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ABSTRACT

The present study focused on the impact of dual earner couple status on work commitment, quality of life and the interaction between quality of work life and marital dissatisfaction, within career stages. The study was based on Super's career theory and theories of the work-family relationship. Dual earner couples were defined as couples in which both partners were employed full-time. A sample of 164 white-collar, dual earner men and women (79 couples and 6 individuals) were surveyed at an academic institution. Half of the couples were parents. There were no sex or parenting differences in work commitment (occupational commitment and job involvement) when income, age and career stage were used as covariates. High salience in work and family was not associated with diminished work commitment, but professional women who had non-professional partners had significantly lower job involvement than those who had professional partners. Secondly, quality of life and marital dissatisfaction were investigated. Quality of life and marital dissatisfaction did not differ across age, career stages or parenting. Furthermore, quality of life did not differ by couples' level of work and family salience, work commitment, or egalitarianism. Thirdly, a segmentation relationship was found which meant that people tend to compartmentalize their marital and work roles, rather than have spillover of affect between the two roles or compensate for dissatisfactions in one role with rewards in another. Unexpectedly, work-family conflict did not differ by age or career stage. However, parents of teenagers did experience significantly greater work-family conflict than all others. Men in egalitarian couples and men in couples for whom both family and work were highly salient for both partners perceived greater work-family conflict than other men. Professional women with professional partners experienced significantly less work-family conflict than those with non-professional partners. The trend of declining sex differences in work commitment, quality of life and work-family conflict is continuing. It is suggested that employers need not be wary of employing women and parents if they can provide good childcare facilities and equal employment opportunities policies.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Research on relationships between work and family only began in the 1970's, as prior to this they were treated as distinct from one another. Work-family conflict became more salient due to the increased numbers of women in the work force in the 1980's, and a vast amount of research was devoted to identifying the linkages between employees' work and nonwork lives. In the 1976-1986 period, female full-time participation in the workforce increased from 32% to 42% in New Zealand (Davey & Mills, 1989). Furthermore, over half the mothers of school aged children were in paid employment. In 1984, 58% of couples with children were dual earners and 60% of couples without children were dual earners in New Zealand (Household Expenditure and Income Survey, 1986). New Zealand women now entering the childbearing age group may be less likely to leave the labour force, for an extended period of time, than their counterparts of previous generations (Horsfield, 1988). This implies that there will be a continued increase in dual-career families. However, research has yet to adequately attend to the relationship between the work/family interface and physical, family and organizational well-being (Lambert, 1990).

Many of the studies done in the sixties and the seventies may no longer be relevant due to changing norms and attitudes towards women’s employment. There have been major changes in social conceptions of gender, parenthood, and work identities (Beach, 1989). The 1960’s view was that married women’s participation in the labour force was threatening to marriage and family. The rise in number of dual earner families has been accompanied by a change from the traditional success ethic to one emphasizing 'quality of life' (Hall & Hall, 1978) and increasing concern for the fulfilment of social and personal goals (Management for the XXI Century, 1982). Women want to know the effects of a husband’s career, his attitudes and behaviour, and children on their own career development (Nieva & Gutek, 1981). One of the fundamental questions raised in the study of dual-career families is whether both spouses can prosper as career persons and marriage partners (Sekaran, 1983a).
The family and the workplace have frequently been characterized as 'greedy institutions' because of the commitment of time and energy that each demands during the peak years of family formation and career mobility (Coser, 1974). The normative pattern of women's lives has been gradually transformed from one in which family (marriage and parenthood) and work roles were enacted sequentially to one in which work and family roles are held simultaneously leading to concern about the implications for well-being of multiple roles (Wortman, Bierhat & Lang, 1991).

Insights about the interdependence of work and family are unlikely to be generalizable across all work situations and all family situations. A distinction between types of work has been shown to be relevant for the effects of men's employment on their spouses (Burke, Weir & DuWors, 1980). High commitment to both career and family has been linked to increased conflict and stress (Price-Bonham & Murphy, 1980; Skinner, 1984). However, Pendleton, Poloma and Garland (1982) write that research has shown that marriages where both spouses pursue jobs demanding a continuous and high degree of commitment are basically rewarding for husbands and wives.

Quality of work life has been shown to be an important variable, in addition to type of work, when studying the impact of work and multiple roles on dual earner couples. Kotler and Wingard (1989) found that focusing on the quality of a role rather than just the fact that one has a particular role (for instance, professional role, parenting role or spouse role) when investigating the relationship between multiple roles and mental health is more effective. The quality of the role can be measured by the amount of stress and/or satisfaction derived from it. A spouse who finds marriage to be highly stressful is more likely to carry over negative affect to another role than a spouse who is not overly stimulated by his/her role.

For most men and women today, employing organizations and family are the two central institutions in life (Mortimer, Lorence & Kumka, 1986). Research is required on the motivations of men and women in dual career couples so that employers may make informed, fair decisions on hiring and company policy (Gilbert & Rachlin, 1987). If dual career couples are unable to integrate their work and family roles their career salience
and occupational commitment may be affected (Ridley, 1973). Furthermore, different expectations of men and women's work commitment can trigger work-family conflict and retard an organization's progress. Schwartz (1989) observed that employers expect mothers to have lower work commitment but fathers are never seen to be on a 'daddy track' of lower work commitment. Despite differences in approach to conceptualization, definition, and measurement, most analysts recognize gender, age, social origin, work context and family factors as important determinants of work and family commitment (Bielby, 1992).

The present study is based on career stage theory and work-family relationship theory as described in Chapter Two. Chapters Three, Four, Five and Six describe the relevant literature, highlighting areas requiring further research and then outlining the present study's research questions. The present study focuses on the impact of dual earner couple status on work commitment, quality of life and the work-family relationship. The method and results are described in Chapters Seven and Eight and findings are discussed in Chapter Nine.
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) defined careers as work that is highly salient to the worker, requiring commitment and following a developmental progress. However, a broader definition of career was used in the present study, in accordance with recent literature that views a career more broadly as a pattern of work-related experiences that span the course of a person's life (Greenhaus, 1987).

Dual earner couple research literature is confusing in that the terms, dual earner, two earner, dual worker, dual provider, dual career, dual income are often used interchangeably. The result has been a body of research plagued by conflicting findings (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987). In the present study dual career couples were defined as couples (not necessarily married) who held professional or managerial employment, while dual earner couples referred to those couples in which at least one partner was engaged in non-professional employment (Hall & Hall, 1979; Mott, 1982; Rapoport, Rapoport & Bumstead, 1978; Sekaran, 1982, 1984, 1986). It was important to distinguish between dual career couples and dual earner couples because there may be differences in commitment to one’s work (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). Even then, Hiller and Dyehouse (1987) found that one cannot assume that because one has a professional job that one is career oriented and vice versa, and therefore the present study also used measures of occupational commitment and job involvement.

Ostensibly research on dual earner couples has proceeded atheoretically (Gutek, Larwood & Stromberg, 1986), but implicitly much of the dual-career couple research has been based on role theory. Sekaran and Hall (1989) call for theoretical analysis, arguing that research on the dual career couple has been extremely descriptive and problem focused. Both work-family relationship theory and career stage theory appear to be extremely useful for theorizing about dual earner couples and therefore the present study was based on these two theories.
2.1 Work-Family Relationship Theory

Considerable evidence exists for an interactive relationship between 'work' and 'nonwork' domains (Near, Smith, Rice & Hunt, 1983). For instance, numerous studies indicate that dual-earner marriages can engender role conflict when jobs and family life interfere with each other (Sekaran, 1986), causing stress for both husbands and wives, which is more severe for parents than childless couples (Lewis & Cooper, 1987).

There are five main models of the relationships between life at work and life at home (Burke & Bradshaw, 1981; Evans & Bartolome, 1984; Kanungo & Misra, 1984), namely spillover, compensation, segmentation, instrumental and conflict. These models all focus on the individual rather than the family unit.

Spillover theory proposes that a person’s activities on the job and level of job satisfaction will overlap with off-job activities and satisfaction, and vice versa. In other words, an individual whose job demands a high level of activity (e.g., physical exertion) would be predicted to engage in pursuits outside of the job which also entail substantial activity. Similarly, the spillover proposition argues that those who are highly satisfied at work will display higher levels of satisfaction with off-job activities than will individuals whose job satisfaction is low. For example, Miller (1980) explained that for both women and men, regardless of position, job conditions that encourage self-direction contribute to a positive self-evaluation, flexible orientations towards others, and effective intellectual functioning. Fifty-nine percent of male managers interviewed by Evans and Bartolome (1980) reported that their work-family relationship was one of spillover as opposed to the other four theories of work-family interface.

Compensation theory proposes that there is an inverse relationship between job and off-job experiences and satisfaction, such that lack of fulfilment of one’s needs in one sphere will be compensated for by involvement in the other sphere. For instance, a person whose family and recreational life is dissatisfying might compensate by becoming more involved in his or her job; an individual whose job does not fulfil the need for achievement or recognition might seek fulfilment of these needs through involvement
in community or political organizations, sport or family life. Work may mitigate the impact of stress and enhance well-being by providing sources of self-esteem, social support and satisfaction (Kohn & Schooler, 1982). In support of the compensation hypothesis, Broadbent (1985) noted that leisure satisfaction acts as a buffer against depression caused by dissatisfaction and stress at work. Loscocco (1989) found that employee’s work commitment is partly determined on the basis of how the quality of work life compares to the quality of nonwork roles. Specifically, people will disengage from an unrewarding work role to the extent that they can compensate with a satisfying nonwork role.

Segmentation theory postulates that work and family environments are distinct and that an individual can function successfully in one without any influence on the other (Evans & Bartolome, 1984). Some recent studies have supported the segmentation model in that women’s affective experiences in one role and distress have not been affected by affective experiences in another role (Aneshensel, 1986; Barnett & Marshall, 1992; Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler & Wethington, 1990).

Instrumental theory suggests that one environment is a means by which things are obtained in the other environment. For example, work is something an individual has to do in order to lead the kind of life an he or she wants (Evans and Bartolome, 1981).

Conflict theory posits that work and family are mutually incompatible because they have distinct norms and requirements (Evans & Bartolome, 1980; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). There is a price that must be paid for career success and career achievement requires sacrifice and compromise to family and leisure life. Inter-role conflict between work and family roles has been studied by many (Baruch & Barnett, 1986; Burke, 1986; Burke & Bradshaw, 1981; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Jones & Butler, 1980).

Most of the research on the work-family interface has been done on spillover theory (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). Lambert (1990) suggests that both spillover and compensation occur and that research is needed to identify those characteristics of work and family which operate under the different processes. Staines (1980) reviewed the research
literature and concluded that among white-collar and professional employees the prevailing pattern was spillover between work and nonwork lives.

2.2 Career Stage Theory

Most studies on dual-earner couples and quality of life have aggregated results across career stages and life stages ignoring the developmental perspective of the family life cycle and career stages of dual earner couples. Levinson (1986) suggests that men and women continually re-evaluate organizational commitment, satisfaction, and the interface between work and family. Critical career transition points may impact on employee emotional well-being. Work-family conflict is highly detrimental not only to the couples (implications for their career development strategies), but also to the organization (Sekaran, 1988; Taylor, 1986). Therefore, Sekaran and Hall (1989) suggest exploring which stages in family and work life cause work-family conflict.

Career theories and definitions are generally limited to an individual's career development and ignore the simultaneous interface with marriage and family life, although career theories are becoming more dynamic (Sonnenfield & Kotter, 1982). Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee (1978), argue that personal development factors have to be worked through at particular age-based life stages (e.g. mid-life transition, years 40-45). Each life-stage can be defined in terms of one or two major concerns, that receive the largest time and energy and strongly influence the choices made in other aspects of life. According to Levinson et al's (1978) model of adult development (as interpreted by Ornstein, Cron and Slocum, 1989) one would expect people under 30 to be less committed, involved and satisfied with their work, based on the contention that entry into adult work is provisional with respect to an individual's commitments to an organization, other people and activities. Between 34 and 45 years of age people are establishing their personal and professional goals and are striving for advancement and this therefore is likely to be the period of greatest occupational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction. The mid-life transition (40-45) is likely to be accompanied by a decrease in
occupational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction because individuals are questioning the importance of work in their lives. In middle adulthood (46-50) there may be an improvement in occupational commitment and job satisfaction in contrast to the previous period as people are adjusting to decisions made in mid-life transition but not as strong as in the establishment period (34-39). At age 50 people’s occupational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction may be lower because there is uncertainty about one’s career aspirations and accomplishments. Between ages 50 and 60 one would expect occupational commitment and job involvement to remain stable as individuals accept their work and family situation.

Wolfe and Kolb (1980) surveyed 494 professional men and women using Levinson’s age categories to investigate the interface between work, family and career stages. They found that in early adulthood (24-40) career development was the dominant issue, while during the mid-life transition (41-45) career development dropped in importance as attention was turned to family and self. Entrekin and Everett (1981) surveyed an 82 percent male, Australian sample and were able to empirically demonstrate a mid-career crisis consistent with general literature on the mid-career crisis or transition.

However, age-related conceptualizations of life-span career development are likely to be less useful than those that allow for individual variation in timing and sequencing of career and family events (Swanson, 1992) because of societal and demographic changes. Many career issues will be a function not so much of how old one is but where one is located in that particular career: as Hall (1976) points out, the role and issues of apprenticeship in a particular profession must be accepted as much by a 40 year old who is just beginning in that profession as a 'second career', as by a young person who is in the early stages of work life. Hearn (1981) claimed that there is a growing amount of evidence that disorder in careers is common rather than an exception - which means that it may be futile to force careers into age-dependent stage theories. Rush, Peacock and Milkovich (1980) reported that career stage does not appear to be age linked. Likewise, Osipow (1991) observed that there has been a vast shift in the career patterns of women and therefore the modal patterns of career,
family and individual development, whether considered together or individually, may no longer exist. Consequently, Super, Zeikowitz & Thompson's (1980) conceptual career stages were used in the present study.

Super's (1980) career development theory has four stages, namely exploration, establishment, maintenance and disengagement and each stage is operationalized in terms of the respondent's perceptions. The first stage is the exploration stage in which people decide on what work they desire to do and carry this out. The second stage is the establishment stage in which people start to settle in their ways and contribute towards family support, make use of abilities and training, and pursue meaningful interests. The third stage is the maintenance stage and this is a time for holding on to one's attained position, possibly updating and innovating in one's field. In the fourth stage, the disengagement stage, an individual lessens his/her workload and starts planning for retirement. Super (1980) also incorporates a recycling factor which may occur at any point in the individuals' career cycle. Recycling occurs when an individual changes their major field of activity after being established in one field.

Cron and Slocum (1986) compared men's work attitudes within each of Super's career stages and concluded that there was some support for his theory. However, Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) found differences between individuals in the exploration stage versus the other three stages, yet identified very few distinctions between individuals in the establishment, maintenance and decline stages. So there is some doubt as to the validity of Super's (1980) career stages. Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) reported that Levinson's age-related theory was superior in predicting factors external to work itself while Super's theory was superior in predicting individuals' perceptions of the work and career performance.

Only recently have researchers started looking at the dynamics of careers separately for men and women (Miller, 1984; Super, 1980) instead of looking at men's career paths alone. Bailyn (1980) notes that a linear progression of a career is particularly inappropriate for women because women's career patterns are more closely related to the family life cycle. Bardwick (1980) sees the major difference between male and
female developmental stages as occurring in their thirties and forties. Women in their thirties are concerned with the 'biological time clock', the effects of growing families, the values of the women's movement, and the continuing effects of traditional values. Secondly, women in their thirties often experience strong career changes, as well as strong life and family changes. In their forties, women are feeling more secure and settled in their relationships and are moving toward more autonomy. Conversely, men in their forties are becoming more sensitive to interpersonal relationships and to their internal psychological needs (Levinson, 1986). In early adulthood, men are mainly concerned in building a career and family, with the career often taking precedence and for them the age-thirty transition is often directed at improving one's lot in the career realm. For men, it is often not until the mid-life transition that they begin to deal in a deep way with family issues and with the conflicts between career and family. Somewhat surprisingly, Ornstein and Isabella (1990) found that professional women's career attitudes fitted better with Levinson, Darrow, Klein and McKee's (1978) age related career stages than with Super's (1980) psychological career stages - both theories are based on men's development.

In summary, the above studies indicate that work commitment changes over career stages (Cron & Slocum, 1986), but that the effect may not necessarily apply to women (Ornstein & Isabella, 1990). Super's (1980) career stages are used because they realistically deal with individuals who sequence and time their careers outside of the norm and they are more closely related to Super's career stage model than Levinson's life stage model (Ornstein, Cron & Slocum, 1989).

2.3 The Present Study

The aim of the present study was to address some of these limitations and gaps in previous research. More specifically, the present study aimed to investigate the relationships between work and family roles and their effect on dual earner couples' overall quality of life and work commitment. There has been public concern regarding the effects of work on the children and husbands of employed women, and
employers have been concerned about the effects of family on an employee's work (Schwartz, 1989).

Sekaran and Hall (1989) hypothesized that work-family interaction (in particular work-family conflict) may be stronger at particular career and life stages (parenting). Taking a different approach, Evans and Bartolome (1984) found that the type of relationship between work and family (spillover, compensation, segmentation, instrumental and conflict) was partly dependent on career saliency and hence stage in the adult development cycle. Previous studies on the work-family relationship of dual earner couples have generally not included a measure of career stage and the present study could produce some enlightening findings in this area.

