

GENDER IDEOLOGY: IMPACT ON DUAL-CAREER COUPLES' ROLE
STRAIN, MARITAL SATISFACTION, AND LIFE SATISFACTION

A Dissertation

by

JENNIFER JEAN KING

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2005

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

GENDER IDEOLOGY: IMPACT ON DUAL-CAREER COUPLES' ROLE
STRAIN, MARITAL SATISFACTION, AND LIFE SATISFACTION

A Dissertation

by

JENNIFER JEAN KING

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Donna Davenport
Committee Members,	Dan Brossart
	Linda Castillo
	Jane Sell
Head of Department,	Michael Benz

December 2005

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

ABSTRACT

Gender Ideology: Impact on Dual-Career Couples' Role Strain, Marital Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction.

(December 2005)

Jennifer Jean King, B.S., Vanderbilt University;

M.A., Michigan State University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Donna S. Davenport

With dual-career couples comprising the most common family type, it is important for mental health professionals, employers, and policy makers to understand the unique challenges of this population (Haddock et al., 2001; Saginak & Saginak, 2005.) Numerous researchers have studied the consequences of family and work role strain for dual-career couples. However, when dual-career couples are able to share responsibilities and negotiate degendered roles they experience the benefits of dual-career couples. The literature clearly supports the importance of egalitarian roles for marital satisfaction and life satisfaction of dual-career couples.

While researchers have studied social role strain, gender role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction and discussed the importance of degendered

roles and responsibilities for dual-career couples, no studies have examined gender ideology. Saginak and Saginak (2005) called for researchers to investigate how gender ideologies and the gender socialization process perpetuate the challenges faced by dual-career couples in balancing work and family.

This study investigated the associations between gender ideology and gender role strain, job-family role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction among 70 individual members of dual-career couples. A multivariate analysis of variance was utilized to investigate the relationship between gender ideology and the criterion measures. Gender ideology was partially associated with gender role strain with the androgynous gender ideology group scoring significantly lower on gender role strain than the masculine or undifferentiated gender ideology groups but not significantly lower than the feminine gender ideology group. Gender ideology was not associated with job-family role strain or marital satisfaction. In addition, gender ideology was also partially associated with life satisfaction with the

androgynous gender ideology group scoring significantly higher on quality of life than the masculine or undifferentiated gender ideology groups but not significantly higher than the feminine gender ideology group.

Thus, the current study indicates there are partial associations between gender ideology and gender role strain and life satisfaction for dual-career couples. Mental health professionals, employers, and policy makers working with dual-career couples should assess the socially constructed gender norms and expectations internalized by individuals into a gender ideology as the possible source of challenges experienced by the dual-career couple.

DEDICATION

To my parents, Roberta Jean Newberry King and Lee King,
 whose love, support, and guidance provided the foundation
 for me to pursue my passions and reach my fullest potential
 and

To my brother, Jeffery Joseph Lee King whose love and
 companionship provided fun, adventure, and challenges to
 live life to the fullest
 and

To my soulmate, Matthew John Weldon whose love,
 understanding, and encouragement provided the freedom,
 energy, and strength to realize my dreams.

Wind Beneath My Wings, Bette Midler

It must have been cold there in my shadow, to never
 have sunlight on your face. You were content to let me
 shine, that's your way. You always walked a step behind.

So I was the one with all the glory, while you were
 the one with all the strength. A beautiful face without a
 name for so long. A beautiful smile to hide the pain.

Did you ever know that you're my hero, and everything
 I would like to be? I can fly higher than an eagle, for
 you are the wind beneath my wings.

It might have appeared to go unnoticed, but I've got
 it all here in my heart. I want you to know I know the
 truth, of course I know it. I would be nothing without
 you.

Did you ever know that you're my hero? You're
 everything I wish I could be. I could fly higher than an
 eagle, for you are the wind beneath my wings.

Did I ever tell you you're my hero? You're
 everything, everything I wish I could be. Oh, and I, I
 could fly higher than an eagle, for you are the wind
 beneath my wings, 'cause you are the wind beneath my wings.

Oh, the wind beneath my wings. You are the wind
 beneath my wings. Fly away. You let me fly so high. Oh,
 you, the wind beneath my wings. Oh, you, the wind beneath
 my wings.

Fly high against the sky, so high I almost touch the
 sky. Thank you, thank you, thank God for you, the wind
 beneath my wings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are numerous individuals to whom I would like to express my deepest gratitude. I know I would not be who I am today without their love, support, companionship, encouragement, guidance, time, and investment in my life.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my doctoral committee for all of their knowledge, expertise, encouragement, time, and investment. I feel so fortunate to have had the opportunity to study under and be mentored by my chair, Dr. Donna Davenport. Dr. Donna Davenport is my inspiration and role model both professionally and personally. I would like to thank her for her wisdom, expertise, commitment, patience, compassion, and for her personal sense of ethics, morals, and responsibility. I have the utmost respect for Dr. Donna Davenport that can not begin to be captured in words so I aspire to live my life making her proud as a mentee and colleague. Next, I would like to thank Dr. Brossart for his statistical expertise and advice throughout the process. Dr. Linda Castillo is a mentor that has continually provided me academic and research guidance as well as someone I personally admire. I would like to thank Dr. Jane Sell for

her time, guidance, expertise, and encouragement outside of the field of psychology that allowed me to broaden my knowledge and experience. Dr. William Rae has continually been a significant part of my development, and I appreciate his intelligence, mentorship, sense of humor, understanding, and flexibility. I would also like to express my gratitude to him for his time and willingness to contribute to my dissertation.

Next, I would like to thank the research participants for their time and assistance in helping me to complete my dissertation. I would also like to express my gratitude to the Texas A&M University Women's Center for providing me a dissertation scholarship.

Several other faculty members I would like to thank who have made significant contributions to my professional development include Dr. Michael Duffy, Dr. David Lawson, and Dr. Collie Conoley.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Alfiee Breland-Noble for her mentorship, guidance, and companionship throughout my graduate school development.

I would like to thank Dr. Paul Schauble for his supervision and mentorship and demonstrating the meaning of

professionalism. I will always respect him and appreciate the significant impact he made in my life.

I would like to express my appreciation to Carol Wagner for her commitment, dedication, time, patience, and energy as the academic advisor for the Department of Educational Psychology.

For my beloved cohort and lifelong friends who made the doctoral degree seem to fly by, I would like to thank Minnette Beckner, Josh Bias, Brent Lane, Tom Marrs, Drew Miller, Clint Quisenberry, Saori Rivera, and Mia Veve.

There are several other close friends who have been especially supportive throughout my life that I would like to thank including Keomany Sayakhom, Natalie Nieves, and Sylvia Chen who are like sisters to me.

