						
M	4.75	4.80	4.80	4.88	5.03	4.83
SD	.91	.72	1.08	.80	.92	.88
Separating Family & Work						
M	4.50	5.02	4.57	4.97	5.13	4.83
SD	.97	.91	.98	.76	.93	.93
Avoiding Responsibility						
M	4.00	3.73	3.73	3.56	3.66	3.72
SD	.68	.84	.95	1.20	.87	.93
Using Social Support						
M	4.11	4.23	4.20	3.87	3.74	4.06
SD	1.16	1.00	.96	1.11	1.08	1.06
Females (N=171)						
	N=34	N=40	N=35	N=36	N=22	
Balancing Work & Family						
M	4.50	5.08	5.05	4.70	3.97	4.72
SD	.98	1.14	.80	.87	1.06	1.04
Cognitive Restructuring						
M	5.31	5.53	5.29	5.64	5.53	5.46
SD	.98	.87	.88	.89	.92	.90
Delegating Responsibility						
M	5.73	5.49	5.62	5.87	5.55	5.66
SD	.72	.84	.91	.66	.96	.83
Limiting Responsibility						
M	4.86	5.29	5.02	5.63	5.52	5.24
SD	.95	1.15	1.09	.81	.80	1.02
Separating Family & Work						
M	5.01	5.13	4.87	4.84	5.18	5.02
SD	.91	1.08	1.02	.95	.90	.98
Avoiding Responsibility						
M	3.75	3.80	3.52	3.87	3.76	3.73
SD	1.14	1.24	1.09	1.18	1.00	1.13
Using Social Support						
M	4.83	4.60	4.72	4.52	4.50	4.65
SD	.85	1.06	.78	.93	1.14	.94

Note. The differences in total N and family life cycle stages total indicates subjects who did not respond to items 6 & 7, part H-regarding children.

Table 4
Summary of Multivariate and Univariate F Tests associated
 with the COPING Factorial Design

Multivariate Tests

Source	df	Approx. F	F Prob.
Gender	1	6.83	(<.0001 *
Life Cycle Stages	4	3.83	(<.0001 *
Interaction	4	1.15	(<.270
Error	303		

Univariate F Tests

Gender			
Balancing Work & Family	1	3.52	(<.0616
Cognitive Restructuring	1	11.96	(<.0006 *
Delegating Responsibility	1	24.34	(<.0001 *
Limiting Responsibility	1	13.86	(<.0002 *
Separating Family & Work	1	2.72	(<.1000
Avoiding Responsibility	1	.00	(<.9541
Using Social Support	1	25.98	(<.0001 *
Life Cycle Stages			
Balancing Work & Family	4	10.16	(<.0001 *
Cognitive Restructuring	4	.82	(<.5104
Delegating Responsibility	4	3.09	(<.0162 *
Limiting Responsibility	4	4.03	(<.0034 *
Separating Family & Work	4	2.68	(<.0320
Avoiding Responsibility	4	.42	(<.7931
Using Social Support	4	1.54	(<.1902
Interaction			
Balancing Work & Family	4	.42	(<.4274
Cognitive Restructuring	4	1.31	(<.2646
Delegating Responsibility	4	1.70	(<.1488
Limiting Responsibility	4	1.30	(<.2708
Separating Family & Work	4	1.22	(<.3035
Avoiding Responsibility	4	.79	(<.5324
Using Social Support	4	.35	(<.8463

*p < .01

Table 5

Tukey HSD Comparisons of Significant Coping Strategy Means
by Life Cycle Stages

Delegating Responsibility

	Means	5.35	5.20	5.46	5.66	5.51
1	5.35		.177	.089	.290	.170
2	5.20			.267	.468*	.347
3	5.46				.201	.080
4	5.66					.120
5	5.51					

Limiting Responsibility

	Means	4.81	5.06	4.91	5.27	5.27
1	4.81		.308	.111	.466*	.582*
2	5.06			.198	.158	.274
3	4.91				.356	.472
4	5.27					.115
5	5.27					

Balancing Work and Family

	Means	4.22	4.93	4.91	4.75	3.97
1	4.22		.650*	.630*	.470*	.307
2	4.93			.019	.179	.957*
3	4.91				.159	.937*
4	4.75					.777*
5	3.97					

*p < .05.