Men and women have different career opportunities, and different work and family norms and therefore it was necessary for the present study to include gender comparisons. Secondly, the work-family interface may be influenced by the interaction of one partner's work role with the other partner's work role (Gupta and Jenkins, 1985). Zedeck and Mosier (1990) reviewed the work-family literature and identified a lack of research using the interaction of couples as it is not as convenient for researchers. Therefore, the present study compared the impact of different couple types (in terms of work and family salience) on the work-family relationship.
CHAPTER THREE: THE WORK COMMITMENT OF MEN AND WOMEN IN DUAL EARNER COUPLES

Morrow (1983) defined work commitment as comprising the work ethic, career saliency, job involvement, organizational commitment and union commitment. Occupational commitment is one’s attitude, including affect, belief, and behavioral intention towards one’s occupation (Blau, Paul & St. John, 1993). It is also known as career commitment, and includes the person’s desire to remain in an occupation following an assessment of alternatives, thus it is one aspect of work commitment. Occupational commitment is particular interest because of its demonstrated linkage with career withdrawal intentions (Aryee & Tan, 1992; Aryee, Yue Wah Chay, Chew, 1994; Blau, 1985) and skill development (Aryee & Tan, 1992). Job involvement is the degree to which a job is an important component of self-image (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Blau, Paul and St. John (1993) empirically demonstrated that the job involvement and occupational commitment measures which are used in the present study are measuring different constructs. Job involvement has a more immediate focus than occupational commitment. Job involvement is highly relevant in the study of dual earner couples because it has been found that over-involvement in one’s job is negatively related to marital quality (Bailyn, 1980). In the present study both occupational commitment and job involvement are measured as important contributors to the concept of work commitment.

3.1 The Developmental Aspect of Work Commitment

Work commitment is a fairly stable attitude but may change with changing situations (Newton & Keenan, 1991) as it is related to career trajectory and locality (Banks & Henry, 1993). Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) outlined how job involvement, occupational commitment and job satisfaction would be expected to change over Super’s (1980) career stages (exploration, establishment, maintenance and disengagement). It is expected that people in the exploration stage will be less
satisfied and involved with their work. Cron and Slocum (1986), found that people in the exploration stage were indeed less satisfied, involved, challenged in their job and were poorer performers than individuals in any other career stages. Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) also found that people in the exploration stage were less organizationally committed but found no differences in job involvement nor in job satisfaction over Super’s career stages.

As the establishment stage is a time of growth, advancement and stabilization it is hypothesized that this is the time of greatest occupational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction. As expected, Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) found that occupational commitment was greater in the establishment stage than in either the exploration or decline stages.

In essence, the maintenance stage of career development is an adaption to the achievements of the establishment stage and therefore it is expected that job attitudes will remain at essentially the same level that they reached during the establishment stage. Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) found no difference in job attitudes between the establishment and maintenance stages as hypothesized.

The disengagement stage is a period when people are withdrawing from their jobs and one would therefore expect less positive job attitudes than the previous two stages. Cron and Slocum’s (1986) study supported this hypothesis but Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) found no difference in job attitudes.

Morrow and McElroy (1987) found that work commitment increased with age. However, no relationship was found between career stage and work commitment when career stage was measured by organizational or positional tenure. Many researchers have also found that job involvement steadily increases with age (Blumberg, 1980; Hammer, Landeau & Stern, 1981; James & Jones, 1980). However, Raelin (1985) found that job involvement was curvilinearly related to career stage (as measured by age), with involvement highest in the late stage and lowest in the middle stage. Raelin’s (1985) last stage approximated Super’s (1988) maintenance
stage and as job involvement was highest then this particular finding fitted in with Super’s model. It is hard to compare findings when different measures of career stage are used.

It is questionable whether or not women’s career development can be generalized to the male career development models (Jenkins, 1989). Betz and Fitzgerald (1987) reviewed the literature and concluded that studies continuing to infer that female concerns are identical to males hide the unique career psychology of women. After observing that research on Super’s career theory had used only male samples, Ornstein and Isabella (1990) compared Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee’s (1976) life stage and Super’s (1980) career stage models with respect to women’s work attitudes. For their sample, women’s work attitudes were moderately related to Levinson et al’s (1976) life stage model but unrelated to Super’s (1980) career stage model.

Finally, situational factors may have an impact on career behaviours (Arthur, Hall & Lawrence, 1989; Collin & Young, 1986; Sonnenfield & Kotter, 1982). McGinnis and Morrow (1990) found that sex, age, family-marital status, occupational category, and organizational tenure explained 12% of the variance in employee work attitudes.

In summary, work commitment does appear to change according to Super’s (1980) career theory (Cron & Slocum, 1986). However, further research is required in the area, partly because use of different career stage measures has made comparisons between studies difficult, and partly because recent research has questioned the validity of Super’s career stages in distinguishing between job attitudes (Ornstein, Cron & Slocum, 1989). Furthermore, it is possible that Super’s career stages do not apply to women (Ornstein & Isabella, 1990) and replicatory studies are required to better establish this finding. The present study addresses these problems by testing for differences in men and women’s job involvement and occupational commitment across Super’s career stages and age groups.
3.2 Parent's Work Commitment

Couples' adult development can be measured by parenting, in that there are cultural norms for the birth of the first child and age of parents when the last child leaves home. Parenting may increase the salience of family and this may have negative repercussions for work commitment. For instance, Steffy and Jones (1988) found that mothers were less committed to work. In a study of stress in two-earner couples and stage in the life-cycle, Lewis and Cooper (1987) found that fathers had lower work commitment and aspirations than other men. Lewis and Cooper (1987) suggested that highly work-oriented, Type A men may have been less supportive and positive towards their wives' continued employment, and hence have been less likely to be members of dual earner couples during the stage of early parenting. Then again, Gould and Werbel (1983) found that women with dependents were more committed to work, possibly because their financial needs were greater.

Powell and Posner (1989) found that family status had no effect on work commitment. Furthermore, Stroh and Reilly (cited in Moses-Zirkes, 1993) found that having children had no discernable effect on women's intentions to leave their organizations (a measure of work commitment) and women's high turnover was predicted by dissatisfaction with their work organization. This runs counter to the stereotype among corporate organizations that women managers are likely to quit their jobs to take care of their children. Similarly, Youngblood and Chambers-Cook (1984), when comparing two comparable textile companies, found that a company sponsored daycare facility was associated with higher employee satisfaction, better work climate, higher scores on commitment measures, and lower turnover intentions. However, Goff, Mount and Jamison (1990) found that the use of a child care centre at work did not reduce work-family conflict, nor parental absenteeism. Nonetheless, support from supervisors regarding family issues and satisfaction with childcare, regardless of location, was related to lower work-family conflict, which in turn was related to less absenteeism.
Steffy and Jones (1988) found that mothers had lower work commitment than other workers. However, Stroh and Reilly (cited in Moses-Zirkes, 1993) argue that lower work commitment in mothers is a result of organization's discrimination against mothers (in terms of promotion and income), and Youngblood and Chambers-Cook (1984) found that daycare facilities were associated with increased work commitment. The present study tests the hypothesis that parenting will not decrease occupational commitment and job involvement when there is access to child-care, controlling for age, career stage and sex (Lewis & Cooper, 1987).

3.3 Sex Differences in Work Commitment

Men and women in the paid labour force have been found to differ somewhat in their level of commitment to work (Agassi, 1982; Mannheim, 1983; Lewis and Cooper, 1987; Sekaran, 1983b). For instance, studies have found women to be less involved in their jobs than men (Aleem & Khandelwal, 1988; Sekaran, 1981; Sekaran, 1983b). Aleem and Khandelwal's (1988) gender variance in job involvement was explained by differences in education, age and income (as an Indian sample was used this may not be directly relevant to New Zealanders). Powell and Posner (1989) found that male working MBA graduates had higher work commitment than their female equivalents. This gender difference in work commitment was largely explained by sex-role identity.

Walker, Tauskey and Oliver (1982) observed that sex differences on work values, preferences and stereotypic personality characteristics are declining. This is particularly the case when organizational level is controlled for (Brief and Oliver, 1982). Overall sex differences in work commitment are disappearing as women's work commitment catches up with that of men's, as a result of women's increased educational attainment and the expansion of job opportunities and rewards that are associated with their increased work commitment (Lorence, 1987). This similarity in work orientation may however, be due not only to the increase in women's work commitment but also to a decrease in men's work involvement by dual career
husbands (Gould & Werbel, 1985). Hardesty and Betz (1980) found that men and women do not significantly differ in their career salience.

The possibility of sex differences in work commitment is of concern, because organizations may hesitate to hire and train women for lateral and upward mobility if they assume that women feel that their career is not salient. For instance, Owen (1984) in a New Zealand study, found that employers preferred women in positions that have been traditionally women's work and were reluctant to promote women because they felt that women's domestic responsibilities would prevent them from doing a good job. As the above overseas studies have indicated that sex differences in work commitment are decreasing it would be of great value to find out if there are any sex differences in work commitment for New Zealanders. Brook and Brook (1989) found no sex differences in the work commitment of New Zealand managers.

3.4 The Effect of Couples' Life-Style on Work Commitment

Previous research on work commitment has been confined largely to identifying the impact of work-related variables (e.g. role strain) on organizational commitment (Steffy & Jones, 1988). Research on the impact of extra-work factors is virtually non-existent, though there has been an increasing number of studies on the influence of work status on family and household outcomes (e.g. Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Hardesty & Betz, 1980). A few recent studies (Feree, 1988; Loscocco, 1990; Rosin, 1990) have indicated that family roles reflect needs, opportunities and constraints which have a decided influence on an individual's reactions to work. The justification for evaluating the effects of family variables on work commitment is based on the premise that just as workplace factors affect extra-work life, so too do family factors influence work attitudes.

Hardesty and Betz (1980) found that family interests were more important than career concerns for both males and females in their sample of dual-career professional people in the United States. This does not necessarily mean that dual
earner couples will have lower work commitment than other workers as research has shown that work conditions and opportunities are the strongest determinants of work commitment, and that marital and family status have little if any impact (Pitman & Orthner, 1989; Rosenfield & Spenner, 1988).

Nieva and Gutek (1981) suggested investigating the effect of one's life-style (salience of work and family) and one's spouse's work commitment on one's own work commitment as there is a lack of research in the area. In particular, the present study looked at the impact of having a professional partner versus a non-professional partner on a professional's work commitment.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE IMPACT OF DUAL EARNER COUPLE STATUS ON QUALITY OF LIFE

The meaning of mental health is bound by culture and time (Jahoda, 1958). New Zealand's dominant culture is still Western or more specifically British and New Zealand European (Willmott, 1989), despite being a multicultural society. Therefore, a Western measure of mental health, Quality of Life (Quinn & Staines, 1978), was used in the present study. Mental health comprises affective well-being, autonomy, competence, integrated functioning and aspiration (Kasl, 1973; Warr, 1987).

Wiener, Vardi and Muczyk (1981) deem it theoretically more parsimonious to apply the same conceptual and operational definition of mental health in all situations. On the other hand, Zedcock and Mosier (1990) point out that many variables used in work-family literature are macro variables, that ignore the processes and antecedents of the quality of life experience such as satisfaction with work, family, or friends. Quality of life for the working population has been conceptualized as derived from satisfactions experienced through having a good job and a good life (Payton-Miyazaki & Brayfield, 1976). Work and family can provide separate sources of social support as well as self-fulfillment and stress, each of which can contribute independently to psychological well-being. Furthermore, they can generate role conflict through their interaction which could also impact on psychological well-being. Therefore, the present study used a global Quality of Life measure (life satisfaction and happiness) and measures of Work-Family Conflict, Marital Satisfaction and Quality of Work Life when investigating the antecedents of mental health.

Research has found reduced sex differences in mental health for husbands and wives when both are employed (Kessler & McRae, 1982; Rosenfield, 1980). This is generally explained by an increase in husbands' depression rather than a decrease in wives' depression (Rosenfield, 1980). Sekaran (1985) found that dual earner women's mental health was lower than that of their husbands. Whereas husbands derived their sense of well-being from both work and non-work satisfactions, wives
derived their sense of well-being basically from the satisfaction derived from the non-work spheres of their lives and by experiencing less interrole conflict.

4.1 Age, Parenting and Quality of Life

Campbell (1981) reviewed five national probability surveys of psychological well-being and found that people under 30 were the least satisfied with regard to most areas of life, including work, marriage and family life. Many studies have found that the young married stage without children and the empty nest stage (when children have left home) are the periods of greatest marital happiness for men and women as the parenting of pre-school children may create maximum child-care demands (Glenn and McLanahan, 1982; Kelly & Voyandoff, 1985; Pleck, Staines & Lang, 1980; White, Booth & Edwards, 1986). It may be that men in dual earner couples are happier without children because working women’s husbands are more likely to share in household responsibilities when there are children present (Geerkin & Gove, 1983). Having reviewed the research literature, McLanahan and Adams (1987) concluded that the presence of preschool children are associated with poorer mental health in employed women.

In contrast to this trend, Sekaran (1985) found a positive relationship between number of children and mental health for wives, which she speculated may be due to emotional and practical support given to mothers by older children. Vannoy and Philliber (1992) found that the older the youngest child the better was the mothers’ marital satisfaction. Similarly, Cooke and Rousseau (1984) found that although interrole conflict may increase with workload and presence of children, the social support function of the family may actually buffer the effects of interrole conflict and contribute to spousal well-being. Some researchers report that, compared to men who are employed and married, those who are also fathers report fewer symptoms of depression and psychophysiological distress (Gore & Mangione, 1983). Multiple roles do not necessarily drain energy, and may even increase it, depending on levels of commitment to particular activities (Marks, 1977). Gilbert, Holahan and Manning (1981) support the theory of role accumulation (Sieber, 1974), which suggests that
multiple roles lead to privileges, resources, and enhanced self concept, and provide buffers against failure in any one role. Positive commitment to work may enable mothers to cope with subsequent role conflict but there is evidence that the effect of high levels of work commitment (as a protective device) is greater for husbands than for wives (Bailyn, 1970). Barnett, Baruch and Rivers (1982) found that overall feelings of well-being were greatest among the women with three roles (wife, mother and worker) and least among the women with one role. Barnett and Marshall (1991) found that when under troubling conditions at work employed women who were not mothers experienced higher levels of distress than did employed women who were mothers. Crosby (1984, p.53) speculated: 'Spouses and children do more than prevent working people from dwelling on their failures; spouses and children also listen to triumphs.' Nonetheless it is possible that the above multiple role studies have been confounded by women with more complex role configurations also having highest initial levels of psychological well-being (Kandel, Davies and Raveis, 1985).

Parenting had no effect on dual earner women's quality of life in Benin and Nienstedt's study (1985) - but decreased men's quality of life. Other studies have found no relationship between the age of a child or other life-cycle and socio-economic variables and quality of life (Guelzow, Bird & Koball, 1991; Vannoy & Philliber, 1993). Vaillant and Vaillant (1993) did a forty year longitudinal study of marital satisfaction and found that it did not change through number of years married, age of each partner or stage in the family life cycle. Vaillant and Vaillant (1993) conclude that the U-curve of marital satisfaction found by most prior studies (e.g. Rollins & Cannon, 1974) may be an artifact of retrospective and cross-sectional studies.

In summary, there have been conflicting findings as to whether parenting decreases quality of life (Kelly & Voyandoff, 1985), increases quality of life (Sekaran, 1985) or has no effect (Vannoy & Philliber, 1993). Recent research indicates that the more roles that a person occupies the better their mental health (Thoits, 1983). It would follow from this that employed mothers would report greater quality of life in the present study than employed non-mothers. However, considerations of role conflict
and role strain suggest that combining the very demanding roles of worker and parent may produce lower quality of life. The present study explored the effect of parenting (as measured by presence of children and age of youngest child) on dual earners couples' quality of life.

4.2 The Effect of Couple's Life-Style on Quality of Life

Hunt and Hunt (1982) argue that what is becoming incompatible with family life is not women's participation in the labour force, nor the principle of sex equality, but careers. Given the necessity of earning a living, many sociologists believe that parents (especially mothers) must limit their occupational choices to those jobs that accommodate outside responsibilities (Feiner & Roberts, 1990; Filer, 1985; Hall, 1986; Polachek, 1981; Zalokar, 1988). For highly educated men and women who are able to have careers, having families often means that they take jobs instead of careers. As Hochshild (1976, p.256) succinctly states, 'The career system is shaped for and by the man with a family who is family-free'.

High career commitment has tended to be associated with positive psychological outcomes for dual earners (Sekaran, 1985). Hardesty and Betz (1980) found that higher levels of career salience among wives were related to higher reported levels of marital adjustment among husbands. Stoner and Hartman (1990) found that childless dual earner couples with high career commitment were well adjusted because the partners understood each other's time demands and the pressures necessary for advancement. Stoner and Hartman (1990) reasoned that this was because not having children removed the psychological guilt associated with women's careers.

However 30% of the women Stoner and Hartman (1990) studied felt that career progress had harmed their family/home life and most of the relevant literature would suggest that over-involvement in career pursuits may be negatively related to marital quality (Bailyn, 1980). High levels of involvement with a career may reduce the extent of enabling processes or support in the family. Couples high in work and
family involvement have high stress due to increased role expectations in work and family spheres (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Sekaran, 1986) and high levels of permeability in the two roles (Hall & Richter, 1988). Whereas, Karamayya and Reilly (1992) found that couples characterized by high family involvement and moderately low work involvement of both spouses showed high levels of marital satisfaction and low stress. Regan and Roland (1985) suggest that aspiring professionals need to lower their career aspirations or consciously reject parenthood.

Similarity of commitment (high or low) to work has been positively associated with marital satisfaction (Thomas, Albrecht, White, Faires & Shoun, 1982; White & Hatcher, 1984). If one partner is more highly committed to work or family there may be a feeling of unfairness and hence willingness to give support may be affected. However, Hall and Hall (1979) contend that if both partners have high career salience they may experience intense role conflicts because neither partner is willing to make career sacrifices.

Marriages in which wives obtain higher occupational status than their husbands are difficult to sustain because of the extent to which couples diverge from traditional gender-related patterns of work commitment (Greenhaus, Bedeian & Mossholder, 1987; Hiller & Philliber, 1982; Hornung & McCullough, 1981). Higher women's work commitment has been associated with marital instability (Booth, Johnson, White & Edwards, 1984; Ladewig & McGee, 1986). Schoenbach (1985) found that education but not earnings led to more flexibility in matters such as role norms and from this one would expect that a wife's higher occupational status would not negatively affect well-educated couples. Hardesty and Betz (1980) reported that dual-career couples showed relatively high levels of marital adjustment especially when the wife had a higher level of education than the husband.