Jason Steward, Andy Case, and Elizabeth Matthew are friends and colleagues whom I respect for their strength and appreciate for their investment and support in my life.

Dr. Dan Weldon and Mrs. Monica Weldon are like second parents to me and I will always appreciate their love and support. I would also like to thank Dr. Dan Weldon for his time, investment, guidance, and encouragement with the dissertation process and doctoral program.

For those who are no longer physically here who are shining down from heaven, I would like to thank Johnathan King, Ina Newberry, Maggie King, and Ulu Matthews.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their love, support, guidance, and encouragement throughout my doctoral program and life including my parents, Roberta Jean Newberry King and Lee King, my brother Jeffery Joseph Lee King, and my soulmate Matthew John Weldon who are the wind beneath my wings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Rationale for Study.....	1
Problem Statement.....	6
Purpose of Study.....	8
Research Questions.....	9
Significance of Study.....	11
Definitions of Terms.....	12
Organization of Study.....	14
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
Social Role Strain.....	15
Gender Role Strain.....	19
Marital Satisfaction.....	22
Life Satisfaction.....	25
Gender Ideology.....	28
Summary.....	31

CHAPTER	Page
III METHODOLOGY.....	32
Participants.....	32
Instrumentation.....	38
Procedure.....	47
Data Analyses.....	48
IV RESULTS.....	50
Preliminary Analyses.....	50
Bivariate Analyses.....	56
Scale Reliability.....	63
Primary Analyses.....	67
Ancillary Analyses.....	77
Summary of Results.....	83
V CONCLUSIONS.....	85
Research Questions.....	85
Limitations and Strengths.....	94
Clinical Applications.....	98
Recommendations for Future Research.....	100
REFERENCES.....	102
APPENDIX A.....	113
APPENDIX B.....	122
VITA.....	126

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Sample Demographics.....	36
2	Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Variable Measures.....	54
3	Descriptive Statistics for Categorical Variable Measures.....	55
4	Correlations Among Demographic Variables.....	60
5	Correlations Among Measures.....	61
6	Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology Predicting Gender Role Strain.....	70
7	Specifics of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology Predicting Gender Role Strain.....	71
8	Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Gender Ideology Predicting Job-Family Role Strain....	72
9	Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology Predicting Marital Satisfaction.....	75
10	Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology Predicting Life Satisfaction.....	78
11	Specifics of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology Predicting Life Satisfaction.....	79

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale for Study

During the past four decades one of the most significant social transformations in the United States has been the increase in dual-career couples (Haddock et al., 2001). Dual-career couples now comprise the most common family type (Haddock, 2002). While women from lower socioeconomic status groups have been in the labor force for an extended time, with the increase in middle and upper class women entering the paid labor force, researchers have begun to address challenges for dual-career couples (Haddock et al., 2001). Even with the dual-career family type increasing, many workplaces still operate with the assumption that paid employees also have a full-time adult at home to take care of all the unpaid household labor (Haddock et al., 2001). Employees in the United States work an average of 47 hours per week outside of the home doing paid labor, which is more than any other country in the world (Coontz, 2000). Yet employers continue to resist

This dissertation follows the style of *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.

implementing family-friendly work policies such as flextime (Galinsky et al., 1996). This lack of family-oriented policies takes an important social, psychological, and physical toll on millions of dual-career couples. One of the most commonly researched problems of dual-career couples is work and family role strain.

Social Role Theory

Social Role Theory is one conceptual basis from which dual-career couples' work and family role strain has been researched (Perrone & Worthington, 2001). Social Role Theory explains that individuals meet personal and relational needs by participating in different roles with role partners (Fein, 1990, 1992). Researchers have examined the salience of the worker and family roles and the competing time demands they pose on each other for dual-career couples (Cinamon & Rich, 2002; Bonebright, Clay, & Ankenmann, 2000). Role strain exists when there are too many competing demands on an individual based on available resources and time (Silverstein, Auerbach, & Levant, 2002; Perrone & Worthington, 2001). For example, Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman (1996) found that 42% of nonparents and 58% of parents reported some conflict in managing family and work social roles. Barnett and Rivers

(1996) found that 75% of dual-career parents reported strain in combining work and parenting. Researchers examining the challenges faced by dual-career couples have also examined role strain created by gender.

Gender Role Strain

Pleck's (1981, 1995) Gender Role Strain Model is a second conceptual basis that has been applied to dual-career couples' challenges as well. Gender role strain develops when individuals internalize stereotyped societal norms around gender ideals that are often contradictory, inconsistent, and unattainable (Pleck, 1995). Many dual-career couples experience role strain because of the gendered stereotypes they have adapted from societal expectations and norms (Silverstein, Auerbach, & Levant, 2002). Traditional families are described as the male being the primary breadwinner and the female being the primary caretaker and homemaker. Even with women entering the labor force, many dual-career couples still put the financial pressures on the male of the household and the caretaker and homemaker responsibilities on the female of the household (Vogel et al., 2003; Silverstein, Auerbach, & Levant, 2002). With these gender stereotypes, women report role strain of having to do the majority of childrearing

and household responsibilities while working full-time (Vogel et al., 2003). Men also report feeling pressured to be the primary breadwinner and feeling accordingly isolated from their wife, children, and family because of their time away from home with work responsibilities (Vogel et al., 2003). Societal expectations regarding what is appropriate male and female behavior and responsibilities limits many dual-career couples from balancing their work and family demands most effectively (Eagly, 1987). The role strain created by competing social roles and gender-stereotyped behaviors has been associated with negative consequences for the individual.

Consequences of Role Strain

Numerous researchers have discussed negative consequences of work and family role strain of dual-career couples including burnout, decreased family and occupational well-being, job and life dissatisfaction, illness, depression, and marital distress (Hayes & Mahalik, 2000; Perrewe & Hochwarter, 1999; Good et al., 1996; Pleck, 1995, Good & Mintz, 1990). Norrell & Norrell (1996) found that role strain was a significant contributor to marital distress between members of dual-career couples. Campbell & Snow (1992) discovered that higher levels of conflict

between work and family were associated with lower levels of marital satisfaction. While the possible negative consequences of role strain seem clearly identified, several researchers have also described the possible positive aspects for members of dual-career couples.