Table 6
Intercorrelations with Levels of Significance Between
Role Strain Categories and Coping Strategies

Females (N=171)

	DEL	COG	SEP	BAL	SUP	LIM	AVD
MSTR	-.18 .014	-.20 .007	-.16 .037	-.13 .070	.01 .815	.12 .099	.18 .018
PRSTR	-.19 .011	-.40 .0001	-.28 .0001	-.08 .262	-.12 .100	.09 .239	.16 .036
PSTR	-.21 .030	-.46 .0001	-.16 .092	-.08 .406	-.07 .445	.06 .494	.11 .229
PESTR	-.17 .023	-.11 .156	-.09 .233	-.04 .572	.07 .336	.09 .232	.06 .409

Males (N=158)

MSTR	-.22 .005	-.31 .0001	-.15 .054	-.006 .937	-.016 .838	.06 .419	.35 .0001
PRSTR	-.15 .045	-.29 .0002	-.16 .034	-.062 .434	-.061 .441	.18 .020	.32 .001
PSTR	-.11 .261	-.32 .001	-.22 .024	-.02 .810	.19 .049	.11 .235	.37 .0001
PESTR	.02 .773	-.16 .044	-.08 .267	-.09 .226	.03 .640	.19 .012	.22 .006

Note. MSTR= Marital role strain;
 PRSTR= Professional role strain;
 PSTR= Parental role strain; PESTR= Personal role strain.
 DEL= Delegating Responsibility; COG= Cognitive
 Restructuring; SEP= Separating Responsibility;
 BAL= Balancing Responsibility; SUP= Using Social Support;
 LIM= Limiting Responsibility; AVD= Avoiding Responsibility.

Appendix

Factor Analysis of Coping Items

Cognitive Restructuring	Item	Factor Loading
	Believing that our family life is better because both of us are employed.	.74
	Believing there are more advantages than disadvantages to our lifestyle.	.72
	Believing that my career has made me a better wife/husband than I otherwise would be.	.71
	Believing that my career has made me a better parent than I otherwise would be.	.70
	Believing my commitment to my career sets a good example for our child(ren).	.63
	Overlooking the difficulties; focusing on the good things about our family.	.54
	Believing it is important that I excel at both my career and as a wife/husband and mother/father.	.46
	Ignoring criticisms about parents who both work.	.45
	Setting aside family time.	.42
Delegating Responsibility		
	Encouraging our child(ren) to help out whenever possible.	.77
	Encouraging our child(ren) to be more self-sufficient.	.70
	Delegating tasks to other family members.	.64
	Encouraging frequent communication among all family members.	.53
	Setting priorities and doing the most important things first.	.43
	Becoming more efficient, planning and organizing my time.	.42
Limiting Responsibility		
	Eliminating certain community activities.	.74
	Cutting down on the amount of "outside activities" in which I can be involved.	.66
	Cutting back on leisure activities.	.60
	Buying goods and services that save time.	.55
	Changing our standards of how well household tasks must be done.	.47
	Leaving some things undone around the house.	.44

Balancing Work and Family	Item	Factor Loading
	Limiting my involvement on the job-saying no to some of the things I could be doing.	.54
	Reducing the time I spend at work.	.50
	Planning career changes around family needs.	.48
	Having a schedule flexible enough to accommodate special needs and events.	.41
	Sharing more child care and household tasks with my husband/wife.	.40
Separating Work and Family		
	Planning ahead so that major changes at home will not disturb my career goals.	.74
	Making better use of time at work.	.73
	Separating my work life from family life so I can concentrate my effort on one area at a time.	.49
Avoiding Responsibility		
	Postponing certain tasks until the pressure to do them subsides.	.73
	Finding legitimate excuses to keep from fulfilling obligations I dislike.	.69
	Using family responsibilities to justify not accepting more job responsibilities.	.57
	Putting off tasks I don't have time to do.	.45
Using Social Support		
	Arranging for child care so my husband/wife and I can spend time together.	.58
	Relying on extended family members for support and encouragement.	.51
	Making friends with other two-career couples.	.50
	Believing that I need lots of stimulation and activity to be satisfied with my life.	.49
	Having good friends that I can talk to.	.47

APPENDIX A
LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature Review

The purpose of the following literature review is to describe in greater detail the studies pertinent to the investigation of role strain and coping among dual-career families across the family life cycle.