Quality of life was investigated in the present study in response to the great concern for it in today's society (Nieva & Gutek, 1981). There have been conflicting research findings in that some researchers have found that dual earner couples with high work commitment are well-adjusted (Stoner & Hartman, 1990), whereas others found that
they have increased stress (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). Then again, White and Hatcher (1984) found that marital satisfaction was greatest when partners had equal commitment to work. The present study explored the effects of couples’ different combinations of work and family salience on their quality of life and marital satisfaction. Much of the empirical research over the last three decades has focused on work commitment, as if commitment to family was a natural and unproblematic outcome of household arrangements (Bielby, 1992) - which is not necessarily the case. Therefore, the present study included measures of family involvement and lifestyle (salience of work and family measure) when exploring the effect of couple’s degree of family involvement and work involvement on quality of life and marital satisfaction. The present study also looked at the impact of female partner’s higher occupational status on men’s quality of life. Furthermore, it would be expected from Veenhowen and Jonkers’ (1984) findings of correlations between context-free mental health and occupational prestige that income and occupation would impact on the relationship between life style and quality of life in the present study.
Experiences and events arising within the work domain can have far-reaching effects on one’s personal and family life. Evans and Bartolome (1986) found that work and career had a stronger influence on life outside work than vice versa, except in extreme cases of family crisis.

Multiple roles (work, marital, parenting) may reduce stress because there are more opportunities for fulfilment, according to Nieva's (1985) review of work and family linkages. Indeed, Kessler and McRae (1981) note that as women increasingly combine work and family their mental health increases. Research on multiple roles and mental health has been limited almost exclusively to women (Barnett, Marshall & Pleck, 1992), with literature on men’s mental health focusing primarily on the job role. However, recent studies say that family roles are key to men’s mental health (Farrell & Rosenberg, 1981; Guelzow, Bird & Koball, 1991; Pleck, 1985). For instance, Pleck (1983) found that across a variety of self-report studies, dual earner men were more psychologically involved with their families than with their work (that is, following a more female stereotyped involvement) - contrary to the usual stereotype of men obsessed by work and oblivious to the family. Barnett, Marshall and Pleck (1992) found that dual earner men’s global life satisfaction was equally determined by quality of work life and quality of family life.

Near, Rice and Hunt (1980) suggested that the conceptualization of the work-leisure relationship can be better conceptualized if the domains are broken down into two components - the objective or structural aspects of each domain and the subjective reactions or the behaviours associated with each domain. It is assumed that the relationships between objective structures in one domain and individual reactions in the other domain should not necessarily resemble the pattern of relationships between individual reactions in the two domains. Taken as a whole, research has focused on the occupancy not quality of roles, whether, for example, men are fathers or not
(Gore & Mangione, 1983). However, research on the quality of roles has been found to be more relevant (Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Barnett & Marshall, 1991; Kotler & Wingard, 1989) as for example, Jackson, Zedek and Summers' (1986) finding that emotional interference from work was consistently related to family life outcomes but structural interference was found to have little effect on the quality of family life. Therefore, role quality rather than role occupancy measures were used to investigate spillover in the present study.

Analytically the three possible major relationships between work and marital roles can be represented in Figure 1.

**SPILLOVER:**

```
work ←------- + -------→ marriage
```

**COMPENSATION:**

```
work ←------- - -------→ marriage
```

**SEGMENTATION:**

```
work ←------- 0 -------→ marriage
```

Figure 1 Possible Relationships between Work and Marital Roles

5.1 An Interactive versus an Independent model of the impact of Work and Family roles on Quality of Life

Evans and Bartolome (1984) found that the way male managers perceive the work-family interface is influenced by the emotional outcomes of work and the relative importance of work in the life of the person. The emotional outcomes of work are related to how well the person and job fit. Male managers who had positive feelings about work tended to perceive the work-family relationship as being in conflict or independent from each other. In contrast, those who had mixed feelings towards work tended to see the work-family relationship as one of negative spillover of work into private life (Evans & Bartolome, 1984).

Many studies support Evans and Bartolome's (1984) conclusion that those who derive negative affect from their work are more likely to have a spillover relationship between work and family. Negative conditions at women's work have been related to
women's perception of increased stress at home (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler & Wethington, 1989; Coverman, 1989) and less satisfying family relations, less family cohesion, and low marital satisfaction (Coverman, 1989; Repetti, 1987; Sears & Galambos, 1992). Job stress was linked to women's reports of anxiety, depression, and marital and life satisfaction (Freudiger, 1983; Kessler & McRae, 1982). Crouter, Perry-Jenkins, Huston and Crawford (1989) also found that stress derived from men's work impacted on the household. For example, they found that low stress and high arousal at work was associated with greater involvement with active leisure whereas high stress was associated with increased negative marital interactions.

However, positive spillover relationships between job and marital satisfaction have also been found for both males and females in dual earner couples (Benin & Nienstedt, 1985; Giscombe, 1983). According to Pond and Green (1983) a significant positive relationship exists between satisfaction with work (satisfaction, involvement, role conflict) and satisfaction with marriage for males. Similarly, Barnett and Baruch (1985) reported positive spillover between women's work and parenting.

The latter studies may have found positive spillover because of the high salience of a particular domain: Moen (1985) wrote that emotional salience in an occupation represents a potential source of work intrusion into the family domain. Evans and Bartolome (1984) found that those whose work was perceived as dominant reported a spillover relationship between work and family and those for whom work was of moderate importance tended to see professional and private life as being independent of each other. Those who attached little importance to work tended to see work as instrumental to private life, or private life as compensation for disappointments in work. The relative importance of work was found to change with adult development stages (Evans & Bartolome, 1984). Work appeared to be important in early adult stages, while family became more salient in later life.

Pond and Green (1985) observed that if a woman perceived her work to be highly salient then there was a significant relationship between job and marital satisfaction, if not, there was no significant relationship between marital and job satisfaction.
Similarly, Giscombe (1983) attributed the positive relationship between job and marital satisfaction for women to the fact that the women in the sample had careers, not jobs.

Furthermore, Crouter (1984) found that women with young children (less than twelve years of age) are most likely to report high spillover from the family to the workplace, in contrast to mothers of older children and to all fathers regardless of the age of the children in a sample of blue collar workers. Parents of preschoolers are commonly expected to have high family salience because of the parenting demands of preschoolers (Katz & Piortrkowski, 1983).

However, there has also been research that suggests that there is no spillover relationship between work and family. The previously mentioned studies have used correlations between work and family roles to assess the work-family interface. Recent studies (e.g. Barnett & Marshall, 1992) have assessed spillover by testing for an interaction effect between work role quality and marital role quality (or parenting role quality) on overall distress or well-being in addition to their main effects on overall distress or well-being. Existence of an interaction effect (e.g. marital satisfaction * quality of work life) would indicate spillover or compensation between the two domains. Figure 2 depicts an interaction effects model.

![Figure 2 Interactive Effects Model of the relationship between Quality of Work Life and Marital Satisfaction and Quality of Life](image)

Recent findings from studies on women (Aneshensel, 1986; Barnett & Marshall, 1992; Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1990) showed that relationship between affective experiences in one role and distress were not affected by affective experiences in another role. Barnett and Marshall (1992) found that males in dual earner couples generally had no spillover relationship between their quality of experience in one role and their symptoms of psychological distress in another role. For example, positive feelings from partner roles did not cross-over to positive feelings in their job-role. Barnett and Marshall (1992) suggested that spillover effect may apply only to women as it would appear that men compartmentalize role-related affective experiences such that their effects on psychological distress are primarily independent. The only spillover relationship found was that job-role quality was exacerbated if men had concerns in their relationships with their partners. It appeared that although men reap psychological benefits from rewards in each of their roles, these role-related rewards did not enable them to cope better with stresses in their second role. Barnett and Marshall (1992b) concluded that the spillover hypothesis did not apply to men in dual earner relationships.

Burke (1986) examined sex role differences in the effects of nonwork and work satisfactions and observed that women are more likely to bring work influences into the nonwork domain, and to bring personal needs and nonwork satisfactions and dissatisfactions into the work situation. Many women professionals, including managers, also think more frequently about matters at home while they are at work than do their male counterparts (Richter, 1985). Conversely, Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler and Wethington (1989) found a strong spillover relationship from home to work for males. They speculated that this may reflect differences in socialization of men and women and resulting skill of managing multiple roles.

However, it is possible that the previous studies (Barnett & Marshall, 1992) found no interactive effect between work and family on quality of life because one of the variables was not salient enough. Bartolome and Evans (1980) found that different combinations of work satisfaction, work distress and work involvement resulted in different work-family relationships.
In the past, most researchers have chosen to look at work and marriage variables for only one member of a married couple, possibly for ease of data collection (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). However, theoretically spillover applies to both partners and therefore the present study not only related work and marriage variables within individuals but also the relationship between work and marriage variables between partners.

Wortman, Biernat and Lang (1991) found that a wife's experience of spillover stress and her level of marital commitment can account for a substantial amount of variance in her husband's depression. In other words, the advantage of using couples instead of individuals means that the researcher can also measure the relationship between one's partner's role quality and one's own. There are conflicting findings with regard to whether there is a transmission of stress from either the husbands' work conditions or the wives' work conditions to their partner's marital adjustment - some say it is only from male to female (Jones & Fletcher, 1993), others that is only from female to male (Booth, Johnson, White & Edwards 1984; Ladewig & McGee, 1986) or that there is no cross-over of affect at all between spouses (Sears & Galambos, 1992).

Kabanoff and O'Brien (1980) noted that age, sex, education, income and personality variables moderated the relationship between work and nonwork. They concluded that these variables would not only moderate the perception of job attitudes but might also be expected to have a large effect on the choice and availability of nonwork activities. Conversely, Rice, Frone and McFarlin (1992) found that sociodemographic variables did not significantly moderate the impact of the relationship between work and nonwork on quality of life.

The popular belief that women bring more (than men) of their family problems into the work place is highly detrimental to New Zealand women's career prospects. The effect of family on the work-place could have important implications for organizations in terms of morale, stability and the productivity of the work force (Voyandoff, 1980). The present study investigated whether or not there were any sex differences in the relationship between work and family.
The present study used quality of life, a measure of subjective well-being, rather than its opposite, psychological distress. Barnett and Marshall (1991) point out that these are separate constructs, that is, the absence of distress symptoms does not necessarily indicate subjective well-being. Barnett and Marshall (1991) found that the effects on well-being of work and family variables are independent for women. More specifically, in every instance, the relationship between psychological distress and the work factors and well-being is unaffected by the family-role variables, that is, occupancy and quality. In contrast, the relationship between psychological distress and the work factors is conditioned by family-role occupancy, and, in certain instances, by family-role quality. That is, the two mental health dimensions, well-being and psychological distress are not merely opposite ends of the same construct. However, a later study by Barnett and Marshall (1992) found no spillover effect between work and family roles for psychological distress.

Near, Rice and Hunt (1980) found that self definition of one's life role may be a major part of the social-psychological basis for work-leisure relationships. It is insufficient to test for spillover, compensation and segmentation without considering the various dimensions of work and family. Evans and Bartolome (1984) found that the relationship between work and family is modified by the salience of one's work which in turn is related to adult developmental stage. The relationships between work and marriage cannot be expected to be the same in different populations or even to be constant for members of the same population at different stages of the life cycle. The present study investigated spillover effects on overall quality of life, by testing whether the interaction of quality of work life and marital satisfaction accounts for a significant proportion of the variance in overall quality of life, over and above that accounted for by the main effects of the experiences in the two roles for individuals and across partners.
5.2 The Developmental Aspect of Work-Family Conflict

Sekaran and Hall (1989) write that only by exploring the dynamics of the relationships between the individual, the family and the career can we begin to understand the life stages in which the spouses have a relatively easy time establishing the work-family-self linkages and the specific stages where they experience problems. After all, work-family conflict is highly detrimental not only to the couple but to the organization as well (Sekaran, 1988; Taylor, 1986). Work-family conflict is incompatible pressures arising simultaneously from work and family roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Role conflict has been found to be significant for parents but not for non-parents (Lewis & Cooper, 1987; Voyandoff, 1988). Lewis and Cooper’s (1987) study, on stress in dual earner couples and stage in the life cycle, demonstrated that low occupational status, work commitment and aspirations, and non-home-based child-care arrangements, are significant predictors of stress. Kelly and Voyandoff (1985) predicted that parents of children under six years old would have increased conflict because of the heavy time and energy demands on the parents. However, they were not able to demonstrate this because of small group sizes. Greenhaus and Kopelman (1981) reported that half of their male sample experienced work-family conflict and that the work-family conflict was heightened when the wife was employed in a managerial or professional role, when they had children who were all pre-schoolers, and when the men placed great importance on work.

In spite of the trends towards egalitarianism among two earner couples, the majority retain traditional patterns of domestic responsibilities (Berk, 1985; Pleck, 1985). This is particularly the case when the couple become parents (Elliot, Rugg, Watson & Brough, 1983). Married professional women have more role obligations than their male counterparts and as such may be more likely to experience inter-role conflict than married professional men (Graddick & Farr, 1983). When a woman takes on the working role in addition to her role as wife and mother the man generally does not help equally with the fathering and housekeeping role. In point of fact, working
mothers have reported more work-family pressure than working fathers (Lewis & Cooper, 1987).

Work-family conflict can also be investigated in terms of each partner's personal development: Grunbaum (1979) wrote that at a point in life when men may be turning their resources back in toward their family (affiliation), women may be turning their energies toward career pursuits (assertion) causing a divergent pattern of conflict. Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee's (1978) found that males in their twenties are preoccupied with their careers but in their thirties they become more interested in their families. Supporting Levinson et al's (1978) findings, Madill (1985) found that while groups of therapists remained committed to the working role their level of commitment to the home/family role steadily increased after age 25. That is, between 25 and 55 years of age the working and home/family roles appeared to compete with one another in terms of these therapists's levels of commitment, participation and role values. Some of this competition between roles can be healthy and provide for marital growth but extensive work-family conflict can have adverse effects on individual well-being (Jones & Butler, 1980). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) suggest that career stage effects on work-family conflict may differ for men and women. They hypothesize that women would have greater work-family conflict in early career when they are establishing themselves at work as well as dealing with strong demands from partner and children, rather than in mid-career.

There has been little research linking work-family conflict to career stage. According to Sekaran and Hall's (1989) theory, people with young children at different career stages (which involve different degrees of work commitment) may have different degrees of work-family conflict. Greenhaus and Kopelman (1981) found an increased possibility of work-family conflict at stages in the couples' life and career development when there is high family salience and high work salience. The present study compared the degree of work-family conflict between partners in the peak of their careers (establishment and maintenance stages) with those couples where at least one partner was in a less demanding career stage, controlling for parenting.
5.3 The Effect of Couples' Life-Style on Work-Family Conflict

When there is high commitment to work and to family and there are limited resources there is stress and conflict (Price-Bonham & Murphy, 1980; Skinner, 1984). Taking this finding a step further, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) propose that if pressures to participate in both family and career are equal the highest degree of work-family conflict may be expected. Madill, Brinnell, Macnab, Stewin and Fitzsimmons (1988) found that professional women had greater work-family conflict than non-professional working women. Madill et al (1988) reasoned that this occurred because professional women gave equal salience to their family and working roles whereas non-professional working women gave priority to their home/family role. Similarly, Greenhaus and Kopelman (1981) found a positive relationship between the salience employees attach to their own work role and the degree of work-family conflict. On the other hand, Locksley (1980) found that level of interest in work does not effect work-family conflict.

Greenhaus, Parasuraman, Granrose, Rabinowitz and Beutell (1989) found a stronger positive relationship between career priority and job involvement and work-family conflict among dual career women than among dual career men. Women's partners' work salience (career priority and job involvement) did not interact with her own work salience to influence work-family conflict. Greenhaus et al (1989) found that a man's level of work salience was unrelated to his own feelings of work-family conflict but that the combination of his work salience and his partner's work salience predicted his work-family conflict. Men who had high job involvement and had partners with high job involvement had surprisingly little work-family conflict. Relationships in which both partners regard his or her own career as having greater priority than that of their partner's career induce conflict in men (Greenhaus et al, 1989).

Similarly, Greenhaus and Kopelman (1981) found that husband's perceptions of work-family conflict are affected by their wife's degree of work salience. Husbands, whose wives were employed in managerial/professional positions, experienced more
intense conflicts. Greenhaus and Kopelman (1981) suggest that this was because work involvement of wives in high level positions places demands on husbands to participate more actively in home and family roles, thereby generating more role conflict for the husband.

The relevance of couples' work and family involvement to work-family conflict in the present study is determined using Hall and Hall's (1979) categorization of dual earner couples. Hall and Hall (1979) identified four general types of dual earner/career couples: accommodators, adversaries, allies and acrobats. Hall and Hall's categorization of dual earner couples is theoretical and has not previously been empirically tested (Yogev & Brett, 1985).

In the accommodator couple one partner is typically high in career involvement and low in home involvement, with the second partner reversing those priorities. Thus the degree of involvement of each partner complements the other. Hall and Hall (1979) suggest that this arrangement minimizes conflict and allows each partner to achieve satisfaction without undue cost.

Adversaries are couples high in work and low in family involvement (Hall & Hall, 1979). Hall and Hall (1979) suggest that this pattern is the most stressful. Both partners are typically very involved with their careers and not very involved in with home, family, or partner support roles. A well-ordered home and family life are valued by adversaries, yet neither is willing to fulfil this role function. Young and Willmott (1973) found that dual-career parents who were highly committed to their work experienced more intense work-family conflict in relation to their family responsibilities than couples who were less highly committed to their work.

Acrobats are couples who are highly involved in work and family. These acrobats view their relationship and family roles as equal in importance to their careers. They receive satisfaction from both domains, home and career. Acrobats are also likely to experience the most conflict and overload in trying to meet all their demands.
Allies are couples in which both spouses are highly involved in the same sphere and not concerned with perfection in the other. Both partners may be strongly family oriented and have little career identification, or the converse may be true. This structure facilitates the setting of priorities and minimizes conflict.