Positive Aspects

Researchers have also identified key benefits of dual-career couples (Haddock, Zimmermann, Ziembra, & Current, 2001; Perrone & Worthington, 2001; Barnett & Rivers, 1996). Women in dual-career couples often report an independent identity, increased self-esteem, and enhanced social contacts (Barnett & Baruch, 1985). Men also report feeling decreased pressure of being the financial provider and increased opportunities for family involvement (Barnett & Rivers, 1996). Some couples are able to successfully share the provider-role and care-taking role so the gendered division of labor disappears and the social demands are easier to cope with (Silverstein, Auerbach, & Levant, 2002). Individuals who have both work and family identities are able to pursue fulfillment in both familial relationships and professional roles (Barnett & Rivers, 1996). Those couples that can successfully negotiate and balance work and family report having happier relationship

satisfaction, higher self-esteem, less psychological distress, higher overall well-being, and higher job satisfaction and efficiency (Perrone & Worthington, 2001). However, key ingredients in ensuring the benefits in dual-career family types are the ability to negotiate a shared responsibility for work and family demands and an egalitarian relationship (Haddock, 2002).

Shared Roles and Responsibilities

Individuals in dual-career couples that share responsibilities and negotiate roles are able to experience the benefits of the dual-career couple family type (Haddock et al., 2001; Perrone & Worthington, 2001). Haddock et al., (2001) reported that couples that experience more egalitarian roles and degendered role responsibilities are likely to stay married and maintain higher marital satisfaction. Individuals who are able to experience degendered roles within their dual-career couples experience less role strain and experience higher overall well-being (Haddock et al., 2001).

Problem Statement

While several researchers have addressed the benefits of degendered role responsibilities of dual-career couples, there have been no studies examining how gender ideology

affects role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Earlier researchers in psychology and sociology examined the concept of gender ideology. Gender ideology is more than just biological sex and instead includes attitudes and behaviors about what is appropriately feminine and masculine according to the gender stereotypes of one's society (Barnett et al., 1993). Sandra Bem is one of the pioneer researchers that examined androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated gender ideologies (Bem, 1974; Bem, 1978). Bem theorized that those androgynous individuals who could demonstrate both instrumentality and expressiveness by adapting to situations or by blending the two forms together would demonstrate higher psychological health and well-being than those individuals who could not (Bem, 1978). Individuals with the ability to be sensitive to both masculine and feminine cues are able to respond to a wider array of situations than feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated individuals (Woodhill & Samuels, 2003). Researchers discovered that those with androgynous ideologies experienced less psychological distress and overall higher well-being than those with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated ideologies (Antill, 1983; Campbell,

Steffen, & Langmeyer, 1981; Cheng, 1999; Green & Kendrick, 1994; Kirchmeyer, 1996; Rose & Montemayor, 1994; Sawrie, Watson, & Biderman, 1991; Shaver et al., 1996; Shimonaka et al., 1997; Stake, 1997; Wubbenhorst, 1994). Silverstein, Auerbach, and Levant (2002) explained that the rigid societal definitions of what is feminine and masculine are destructive to the well-being of both men and women. However, no research has addressed how the variable gender ideology relates to role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction of dual-career couples.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the current study is to address a gap in the role strain literature on dual-career couples. While researchers have examined the impact of Social Role Theory's competing demands and gender role strain's effect on marital satisfaction and psychological distress, no studies have determined how gender ideology fits into the literature on role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Including gender ideology in the literature on dual-career couples allows us to determine the impact of individuals' internalized societal gender expectations and norms on role strain of the individual. Focusing on the possible individual source of the role strain experienced

in dual-career couples has implications for how to decrease the role strain experienced. A reasonable hypothesis is that individuals categorized as having feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies will have increased role strain, decreased marital satisfaction, and decreased life satisfaction.

Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

Research Question 1

Do dual-career individuals classified as having feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less role strain than individuals classified as having androgynous gender ideologies, as measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale-I (O'Neil, et al., 1986) and Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981)?

Research Question 2

Do dual-career individuals classified as having feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory- Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less marital satisfaction than individuals classified as having androgynous gender

ideologies, as measured by the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997)?

Research Question 3

Do dual-career individuals classified as having feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory- Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less overall life satisfaction than individuals classified as having androgynous gender ideologies, as measured by the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994)?

Hypotheses

Based on the literature, it is expected that dual-career individuals classified as having feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies will have higher role strain than dual-career individuals classified as having androgynous gender ideologies. It is also expected that dual-career individuals classified as having feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies will have less marital satisfaction than dual-career individuals classified as having androgynous gender ideologies. Lastly, it is expected that dual-career individuals classified as having feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies will have less overall

life satisfaction than dual-career individuals classified as having androgynous gender ideologies.

Significance of Study

With increasing dual-career couple family structures and previous research focusing on the negative consequences of role strain and positive aspects when degendered role responsibilities exist, this study seeks to address a gap in the dual-career literature regarding gender ideology of the individual. It makes sense that gender ideology of the individual affects role strain in dual-career couples given that gender ideology likely influences individuals' perceptions on degendered roles and responsibilities. Nevertheless, there have been no empirical studies to address how the individuals' gender ideology impacts role strain, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction for individuals in dual-career couples. Knowing more about the potential individual origin of dual-career couples' role strain is imperative to mental health professionals working with dual-career individuals or couples, employers, and policymakers impacting dual-career structure families. If gender ideology is influential on individual members of dual-career couples' role strain, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction, this can guide mental health

professionals in working with dual-career couples. Mental health professionals can address the societal norms and expectations internalized on an individual level into a gender ideology as the possible source of the negative consequences experienced by many dual-career couples. The significance of the current study also integrates the literature on dual-career couples' role strain, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction to provide a more comprehensive picture than previous research studies.

Definitions of Terms

Numerous terms exist within the gender-related research area. Definitions of common terms used in this study are provided so that clarity and consistency of concepts throughout the study is facilitated.

Sex: This term refers to whether one is born biologically male or female (Gilbert & Scher, 1999, p. 3).

Gender: This term refers to the social construction of masculinity and femininity within a culture (Stewart et al., 2003, p. 4).

Gender identity: This term refers to an individual's own feeling of whether he or she is a man or woman (Ward, 2003, p. 262).

Gender roles: This term describes the assignment of social roles that determine how people defined as males or females will act, dress, speak, get married, or be friends with others (Ward, 2003, p.5).

Gender role socialization: This term refers to the process by which children and adolescents acquire and internalize the values and behaviors seen as appropriately feminine, masculine, or both (Stewart et al., 2003, p.18).

Gender ideology: This term refers to a collection of related beliefs about men and women in society. These beliefs about what is appropriately feminine or masculine influence individuals' behavior. In the United States for example, our gender ideology includes the belief that men and women have different attitudes toward domestic responsibilities (Stewart et al., 2003, p. 6).

These definitions attempt to clarify the distinction between biologically determined sex and socially constructed gender and how they interact to influence values, beliefs, and behaviors.