Role Strain

Role strain is the difficulty experienced as a result of fulfilling the simultaneous demands and expectations of multiple role obligations (Goode, 1973; Sieber, 1974). Perhaps the most comprehensive study of dual-career families was done by Rapoport and Rapoport (1971). They conducted in-depth interviews with 16 dual-career couples and 25 traditional couples. They defined dual-career families as those in which husbands and wives pursue careers and at the same time maintain family roles; the "traditional" couples were such that the wives did not work outside the home after having children. The women in both groups were college graduates. The couples interviewed were part of a larger sample of 220 couples who responded to mailed questionnaires.

The Rapoport's reported on five areas of strain which are experienced by dual-career couples: 1) role overload, 2) discrepancy between one's personal norms and the prevailing social norms, 3) personal identity and self esteem strain, 4) difficulty developing and maintaining social networks, and 5) role cycling of career and family demands.

Rapoport and Rapoport (1972) discuss three examples when dilemmas become activated and must be resolved: at critical transition points in the family life cycle (particularly birth of the first child), at critical transition points in the career life cycle of either partner, and at critical events in the life space of the children (school problems).

Bebbington (1973) re-examined the Rapoport's data and concluded that dual-career families experience a high degree of stress. When he questioned how certain couples maintain such a stressful life-style, he found that the couples studied accepted the dual-career stress as inevitable and preferable to the stress of alternative life-styles available.

Holmstrom (1973) interviewed 20 dual-career couples. She addressed external strain, experienced by dual-career couples, as a result of constraints outside the family. Holmstrom suggested that work and sex roles be redefined. Examples of her recommendations are 1) flexible work schedules for men and women 2) increasing the father's role in child rearing and 3) establishing child care centers.

Johnson and Johnson (1977) interviewed 28 dual-career families with at least one child under 12 at home and concluded that dual-career women with young children experienced the greatest strain. Over 65% of the reports of role strain dealt with conflict between career and children.

Holahan and Gilbert (1979) investigated role conflict in 28 dual-career couples. Data analysis revealed that patterns of conflict differed between couples with children and those without children. However, there was no significant gender differences were found in the parent group. Addition of the parent role provided increased conflict with each of the other life roles.

Bird and Ford (1985) investigated sources of role strain among 69 dual-career couples. Women reported significantly higher degrees of role strain than men. As the number of children and the importance of the parental role increased, so did the degree of role strain for the dual-career women. Dual-career fathers who report having a young child and sharing child-care tasks experienced significantly higher levels of role strain than other fathers.

In summary, role strain originates as a result of expectations from within oneself, from others or as a conflict between equally valued roles. The predominance of the role strain research concludes that role strain is greatest for parents with preschoolers. A void exists in the literature examining the entire life span of the dual-career family.

Coping

Coping is any response to role strain which functions to prevent, avoid, tolerate or minimize external and internal

demands and conflicts among them (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). Pearlin notes that there are three major types of coping: 1) responses that change the situation out of which strainful experiences arise 2) responses that control the meaning of the strainful experience after it occurs but before stress emerges 3) responses that function more for the control of stress itself after it has emerged.

Rapoport and Rapoport (1971, 1976) outlined a three level approach to stress management in the dual-career families: increase personal awareness of key issues, increase interpersonal skills between partners and develop or increase external support. The Rapoport's believed that the dual-career couples were efficient in dealing with strain and hypothesized that these couples may utilize more effective problem solving techniques than other families.