Similarity of career/work salience irrespective of whether it was high or low, has been associated with low work-family conflict and high well-being (Beutell & Greenhaus, 1982; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Lewis & Cooper, 1987) and high marital satisfaction (Karambayya & Reilly, 1992). Holahan and Gilbert (1979) concluded that the couples must have worked out a system of mutual understanding and accommodation. Similarly, Beutell and Greenhaus (1982) found a negative relationship between work-family conflict and career salience and concluded that it is possible that two partners with high levels of work salience may understand each others career needs and protect one another from intense conflict.

Frone and Rice (1987) found that extent of role involvement is related to the stress produced by role conflict. However, Locksley (1980) found that high work salience was unrelated to work-family conflict and Evans and Bartolome (1984) found that work-family conflict was most likely to occur when workers derived positive affect from their work. It was hypothesized that parents (at least mothers) would have higher work-family conflict than others. The relevance of Hall and Hall’s (1979) categorization of dual earner couples to work-family conflict was tested. It was hypothesized that the highest levels of conflict would be experienced by the acrobats because they seek perfection in both areas and next would be the competitive adversaries. Whereas allies and accommodators were hypothesized to have lower levels of conflict because of their more compatible expectations.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

From the large amount of literature reviewed, the following research questions are summarized under the three themes - work commitment, quality of life, and the work-family relationship. The primary aim of the present study is to determine the effect of dual earner couple variables on their quality of life and work commitment at different career stages and different levels of work and family salience.

Therefore the specific research questions are:

6.1 Work Commitment

1) Occupational commitment and job involvement will be highest in Super’s establishment and maintenance stages and will increase with increasing age. It is possible that there will be no effect for women.

2) Parenting will have no impact on men and women’s occupational commitment and job involvement because the sample has access to excellent child-care services. Factors known to impact on occupational commitment and job involvement such as career stage and age will be taken into account.

3) There will be no sex differences in occupational commitment and job involvement when career stage, age and contextual factors such as income and occupation have been taken into account.

4) Life-style will be used to test whether an individual who has salience in both work and family has similar occupational commitment and job involvement as an individual who is focused chiefly on work.
5) The present study compares occupational commitment and job involvement of professionals in dual career versus a dual earner couples in traditional versus an egalitarian couples.

6.2 Quality of Life

1) Parenting will not decrease quality of life and marital satisfaction because of the excellent childcare facilities available to the sample. Age may increase quality of life and marital satisfaction.

2) Couples' life-styles will affect their quality of life and marital satisfaction such that couples with a similar degree of occupational commitment will have higher quality of life than those who do not.

3) Couples in which women have greater occupational status will not have lower quality of life if they are well-educated.

4) Couples' quality of life and marital satisfaction may be affected by their egalitarianism.

5) Couples' degree of work and family involvement will effect their quality of life, such that couples in which both partners are highly family involved versus both partners being highly work involved (using Hall and Hall's, 1979, categorization of dual earner couples), will have better quality of life and marital satisfaction.

6.3 Work-Family Interface

1) Men and women who are high in both work and family salience will have experience spillover between work and marital role quality. Secondly, marital satisfaction and quality of work life will have a positive interactive effect on quality of life for those high in work salience - indicating spillover as opposed to
segmentation or compensation. This is tested for individuals and across couples. The present study tests for spillover in four different subgroups of the sample, namely, career and family accommodated people, professionals, males and females. The first two groups are tested because of their high work salience and hence their greater likelihood of experiencing spillover. Secondly, males and females are analyzed separately because previous studies have found sex differences in these relationships.

2) Work-family conflict will differ such that parenting and the career stages of establishment and maintenance will be times of greatest work-family conflict. Couples who are in the establishment and maintenance career stages will have greater work-family conflict than those couples in which at least one partner is not in these highly committed career stages.

3) Acrobat couples will have greatest work-family conflict because they seek perfection in both work and family followed by adversary couples. Ally and accommodator couples are predicted to have low levels of work-family conflict. The present study also compared levels of work-family conflict for couples with different levels of work commitment, egalitarianism and occupational status.
CHAPTER SEVEN: METHOD

7.1 Subjects

The sample were dual earner couples from a New Zealand tertiary educational institution. Dual earners were defined for this study as couples in which both partners were in full-time employment. The sample included de-facto couples because ten percent of people in their twenties are living in de facto marriages (Davey & Mills, 1989). At least one person from each couple worked at the tertiary educational centre. They were all full-time, white-collar workers except for two blue-collar workers.

Questionnaires were returned by 79 couples and 6 individuals. A demographic breakdown showed that there were 82 males and 82 female respondents. Table 1 lists the demographic characteristics of the sample.

Table 1  Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 yrs</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 yrs plus</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 yrs plus</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 yrs plus</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 yrs plus</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - 34,000 plus</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35 - 44,000 plus</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45 - 54,000 plus</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000 plus</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some tertiary</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree/Diploma</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNGEST CHILD'S AGE</td>
<td>No child</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 18</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 12</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 6</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME</td>
<td>No child</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 children</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The sample size may differ in parts because of missing data. The percentages may not necessarily add up to 100% due to rounding error.

There is a discrepancy in Table 1 in that 56.1% of subjects said they had no children at home in the 'Youngest Child's Age' measure whereas 56.7% of subjects said they had no child at home in the 'Number of Children at Home' measure. This occurred because 69 people stated that they had children at home but 72 people filled in ages of their youngest child living at home. The three respondents responsible for this discrepancy reported that their youngest child living at home was over eighteen and as such it is likely that they did not report their child in the 'number of children at home' because they categorized their child as an adult.
Subjects were selected by systematic random sampling at a New Zealand tertiary educational centre. It is acknowledged that this source of subjects limits the generalizability of the results. The fact that the questionnaire had to be completed by working couples required that the sample not be wholly random (otherwise the response rate would be too small). There are approximately 1700 workers at the institution. An attempt was made to call every second person in the institution’s telephone directory which resulted in 608 people being telephoned over a five day period. The fact that 608 people, rather than 850 people were contacted due to many people being unavailable when telephoned - some were away on study leave, others on sick leave. Following explanations about the purpose of the study and the criteria for selection of subjects, questionnaires and information sheets were distributed to the 166 couples interested in participating (reasons given for not participating were: single, partner was unemployed, partner worked part-time, partner was away, lack of time, intention to be away at the time the questionnaire would be sent, lack of interest).

There was a response return rate of 49 percent. Six of the questionnaires were returned by only one partner in each couple and were therefore only used for appropriate analyses - questionnaires with missing data were dealt with similarly. Four people did not complete the Adult Career Concerns Inventory (ACCI) and several people said they found the questions in the ACCI repetitious. Subjects may have felt uncomfortable about some questions: Four men did not complete the section on Marital Satisfaction.

7.2 Materials

Questionnaire
A questionnaire was used to collect data because it places less pressure on the respondent for an immediate response, and the anonymity of the procedure encourages respondents to be freer in expressing their views. As the questionnaire was mailed, the researcher did not directly interact with the respondent, and therefore
there was less likelihood that she would prejudice the results. Furthermore, the questionnaire provides objective information which is relatively simple to score. The questionnaire was fourteen pages long and took approximately 45 minutes to complete. Diverse outcome measures were used to better measure the effects of different variables on the work/home interaction on workers, their partners/families and employing organizations.

The Couple Questionnaire (refer to Appendix A) was constructed by combining several measures: Career Planning/Support, Job Involvement, Family Involvement, Career Priority, Occupational Commitment, Quality of Work Life, Marital Satisfaction, Quality of Life, Work-Family Conflict, Life-Style Commitment and the Adult Career Concerns Inventory.

Demographic variables
The demographic variables of age, sex, highest level of education achieved and income were elicited by single answer questions. To assess if number of children was in any way related to career concerns, respondents were asked the number of children they had, and the age of their youngest child. Age of youngest child was coded according to a scheme outlined by Bedeian, Burke and Moffett (1988) of, no children, youngest child over 18, youngest child between 13 and 18, youngest child between 6 and 12, youngest child under 6, which represents increasing parental demands. It was unnecessary to question whether subjects had access to child-care because there was a creche at the institute. Subjects were given seven occupational categories (including 'other') to choose from, and these were then dichotomized into 'professional/managerial' and 'non-professional' categories (see Appendix A).

Career Planning/Support
This two item measure (7 point scale), by Steffy and Jones (1988), asks to what extent one's partner supports and discusses one's career. In the present study career planning/support had a mean of 3.7, a standard deviation of .87 and an alpha coefficient of .71 was obtained.
Job Involvement
Blau, Paul and St John's (1993) cumulative results suggested that Kanungo's (1982) scale be reduced from 10 to 7. Therefore, job involvement was measured using 7 item scale. Each item was measured on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 6 being 'strongly agree'. An example of an item in the measure is 'I like to absorbed in my job most of the time'. Blau, Paul and St John (1993) found a mean of 24.4, standard deviation of 6.8 and alpha of .91 on the Kanungo (1982) scale. In the present study an alpha coefficient of .85 was obtained. Kanungo's (1982) scale was used because Blau (1985) found that it is uni-dimensional and a purer measure of psychological identity than Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) measure of job involvement.

Family Involvement
Family involvement was measured using four items (Prone & Rice, 1987) similar to those in the job involvement scale. Each item was measured on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being, 'strongly disagree' and 7 being 'strongly agree'. An example of an item is, 'To me my family role is only a small part of who I am'. In the present study an alpha coefficient of .81 was obtained.

Career Priority
Career priority was assessed by the following single item measure, on a five point scale, 'How important is your career relative to your partner's?' A low score indicates that one gives one's own career priority over one's spouse's career.

Occupational Commitment
Occupational commitment was measured using 11 items, rated on a scale of 1 to 6 (strongly disagree to strongly agree), from Blau's (1988) measure of career commitment, Gould's (1979) measure of career involvement and Sekaran's (1982) measure of career salience, as used by Blau, Paul and St John (1989). An example of the items is "If I could, I would go into a different occupation". Blau, Paul and St John (1993) found an alpha of .91. In the present study an alpha coefficient of .88 was obtained.
Quality of Work Life
Quality of Work Life (Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, 1975) measures job-related well-being and the extent to which work experiences are rewarding, fulfilling and devoid of stress and other negative consequences. Respondents are asked to "rate how you see yourself on a scale of 1 to 7", on for example, "successful". One item was dropped here (risky-cautious), leaving eight items, following the example of Higgins and Duxbury (1992) because it has been found to lack relevance to the scales. An alpha coefficient of .83 was obtained in the present study.

Marital Satisfaction
This is a six item measure of marital satisfaction developed by Rusbalt (1982, cited in Gould and Werbel, 1983) which questioned the degree to which respondents were satisfied with their marriage and spouse. An example of the items is "To what extent are you satisfied with your current relationship?". Each item was rated on a scale of 1 to 9, with 1 being 'not at all' and 9 being 'extremely'. Gould and Werbel (1983) found an alpha coefficient of .86 as did Steffy and Jones (1988). In the present study an alpha coefficient of .90 was obtained.

Quality of Life
This measure was devised by Quinn and Staines (1979, cited in Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian & Mossholder, 1989). It consists of eight bipolar scales on life satisfaction and two bipolar scales on happiness. Respondents are requested to 'indicate how you feel about your present life, generally' on eight bipolar items, scaled from 1 to 7. An example of the items is, 'interesting versus not interesting'. Secondly, they are asked to rate their present state of happiness and satisfaction with life (See Appendix A). It is scored by averaging and standardizing the 8 bipolar scales on life satisfaction, averaging and standardizing the last two items and then averaging and standardizing these two component scores. In the present study an alpha coefficient of .76 was obtained.
Work-Family Conflict

Kopelman, Greenhaus and Connolly (1983) developed this seven item, true/false measure of the extent of an individual's work-family conflict. An example of the items is "My work schedule often conflicts with my family life". Van Eck Peluchette (1993) obtained a reliability estimate of .89 for this measure. An alpha coefficient of .75 was obtained in the present study.

Life-Style Commitment/ Most satisfying facet

Goldsen, Rosenberg, Williams and Suchman (1960; cited in Glenn & McLanahan, 1982) used a two item measure which asks the respondent to pick the two items that give him/her the most satisfaction out of life. The areas given to choose from are: your career or occupation; family relations; leisure time, recreational activities, religious beliefs or activities, participation in affairs of the community; participation in activities directed toward national or international betterment; running a home; other. Using this measure respondents can be placed into five categories which reflect approaches to balancing major spheres of life: family-directed (family most important life goal and any other goal except career, second most important); family-accommodated (family most important life goal and career second most important); career-accommodated (career most important life goal and family second most important); career directed (career most important life goal and any other goal except family second most important; and other directed (neither family nor career as most important).

Couples were categorized according to Hall and Hall's (1980) system of accommodators, adversaries, allies and acrobats, using the 'Life-style Commitment' measure (Goldsen, Rosenberg, Williams & Suchman, 1960, cited in Glenn and McLanahan, 1982). There were 16 accommodator couples, 4 adversary couples, 23 ally couples and 11 acrobat couples in this sample. Twenty five of the couples did not fit into these categories and were therefore not used in the analyses involving these variables.
Accommodator couples were defined as couples in which one partner derived greatest satisfaction/salience from their job and did not cite family as the second most important source of satisfaction, and their partner derived greatest satisfaction/salience from their family and did not cite their job as their second most important source of satisfaction.

Adversary couples were defined as couples in which both partners derived greatest satisfaction/salience from their work and did not cite family as their second most important source of satisfaction.

Ally couples were defined as couples in which both partners derived greatest satisfaction/salience from their family and did not cite their work as their second most important source of satisfaction.

Acrobat couples were defined as couples in which both partners derived greatest satisfaction/salience from their work and family roles.

Karambayya and Reilly (1992) note that Hall and Hall’s (1979,1980) categories of acrobats, adversaries, allies and accommodators have not been independently confirmed, using either alternative methodology or a different data set.

**Adult Career Concerns Inventory (ACCI)**

Conceptualizations of life-span career development based on solely age-related stages or transitions will likely be less useful than those that allow for individual variation in timing and sequencing of career and family events (Swanson, 1992) and therefore the ACCI was used in the present study. This inventory assesses an individual’s awareness of and concern with various tasks of career development (usually used for vocational guidance). The ACCI is a measure of attitudes deemed essential to career and vocational adaptability and is designed to assess planfulness and foresight in thinking ahead about one’s work and working life. The survey consists of a total of 60 items, each of which describes a potential career concern. Each item is rated as of from 1 'no concern’ to 5 'great concern’ (Refer to Appendix A). There are 15 items
that describe career concerns for each of Super's (1980) four stages, exploration, establishment, maintenance and disengagement. Scores for the 15 items were averaged and respondents were classified as being in the stage in which their average response was closest to three. In some cases, respondents could not be categorized due to missing data or their scores falling equally close to three in more than one stage. Cases which fell equally close to three in more than one stage were classified by inspection of their answer to item 61 in the ACCI which describes whether or not they are considering a career change and their age. Validity for the Career Concern Inventory - Adult Form (Super, Zelkowitz & Thompson, 1981) has been assessed by Zelkowitz (1974), Super and Kidd (1979), Super, Zelkowitz and Thompson, (1981), Hall (1985), Slocum and Cron (1985), and Stout, Slocum, and Cron (1988).

Ornstein and Isabella (1990) conducted a principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine the factor structure associated with the four scales. The factors that resulted from this analysis accounted for 51.5% of the variance. Items loaded heavily on the factors associated with the appropriate career stage. Internal consistency reliabilities for the subscales were exploration, alpha coefficient = .95; establishment, alpha coefficient .92; maintenance, alpha coefficient = .91. In the present study internal consistency reliabilities for the subscales were exploration, alpha coefficient = .96; establishment, alpha coefficient = .95; maintenance, alpha coefficient = .95; disengagement, alpha coefficient = .92. The alpha coefficient for the whole ACCI in the present study was .97 which indicates that there may be a problem with the distinctiveness of each career stage.

7.3 Procedure

The research proposal and questionnaire for the present study were approved by the Ethics Committee at the institution concerned. Confidentiality was absolute in that questionnaires had matching code numbers rather than names, and were returned by mail rather than personally handed over to the researcher. Information sheets were sent out with the questionnaires and as informed consent was implicit in that people
could refuse to return questionnaires, no consent form was used. Personal information was kept to a minimum and there was no reason to think that completing the questionnaire would be psychologically disturbing to participants.

The format and content of the questionnaire was pretested on ten couples selected from the same population as used in the main study. None of the ten couples were used in the main study. As a result of this pilot study of two measures were removed to shorten the length of the questionnaire as they were not directly relevant.

Two copies of the questionnaire and information sheet (refer to Appendix A) were sent to each couple with matching codes (ensuring confidentiality and enabling partner’s questionnaire to be identified) for each partner, and they were given separate envelopes in which to return them. Couples were requested not to communicate with each other (with regard to the questionnaire) until the questionnaires were sealed and sent. Couples were given three weeks in which to return the questionnaire. Reminders were not sent out, as it was impossible due to the anonymity of the respondents. Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Norusis, 1988) as described in Chapter Eight. Feedback will be given to subjects in an organizational magazine.
CHAPTER EIGHT: RESULTS

Two system files were created for analysis of data. Each variable in the first system file applied to the entire sample. The data file listed males and their partners consecutively and from this a second system file was created containing separate variables for males and females such that couples could be matched up to compute couple variables. For example, a dichotomous variable of dual earner versus dual career couple was created by matching up partners who were both professionals versus couples in which one partner was not a professional.

Prior to analysis, all the variables used in the Couples Questionnaire were examined using the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) for accuracy of data entry, missing values, outliers and fit between their distributions and the assumptions of multivariate analysis.

Missing Data
In view of the fact that there were not many variables with missing data, cases were simply deleted from analyses where appropriate. Substitution of means for missing values was not used because this would have caused a loss of variance. There were two missing cases for Education, two for Life-Style, four for Marital Satisfaction, one for Quality of Work Life, two for Career Priority, one for Occupational Commitment, two for Family Involvement and four for the Adult Career Concerns Inventory. The four respondents who did not complete the Marital Satisfaction measure were male, three of whom were professionals. Three of the four subjects’ missing data on the Adult Career Concerns Inventory were from male professionals between the ages of 45 years and 55 years, the fourth subject who had missing data on the Adult Career Concerns Inventory was a female professional. There was insufficient missing data to warrant testing for a trend.