Organization of Study

There are five chapters that describe the current study. In chapter I, an introduction to the study and a general overview of the rationale for the study is provided. In chapter II, a literature review and integration of previous studies providing the basis for the current study is presented. In chapter III, the methods used in the study to collect and analyze the data are given. In chapter IV, results of the study are presented. In chapter V, a discussion of the results relevant to the previous literature basis, strengths and limitations of the current study, clinical applications, and future recommendations for related research is given.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is organized into six sections that discuss the relevant literature and provide a rationale for the current study. The first five sections discuss the relevant dual-career couples' literature on each of the five constructs researched in the study, including social role strain, gender role strain, marital satisfaction, life satisfaction, and gender ideology. The sixth section provides a summary and synthesis of the literature to provide the rationale for the current study.

Social Role Strain

Description of Social Role Strain

Role strain as defined by Social Role Theory is when there are too many competing demands on an individual based on the multiple roles in which he or she is involved (Fein, 1990, 1992). According to Social Role Theory, individuals meet personal and relational needs by participating in various roles with role partners (Fein, 1990, 1992). When these roles become too demanding on the individual, role strain is present. Role strain has been researched in individuals in dual-career couples by investigating the two primary roles of spouse and career person (Perrone and

Worthington, 2001.) Perrone and Worthington (2001) researched role strain in individuals in dual-career couples using the Job-Family Role Strain Scale developed by Bohlen & Viveros-Long (1981). They found that job-family role strain is related to decreased satisfaction with the dual-career lifestyle and negative evaluation of marriage. Their research also found that with increased cooperation between husband and wife the negative impact of role strain on marital satisfaction was decreased (Perrone & Worthington, 2001).

There have been several other studies that have investigated social role strain in dual-career couples. Perrewe and Hochwarter (1999) also found that individuals with increased work and family demands and role strain reported burnout, decreased family and occupational well-being, and job and life dissatisfaction. However, they also indicated that spousal support decreased the negative impact of role strain. Cinnamon and Rich (2002) also investigated the salience of the worker and family roles and the competing time demands they pose on each other for dual-career couples. They found that women attributed greater importance than men to both the parenting and work roles. However, both men and women in dual-career couples

reported work-family conflict. Bonebright, Clay, and Ankenmann (2000) researched role conflict between work and family as it related to life satisfaction. They found individuals with increased work-family conflict to have significantly less overall life satisfaction. They indicated their research was prompted by McGuire's (1999) APA monitor article on the dramatic and remarkable increase in workers working long hours and the increase in those seeking counseling related to balancing family and work demands.

Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman (1996) researched role strain in dual-career couples and found that 42% of nonparents and 58% of parents reported some conflict in managing family and work social roles. Barnett and Rivers (1996) also demonstrated the difficulty for some dual-career couples in managing family and work social roles when they discovered that 75% of dual-career couples reported conflict in managing the family and work roles.

Thus, there are several studies that have researched the role strain experienced by members of dual-career couples with the competing demands of worker and family social roles. Several of these studies found that the worker and family role strain could be decreased or

moderated with individuals sharing family and worker responsibilities and supporting one another in their various roles. Researchers have indicated the importance of degendering household and work responsibilities to share responsibility and effectively balance work and family roles for decreasing role strain (Haddock, Zimmerman, Ziembra & Current, 2001; Saginak & Saginak, 2005). Saginak and Saginak (2005) also indicated the importance of researchers examining gender ideology's effect on balancing work and family role strain. The individuals' gender-based perceptions and stereotypes likely influence how couples balance work and family roles.

Social Role Strain and Gender Ideology

While the empirical research on dual-career couples has found evidence for Social Role Theory's role strain from the competing demands of worker and family roles, there are no studies which examine how gender ideology impacts dual-career couples' role strain. Including the gender ideology variable in the literature on dual-career couples and role strain allows us to determine the impact of individuals' internalized societal gender expectations and how these affect the role strain experienced. This study added this important piece to the literature by

investigating the relationship between gender ideology and role strain experienced due to the competing worker and family social roles of dual-career couple individuals. The research on gender ideology conducted and how this variable relates to the literature on dual-career couples will be discussed in greater detail later. Researchers examining the challenges faced by dual-career couples have also examined gender role strain.

Gender Role Strain

Description of Gender Role Strain

Role strain, as defined by Pleck's (1981, 1995) Gender Role Strain Model, is when individuals internalize stereotyped societal norms around gender ideals that are often contradictory, inconsistent, and unattainable (Pleck, 1995). When individuals attempt to conform to these culturally stereotyped gender role norms, psychological stress occurs. Pleck (1981) referred to this stress as gender role strain.

O'Neil, Good, and Holmes (1995) developed a major research program that demonstrated that gender role strain existed when individuals enacted the traditional societal stereotyped norms of what is appropriate male and female behavior. Traditional gender roles are described as the

male being the primary breadwinner and the female being the primary caretaker and homemaker. O'Neil developed the Gender Role Conflict Scale (also used in this study) for use in the Gender Role Conflict Research Program that began in 1978 and has been widely used by researchers since then. Vogel et al., (2003) found that even with women in the labor force, many dual-career couples still place the financial pressures on the male of the household and the caretaker and homemaker responsibilities on the female of the household. With these gender stereotypes women report gender role strain of having to do the majority of the childrearing and household responsibilities while working full time (Vogel et al., 2003). Men also report gender role strain of feeling pressured to be the primary breadwinner and feeling isolated from their wife, children, and family because of their time away from home with work responsibilities (Vogel et al., 2003).

Society's influence on what is appropriate male and female behavior and responsibilities limits many dual-career couples from balancing their work and family demands most effectively (Eagly, 1987). Silverstein, Auerbach, and Levant (2002) also researched gender role strain experienced by fathers who were members of dual-career

couples. They reported that culture's rigid definitions of what is masculine and feminine are destructive to the well-being of both men and women. They found that virtually all of the men were stressed by trying to fulfill both the primary provider role and the nurturing involved father role. These demands were unattainable and created gender role strain (Silverstein, et al., 2002). However, they also found that couples who shared the provider and caretaker roles by degendering responsibilities exhibited less gender role strain (Silverstein et al., 2002). Thus, there are several studies that have researched gender role strain experienced by members of dual-career couples. Silverstein, Auerbach, and Levant (2002) found that degendered role responsibilities also decreased the gender role strain experienced.

Gender Role Strain and Gender Ideology

While the research on dual-career couples has found evidence for gender role strain with the culturally constructed gender stereotyped norms of what are appropriately male and female behaviors, no studies have examined gender ideology's impact on gender role strain. As Saginak & Saginak (2005) discussed, gender ideology is an important concept that likely influences how couples

divide responsibilities and negotiate demands. Including the gender ideology variable in the literature on dual-career couples and gender role strain allows us to determine the impact of the individuals' internalized societal gender expectations and how these affect the gender role strain experienced. This study added this important piece to the literature by investigating the relationship between gender ideology and gender role strain for individuals who are members of dual-career couples. Researchers examining dual-career couples have also examined marital satisfaction.