Several research studies examined coping strategies used by dual-career women. Poloma (1972) outlined four strategies used by 53 dual-career women in her study. They include 1) defining dual-career patterns as favorable 2) establishing priorities among roles, 3) compartmentalizing work and family roles, and 4) compromising career aspirations. Johnson and Johnson (1977) identified the following techniques in managing role strain: 1) role cycling (alternating career and family commitments), 2) compensation (making every moment count), 3) raise children

to be independent and self-reliant, and 4) increase contact with other dual-career families. Elman and Gilbert (1984), using reports from a sample of women with preschool children, found increased role behavior to be the most widely used coping strategy. This behavior "involves efforts by the individual to do it all, by working harder and more efficiently" (Elman & Gilbert, 1984, p.324).

Bird, Bird and Scruggs (1984) included 38 career-earner and 69 dual-career couples in an examination of differences in coping strategy use. Men compared to women used empathy more often to cope with role strain while women chose the strategy organization to a greater extent than men. In a later analysis examining only the dual-career couples, Bird and Bird (1986) examined the relationship between the use of coping strategies and the reduction of role strain. It was reported that both spouses used compartmentalization to reduce internal role strain.

Skinner and McCubbin (1982) developed the dual-employed coping scales (DECS) to study coping strategies used by dual-employed families. From data analysis of the 69 couples, four patterns of coping were identified. The patterns were described as behaviors that: maintain or restructure the family system, enable personal management of stress, accommodate family to work and work to family or allow for obtaining support from outside the family system.

The results indicated that women were more likely to use coping strategies that maintained a balance between work and family. The women limited career goals and planned work responsibilities around family needs.

Gilbert (1985) interviewed 51 dual-career men between the ages of 28 and 45. Each man described aspects of his own and spouse's professional work, his roles within the family, his relationship with his spouse and the effect of the dual-career family on his career development and family relationships. She emphasizes the importance of mutual spousal support to successful dual-career marriages. Gilbert noted that in response to examining why some dual-career marriages succeed and others do not, she consistently found that coping strategies and resistant resources made the difference.

Guelzow and Bird (forthcoming) examined role strain and stress reported by 276 dual-career women. Cognitive Restructuring was found to be related to decreased role strain.

Other coping strategies employed by dual-career couples include hiring outside help for domestic needs or child-care, negotiating less time intensive work arrangements, using flexible scheduling, and refusing promotions that require geographic mobility (Holmstrom, 1973; Kater, 1985; Skinner, 1980).

Family/Career Life Cycle

The developmental approach to family study is most frequently credited to Evelyn Duvall and Reubin Hill who first conceptualized it for the National Conference on Family Life in 1948. The life cycle of the family is a term that has been used for many years in reference to the succession of critical stages through which the typical family passes during its life span (Glick, 1977). Although the concept of family life cycle is generally well understood, the events that are important in marking transitions from one stage to another is less agreed upon. Most models attempt to identify major transition points within the life cycle, for example, marriage, childbearing, widowhood.

Critics argue that the family life cycle concept is a static one and fails to take into account the various family forms of today (Glick, 1977; Norton, 1983; Trost, 1974). Researchers have begun to establish new means of using the life cycle model when studying individuals or single parents (Aldous, 1978; Glick, 1977; Hill, 1986).

Voydanoff and Kelly (1984) suggest that family life cycle variables provide a way to map the impact of the supply and demand of both stressors and coping resources in the family. Though no reviewed research examined dual-career families from a life cycle perspective, an

overview of role strain and coping adapted to the family life cycle follows using a five stage framework. The five stages are defined as 1) Establishment stage (childless)
2) New Parents stage (oldest child 1 day to 5 years)
3) Family with school age child (oldest child 6-12 years)
4) Families with adolescents (oldest child 13-18 years)
5) Families with young adults (oldest child over 18 years).

Duvall & Miller (1985) note that for couples in general being married involves coming to terms with what is expected by one's culture, by one's mate, by one's self and as a couple. Not only is marriage a relationship between two persons, it is a formal acknowledgement between the couple and the larger world. During the first stage, couples usually make a decision about having children. The choice between early and late parenthood involves several trade-offs in the performance of career and family activities over the life course. For example, early parenthood may increase economic pressures on the family and create some difficulties in career establishment or some women may find it difficult to interrupt a career once it has been established (Voydanoff, 1985). Gilbert (1985, p.30) found in her study that "In the absence of younger children, the careers of both spouses progressed more or less in parallel".