Analysis of Data
Occupation was split into a dichotomous variable: professional/managerial and other occupations (a split of 106 to 60) because it did not follow a normal distribution.
the same reason 'Number of children' was split into a dichotomous variable of children and no children (71 to 93 split).

Normality was checked both statistically and graphically. To reduce extreme skewness and kurtosis several variables were transformed. Quality of Work Life and Quality of Life had substantial positive skewness and were therefore logarithmically transformed. There was a significant correlation between Quality of Life and the transformed Quality of Life, $r(153) = .98, p<.001$ and a significant correlation between Quality of Work Life and the transformed Quality of Work Life, $r(153) = .98, p<.001$. Marital Satisfaction had substantial negative skewness and was therefore reflected and renamed Marital Dissatisfaction. There was a significant correlation between Marital Satisfaction and Marital Dissatisfaction, $r(153) = -.96, p<.001$. Transformation of these variables resulted in normality of distribution.

The Age of Youngest Child measure had a slight skewness of .77 ($SE = .19$) it was not transformed as the scale would lose its meaning. Similarly, Income had a negative kurtosis of -1.56 ($SE = .38$) and was left untransformed because otherwise the scale would lose its meaning.

Numerous statistical analyses were conducted using the same core variables, increasing the possibility of Type I error. Grove and Andreason (1982) write that applying t-tests to 100 variables simultaneously at the .05 significance level will give positive results for an average of five variables by chance alone. However, Rothman (1986) argues that significant results found when doing multiple t-tests are not found by chance and hence are not Type I errors as suggested by Grove and Andreason (1982). Moreover, by making the screening criterion for statistical significance more stringent, it is possible that real significant differences may go undetected resulting in Type II error (Rothman, 1986). Following Rothman's (1986) advice the stringency for statistical significance was not raised above .05. All t-tests used pooled variance estimates, except where otherwise mentioned.

ANOVAs using Hall and Hall's (1979) typology of Accommodator, Ally, Acrobat
and Adversary couples were unable to compare Adversary couples as a separate unit because there were only 4 Adversary couples. Similarly, there were only 6 people over 55 years of Age. Whenever Age was used as a variable in an ANOVA people in the over 55 Age group were collapsed into the over 45 Age group. Following this recoding Age remained normal.

Post hoc Scheffe tests were used to determine which pairs of sample means differed significantly following significant ANOVAs. The Scheffe test was used instead of the Tukey test because the cell sizes were not equal in any of the significant ANOVAs. The Scheffe test requires larger differences between means for significance than most other methods (Chase, 1984) thus reducing the possibility of non-significant differences being declared significant.

Chi-square tests were used to analyze non-normal variables, such as Age of Youngest Child. Previous studies have noted that a cell size of at least five is recommended in cross-tabulations but Norusis (1988) found that recent studies suggest that this is too stringent. In the present study the lowest cell sizes were those of people whose youngest child living at home was either under six or over eighteen years of age - eleven respondents in each. Therefore although these cell sizes are small they do not invalidate the results.

All multi-item measures had acceptable internal consistency reliabilities exceeding .7, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha coefficient.

8.1 Work Commitment

**Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement as a function of Career Stage and Age**

Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement were positively associated, $r(163) = .37, p<.001$, but this correlation was not high enough to cause concern about redundancy.
ANOVAs showed that Job Involvement did not differ by Career Stage for males and females (separately). There was a significant difference in males' Occupational Commitment, $F(3,76) = 4.73, p<.01$ (Refer to Appendix B, Table B1) and in females' Occupational Commitment, $F(3,76) = 6.28, p<.01$ (Refer to Appendix B, Table B2) by Career Stage.

For both males and females, Occupational Commitment was significantly greater in the Maintenance Stage than in the Exploration Stage. Furthermore, women in the Maintenance Stage had significantly greater Occupational Commitment than women in the Disengagement Stage. As there were only 7 males and only 9 females in the 'under 25' Age group (The smallest cell size for Career Stage was 12 males in the Exploration stage and 12 males in the Disengagement Stage) it was not possible to test for Age differences in Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement separately for males and females. Secondly, as the results for males and females were not contrary the researcher decided to analyses the relationships between Age, Career Stage, Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement for the sample as a whole.

An ANOVA showed that Occupational Commitment was significantly different over Career Stages, $F(3,156) = 10.6, p<.01$ and over Age Groups, $F(3,156) = 3.30, p<.05$ - for males and females together (tabulated in Appendix B, Tables B3, B4). The strength of the relationship between Occupational Commitment and Career Stages was very weak, $\eta^2 = .02$, with a slight improvement for Age Group on Occupational Commitment, $\eta^2 = .06$. Mean frequency scores were calculated for each of the four Age groups and four Career Stages (Refer to Figures 3 & 4). Comparisons were made using the post hoc Scheffe multiple comparison procedure as to the frequency with which levels of Occupational Commitment occurred for each Age group and Career Stage. People in the Establishment Stage and people in the Maintenance Stage had significantly greater Occupational Commitment than people in the Exploration Stage. People in the Maintenance Stage had significantly greater Occupational Commitment than people in the Establishment and Disengagement Stages. In terms of age groups, Occupational Commitment was significantly lower in the 25-34 Age group than the 45-plus Age group.
Figure 3  Mean Occupational Commitment over Super's Career Stages

Figure 4  Mean Occupational Commitment over Age Groups
There was a significant interaction effect of Age and Career Stage on Occupational Commitment, $F(9,150) = 2.00, p<.01$. An inspection of Figures 3 and 4 shows that this occurred because people under 35 years of age had similar Occupational Commitment to those in the Disengagement Stage.

One-way ANOVAs found that there were significant differences in Job Involvement over Super's Career Stages, $F(3,156) = 3.16, p<.05$ (Refer to Appendix B, Table B5), and over Age groups, $F(3,160) = 2.7, p<.05$ (Refer to Appendix B, Table B6).

However, the strength of the relationship between Career Stage and Job Involvement was weak, $\eta^2 = .02$ as was that between Age Group and Job Involvement, $\eta^2 = .05$. Mean frequency scores were calculated for each of the four Age groups and four Career Stages (Refer to Figures 5 & 6). Comparisons were made using the post hoc Scheffe multiple comparison procedure, showed that there were no significant differences in Job Involvement between the Age Groups (this occurred because the Post hoc Scheffe test is more stringent than the ANOVA) but that Job Involvement was significantly greater in Super's Exploration Stage than in his Maintenance Stage.
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**Figure 5** Mean Job Involvement over Super's Career Stages
Figure 6  Mean Job Involvement over Age Groups

Effects of Parenting on Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement

It was hypothesized that there would be no differences between Parents and Non-Parents in Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement but results indicated that Parenting did have an effect on women's Occupational Commitment. Contrary to expectations, mothers had significantly greater Occupational Commitment than women without children, \( t(77) = 2.52, p<.01 \) (Refer to Table 2). Age, Education, Career Stage and Income were entered as possible covariates in the relationship and there was no longer any significant difference between mothers' and non-mothers' Occupational Commitment. Income was the only significant covariate but Age needed to be added as a covariate as well in order for the difference in Occupational Commitment between mothers and non-mothers to disappear. Income and Age uniquely adjusted the Occupational Commitment scores, \( F(2,79) = 6.63, p<.01 \) (Refer to Appendix B, Table B7). A post hoc separate variance t-test revealed that mothers were significantly older than women without children, \( t(76.43) = 3.28, p<.01 \) (Refer to Table 2). There was no significant difference in Income between mothers and women without children.
Table 2  Univariate Statistics for Parenting Differences in Occupational Commitment and Age for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NON-MOTHER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUP.COMMIT</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCCUP.COMMIT = Occupational Commitment

Mean Job Involvement scores were not significantly different between Parents and Non-Parents, nor by Age of Youngest Child for either men or women.

Effects of Sex on Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement

A chi-square on a cross-tabulation showed that there was no significant difference in the number of men and women who were professionals versus non-professionals.

Males had significantly greater Occupational Commitment, t(161) = 2.12, p<.05, and significantly greater Job Involvement, t(162) = 3.23, p<.01 than females (Refer to Table 3 for further details). However, as the previous results had indicated that Age and Career Stage moderated Job Involvement and Occupational Commitment they needed to be added to this equation to get a more realistic picture of the existence of Sex differences. Secondly, previous research has shown Education and Income to be related to Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement and they were therefore entered into the equation.

It was found that Sex no longer had a significant effect on Occupational Commitment when Education, Income, Career Stage and Age were entered into the model as covariates. As Income and Career Stage were the only significant
covariates, another ANCOVA was run without Education, Parenting and Age in order to increase power (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Income uniquely adjusted the Occupational Commitment scores, $F(1,158) = 16.47, p< .01$ as did Career Stage, $F(1,158) = 4.76, p<.05$ (tabulated in Appendix B, Table B8). Post hoc analyses revealed that there were no Sex differences in Career Stage but that men had significantly greater Income than women, $\chi^2(4, N = 164) = 21.87, p<.01$.

Furthermore, Occupational Commitment is significantly greater for those in the $55,000 plus Income bracket than for those in the $25,000 plus - $35,000 Income bracket, $F(4,158) = 5.09, p<.01$ (Refer to Appendix B, Table B9).

Similarly, an ANCOVA examined Sex as a main effect on Job Involvement with Education, Income, Career Stage and Age as covariates. The covariates Education, Career Stage and Age were not significant individually, but together with Income they contributed significantly to the relationship between Sex and Job Involvement, $F(3,157) = 7.23, p<.01$ (post hoc chi-square and t-tests revealed that there were no Sex differences in Education, Career Stage and Age). A second ANCOVA was run with Income as the only covariate and in this case Sex had no significant main effect on Job Involvement. Income uniquely adjusted the Job Involvement scores, $F(1,162) = 19.43, p<.01$, (tabulated in Appendix B, Table B10). Furthermore, Job Involvement is significantly greater for those in the $55,000 plus Income bracket than for those under $35,000, $F(4,159) = 5.10, p<.01$ (Refer to Appendix B, Table B11).
Table 3  Univariate Statistics for Sex Differences in Work Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUP.COMMIT</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCCUP.COMMIT = Occupational Commitment

Effect of Life-Style on Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement

The majority of the sample put Family First in their lives (39.5%) and 31.6% were Family Accommodated (that is, family was the greatest source of satisfaction with work as the second greatest source of satisfaction) and a chi-square test found no significant Sex difference in this Life-Style variable.

There were significant differences in Occupational Commitment between the four Life-Styles, $F(3,103) = 7.32, p<.01$ (tabulated in Appendix B, Table B12). A post hoc Scheffe test was used to identify where these differences lay. Means in Occupational Commitment increased from Family First to Family Accommodated to Career Accommodated to Career First, as would be expected. The only significant difference in Occupational Commitment was in the Career First individuals who had greater Occupational Commitment than Family First individuals, indicating that one can place great salience on both family and career without decreasing one's Occupational Commitment significantly.

There were significant differences in Job Involvement between the four Life-Styles, $F(3,103) = 9.24, p<.01$ (tabulated in Appendix B, Table B13), in the expected direction. A post hoc Scheffe test indicated that individuals who put Family First had significantly less Job Involvement than the other three groups. There were no other
significant differences indicating that one can place great salience on both family and career without decreasing one’s Job Involvement significantly.

**Effect of Partner’s Work Commitment on own Work Commitment**

Prior to comparing Professionals’ Work Commitment in Dual Earner versus Dual Career Couples it was necessary to confirm that Professionals have greater Job Involvement and Occupational Commitment than non-Professionals. Professionals had significantly greater Occupational Commitment, \( t(161) = 2.97, p<.01 \), and significantly greater Job Involvement, \( t(162) = 3.53, p<.01 \) than Non-Professionals (Refer to Table 4).

Generally one’s partner’s occupational status had no impact on one’s work commitment. A two-way t-test, found that Professional Women in Dual Career couples had significantly greater Job Involvement, \( (M = 21.54, n = 37, SD = 6.20) \) than Professional Women in Dual Earner couples \( (M = 16.61, n = 26, SD = 5.85), t(61) = 3.18, p<.01 \). There were no other significant differences in Occupational Commitment or Job Involvement between Professionals (male or female) in Dual Earner couples versus Dual Career couples, as was expected. There was no significant difference in Job Involvement between partners of Professional women in Dual Earner Couples and Dual Career Couples. There was no significant difference in Job Involvement or Occupational Commitment between Professional women in Traditional versus Egalitarian couples - but this result must be treated with caution because there were only 8 Professional women in Traditional couples group.

Traditional couples were defined as couples in which the male’s career was given priority over the female’s career. Egalitarian couples were defined as couples in which partners gave equal priority to their own and partner’s career, as well as couples in which the female’s career was given priority over the male’s career (there were nine couples in which the female’s career was given priority). There were 20 traditional couples and 58 egalitarian couples in this sample. Sixty five percent of traditional couples were dual earner couples and 49.3% of egalitarian couples were dual earner couples.
The second measure of egalitarianism used was Career Support. Professional men perceived greater Career Support than non-Professional men, $r(79) = -.26, p<.01$. Similarly, Professional women perceived greater Career Support than non-Professional women, $r(79) = -.38, p<.001$. There was no significant difference in Career Support between Professional women in Dual Career versus Dual Earner couples. However, Career Support is only significantly associated with Occupational Commitment, $r(163) = .24, p<.001$ and not Job Involvement which may be why there is a decrease in Dual Earner Professional women’s Job Involvement.

Table 4  Univariate Statistics for Professionals versus Non-Professionals in Work Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>NON-PROFESSIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUP.COMMIT</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>43.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCCUP.COMMIT = Occupational Commitment

8.2 Quality of Life

Age, Parenting and Quality of Life

Data was screened for the potential confounding influence of Occupation and Sex by inspection of correlations but there were no significant correlations between either of these variables and Quality of Life.

An ANOVA showed that there were no significant differences in Quality of Life over different Ages, and therefore this variable did not have to be controlled for in the following analyses on Quality of Life.
A t-test demonstrated no significant difference between Parents and Non-Parents (male or female) on Quality of Life for both males and females. There was no difference in Quality of Life with respect to Age of Youngest Child. In other words, Quality of Life did not appear to follow a particular cycle.

**Effect of Couples’ Life-Style on Quality of Life and Marital Dissatisfaction**

There were no significant correlations between one’s partner’s Occupational Commitment, Job Involvement or Family Involvement and one’s Marital Dissatisfaction nor one’s Quality of Life.

An ANOVA showed no significant differences in Quality of Life between couples in which both partners had a similar levels of Occupational Commitment versus those couples in which both partners had widely different levels of Occupational Commitment (Occupational Commitment difference within couples was divided into three approximately equal sized groups).

ANOVA showed no significant difference in Quality of Life and Marital Dissatisfaction between men and women in Ally versus Accommodator versus Acrobat couples. In other words, both members of a couple could be highly involved in career and family (Acrobat) or only highly involved in family (Allies) and this made no difference to either Quality of Life or Marital Dissatisfaction.

T-tests revealed no significant differences in mean Quality of Life score for men and women in Traditional versus Egalitarian couples nor in Dual Career versus Dual Earner Couples. There was no difference in male or female Quality of Life between Dual Earner couples in which the female was the Professional versus the male being the Professional.

**8.3 Work-Family Interface**

Marital Dissatisfaction and Quality of Work Life did not differ significantly by Age
nor by Career Stage (on computation of ANOVAs), nor by Parenting (for men or women). Similarly, the composite variable, Marital Dissatisfaction * Quality of Work Life did not differ significantly by Age, Career Stage or Parenting. Therefore Age, Career Stage and Parenting were not controlled for in the following analyses.

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were run for a Family Accommodated and Career Accommodated group as they were theoretically more likely to experience a spillover effect as they have high salience in both domains. There was a significant association between Quality of Work Life and Marital Dissatisfaction, $r(49) = .43$, $p<.01$ for Family Accommodated and Career Accommodated people, indicating an apparent compensation effect between work and marital spheres. Hierarchical multiple regression was employed to determine if addition of the interaction term Quality of Work Life * Marital Dissatisfaction improved prediction of Quality of Life beyond that afforded by differences in Marital Dissatisfaction and Quality of Work Life. The component variables, Marital Dissatisfaction and Quality of Work Life were transformed into 'deviation from the mean' scores in order to prevent multicollinearity problems as suggested by Cohen and Cohen (1983). Table 6 displays the correlations between the independent variables and Quality of Life, the unstandardized regression coefficients, the standardized regression coefficients, the increments in $R^2$, and $R$, $R^2$, and adjusted $R^2$. As shown in Table 6, addition of the interaction effect did not reliably improve $R^2$. In other word, there was no Quality of Work Life * Marital Dissatisfaction interaction and both variables had independent effects on Quality of Life. In other words, there was no Quality of Work Life * Marital Dissatisfaction interaction and both variables had independent effects on Quality of Life.
Table 6  Hierarchical Regression of Work and Marital Role Quality variables and the Interaction of Role Quality variables on Quality of Life for Career Accommodated and Family Accommodated people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$ (incremental)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF WORK LIFE</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTION</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .45$

Adjusted $R^2 = .41$

$R = .67$

$n = 50$

** $p<.001$

An interaction effect of Quality of Work Life and Marital Dissatisfaction on Quality of Life was tested as previous studies have found that a spillover effect is more likely to occur when an area is highly salient as work is for Professionals. There was a significant positive association between Quality of Work Life and Marital Dissatisfaction for Professionals, $r(103) = .30$ $p<.01$, suggesting a compensatory effect. A similar hierarchical regression analysis procedure to that used in the previous analysis was applied and the results are displayed in Table 7. Again, addition of the interaction effect did not reliably improve $R^2$. Thus, Quality of Work Life and Marital Dissatisfaction only had independent effects on Quality of Life for Professionals.
Table 7  Hierarchical Regression of Marital and Work Role Quality variables and the Interaction of Role Quality variables on Quality of Life for Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF WORK LIFE</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTION</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .43
Adjusted R² = .41
R = .65

n = 103
** p<.001

There was a significant positive association between Marital Dissatisfaction and Quality of Work Life for males, r(78) = .30, p<.01 and, r(82) = .32, p<.01, for females. Therefore, hierarchical multiple regressions were run separately on males and females to check for sex differences in the work-family interface. Table 8 shows the results of the hierarchical regression for males and Table 9 for females. As shown in Tables 8 and 9, addition of the interaction effect did not reliably improve R². Quality of Work Life and Marital Dissatisfaction only had independent effects on Quality of Life for both males and females. However, it is noted that interaction effect of Marital Dissatisfaction * Quality of Work Life was closer to reaching significance in the case of the females in the sample (p = .09).
Table 8  Hierarchical Regression of Marital and Work Role Quality variables and the Interaction of Role Quality variables on Quality of Life for Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$ (incremental)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF WORK LIFE</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTION</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .34$

Adjusted $R^2 = .31$

$R = .58$

$n = 78$

** $p < .001$
Table 9  Hierarchical Regression of Marital and Work Role Quality variables and the Interaction of Role Quality variables on Quality of Life for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF WORK LIFE</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTION</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Р² = .40
Adjusted Р² = .38
R = .64

There were no significant correlations between one’s partner’s Quality of Work Life and one’s own Marital Dissatisfaction (that is, no spillover or compensatory effect) and there was therefore no point in testing whether an interaction of these variables predicted Quality of Life.