Marital Satisfaction

Description of Marital Satisfaction

Marital Satisfaction as conceptualized by Snyder (1997) involves examining individuals' relationship distress and dissatisfaction with their relationship, including areas such as communication, time together, disagreement about finances, and role orientation.

Several studies have examined marital satisfaction of dual-career couples. Campbell and Snow (1992) researched the impact of gender role conflict on marital satisfaction of men in dual-career couples and found that higher levels of gender role conflict were associated with lower levels

of marital satisfaction. Van Meter and Agronow (1982) also found similar results for women in dual-career couples in that higher role conflict was associated with lower levels of marital satisfaction. An article by Price-Bonham and Murphy (1980) reported, "Sometimes dual-earners may find they cannot continue an intact marriage because the strains become so acute they choose to divorce rather than attempting to continue in a system which is not satisfying," (p.187).

Role strain present in dual-career couples often leads to insufficient time in the couple or family realm due to the worker demands, resulting in decreased closeness, intimacy, and supportiveness within the marital relationship (Haddock, 2002). Role strain has been identified as a significant contributor to marital distress in dual-career couples (Norrell and Norrell, 1996; Eckenrode and Gore, 1990).

Haddock et al., (2001) interviewed dual-career couples and found that 45 of the 47 couples interviewed stressed the importance of equality and partnership for their marital relationship to be successful. Perrone and Worthington (2001) also found that as individuals in dual-career couples cooperated and divided work equitably they

were more satisfied with the combination of their family and worker roles; the negative impact of role strain on marital satisfaction was also lessened. Similarly, Campbell and Snow (1992) found that male gender role conflict and family environment accounted for 47% of the variance in marital satisfaction, demonstrating the significant effect of role strain on marital satisfaction.

Haddock et al., (2001) explained that difficulties of the dual-career family arrangement are often due to inequalities or power imbalances in the marital relationship. In addition, when individuals in dual-career couples share responsibilities and negotiate roles, role strain decreases and they are able to experience the benefits of dual-career family structures, including intellectual companionship between marital partners and an increased understanding of what marital partners experience daily (Goldenberg and Goldenberg, 1984).

Thus, the research on marital satisfaction and dual-career couples has found that marital satisfaction decreases when role strain is present in the relationship. Similarly, several studies have found that when couples decrease role strain by degendering role responsibilities and sharing roles, marital satisfaction increases (Burley,

1995; Stevens, Kiger, & Riley, 2001; Zimmerman et al, 2003.)

Marital Satisfaction and Gender Ideology

Including the gender ideology variable in the literature on dual-career couples and marital satisfaction allows us to determine the impact of individuals' internalized societal gender expectations and how these affect the marital satisfaction experienced. This study added this important piece to the literature by investigating the relationship between gender ideology and marital satisfaction of dual-career couple individuals. Researchers examining dual-career couples have also examined life satisfaction.

Life Satisfaction

Description of Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction, as conceptualized by Frisch (1994), refers to a person's subjective evaluation of the degree to which his or her most important needs, goals, and wishes have been fulfilled. Such satisfaction is comprehensive and includes areas such as goals and values, money, work, play, home, and community. This emerging way of viewing mental health focuses on the positive mental health

movement to move away from just focusing on negative affect and symptoms (Frisch, 1994).

Several studies have examined life satisfaction of dual-career couples. Bonebright, Clay, and Ankenmann (2000) looked at life satisfaction of dual-career couples and found that as work and family conflict increased, life satisfaction decreased. Perrewe and Hockwarter (1999) also found life dissatisfaction to be associated with work and family conflict.

In addition, numerous studies have indirectly examined life satisfaction by researching negative symptomology. Numerous negative consequences of work and family role strain impacting life satisfaction found include burnout, decreased family and occupational well-being, job and life dissatisfaction, illness, and depression (Hayes and Mahalik, 2000; Perrewe and Hochwarter, 1999; Good et al., 1996; Pleck, 1995; Good and Mintz, 1990).

Positive aspects of the dual-career couple family type have been found relating to life satisfaction when individuals share roles and degender responsibilities. Women in dual-career couples often report an independent identity, increased self-esteem, and enhanced social contacts which increase their life satisfaction (Barnett

and Baruch, 1985). Men also report feeling decreased pressure of being the financial provider and increased opportunities for family involvement, thus increasing their life satisfaction (Barnett and Rivers, 1996). Those couples that can successfully negotiate and balance work and family report having happier relationship satisfaction, higher self-esteem, less psychological distress, higher overall well-being, and higher job satisfaction and efficiency, indicative of higher life satisfaction (Perrone and Worthington, 2001).

Thus, the research on life satisfaction and dual-career couples has found that life satisfaction decreases when role strain is present in the relationship. However, life satisfaction increases when couples decrease role strain by degendering role responsibilities and sharing roles.

Life Satisfaction and Gender Ideology

Including the gender ideology variable in the literature on dual-career couples and life satisfaction allows us to determine the impact of individuals' internalized societal gender expectations and how these affect the life satisfaction experienced. This study added this important piece to the literature by investigating the

relationship between gender ideology and life satisfaction of dual-career couple individuals. Next, a discussion will follow that addresses the literature on gender ideology and the importance of examining this variable as it relates to dual-career couples.

Gender Ideology

Description of Gender Ideology

Gender ideology does not refer to biological sex, but instead includes attitudes and behaviors about what is appropriately feminine and masculine according to the gender stereotypes of one's society (Barnett et al., 1993). Sandra Bem is one of the pioneer researchers that examined androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated gender ideologies (Bem, 1974; Bem, 1978). Bem's theory was that androgynous individuals who could demonstrate both instrumentality and expressiveness by adapting to situations or blending the two forms together would demonstrate higher psychological health and well-being than individuals who could not (Bem, 1978).

Woodhill and Samuels (2003) found that androgynous individuals who were able to be sensitive to both masculine and feminine cues were able to respond to a wider array of situations than individuals classified as feminine,

masculine, or undifferentiated. Several researchers have also found that those individuals classified as androgynous experienced less psychological distress and higher overall well-being than those classified as feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated (Antill, 1983; Campbell, Steffen, and Langmeyer, 1981; Cheng, 1999; Green and Kendrick, 1994; Kirchmeyer, 1996; Rose and Montemayor, 1994; Sawrie, Watson, and Biderman, 1991; Shaver et al., 1996; Shimonaka et al., 1997; Stake, 1997; Wubbenhorst, 1994).