The New Parent stage of the family life cycle has

received the most attention when examined from a dual-career perspective. Couples are confronted with having to juggle two careers, a marital relationship and parenting responsibilities. The predominance of studies indicate that during this stage of family life there is the greatest sense of conflict between work and family roles (Akabas, 1984; Kelly & Voydanoff, 1985; Poloma, 1972; Voydanoff, 1985). In the early stages of career development, individuals are expected to have high career involvement while at the same time be physically and emotionally available to young children (Aldous, 1978). Waite (1980) studied employed wives and noted that wives tend to weigh factors differently than husbands regarding labor force participation during the childbearing stages of the family life cycle. Sekaran (1987) notes two major issues that produce tension for dual-career couples in this stage. First, stresses center around the allocation of tasks or division of household management. Second, competitive feelings may surface if one partner gets an edge over the other in career advancement. Husbands in Gilbert's study (1985) often progressed more quickly in their careers vs. their wife's in first marriages that included young children.

For dual-career couples in stage three with school-age children, the added responsibilities of children's nightly

homework, PTA meetings, and school activities can further complicate an already "tight" schedule. Depending on the age of the parents, this stage might include a temporary career plateau or a continuation of the very busy career establishment stage (Hiestand, 1971). Individuals can make what Hiestand (1971, p.12) calls a "45 degree turn", acquiring new skills which enable movement into a new, related field or a highly specialized part of a present field which can be defined as a new profession.

As children reach adolescence, parents are advised to "balance freedom with responsibility as teenagers mature and emancipate themselves" (Duvall & Miller, 1985, p.62). Often this stage four coincides with adult midlife and feelings of urgency about decisions involving life style changes (Healy, 1982). Adults oftentimes look critically at their career stage and evaluate what options lie ahead. This career stage can also be a time of great challenge as family and societal normative expectations encourage individuals to sustain and even surpass past career productivity. Requirements for prolonged, increasingly expensive education for one's children, and an "ever rising consumption lifestyle for one's family" pressure the worker continually to strive for higher earnings and more security (Healy, 1982, p.532).

In Stage five, although the children have left home the

dual-career couple continues to maintain multiple roles. The couple members realize a refocus on the marital relationship as they prepare to once again become a dyad. Women who postponed career advancement believe spouse support to be the key factor in their eventual success (Healy, 1982). At this stage, dual-career spouses may have low professional role strain if both are established in their careers. As Jordeen explains in Healy (1982) "The individual is less concerned with registering new gains than with maintaining present status in the face of competition from younger, more enterprising co-workers" (p.530). During this time there may be many things that attest an individuals' value; for example, being called upon to teach and mentor others or to take leadership roles in civic, social, and political activities (Healy, 1982).

Whatever schema for defining the family life cycle stages is used, it has proven to be a valuable tool in studying family development. The family life cycle perspective can assist dual-career families in understanding the timing and nature of the various transition points in their lives.

References

- Aldous, J. (1978). Family careers : Developmental change in families. New York : John Wiley and Sons.
- Akabas, S. H. (1984). Workers are parents, too. Child Welfare, 63, 387-399.
- 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, 83-94
- 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.
- Duvall, E. M., & Miller, F. (1985). Family Development (6th ed.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Elman, M. R., & Gilbert, L. A. (1984). Coping strategies for role conflict in married professional women with careers. Family Relations, 33, 317-322.