Secondly, the present study looked at the interaction between work and family in terms of Work-Family Conflict. T-tests showed no significant Sex differences in Work-Family Conflict.

Developmental Aspect to Work-Family Conflict
A factorial ANOVA showed that Work-Family Conflict did not differ by Age, nor by Career Stage.
There were no significant differences in Work-Family Conflict for couples in the same versus different Career Stages. Couples in which both partners were in either the Establishment or Maintenance Career Stage (highest occupational commitment and job involvement) were compared with couples in which only one or neither of the partners were in these two stages.

T-tests showed no significant difference in Work-Family Conflict between Parents and Non-Parents. There were significant differences in Work-Family Conflict by Age of Youngest Child, $\chi^2(4, N = 162) = 11.08, p<.05$. Unexpectedly, a Kruskall-Wallis test showed that the greatest mean ranking of Work-Family Conflict was for Parents whose Youngest Child was in the '13-18' Age Group followed by that of Couples with No Children and the lowest Work-Family Conflict mean rank rating was for Parents' whose Youngest Child was Under 6.

**Relationship between Couples’ Life-Styles and Work-Family Conflict**

Contrary to expectations, Quality of Work Life was not significantly associated with Work-Family Conflict. There was no difference in Work-Family Conflict between Career Accommodated, Career First, Family First and Family Accommodated individuals.

Prior to comparing Accommodator, Ally and Acrobat couples in Work-Family Conflict, analyses were run in order to determine whether or not they differed in degree of Occupational Commitment and Job Involvement as this knowledge would add to the explanatory power of any differences found. There were significant differences in males' Occupational Commitment, $F(2,47) = 3.70, p<.05$ and in females' Occupational Commitment, $F(2,47) = 5.00, p<.01$, between Accommodator versus Ally versus Acrobat couples (Appendix B, Tables B14 and B15). However the association between Occupational Commitment and these three types of couples was fairly weak, $\hat{\eta}^2 = .14$ for men and $\hat{\eta}^2 = .18$ for women. A post hoc Scheffe test revealed that men and women had significantly greater Occupational Commitment in Acrobat couples than in Ally couples as would be expected (Refer to Figure 7).
Similarly, there were significant differences in Job Involvement for men in Accommodator versus Ally versus Acrobat couples, $F(2,47) = 5.18, p<.01$ and for women, $F(2,47) = 5.42, p<.01$ (Appendix B, Tables B16, B17). Again there was a fairly weak association between Job Involvement and the above mentioned couple types for males, $\eta^2 = .18$ and females, $\eta^2 = .19$. Post hoc Scheffe tests revealed that men and women in Acrobat couples had significantly greater Job Involvement than men and women in Ally couples (Refer to Figure 8).
Figure 8  Mean Job Involvement for Males and Females in Accommodator, Ally and Acrobat Couples

An ANOVA found no significant differences in Work-Family Conflict between Accommodator Couples, Ally Couples and Acrobat Couples. A t-test showed that men in Accommodator and Ally Couples ($M = 9.15, n = 39, SD = 1.83$) had significantly less Work-Family Conflict than Adversary and Acrobat Couples, ($M = 10.27, n = 15, SD = 1.39$), $t(52) = -2.13, p<.01$ as expected. However, no significant difference was found in women’s mean Work-Family Conflict between Accommodator and Ally Couples versus Adversary and Acrobat Couples.

It was hypothesized that couples who were similar in terms of Occupational Commitment would have less Work-Family Conflict than those who were dissimilar but the present study found no significant difference in mean Work-Family Conflict score between large and small differences in Occupational Commitment within couples (the difference in Occupational Commitment within partners was divided into three approximately equal sized groups of great difference, medium difference and small difference), controlling for male’s and female’s Education. There was a negative association between women’s Work-Family Conflict and their partners’
Occupational Commitment, $r(72) = -.29, p<.01$, as expected.

It was hypothesized that there would be differences in Work-Family Conflict between Egalitarian Couples and Traditional Couples. Men in Traditional couples had significantly lower Work-Family Conflict ($M = 8.75, n = 20, SD = 1.89$) than men in Egalitarian couples ($M = 9.79, n = 57, SD = 1.73$) on mean Work-Family Conflict, $t(75) = -2.26, p<.05$ but there was no significant effect for women.

Men who were members of dual earner couples versus men who were members of dual career couples did not have significantly different Work-Family Conflict. However, women in Dual Career Couples ($M = 8.35, n = 37, SD = 1.96$) had significantly less Work-Family Conflict than women in Dual Earner Couples ($M = 10.10, n = 42, SD = .26$), $t(77) = -4.22, p<.01$. Further t-tests showed no differences in Work-Family Conflict for Professional versus Non-Professional women in Dual Earner Couples but this could have been due to small sample size (8 professionals, 34 non-professionals).
CHAPTER NINE: DISCUSSION

The present study was based on the assumption that affective reactions and behaviours of individual members of dual earner couples may best be explained by combinations of attitudes from both partners, rather than by those of each partner, taken alone. The present study's sample consisted of a 164 members of dual earner couples, whose modal age group was 35-44 years, modal income was $25,000-34,000 and modal education was postgraduate level. Forty-eight percent of the sample had children living with them. The only socio-demographic difference between the sexes was that women had lower incomes than men. This meant that comparisons between the sexes could be made readily, in contrast to most studies which have large occupational differences between males and females, representing the population from which they come. The present study investigated the effects of dual earner couple status variables on work commitment (job involvement and occupational commitment) quality of life and the interaction of work and family role quality.

9.1 Work Commitment

Work Commitment as a function of Age and Career Stage

Levinson (1986) suggested that work commitment and the interface between work and family are re-evaluated at each developmental stage. Super's (1980) career stage theory suggests that occupational commitment and job involvement change with each psychological career stage. As differences in work commitment within dual earner couples were the crux of the present study it was important to ascertain whether there were indeed any cyclical changes in work commitment. Furthermore, as Ornstein and Isabella (1990) found that women's work attitudes are more likely to change with age rather than over Super's career stages, and other studies have shown that men's work attitudes change with career stage (Slocum & Cron, 1986), separate analyses were computed for males and females. The majority of comparisons between the present study's findings and those of previous studies are made with Ornstein and Isabella (1990), Ornstein, Cron and Slocum (1989) and Slocum and Cron (1986). The
latter, unlike many previous studies, operationalized Super's career stages as psychological career concepts, not age.

The present study compared levels of job involvement and occupational commitment over Super's career stages in order to determine whether there were any cyclical changes in work commitment. Job involvement was positively correlated with occupational commitment in the present study as would be expected of two measures of work commitment. However, their correlation was not so great as to be redundant. Job involvement is a more immediate measure of work commitment than occupational commitment. Job involvement is the degree to which a person identifies with a job, and the importance of one's job in one's life. Occupational commitment is also known as career commitment and one's attitudes towards one's occupation.

Firstly, it was established that male occupational commitment was greater in the maintenance stage than in the exploration stage; female occupational commitment was greater in the maintenance stage than in the exploration and disengagement stages. As hypothesized, women's occupational commitment was greater in the maintenance stage than in the disengagement stage when people normally start withdrawing from their jobs. These findings support the hypothesis that occupational commitment would be least in the exploration stage. It was expected that occupational commitment would be greatest in the establishment and maintenance stages. However, there was only an increase in occupational commitment from the exploration to the maintenance stage. It is possible that, in these times of unemployment and uncertainty in New Zealand, people are continually aware of the possibility of redundancy and are more open to other occupational opportunities even when they are establishing themselves in their work. The pattern of occupational commitment was similar for both men and women in the sample.

Men and women's job involvement, did not change with Super's career stages, concurring with Ornstein, Cron and Slocum's (1989) findings. In this instance, personality and situational differences may have been far stronger than career stage in determining job involvement. Super's career theory has been criticized (Osipow,
1973) because it focuses on the self-concept and one's personal preferences and tends to neglect situational, social, environmental and economic factors. Super's (1990) archway model of career development does include situational factors but they are not emphasized strongly in empirical tests of Super's career development model.

Women's occupational commitment was more closely linked to Super's psychological career stages than was men's. This is in contrast to Ornstein and Isabella's (1990) conclusion that women's career attitudes were better categorized by age than by Super's career stages. However, as women tend to stop and start their careers rather than follow an age related career course (Osipow, 1991), it is more logical that women's career patterns should fit into Super's career stages which incorporate a recycling measure rather than normative age-related developmental theories such as Levinson's.

It was not possible to test for age-related differences in occupational commitment and job involvement for men and women separately because there were too few people below 25 years of age, in the present sample. Men and women were analyzed separately originally, because there had been concern that women's work attitudes would not be associated with Super's career stages (Ornstein & Isabella, 1990) as Super's career stages had been validated only on male samples - although the Ornstein and Isabella's (1990) research found that women's work attitudes fitted into Levinson's age based developmental stages which are based on men's development! However, the present study, was able to link women's occupational commitment clearly to Super's career stages and therefore the sample could be analyzed as a whole. Consequently, men and women were analyzed as a single group in the following analyses in order to take advantage of the larger sample size. This lack of sex differences in career stages is in keeping with Walker, Tauskey and Oliver's (1982) observation of declining sex differences on work values, preferences and stereotypic values. It may be that for white-collar dual earner women the similarities in career development with males' career development are particularly pronounced.

Occupational commitment was lowest in the exploration stage, being significantly
greater in the establishment stage and significantly greater still in the maintenance stage (where it reached a peak). People in the disengagement stage had significantly lower occupational commitment than those in the maintenance stage. These results supported Super's theory, except that it was expected that the establishment and maintenance stages would peak in a plateau together. The pattern of occupational commitment found in the present study concurred with Morrow and McElroy's (1987) finding that workers in the maintenance stage were the most committed and Ornstein, Cron and Slocum's (1989) that occupational commitment was greatest in the establishment stage.

The 45-plus age group had significantly greater occupational commitment than the 25-34 age group, suggesting that discrimination in employment against older employees might be ill-advised. The finding that those in the 25-34 age group have relatively low occupational commitment was predicted by Levinson's theory which proposes that these people have only made a provisional commitment to their work. It is possible that there was no significant difference in occupational commitment for the 35-44 age group, because they included both those who were highly committed and established in their work (34-39) and those who were questioning their commitment to work and focusing on their families (40-45). However, the above mentioned categories are based on men's life stages. Bardwick (1980) theorized that women are concerned with family in their thirties and then become more career focused and autonomous in their forties. The high career commitment of men in their early thirties versus the family orientation of women in their thirties, and then the family orientation of men in their forties versus the career orientation of women in their forties may also explain the lack of change in occupational commitment of those in the 35-44 age group. Moreover, the pertinence of these age-related findings is in doubt, because Osipow (1991) suggests that modal patterns of career, family and individual development may no longer exist.

Job involvement was significantly greater in the exploration than the maintenance stage. In other words, individuals still exploring their career choices have greater job involvement but less occupational commitment than individuals who have attained
the work position that they desired. It does seem quite possible that individuals may not be committed to their occupation, because they are still exploring their options but are highly job involved (i.e. their job is very important to their self-concept) in the exploration stage. People in the maintenance stage may be highly committed to their career/occupation because they are in the occupation that they have striven for, but may not be as job involved, with the possibility of family taking a more central position in their self-concept.

Super's career theory can be interpreted to mean slightly different things in terms of work attitudes depending on the orientation of the researcher. In this case, the present results indicating that individuals had greater job involvement in the exploration stage than the maintenance stage were contrary to Slocum and Cron's (1986) and Ornstein, Cron and Slocum's (1989) findings that individuals in the exploration stage were less job involved than individuals in the other three stages (which they interpreted as fitting with Super's career theory). Albeit, Raelin (1985) found that job involvement was curvilinearly related to career stage, being highest in the latest stage (45-60 year olds) and lowest in the middle stage (35-44 year olds). Thus Raelin's results concur with the present study's findings (Raelin's first stage was similarly operationalized as consisting of 25-34 year olds).

There were also differences in job involvement by age group but these differences were not strong enough to be significant in a post hoc Scheffe test. From the present study's results, job involvement would not appear to strongly follow an age or career related pattern.

There was a significant interactive effect of age and career stage on occupational commitment. This was caused by people under 35 years of age having similar occupational commitment to those in the disengagement stage. It was expected that occupational commitment would be lower in the disengagement and exploration stages and this finding is, therefore, unsurprising. There was no interaction in occupational commitment between the disengagement stage and the oldest members of the sample because the oldest respondents were analyzed together with the 45-54
age group due to small cell size.

These relationships between occupational commitment, job involvement and career stage were very weak - a lot weaker than would be expected from Super’s career stages model. Morrow and McElroy (1987) concluded that career stage as a concept may be overstated as it had low explained variance as was the case in the present study. It is likely that factors such as organizational culture and climate may be more related to commitment than career stage and age (Ornstein & Isabella, 1990). However, because there were effects, career stage and age were used as covariates in the present analyses.

Parenting and Work Commitment
It was expected that there would be no differences in job involvement and occupational commitment because parents had access to creche facilities in the present organization (Burke & McKeen, 1993). The creche is operated on a system such that lower income people pay less for their childcare, making it highly viable for all to use. Furthermore, the creche is recognized as an excellent facility. Goff, Mount and Jamison (1990) found that satisfaction with childcare is more significant than the availability of childcare in reducing parent’s absenteeism. As expected the age of one’s youngest child living at home had no effect on occupational commitment nor job involvement.

There were no differences in job involvement by parenting but it appeared that mothers had greater occupational commitment than women without children. However, when age and income were added as covariates there were no difference in occupational commitment between mothers and women without children. Motherhood only appeared to increase occupational commitment because people over 45 years of age had greater occupational commitment than people in the 25-34 age bracket and mothers were significantly older (and hence had higher income) than women without children. It could be argued that past studies such as Lewis and Cooper’s (1987), may have found changes in parents’ occupational commitment because they had not taken into account parents’ age. Albeit in the Lewis and Cooper (1987) sample,
parents were also older than non-parents and they found that fathers' had lower work commitment than other men.

In summary, parenting did not effect work commitment (except as a function of age and income) in accordance with the recent findings of Stroh and Reilly (1993, cited in Moses-Zirkes, 1993) who found that parenting had no effect on female managers' intention to leave an organization. Mothers appeared to have greater occupational commitment than other women because mothers tended to be older. In other words, organizations and parents can only benefit by the cessation of discrimination against mothers and the provision of child-care facilities by employers. Furthermore, as noted by Goff, Mount and Jamison (1991) these child-care facilities need to be of high quality else parents may need to reduce their work commitment to meet their children's needs.

**Sex Differences in Work Commitment**

On first inspection of the results, men had greater occupational commitment and job involvement than women. However, this variance was explained by sex differences in income and career stage. In the present study males had significantly higher income than females. Furthermore, people who earned over $55,000 had greater job involvement and occupational commitment than those who earned between $25,000 and $35,000 and this effect extended to those who earned under $25,000 for job involvement. This finding supports that of Aleem and Khandelwal (1988) who found that the variance in work commitment by sex was explained by differences in education, age and income. As there were no sex differences in education, age, parenting, career stage or occupation in the present study, this variance in income can be interpreted bidirectionally: women could receive lower pay because they have lower work commitment or they could have lower commitment because they have lower pay. As it is well-known that women receive lower pay for equal work in New Zealand (New Zealand Official Year Book, 1993), the second explanation is more likely.

These findings indicate that employers should not regard women as less committed to
work. Employers need to be aware that they may increase their productivity if they give women equal promotional opportunities and equal pay. Sexist discrimination is both unfair and unprofitable. If employers were to give women equal pay for equal work the present study and previous findings suggest that there would be an increase in work commitment. Stroh and Reilly (cited in Moses-Zirkes, 1993) found no gender differences in managers' turnover, their intentions to leave, their job satisfaction and involvement, organizational loyalty, family responsibilities and their sense of how difficult it would be to get a new job as good or better than the one they had. The company was as responsible for the turnover of female managers as male managers and they suggest that companies need to focus on females' current jobs and their career future in the organization.

**Effect of Life-Style on Work Commitment**

The present study found that dual earner couples (no sex difference) place greater emphasis on family than on career, as did Hardesty and Betz (1980). The majority of the sample (39.5%) put family first and 31.6% put family accommodated (that is, family with career as a close second) as greatest source of satisfaction. This is of interest in that many earlier studies have found that men place greater salience in work than family (Loscocco, 1990). However, the present study demonstrates that at least for these white collar New Zealand men, family is of greater salience than work.

Occupational commitment and job involvement were not significantly lower for individuals who placed high salience on both family and work versus those who put career first (as would be expected, those that put family first had lower occupational commitment and job involvement). In other words, according to the present study people need not be concerned that their occupational commitment and job involvement will suffer because of dual interests. This result corroborates Pittman and Orthner's (1989) findings that work conditions and opportunities are the strongest determinants of work commitment.
Effect of Partner's Work Commitment on one's own Work Commitment

The present study compared the work commitment of professionals in dual earner versus dual career couples (after establishing that professionals do indeed have greater work commitment in the present sample). There was no difference in professional men's work commitment be they in dual earner or in dual career couples. However, professional women who were members of dual career couples had significantly greater job involvement than professional women who were members of dual earner couples; there was no difference in professional women's occupational commitment.