Silverstein, Auerbach, and Levant (2002) explained that rigid societal definitions of what is feminine and masculine are destructive to the well-being of both men and women.

Dual-Career Couples and Gender Ideology

The previous discussions on the social role strain, gender role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction constructs as these relate to dual-career couples all demonstrate the benefits of degendered role responsibilities and shared household and work responsibilities for dual-career couples. Perrone and Worthington (2001) found that dual-career couples that negotiate worker and family role responsibilities experience the benefit of decreased role strain. Haddock

et al., (2001) reported that dual-career couples that experience degendered role responsibilities and more egalitarian roles are likely to stay married and maintain higher marital satisfaction. Haddock et al., (2001) also discussed how gender stereotypes and role demands create role strain and decreased well-being.

While several researchers have addressed the benefits of degendered role responsibilities and shared role responsibilities of dual-career couples there have been no studies that have examined how gender ideology affects role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Saginak & Saginak (2005) indicated the importance of individuals' gender ideology for dual-career couples balancing work and family effectively.

Including the gender ideology variable in the literature on dual-career couples allows us to determine the impact of the individuals' internalized societal gender expectations and norms on role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction of the individual. Focusing on the possible source of the role strain, marital dissatisfaction, and life dissatisfaction in dual-career couple individuals has implications for how to decrease the role strain, marital dissatisfaction, and life

dissatisfaction. We can then begin to address how individuals in dual-career couples can shift toward degendered role responsibilities and demonstrate androgynous characteristics for decreasing role strain, marital dissatisfaction, and life dissatisfaction.

Summary

This study added the important variable of gender ideology to the research literature on dual-career couples. The concepts of social role strain, gender role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction have all received attention in the literature on dual-career couples. Several researchers have discussed the importance of degendered role responsibilities for decreased role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Individuals classified as having androgynous gender ideologies are likely to engage in degendered role responsibilities more than individuals classified as feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies thereby demonstrating lower role strain and higher marital satisfaction and life satisfaction. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between gender ideology and role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction of dual-career couple individuals.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is comprised of four sections that describe how the current study was conducted. The first section contains information on the participants, including demographic information. The second section contains information on the instruments used, including reliability and validity information. The third section discusses the procedure used to obtain participants and collect the data. The final section contains information on the analyses used in the study.

Participants

The sample was composed of 74 individuals who were members of dual-career couples. The participants included individuals from Texas, Florida, and North Carolina. The participants voluntarily responded to the survey packet that was mailed out, which included a letter inviting them to participate in the study, an information sheet about the study, and the instruments. See Appendix A for a sample of the participant recruitment letter and information sheet mailed out to participants. The essential requirement for participation was that the participant be a member of a dual-career couple, working a minimum of 35 hours a week

outside of the house, and the couple needed to be living together. Two individuals returned incomplete survey packets, one individual reported working under the 35 hours a week minimum work requirement, and one individual reported his or her spouse worked under the 35 hours a week work requirement leaving 70 individuals for the purpose of data analysis. Both individuals of dual-career couples were invited to participate in the study and participants were included if one or both members elected to complete the individual instruments.

Demographic Information

Table 1 includes demographic information regarding the participants. As indicated in the table, the modal participant was a female (52.9%), 25-34 year old (48.6%), Caucasian (77.1%), had completed an advanced college degree (54.3%), had an income level for the individual's job in the \$41,000-\$61,000 range (30.0%), was employed as a professional non-faculty (48.6%), and was not a parent (54.3%). Of the sample group, 37 were female and 33 were male. The age of the respondents ranged from 24 years or younger to 65 years and older, with a median age of 25-34 years old. The sample was 77.1% Caucasian, 14.3% Hispanic, 2.9% Asian, 1.4% African American, and 2.9% Mixed

ethnicities. A description of the sample's educational levels show that 10.0% had a high school diploma or less, 30.0% had completed some college or graduated from college, and 60.0% had completed some graduate work or completed an advanced degree. Participants reported their spouses' educational levels: 8.6% had a high school diploma or less, 35.7% had completed some college or graduated from college, and 55.7% had completed some graduate work or completed an advanced degree. The median income level range for the participant was between \$41,000-\$61,000 and his or her partner's median income level range was also between \$41,000 and \$61,000.

The income level ranged from less than \$15,000 (1.4%) to more than \$100,000 (8.6%) for the participant and less than \$15,000 (3.0%) to more than \$100,000 (10%) for the participant's partner. 45.7% of the respondents had children and 22.9% indicated they had a child under 18-years-old. The modal job category reported of the participants was professional non-faculty (48.6%) followed by executive, administrative, or managerial (17.1%). The participants' partners' modal job category was professional non-faculty (47.1%), followed by executive, administrative, or managerial (15.7%). Additional demographic information specifics on the participants can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample Demographics

Demographic variable	Total sample (N = 70)
Sex	
Male	33 (47.1)
Female	37 (52.9)
Age in years	
24 or younger	2 (2.9)
25-34 years	34 (48.6)
35-44 years	12 (17.1)
45-54 years	12 (17.1)
55-64 years	7 (10.0)
65 or older	3 (4.3)
Ethnicity	
White/Caucasian	54 (77.1)
Black/African-American	1 (1.4)
Hispanic/Latino(a)	10 (14.3)
Asian/Asian American	2 (2.9)
Mixed	2 (2.9)
Other	1 (1.4)
Participant Level of Education	
Some high school	0 (0.0)
Completed GED	0 (0.0)
Graduated high school	7 (10.0)
Some college	6 (8.6)
Completed college	15 (21.4)
Some graduate work	4 (5.7)
Completed advanced degree	38 (54.3)
Spouse Level of Education	
Some high school	0 (0.0)
Completed GED	0 (0.0)
Graduated high school	6 (8.6)
Some college	8 (11.4)
Completed college	17 (24.3)
Some graduate work	4 (5.7)
Completed advanced degree	35 (50.0)

Table 1 (Continued)

Demographic variable	Total sample (N = 70)
Job Category of Participant	
Executive, Administrative, or Managerial	12 (17.1)
Professional Non-Faculty	34 (48.6)
Faculty	11 (15.7)
Secretarial/Clerical	4 (5.7)
Technical/Paraprofessional/Skilled Craft	4 (5.7)
Service and maintenance	1 (1.4)
Other	4 (5.7)
Job Category of Participant	
Executive, Administrative, or Managerial	11 (15.7)
Professional Non-Faculty	33 (47.1)
Faculty	10 (14.3)
Secretarial/Clerical	3 (4.3)
Technical/Paraprofessional/Skilled Craft	7 (10.0)
Service and maintenance	1 (1.4)
Other	5 (7.1)
Parental Status	
Have Children	32 (45.7)
Do Not Have Any Children	38 (54.3)
Dependent Child(ren) Under the Age of 18	
Have Dependent Child(ren)	16 (22.9)
Do Not Have Dependent Child(ren)	54 (77.1)

Note. Values in parentheses reflect percentage of total sample size (n/N).