- Gilbert, L. A. (1985). Men in dual-career families: current realities and future prospects. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Glick, P. (1977). Updating the family life cycle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 5-13.
- 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.
- Guelzow, M., & Bird, G. (1986). Coping responses and psychological resources as mediators in the stress process for dual-career women. Unpublished manuscript.
- Healy, C. (1982). Career development: Counseling through the life stages. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Hiestand, D. (1971). Changing careers after thirty-five: New horizons through professional and graduate study. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hill, R. (1986). Life cycle stages for types of single parent families: of family development theory. Family Relations, 35, 19-29.
- 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.
- Kater, D. (1985). Management strategies for dual-career couples. Journal of Career Development, 12, 75-79.
- Kelly, R. & Voydanoff, P. (1985). Work/family role strain among employed parents. Family Relations, 34, 367-374.
- Norton, A. (1983). Family life-cycle: 1980. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 267-275.
- 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. (1971). Dual-career families. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. (1972). The dual-career family: A variant pattern and social change. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a sociology of women (pp. 216-244). Lexington, MA: Xerox.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R.N. (1976). Dual-career families re-examined. London: Martin Robinson.
- Sekaran, U. (1987). Dual-career families. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- 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: Spouses differences. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Washington, DC.
- Trost, J. (1974). This family life cycle-An impossible concept? International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 4, 37-47.
- Voydanoff, P. (1985). Work/ family linkages over the life course. Journal of Career Development, 12, 23-32.
- Voydanoff, P. & Kelly, R., (1984). Determinants of work-related family problems among employed parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 881-892.
- Waite, L. (1980). Working wives and the family life cycle. American Journal of Sociology, 86, 272-294.

APPENDIX B

Methodology

Methodology

This appendix describes in greater detail the research methodology utilized in this study.

Pilot

A pilot study was implemented in November 1985, using a sample of fourteen dual-career couples similar to the identified population. Purposes of the pilot were to obtain feedback regarding ambiguous or confusing terminology and to determine adequate variance within response choices. As a result of the pilot, directions for completion as well as specific items were altered.

Sample

In 1986, a sample of 310 dual-career couples, (620 spouses), was elicited from the Roanoke and New River Valley areas of Virginia. The sample respondent's were contacted through professional organizations and personal networks using the snowball technique. This technique is considered an appropriate sampling technique for use with specialized populations, because of the difficulty of locating dual-career couples by use of random sampling methods (Smith, 1981). Individuals who were contacted initially provided the names of other dual-career couples.

Procedure

The instrument (Appendix D) was constructed according to the Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978). The

questionnaire was printed as a booklet, consisting of three 8"x12" sheets of paper and a cover page folded in the middle and stapled. Each page of the questionnaire was typed and then photographically reduced by 75%. The cover, 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.

The cover letter (Appendix C) explained the purpose of the study and enlisted the couple's participation. The Total Design Method 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 (Dillman, 1978). The implied reward is the feeling derived when they have contributed to the solution of the problem.

Each couple was sent two questionnaires, one each for the husband and the wife, along with a cover letter. After one week, a post card was sent to all participants thanking them for returning the questionnaire or urging completion by non-respondents. Two additional follow-up letters were mailed to participants at two-week intervals in order to encourage response. The final letter included another copy of the questionnaire.

Responses were received from 70% of the individuals after the three follow-up contacts. The response rate was

calculated as the percentage of completed questionnaires divided by the total sample surveyed after subtracting for refusals, ineligible respondents or unusable questionnaires received (Dillman, 1978).

Data Analysis

For a previously conducted study (Wanamaker & Bird, 1986) responses on the 44 coping strategy items were subjected to principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. The intent of this procedure was data reduction. 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, 12, 14, 28, and 31.

Tables 7 and 8 present the Pearson r coefficients with level of significance indicated for role strain and coping strategies by gender.

Table 7
Intercorrelations Between Role Strain Categories and Coping Strategies
 Males (N=158)

	MSTR	PRSTR	PSTR	PESTR	DEL	COG	SEP	BAL	SUP	LIM	AVD
MSTR	1.00 .00	.62 .0001	.59 .0001	.34 .0001	-.22 .005	-.31 .0001	-.15 .054	-.006 .937	-.016 .838	.06 .419	.35 .0001
PRSTR		1.00 .00	.63 .0001	.53 .0001	-.15 .045	-.29 .0002	-.16 .034	.062 .434	-.061 .441	.18 .020	.32 .0001
PSTR			1.00 .00	.46 .0001	-.11 .261	-.32 .001	-.22 .024	-.02 .810	.19 .049	.11 .235	.37 .0001
PESTR				1.00 .00	.02 .773	-.16 .044	-.08 .267	-.09 .226	.03 .640	.19 .012	.22 .006
DEL					1.00 .00	.40 .0001	.38 .0001	.19 .013	.28 .0003	.29 .0002	-.11 .168
COG						1.00 .00	.28 .0003	.17 .031	.26 .0008	.07 .342	-.13 .105
SEP							1.00 .00	.21 .008	.24 .001	.22 .004	-.06 .418
BAL								1.00 .00	.25 .001	.16 .035	.05 .490
SUP									1.00 .00	-.02 .800	-.02 .748
LIM										1.00 .00	.30 .0001
AVD											1.00 .00