The researcher speculated that this difference in professional women's job involvement was a function of egalitarianism. White and Hatcher (1984) found that partners are happier if they both have equal degrees of work commitment as this situation appears to the fairest one (assuming that the greater a partner's job involvement the less a partner's spouse involvement). It may be that women are more concerned about not having greater job involvement than their partners and the possible marital instability that may follow. On the other hand, men may feel that it is part of their traditional gender role to have higher work commitment than their partner. Professionals had higher career support than non-professionals which relates to their occupational commitment, but not to their job involvement. Possibly dual earner couples believe in egalitarianism and hence give increased career support to professionals, but this support may only be for the ideal of a career and not necessarily for day to day job involvement.

Having speculated that this difference in job involvement was a function of egalitarianism, the researcher compared professional women's job involvement in egalitarian versus traditional couples. Traditional couples were defined as those couples in which the male's career was given precedence. However, there was no significant difference in professional women's job involvement in egalitarian versus traditional couples. This finding needs to be interpreted with caution because there were only eight professional women in traditional couple groups.
To summarize, it may be that professional women who have partners with low occupational status have lower job involvement because they do not want to jeopardize their marriage by being too involved in their job. Professional women’s occupational commitment did not change because they received equal career support whether they were in dual earner or dual career couples. Professional women may receive equal career support in both couple types because occupational commitment is less immediate and hence less threatening to their partner. It is also possible that there would have been a significant difference in professional women’s job involvement between traditional and egalitarian couples if the sample size had been larger.

9.2 Quality of Life

There were no sex differences in quality of life in the present study in contrast to most past studies. However, Rosenfield (1980) did find that sex differences in mental health are diminishing.

Age, Parenting and Quality of Life

Quality of life, marital dissatisfaction and quality of work life did not differ by age nor by career stage. This is in contrast to findings by Campbell (1987) that people under the age of 30 are least satisfied. Similarly, parents and non-parents did not have significantly different quality of life or marital dissatisfaction, nor did parents whose youngest child was of different ages. This concurs with Benin and Nienstedt’s (1985) and Barnett and Marshall’s (1991) findings. It is possible that previous studies found differences in quality of life between working mothers and other working women because women with extra roles had greater initial levels of psychological well-being (Kandel, Davies & Raveis, 1985). Factors such as good childcare facilities and a sense of coherence may be more important to quality of life than having children. These findings reveal no cyclical differences in quality of life, nor marital dissatisfaction.
Effects of Couples' Life-Style on Quality of Life

There were no significant correlations between one's partner's occupational commitment, job involvement or family involvement with one's own marital dissatisfaction or quality of life. This replicated Sears and Galambos' (1992) finding of no crossover between work conditions and marital adjustment between partners.

There were no significant differences in quality of life between the various types of couples: Dual career versus dual earner or egalitarian versus traditional. It is possible that there were no differences in quality of life for partners of professionals versus partners of non-professionals because there was little difference in job stress between the two - but this cannot be verified as a measure of job stress was not included in this study.

Differences between accommodators versus allies versus acrobats versus adversaries could not be tested because there were only four adversary couples in the sample. However, it was established that there were no significant differences in quality of life nor in marital dissatisfaction between ally, acrobat and accommodator couples. This is contrary to Karambayya and Reilly's (1992) finding that couples categorized by high family involvement and moderately low work involvement (corresponds to allies in the present study) had higher levels of marital satisfaction. In the present study high family involvement was indeed associated with lower marital dissatisfaction but job involvement was unrelated. So even though allies did indeed have lower job involvement than acrobats it had no impact on their marital dissatisfaction.

There was no significant difference in marital dissatisfaction between couples similar in degree of occupational commitment and couples in which partners had widely different degrees of occupational commitment. This is contrary to findings by Thomas, Albrecht, White, Faires and Shoun (1982) and those of White and Hatcher (1984), who found that couples who had similar degrees of work commitment had higher marital satisfaction. However, as Bailyn (1980) points out, over-involvement in career pursuits may be negatively related to marital satisfaction. So even if
occupational commitment is equally high for both partners it may increase marital dissatisfaction.

9.3 Work-Family Interface

There was a significant positive association between marital dissatisfaction and quality of work life for the whole sample, suggesting that a possible compensatory relationship exists between dissatisfactions in one sphere and satisfactions in the other sphere. This is contrary to what would be expected from previous findings (Jackson & Masclach, 1982; Near, Smith, Rice & Hunt, 1984; Pond & Green, 1983) that marital satisfaction is positively associated with quality of work life when work life is perceived as salient (taking the view that work life is salient for all dual earner couples).

Hierarchical multiple regressions were run to determine whether or not there was an interactive effect (quality of work life by marital dissatisfaction) on quality of life which would demonstrate either a spillover or compensation relationship rather than a segmentation relationship. Four separate hierarchical regression analyses on 'career accommodated' and 'family accommodated' people, professionals, males and females were run so that more specific predictions could be made. Career accommodated people and family accommodated people were predicted to have spillover between work and marital roles on quality of life because both domains were salient.

Professionals were predicted to have spillover because work is important to them. Finally, males and females were separated to test for sex differences as Burke (1986) found that women were more likely to experience spillover.

Marital dissatisfaction, quality of work life, the composite variable marital dissatisfaction by quality of work life, and quality of life did not differ by age, career stage and parenting, contrary to hypothesis and they were therefore not entered into the hierarchical regressions.
There were positive correlations between marital dissatisfaction and quality of work life which suggested a possible compensatory relationships. However, none of the interactions between the these two variables were strong enough to be significant predictors of quality of life. Marital dissatisfaction and quality of work life predicted quality of life independently. Therefore, it was concluded that a segmented type of relationship between work and marriage existed rather than either compensation or spillover. The interactive effect of women’s quality of work life by marital dissatisfaction was the closest of the four groups to being a significant predictor of quality of life.

These findings concurred with those of Barnett and Marshall (1992) who concluded that there was no work-role by partner-role spillover relationship for men in dual earner relationships. The finding of segmentation contradicts the view that the boundaries between family and work roles are 'permeable' for women and therefore, that women are less able to cope with stressors in the workplace. This myth of permeability has fuelled many popular debates over the ability of women with children to manage challenging jobs (e.g., Schwartz, 1989). It would appear from the present study that men and women compartmentalize role-related affective experiences such that their effects on overall quality of life are independent, thus supporting the segmentation hypothesis.

The lack of spillover effects appears to contradict Bartolome and Evans’ (1984) proposition that spillover of affect is likely to occur when a life domain is particularly salient. Furthermore, the lack of spillover was not explained by respondent’s deriving positive affect rather than negative affect from their work. Bartolome and Evans also suggested that spillover is more likely to occur when there are mixed feelings rather than positive feelings toward a domain. Prior to transformation of variables, marital satisfaction had a strong negative skew indicating that a greater number of people had high marital satisfaction than would be expected from the normal distribution. Both quality of work life and quality of life had positive skewness, indicating that a large number of people had lower quality of work life and lower quality of life than would be expected from the normal
population. These measures have been validated on large samples and the researchers do not mention transforming the variables (Higgins & Duxbury, 1992; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Bedeian & Mossbolder, 1989; Steffy & Jones, 1988). Therefore the present researcher presumes that this sample tended to derive mixed feelings from their work life and hence Bartolome and Evans' (1984) work would again suggest that there should be spillover between work and family. The present findings appear to cast doubt on Bartolome and Evans' proposition that spillover occurs when a life domain is highly salient and the occupant derives negative affect from it, at least in terms of affect. It may be that spillover would have been found if other variables (e.g. structural measures) had been measured. Furthermore, Bartolome and Evans found that people tend to describe a dominance of one type of work-nonwork relationship over another, rather than a symmetrical relationship which may be more clearly identified by means of qualitative research.

One explanation for the finding of a segmentation rather than an interactive relationship between marital dissatisfaction and quality of work life on quality of life is a possible bias in the sample. People with troubled partnerships or who are in conflict about role sharing are less likely to agree to participate in studies (Smith & Reid, 1986) and therefore the sample may be biased towards those who are happy in their dual earner relationship.

In sum, the effects of multiple role quality (marital and work) on quality of life are independent for dual earner couples in the present sample. There was no spillover (or compensation) of affect between partner's marital dissatisfaction and one's own quality of work life either. Men and women benefit from multiple roles because the arenas of work and family make independent contributions to their quality of life. It is possible that different variables (attitudinal and structural) may produce different relationships work and marriage. As Near, Rice and Hunt (1980) suggested, objective structures in one domain and individual reactions in another domain may have a different relationship to individual reactions in both domains. Moreover, if affect was measured by psychological distress rather than quality of life there may be different results (Barnett & Marshall, 1991).
Developmental Aspect of Work-Family Conflict

The present study also investigated the relationship between work and family by studying work-family conflict. The present study found no sex differences in work-family conflict. This replicates the findings of Greenhaus, Parasuraman, Granrose and Beutell (1989), which were contrary to those of Cleary and Mechanic (1983) who found that women experience greater interrole conflict. Therefore there was little concern that sex differences might be obscured by running analyses for men and women together.

Unexpectedly, there were no differences in work-family conflict for individuals at different age and career stages. Bailyn's (1980) 'slow burn' model assumes that early career years are characterized by strong pressures from both work and family domains. This would imply that the strongest work family conflict was in the early stages. It is possible that there were different unmeasured role pressures in the present study that altered the relationship between career stage and work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Contrary to Greenhaus and Beutell's (1985) suggestion, there were no significant differences in work-family conflict for couples who were in the same career stage versus those in different career stages. Couples in which both partners were in the establishment or maintenance career stages (and hence had highest occupational commitment) did not differ in work-family conflict.

There were no significant differences in work-family conflict between those who had children and those did not have children living at home. This was in contrast to Lewis and Cooper's (1987) findings. It may be that a blue-collar sample would have greater work-family conflict in early dual earner couple parenting because of a lack of resources. However, parents whose youngest child was aged 13-18 had significantly greater work-family conflict than parents whose youngest child was aged under six. This was unexpected in that Kelly and Voyandoff (1985) predicted that work-family conflict would be greatest when children are at the demanding preschool stage and parents are simultaneously coping with the early pressures of
their careers. This contrary finding could be due to a cohort effect. New Zealanders are marrying later and changing their patterns of child rearing (New Zealand Official Year Book, 1993). Keith and Schafer (1980) found that older couples had less role strain than younger couples, because in their sample younger people were adjusting to their new jobs and recent parenthood simultaneously. However, in the present study parents were older and were already established in their working roles and were therefore able to deal with children more effectively, especially financially. In contrast, teenagers can cause work-family conflict in their attempts to establish independence.

Couples' Life-Style and Work-Family Conflict

Men in traditional couples had less work-family conflict than men in egalitarian couples (no effect for women). Men in traditional couples were focused on their own career and their partner's career offered no competition of interest because the couple gave priority to the male's career. However, in egalitarian couples both partners' careers were given equal footing leading to possible conflict of interests and work-family conflict. As would be expected, there was no similar effect for women because of the nature of the measure used: Egalitarian couples were defined as those in which partners gave equal priority to their own and partner's careers, as well as nine couples in which the woman's career was given priority over her partners; traditional couples were defined as couples in which the male's career was given priority.

Women in dual career couples had less work-family conflict than women in dual earner couples (no effect for men), in accordance with Beutell and Greenhaus's findings (1982). Beutell and Greenhaus (1982) explained that two partners with high levels of work salience may understand each others career needs and protect one another from intense conflict. However, in the present study, there were no significant differences in work-family conflict between couples who widely different levels of occupational commitment versus couples who had similar levels of occupational commitment - as found by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, Rabinowitz and Beutell (1989). In the present study, the fact that a man has a professional partner is
of less importance to his perception of work-family conflict, than perceiving his partner’s career to be equal to his own.

Oddly enough, there was a negative relationship between job involvement and work-family conflict in direct contrast to previous research (Frone & Rice, 1987; Greenhaus & Kopelman, 1981; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, Granrose, Rabinowitz & Beutell, 1989). Frone and Rice (1987) found that job involvement and job-spouse conflict were positively related for individuals high in spouse involvement and unrelated for individuals low in spouse involvement. The present results go further than this and suggest that it is possible to obtain high job involvement together with low work-family conflict, or vice versa.

People in acrobat couples had greater job involvement and greater occupational commitment than people in ally couples. This was to be expected because in acrobat couples both partners have high salience in both work and family whereas in ally couples both partners have high salience in family. However, acrobats did not have significantly higher work-family conflict than accommodator or ally couples (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Hall & Hall, 1979). As predicted, men in accommodator and ally couples had significantly less work-family conflict than men in adversary and acrobat couples (no effect for women) as was hypothesized by Hall and Hall (1979). In other words, men in couples in which at least one partner did not perceive their career to be especially salient perceived less conflict than men in couples in which both partners were highly career oriented. There may have been no similar effect for women because women are more accepting of their partner’s high work salience and are adaptive to it, as it is the norm in New Zealand.

In summary, men’s work-family conflict is more related to the priority given to their career by the couple, whereas women’s work-family conflict is reduced when both partners’ have equal occupational status. Furthermore, men in couples in which both partners have high work salience (acrobats and adversaries) have greater work-family conflict than men in ally and accommodator couples.
9.5 Limitations of the Present Study

Though the logic underlying the research questions is causal, the correlational design used in this study does not allow inferences about causality. Moreover, the large number of analyses run may have resulted in Type 1 error. Furthermore, the present study is limited in generalizability in that the sample was drawn from an academic institution rather than from the larger white-collar working population of New Zealand. A large proportion of the present study’s sample had flexibility in organizing their individual work schedules and conditions of employment.

Some potential measurement problems are noted. For example, when using the Adult Career Concerns Inventory (1981), people were classified as being in the psychological stage in which their average score was closest to three. Although this classification scheme follows from the suggestions of Super, Zelkowitz and Thompson (1981) it allowed for instances in which small differences between average scores were treated the same as large differences. This classification scheme may be problematic as subtle, yet potentially critical, variations in career concerns and issues may be overlooked or eliminated. Furthermore, there appears to be a problem of low discrimination between each of Super’s career stages, as the overall internal consistency of the ACCI was extremely high.

Hall and Hall’s typology of dual earner couples is limited in that it only focuses on work and family involvement. Some couples may find other areas of life more salient than either of the above, as was the case in the present study. This meant that many couples could not be used in analyses using this categorization system in the present study.

Comparison between studies is fraught with difficulties in that different measures of work commitment, different methods of sampling, different operationalizations of career stage and different definitions of dual earners are used. However, the present study was able to make comparisons with studies which used the same operationalizations of career stage and similar definitions of dual earner couples.
Further replication is required to validate discrepant findings in the present study.

9.6 Summary and Suggestions for Future Research

Differences in occupational commitment were predicted by Super's career stages, particularly for women. However, career stages only explained two percent of the variance in occupational commitment. The age groupings used in the present study did not differentiate well between either levels of job involvement or occupational commitment. All in all, it would appear that career stage and age are not the most important predictors of occupational commitment and job involvement, and that personality and situational factors might be needed as well to explain them more adequately. This criticism of Super's theory is not new, as in 1973 Osipow reported that the major weaknesses of Super's theory were its lack of attention to economic and social factors.

The finding that women's work commitment followed Super's career stages implies that Super's Adult Career Concerns Inventory can be used for the vocational guidance of both men and women. Researchers have queried the wisdom of using the same theories of career development for both men and women (Bailyn, 1980) because of the less continuous nature of women's career development. However, Super's career theory, although based on men, has included a recycling measure which can incorporate discontinuities in women's career development. Secondly, Super's career stages are based on psychological concepts rather than age-related developmental stages so that normative male and female age differences are inconsequential.

The present study found that parenting only altered work commitment (as measured by job involvement and occupational commitment) in that mothers had greater occupational commitment than women without children. Further analysis indicated that mother's occupational commitment was greater than that of women without children because they were older and age is associate with increased income and
occupational commitment. As occupational commitment is a measure of commitment to one's career, rather than immediate involvement in the job and the importance of one's job in one's life, it is logical that those who are less committed to their careers are more likely to quit working for parenthood, leaving mothers who are more committed to working in the dual earner sample. Women who are committed to their career have a stronger reason to continue working than those who are highly involved in their work because if they take a break from their career they may never reach their goals, whereas it is quite possible for a person to return to work and be highly job involved once again. It is highly recommended that future research into work commitment and parenting takes account of parents' age as women from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and those who have lower education have their first birth at an earlier age (Pratt, Mosher, Bachrach & Horn, 1984).

Women had lower work commitment than men. This was explained by the fact that they received lower income even though there was no sex difference in occupational status. This is of practical interest, in that most studies have been unable to compare men and women without controlling for occupational differences whereas the present study was able to clearly establish that women who have equal occupational status, parenting status and education were given lower pay and had lower work commitment. These results suggest that employer discrimination has resulted in women's lower work commitment and therefore it is possible that equal opportunities for women may increase women's work commitment.

The majority of the men and women in the present study cited family as their greatest source of satisfaction and hence family was taken to be the most salient area of their lives. Sex differences in work and family patterns are changing, such that men are becoming more family oriented and women are becoming more career oriented (Hardesty & Betz, 1980). Possibly in the future, work and family patterns will not be a matter of sex difference but one of personal preference - in the present study there was no actual difference in work-family salience as both men and women found family to be most salient. However, the present study's sample is unique to the institution from which it came, in that there were no sex differences in occupation,
education or parenting status and all were white collar workers. Having dual salience in family and work did not decrease work commitment. Only people who did not cite work as one of the top two sources of great satisfaction had lower work commitment, as would be expected. This is of practical importance to individuals (or their employers, for that matter) concerned that their commitment to work will suffer if they are highly committed to their families. These results demonstrate that the nature of commitment is such that strong commitment in one sphere does not necessitate a diminishing of commitment in another sphere.