Instrumentation

Participants completed a survey packet that included a demographic questionnaire and instruments measuring identification with ethnicity, gender ideology, gender role conflict, job-family role strain, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction. The demographic questionnaire requested information on the participant's gender, age, ethnicity, level of education, partner's level of education, marital status, length of relationship, parental status, number and age of children, type of job, partner's type of job, hours each partner works outside of the house, hours each partner spends on household work and the type of work, and each partner's income range. See Appendix B for the demographic questionnaire used in the study. The other instruments used in the study are described below.

Ethnic Identification

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) is a 12-item instrument designed to measure an individual's ethnic identification towards his or her own ethnic group. The two factors measured include ethnic identity search and belongingness to one's own ethnic identity. Most individuals are able to complete the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure in 5 minutes or less. The participants

indicate their level of agreement on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree), with higher scores indicative of higher ethnic identification toward one's own ethnic group. Item examples include: I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs; I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group; and I participate in cultural practices of my own ethnic group, such as special food, music, or customs. The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure was standardized on a sample of 553 ethnically diverse individuals. The instrument has demonstrated good reliability, with alpha reliability coefficients typically above .80 across a wide range of ethnic groups and ages.

Gender Ideology

Participants completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981). The short form of the Bem Sex Role Inventory is a 30-item instrument designed to assess gender related personality traits. Most individuals are able to complete the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form in 10 minutes and the revised shorter version does not contain the problematic "masculine" and "feminine" items or the feminine scale items with low social desirability that the

long version did (Bem, 1974; Bruch, 2002). It contains 10-items that are stereotypically feminine (affectionate, gentle, understanding, sensitive to the needs of others) and 10-items that are stereotypically masculine (independent, assertive, dominant, willing to take risks). The Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form also contains 10-items that serve as filler characteristics (truthful, conscientious, reliable, tactful). Participants are asked to indicate on a 7-point scale how well each of the 30 characteristics describes himself or herself. The scale ranges from 1 ("Never or almost never true") to 7 ("Always or almost always true") and is labeled at each level. The participant is then categorized based on his or her scales on both the masculine and feminine scales. The participant is classified into one of four categories including "androgynous" where he or she is high on both feminine and masculine dimensions, "undifferentiated" where he or she is low on both feminine and masculine dimensions, "masculine" where he or she is high on the masculine characteristics and low on the feminine characteristics, or "feminine" where he or she is high on the feminine characteristics and low on the masculine characteristics. The Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form is based on the conception that the

traditionally sex-typed person is someone who is highly attuned to cultural definitions of sex-appropriate behavior and who uses such definitions as the ideal standard against which his or her own behavior is evaluated (Bem, 1981). The Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form was standardized on 1,539 individuals that were representative of the general population with regard to sex, ethnicity, and age categories.

In terms of reliability and validity of the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form, factor analytic studies have shown that both of the masculine and feminine scales demonstrate high internal consistency, reflect two orthogonal dimensions, and show sound convergent and divergent validity (Martin & Ramanaiah, 1988; Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1983). The Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form has yielded highly reliable scores in previous studies, with alpha reliability coefficients for both the feminine, masculine, and overall scores and test-retest reliability coefficients generally exceeding .85. Construct validity is provided by a series of studies on feminine and masculine behavioral functioning. Individuals in these studies displayed feminine behaviors consistent with his or her feminine classification, masculine

behaviors consistent with his or her masculine classification, both masculine and feminine behaviors consistent with his or her androgynous classification, and neither strong feminine or masculine behaviors if he or she was classified as undifferentiated (Bem, 1975; Bem, Martyna & Watson, 1976).

Gender Role Strain

The Gender Role Conflict Scale-I (O'Neil et al., 1986) is a 37-item instrument designed to assess four dimensions of gender role conflict: Success, Power, and Competition; Restrictive Emotionality; Restrictive Affectionate Behavior; and Conflicts Between Work and Leisure and Family Relations. Most individuals are able to complete the Gender Role Conflict Scale-I in 15 minutes or less. The participants indicate their level of agreement on a 6-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree), with higher scores reflecting more gender role conflict. Item examples include: I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health; I sometimes define my personal value by my career success; and My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life. The Gender Role Conflict Scale-I was standardized on diverse samples of individuals in the United States and six

other countries that were representative of different ethnicities, sexes, and age categories.

The Gender Role Conflict Scale-I has yielded highly reliable scores in previous studies, with alpha reliability coefficients and test-retest reliability coefficients generally exceeding .85. Construct validity of the Gender Role Conflict Scale-I is supported by findings of positive correlations with depression (Good & Mintz, 1990) and psychological distress (Good et al., 1995).

Job-Family Role Strain

Participants completed the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). The Job-Family Role Strain Scale is a 16-item instrument designed to measure values and emotions about strain between job and family roles. Most individuals are able to complete the Job-Family Role Strain Scale in 15 minutes or less. Participants indicate on a 5-point Likert scale how much the item is reflective of himself or herself (ranging from 1= Always to 5= Never) where high scores indicate greater role strain. Item examples include: I have a good balance between my job and my family time; and I feel more respected than I would if I didn't have a job. The Job-Family Role Strain Scale was standardized on a large sample

of individuals who took part in the Family Impact Seminar representative of different ethnicities, sexes, age categories, and occupations.

The Job-Family Role Strain Scale has satisfactory reliability with alpha reliability coefficients generally exceeding .80 and test-retest reliability coefficients generally exceeding .75. Construct validity is also supported by factor analysis studies (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981).

Marital Satisfaction

Participants completed the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997). The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised was designed to measure the nature and extent of relationship distress for couples and contains 150 true-false items. The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised can be used with both married couples as well as partnered couples that are cohabitating; it takes approximately 30 minutes to complete. The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised contains 13 scales with higher scores indicating greater couple distress and dissatisfaction. For the purpose of the current study, participants completed the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale

consisting of 22-items measuring the participant's overall dissatisfaction with his or her relationship. Item examples on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale include: There are some serious difficulties in our relationship; I might be happier if I weren't in this relationship; and Our relationship has been disappointing in several ways. The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised was standardized on a sample of 2,040 individuals from 22 states that were reflective of the general population with respect to sex, age, educational level, geographic region, ethnicity, and occupation.