Note. MSTR= Marital role strain; PRSTR= Professional role strain;
 PSTR= Parental role strain; PESTR= Personal role strain.
 DEL= Delegating Responsibility; COG= Cognitive Restructuring;
 SEP= Separating Responsibility; BAL= Balancing Responsibility;
 SUP= Using Social Support; LIM= Limiting Responsibility;
 AVD= Avoiding Responsibility.

Table 8
Intercorrelations Between Role Strain Categories and Coping Strategies
 Females (N=171)

	MSTR	PRSTR	PSTR	PESTR	DEL	COG	SEP	BAL	SUP	LIM	AVD
MSTR	1.00 .00	.53 .0001	.53 .0001	.43 .0001	-.18 .014	-.20 .007	-.16 .037	-.13 .070	.01 .815	.12 .099	.18 .018
PRSTR		1.00 .00	.51 .0001	.48 .0001	-.19 .011	-.40 .0001	-.28 .0003	-.08 .262	-.12 .100	.09 .239	.16 .036
PSTR			1.00 .00	.35 .0002	-.21 .030	-.46 .0001	-.16 .092	-.08 .406	-.07 .445	.06 .494	.11 .229
PESTR				1.00 .00	-.17 .023	-.11 .156	-.09 .233	-.04 .572	.07 .336	.09 .232	.06 .409
DEL					1.00 .00	.41 .0001	.28 .0002	.19 .010	.22 .003	.07 .343	-.009 .090
COG						1.00 .00	.34 .0001	.15 .039	.31 .0001	.13 .077	.005 .939
SEP							1.00 .00	.27 .0003	.27 .0003	-.02 .770	.12 .097
BAL								1.00 .00	.15 .041	.12 .111	.11 .154
SUP									1.00 .00	-.007 .918	.25 .002
LIM										1.00 .00	.25 .0009
AVD											1.00 .00

Note. MSTR= Marital role strain; PRSTR= Professional role strain;
 PSTR= Parental role strain; PESTR= Personal role strain.
 DEL= Delegating Responsibility; COG= Cognitive Restructuring;
 SEP= Separating Responsibility; BAL= Balancing Responsibility;
 SUP= Using Social Support; LIM= Limiting Responsibility;
 AVD= Avoiding Responsibility.

APPENDIX C
Correspondence



COLLEGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 - 8299

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT (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



COLLEGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 - 8299

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT (703) 961-4794 or 4793

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

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, 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



COLLEGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 - 8299

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT (705) 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, _____, 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) 961-4794 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

APPENDIX D

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

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

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>	

IV. PERSONAL ROLES:

- | | SD | | | | | | | SA |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----|
| | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 1. I constantly push myself to be a success in all aspects of my life. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 2. Sometimes I feel like I never get a moment to myself. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 3. I have to rush to get everything done each day. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 4. I'm torn between a need to make some changes in my life and a desire to keep things as they are. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 5. I regularly take time for myself, away from career and family. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 6. I am frequently under pressure to comply with what other people think is best for me. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |
| 7. Many of the things I do are to please other people, not myself. | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | |

PART H

Finally, we would like to request some general information needed to help interpret the results of the study.

1. What is the year of your birth? _____

year

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	Years	Age at Marriage	Years	Still Married(SM), Divorced(D), Widowed(W)
First Marriage:	_____	Years	_____	Years	SM D W
Second Marriage:	_____	Years	_____	Years	SM D W
Third Marriage:	_____	Years	_____	Years	SM 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)	_____	_____	_____	_____	GIRL(S)	_____	_____	_____	_____
	age	age	age	age		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						Extremely
Important						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

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