Female professionals' job involvement was lower in dual earner couples than in dual career couples. It was speculated that this was a gender role effect. Job involvement may differ rather than occupational commitment because partners are prepared to give support to the wider concept of a career but women themselves may not want to endanger their marriage by being more absorbed in day to day job matters (job involvement). The practical implications of professional women's job involvement being lower in dual earner couples are worrying. It may be detrimental for organizations to hire a professional woman with a non-professional partner.

Parenting did not have an effect on overall quality of life, nor on marital dissatisfaction. However, researchers such as Lewis and Cooper (1987) strongly suggest that the family life cycle has an impact on quality of life. It may be that the availability of good childcare services has reduced marital dissatisfaction in the present sample. Consequently, future researchers should measure satisfaction with childcare as a potential moderator of marital satisfaction and quality of life in addition to the age and number of children in the home. The present study's results reveal that quality of life does not follow a cycle akin to that of parenting.

There was no difference in couples' quality of life in terms of their degree of work and family salience, occupational status or egalitarianism. This suggests that quality of life is not dependent on life-style, but on the quality of salient life roles. Various life-styles suit different people and it is not necessarily the type of life-style but satisfaction with a life-style that determines quality of life. However, lack of
differences in quality of life could also have resulted from a lack of heterogeneity in the present sample. Future research could compare the quality of life of dual earner couples in terms of work and family involvement and egalitarianism over a broader population which includes both blue-collar and white-collar workers. The researcher predicts that a blue-collar male whose partner’s work salience is higher than his own would tend to have lower quality of life and marital satisfaction because it would be contrary to his gender role ideology which is a function of education (Schoenbach, 1985).

Marital dissatisfaction and quality of work life only had independent effects on quality of life indicating a segmentation relationship despite a positive correlation between the two spheres. Baruch and Marshall (1992) likewise found no spillover of affect between work and marital roles for dual earners in terms of psychological distress. Future research could explore the instances in which spillover between work and marital roles is likely to occur. Analysis of variables such as role demands (e.g. the need to travel in one’s job) as well as behaviours associated with roles (e.g. a managerial role at work may be accompanied by more authority in the home) as opposed to the feelings generated by those roles may reveal spillover into other spheres of life. It has been hypothesized that negative affect is more likely than positive affect to cause spillover between roles creating greater overall psychological distress. In addition research could continue to investigate the influence of positive and negative affect on spillover incidence. Theories could be developed on specific work-related influences which translate into levels of marital satisfaction, work-family conflict, emotional well-being and life-satisfaction.

Work-family conflict did not differ by career stage nor age, contrary to Sekaran and Hall’s (1989) hypothesis. Furthermore, work-family conflict did not differ when both partners were in career stages commanding large amounts of work commitment versus work-family conflict when at least one partner was in a stage requiring lower work commitment. Possibly work-family conflict does not change by career stage because couples have organized their lives well and have staggered important events such as parenting. For example, parenting at an older age may have meant that
parents of preschoolers did not have significantly greater work-family conflict in the present sample.

Future research could also include measures of self-esteem as it has been suggested that this variable could mediate the relationship between work and nonwork spheres. Romzek (1985) found that people with high self-esteem were better able to balance their work and nonwork lives. Similarly, Sekaran (1983) points out that those with higher self-esteem overcome hurdles, feel confident, and derive greater satisfactions. Sekaran (1986) found that men with high self-esteem who were also highly job involved had significantly higher levels of job satisfaction than those who had low levels of self-esteem but were highly job involved.

Furthermore, research into the work-nonwork relationship needs to be more interdisciplinary, as was the case in the present study. Loscocco and Roschelle (1991) point out that sociologists, counselling psychologists and industrial-organizational psychologists tend to be unaware of each other’s work and may repeat research unnecessarily.

Finally, future research into the work-nonwork relationship could include ethnic comparisons between the major ethnic groups that make up the population of New Zealand. The present study could not make ethnic comparisons as a larger and more heterogeneous sample would be required. It is predicted that Maori would have greater chance of spillover between work and family due to a more holistic outlook on life.
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APPENDIX A: DUAL EARNER COUPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dual Earner Couple Research
Information Sheet

The researcher is Bridget Murphy, a Masters student at Massey University. The research will be used to fulfil the requirements for a Masterate Degree in Psychology.

WHAT THIS STUDY IS ABOUT
I am looking at how dual earner couple's commitment to their career, and their job involvement, impacts on their well-being. I will take into consideration the presence of children, career stage, life stage and other factors that have been found to be related.

ELIGIBILITY
You are eligible to take part in this study if both you and your partner are employed full time.

WHAT YOU WILL BE ASKED TO DO
You and your partner will be asked to complete a questionnaire (of approximately forty minutes) and requested not to discuss it together until you have both completed it.

YOUR RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT
All participants:
* have the right to contact the researcher at any time during the research to discuss any aspects of the study
* have the right to refuse to answer any question, or withdraw from the study at any time
* provide information on the understanding that it is completely in confidence to the researchers, to be used only for the purposes of the research. It will not be possible to identify individuals in any reports of the results.
* will receive information about the results of the study if requested
A STUDY OF

DUAL EARNER COUPLES

Please do not discuss your responses to the questionnaire with your partner before completing it. Seal your completed questionnaires in the envelopes provided and return to researcher via Massey internal mail.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

RESEARCHER: BRIDGET MURPHY
PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
MASSEY UNIVERSITY
DUAL EARNER COUPLES' QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE PLACE THE NUMBER OF YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH QUESTION IN THE BOXES ON THE RIGHT HAND SIDE OF THE PAGE. PLEASE GIVE YOUR FIRST RESPONSE - DO NOT SPEND TOO LONG ON EACH QUESTION

SECTION ONE: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. How old are you?
   1) Under 25
   2) 25 plus - 35
   3) 35 plus - 45
   4) 45 plus - 55
   5) 55 plus

2. What sex are you?
   1) male
   2) female

3. How many children are living with you?
   1) 1
   2) 2
   3) 3
   4) 4 or more
   5) 0

4. How old is your youngest child living at home?
   1) no child
   2) youngest over 18
   3) youngest 13-18
   4) youngest 6-12
   5) youngest less than 6 years old

5. What is your highest educational achievement?
   1) high school graduate
   2) some tertiary education
   3) an undergraduate qualification (a degree or diploma)
   4) postgraduate education
6. Into which of these categories would your work fit best?
   1) academic
   2) professional/managerial
   3) clerical/sales
   4) service
   5) skilled/semi-skilled
   6) unskilled labour
   7) other - Please specify ...

7.a. How much do you earn per year?
   1) Under $25,000
   2) $25,000 plus - $35,000
   3) $35,000 plus - $45,000
   4) $45,000 plus - $55,000
   5) $55,000 plus

7.b. Do you earn substantially more than your partner?
   1) Yes
   2) No

8. To what extent do you and your partner discuss your career goals and means of meeting both yours and your partner’s career goals whilst simultaneously meeting non-work demands?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Do not engage discussion

9. How supportive is your partner in your career/job efforts?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not supportive at all extremely supportive

Job Involvement

10. Most important things for me involve my job
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    Strongly disagree Strongly agree

11. My job is only a small part of who I am
    1 2 3 4 5 6
    Strongly disagree Strongly agree
12. I live, eat and breathe my job
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree

13. Most of my interests are centred around my job
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree

14. Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree

15. My job is very central to my existence
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree

16. I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree

Family Involvement

17. The most important things which happen to me involve my role in the family
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree

18. Most of my interests are centred around my family
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree

19. I am very much involved in my role in my family
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree

20. To me my family role is only a small part of who I am
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree
### Career priority

21. How important is your career relative to your partner’s?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My career has much higher priority than my partner’s career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My partner’s career has much higher priority than my career

### Occupational commitment

22. If I could, I would go into a different occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I can see myself in this occupation for many years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. My occupational choice is a good decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If I could chose again, I would not choose this occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Even if I had no need for the money, I would still continue in this occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. I am sometimes dissatisfied with my occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I like this occupation too well to give it up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. My education and training is not tailored for this occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. I have the ideal occupation for my life work
1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree
6
Strongly agree □

31. I wish I had chosen a different occupation
1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree
6
Strongly agree □

32. I am disappointed that I chose this occupation
1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree
6
Strongly agree □

Quality of Work Life

Describe how you see yourself at work, on a scale of 1 to 7

33. Successful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not successful □

34. Important
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not important □

35. Happy
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Sad □

36. Doing my best
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not doing my best □

37. Flexible
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not flexible □

38. In control
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not in control □

39. Working my hardest
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not working my hardest □

40. Knowing my job well
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not knowing my job well □
Marital Satisfaction

41. To what extent are you satisfied with your current relationship?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 89
   Not at all Extremely

42. To what degree do you like your partner?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 89
   Not at all Very much

43. To what degree do you love your partner?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 89
   Not at all Very much

44. How does your relationship compare to other people's?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 89
   Much worse than Better than most

45. How committed are you to maintaining your relationship?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 89
   Not at all Extremely

46. To what degree do you feel attached to your current relationship?
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 89
   Not at all Extremely

Quality of Life

Indicate on a scale of 1 to 7 how you feel about your present life, generally

47. Interesting
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not interesting

48. Enjoyable
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not enjoyable

49. Worthwhile
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not worthwhile

50. Friendly
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not friendly
51. Full
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not full

52. Hopeful
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not hopeful

53. Rewarding
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Disappointing

54. Brings out the
   the best in me
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Doesn’t give me much of a chance

55. Then taking all things together, how would you describe your present state of happiness
   1) Very happy
   2) Happy
   3) Not very happy

56. How satisfactory do you find the ways you are spending your life these days?
   1) Completely satisfactory
   2) Satisfactory
   3) Not very satisfactory

Work-family conflict

57. My work schedule often conflicts with my family life
   1) True
   2) False

58. After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I would like to do
   1) True
   2) False

59. On the job I have so much work to do that it takes away from my personal interests
   1) True
   2) False
60. My family dislikes how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am home
   1) True
   2) False

61. My work takes up time that I would like to spend with my family
   1) True
   2) False

62. My job makes it difficult to be the kind of partner or parent I would like to be
   1) True
   2) False

Most satisfying facet

63. Which of the following things gives you the most satisfaction out of life?
   1) Your career or occupation
   2) Family relations
   3) Leisure time, recreational activities
   4) Religious beliefs or activities
   5) Participation in affairs of the community
   6) Participation in activities directed toward national or international betterment
   7) Running a home
   8) Other - Specify...

64. Which of the following gives you the next greatest satisfaction?
   1) Your career or occupation
   2) Family relations
   3) Leisure time, recreational activities
   4) Religious beliefs or activities
   5) Participation in affairs of the community
   6) Participation in activities directed toward national or international betterment
   7) Running a home
   8) Other - Specify...
SECTION TWO: ATTITUDES

PLEASE ENTER YOUR RATING FOR EACH QUESTION IN THE BOXES ON THE RIGHT HAND SIDE OF THE PAGE.

1. No concern
2. Little concern
3. Some concern
4. Considerable concern
5. Great concern

1. Clarifying my ideas about the type of work I would really enjoy

2. Deciding what I want to do for a living.

3. Finding the line of work I am best suited for.

4. Learning about beginning jobs that might be open to me.

5. Identifying the skills required for jobs that interest me.

6. Choosing the best among the occupations I am considering.

7. Choosing the most challenging job among those that interest me.

8. Finding a line of work that really interests me.


10. Choosing a job that will really satisfy me.

11. Getting started in my chosen field.

12. Deciding how to qualify for the work I want to do.

13. Meeting people who can help me get started in my chosen field.
Please rate each statement according to the following scale:

1. No concern
2. Little concern
3. Some concern
4. Considerable concern
5. Great concern

14. Finding opportunities to do work that I really like.

15. Making specific plans to achieve my current goals.

16. Settling down in a job I can stay with.

17. Making a place for myself where I work.

18. Doing things to help me stay in the field in which I have started.


20. Getting established in my work.


22. Developing a reputation in my line of work.

23. Becoming a dependable producer.

24. Becoming especially knowledgeable or skilful in my work.

25. Winning the support of my employer, colleagues, or clients.

26. Planning how to get ahead in my established field of work.

27. Improving my chances of advancement in my current occupation.
Please rate each statement according to the following scale
1. No concern
2. Little concern
3. Some concern
4. Considerable concern
5. Great concern

28. Doing things that make people want me in my work.

29. Finding ways of making my competence known.

30. Advancing to a more responsible position.

31. Maintaining the occupational position I have achieved.

32. Holding my own against the competition of new people entering the field.

33. Adapting to changes introduced since I got established in my occupation.

34. Keeping in tune with the people I work with.

35. Keeping the respect of people in my field.

36. Keeping with new knowledge, equipment, and methods in my field.

37. Attending meetings and seminars on new methods.

38. Visiting places where I can see new developments.

39. Getting to know important people in my field.

40. Getting refresher training to keep up.

41. Identifying new problems to work on.

42. Finding out about new opportunities as my field changes.
Please rate each statement according to the following scale

1. No concern
2. Little concern
3. Some concern
4. Considerable concern
5. Great concern

43. Deciding what new fields to open up or develop.

44. Developing new skills to cope with changes in my field.

45. Developing new knowledge or skills to cope with changes in my field.

46. Developing easier ways of doing my work.

47. Concentrating on things I can do as I get older.

48. Cutting down on my working hours.

49. Avoiding occupational pressures I formerly handled more easily.

50. Developing more hobbies to supplement work interests.

51. Finding activities I would like in retirement.

52. Planning well for retirement.

53. Making sure that I have a good life when I retire.

54. Talking to retired friends about retirement and adjustments.

55. Setting aside enough assets for retirement.

56. Having a good place to live in retirement.

57. Having a good life in retirement.
Please rate each statement according to the following scale
1. No concern
2. Little concern
3. Some concern
4. Considerable concern
5. Great concern

58. Having friends I can enjoy in retirement.  

59. Making good use of free time that comes with retirement.  

60. Doing things I have always wanted to do but never had time for.  

61. After working in a field for a while, many persons shift to another job for any of a variety of reasons: pay, satisfaction, opportunity for growth, shut-down, etc. When the shift is a change in field, not just working for another employer in the same field, it is commonly called a 'career change'. Following are five statements which represent various stages in career change. Choose the one statement that best describes your current status, and mark that number in this box.
1. I am not considering making a career change.
2. I am considering whether to make a career change.
3. I plan to make a career change and am choosing a field to change to.
4. I have selected a field and am trying to get started in it.
5. I have recently made a change and am settling down in the new field.  

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
**APPENDIX B: UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE TESTS**

In the following tables, $p<.05 = *$; $p<.01 = **$.

**Table B1**  One-way ANOVA for Males' Occupational Commitment by Career Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1236.81</td>
<td>412.27</td>
<td>4.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6362.72</td>
<td>87.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7599.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table B2**  One-way ANOVA for Females' Occupational Commitment by Career Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1689.13</td>
<td>563.04</td>
<td>6.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6544.58</td>
<td>89.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8233.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table B3**  One-way ANOVA for Occupational Commitment by Career Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>285.43</td>
<td>95.14</td>
<td>10.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13994.76</td>
<td>89.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16848.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table B4**  One-way ANOVA for Occupational Commitment by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000.91</td>
<td>333.64</td>
<td>3.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16088.16</td>
<td>101.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>17089.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B5  One-way ANOVA for Job Involvement by Career Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>389.35</td>
<td>129.78</td>
<td>3.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHN GROUP</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>6411.90</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6801.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B6  One-way ANOVA for Job Involvement by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>339.04</td>
<td>113.01</td>
<td>2.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHN GROUP</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6686.77</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7025.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B7  One-way ANCOVA for Parenting Differences in Occupational Commitment with Age and Income as Covariates for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ADJUSTED SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COVARIATES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1223.37</td>
<td>611.69</td>
<td>6.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>647.34</td>
<td>647.34</td>
<td>7.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>241.93</td>
<td>241.93</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275.52</td>
<td>275.52</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7195.21</td>
<td>92.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8694.11</td>
<td>107.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B8  One-way ANCOVA for Sex Differences in Occupational Commitment with Income and Career Stage as Covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ADJUSTED SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.11</td>
<td>79.11</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1536.18</td>
<td>1536.18</td>
<td>16.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER STAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>444.36</td>
<td>444.36</td>
<td>4.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>14553.04</td>
<td>93.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16848.194</td>
<td>105.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B9  One-way ANOVA for Income differences in Occupational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1951.92</td>
<td>487.98</td>
<td>5.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>15137.14</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>17089.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B10  One-way ANCOVA for Sex differences in Job Involvement with Income as a Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ADJUSTED SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130.60</td>
<td>130.60</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>742.43</td>
<td>742.43</td>
<td>19.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>6152.78</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7025.81</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B11  One-way ANOVA for Income differences in Job Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>799.03</td>
<td>199.76</td>
<td>5.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6226.77</td>
<td>39.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7025.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B12  One-way ANOVA for Life-Style differences in Occupational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1775.52</td>
<td>591.84</td>
<td>7.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8325.15</td>
<td>80.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10100.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B13  One-way ANOVA for Life-Style Differences in Job Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>941.91</td>
<td>313.97</td>
<td>9.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3500.59</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4442.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B14  One-way ANOVA for Males’ Occupational Commitment in Acrobat, Accommodator and Ally Couples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>677.17</td>
<td>338.59</td>
<td>3.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4300.45</td>
<td>91.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4977.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B15  One-way ANOVA for Females’ Occupational Commitment in Acrobat, Accommodator and Ally Couple

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>893.27</td>
<td>446.64</td>
<td>5.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4192.35</td>
<td>89.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5085.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B16  One-way ANOVA for Males’ Job Involvement in Acrobat, Accommodator and Ally Couples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>355.90</td>
<td>177.95</td>
<td>5.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1616.10</td>
<td>34.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1972.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B17  One-way ANOVA for Females' Job Involvement in Acrobat, Accommodator and Ally Couples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWN GROUP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>452.82</td>
<td>226.41</td>
<td>5.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHN GROUP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1963.60</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2416.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>