The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale has highly reliable scores with previous studies reporting alpha reliability coefficients and test-retest reliability coefficients generally exceeding .85. Convergent validity is demonstrated by high correlations of the Global Distress Scale with similar scales on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Snyder, 1997), the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (Snyder, 1979), and with Spanier's Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Snyder & Wills, 1989; Whisman & Jacobson, 1992; Wilson et al., 1988).

Life Satisfaction

Participants completed the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994). The Quality of Life Inventory is designed to assess overall subjective well-being and contains 32-items. Most individuals are able to complete the Quality of Life Inventory in 10 minutes or less. The participants respond to half of the items on a 3-point scale for importance of the items (where 0=Not important and 2=Extremely Important) and the other half of the items on a 6-point Likert-type scale indicating the participant's satisfaction in a particular area (from -3= Very Dissatisfied to +3= Very Satisfied). Higher scores are indicative of participants' reporting higher overall quality of life. Item examples include: How important is work to your happiness and How satisfied are you with your work; How important is play to your happiness and How satisfied are you with the Play in your life. The Quality of Life Inventory was standardized on a national sample of 1,924 individuals who were representative of the U.S. Census data with regard to sex, age, ethnicity, and education level.

The Quality of Life Inventory has satisfactory reliability, with test-retest reliability coefficients generally exceeding .75 and alpha reliability coefficients

generally exceeding .80. The Quality of Life Inventory is supported on convergent validity with high correlations with similar scales such as the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) and the Quality of Life Index (Frisch, 1994).

Procedure

Prior to data collection, the present study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects in Research at Texas A&M University. The forms required by the Institutional Review Board contained in the "IRB Application Protocol for Human Subjects in Research" including the participant recruitment letter and informed consent information sheet were submitted and approved.

Participants were initially recruited through a random sampling of Texas A&M University personnel provided by the Texas A&M University Office of Payroll, Budget, and Personnel. Participants received the survey packet through campus mail and were asked to return the packet back to the principal investigator through campus mail. From this method of recruitment the principal investigator received 61 completed surveys from the 300 surveys that were randomly mailed out. The principal investigator also asked the individuals to return the surveys whether or not they

completed them so that the surveys could be resent if they were uncompleted. 8 surveys were returned uncompleted with several individuals indicating he or she was not a member of a dual-career couple. The initial return rate of completed surveys was approximately 20%. To increase the participants, the principal investigator expanded the sample by sending recruitment letters out to employees at two university counseling centers in North Carolina and Florida where the principal investigator had personal connections. Participants contacted the principal investigator to indicate an interest in participating in the study before the surveys were mailed out. From this method of recruitment 13 surveys were returned of the 18 surveys sent out for a return rate of approximately 75%. Thus, the overall return rate was 22% with a total of 70 surveys returned completed of the 318 surveys that were sent out.

Data Analyses

All the data was entered and analyzed using SPSS for Windows, a statistical data analysis software package. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were initially run that are reported in detail in Chapter IV Results. A MANOVA statistical analysis procedure was used to test the

hypotheses that participants scoring in the androgynous category, according to the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form, would demonstrate lower gender role strain and job-family role strain and higher marital satisfaction and overall life satisfaction than participants scoring in the feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated categories on the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form instrument. A multivariate analysis of variance was used due to the independent variable gender ideology being categorical. The criterion variables included gender role strain, job-family role strain, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter provides the results of the data analyses and is divided into four sections. The first section discusses the preliminary analyses, including descriptive statistics and scale reliability. The second section discusses the primary analyses, including the hypotheses and results of each hypothesis. The third section discusses the ancillary analyses of several demographic variable associations with the measures, and the fourth section discusses the summary of the results.

Preliminary Analyses

The preliminary analyses describe descriptive statistics of the sample and the survey measures and scale reliability of the measures.

Sample Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the sample demographics and survey measures. The sample was examined for outliers on all measured variables using Moore and McCabe's (1989) criteria of an outlier as an observed value that lies +/- 3 standard deviations away from the mean. All outliers were removed and not included in the subsequent analyses.

Table 1 presented the details of the descriptive statistics that are generally discussed below. Inspection of the results indicated that the sample was well balanced with regard to sex with 52.9% (n=37) of the sample female and 47.1% (n=33) of the sample male. The sample was 77.1% (n=54) Caucasian, followed by 14.3% (n=10) Hispanic, 2.9% Asian (n=2), 2.9% Mixed ethnicities (n=2), and 1.4% African American (n=1). With respect to age of the participants, 48.6% (n=34) reported being between 25-34 years old.

The sample population was highly educated, with 54.3% (n=38) reportedly completing an advanced college degree; this was comparable to the participants' spouses' high level of education with 50.0% (n=35) reportedly completing an advanced college degree. The sample was predominately childless with 54.3% (n=38) reportedly having no children and 77.1% (n=54) reportedly not having dependent children under the age of 18 years old. The sample consisted of approximately half, 48.6% (n=34) being employed in a professional non-faculty job position. Similarly, 47.1% (n=33) of respondents' spouses worked in professional non-faculty positions. Over half, 52.9% (n=37) of the sample's individual income was between \$26,000-\$61,000 with 30.0% (n=21) of the sample reporting their individual income

between \$41,000-\$61,000. The individual income of the sample's spouses was comparable with 49.9% (n=35) reportedly having incomes between \$26,000-\$61,000 and 22.9% (n=16) reportedly having an income between \$41,000-\$61,000. Descriptive statistics on the measures will now be discussed to indicate how the sample participants scored on the measures.

Instrumentation Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 includes descriptive statistics on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), Marital Satisfaction Inventory Revised-Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997), and Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992).

Role Strain, as measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), had a possible range of 37-222 with higher scales indicative of higher gender role conflict. The mean for the sample was 118.14 (SD= 28.99, range 62-191), indicating the participants reported a moderate to high overall gender role strain.

The Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981) was also used as a measure of role strain and had a possible range of 11-55 with higher scales indicative of higher job-family role strain. The mean for the sample

participants was 30.20 (SD= 5.79, range 18-44), indicating the participants reported a moderate overall job-family role strain.

Marital Satisfaction was measured by the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) which had a possible range of 0-22 with higher scales indicative of higher marital dissatisfaction. The mean for the sample was 2.61 (SD=4.33, range 0-22), indicating the majority of participants reported marital dissatisfaction in the low to average range.

For the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) participants could score a possible range of 12-48 with higher scales indicative of higher ethnic identification toward one's own ethnic group. The mean for the sample participants was 32.27 (SD= 4.73, range 21-45), indicating the participants moderately identified with their ethnic group.

Table 3 includes descriptive statistics on the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) and Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994).

The Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) was the measure of gender ideology with the participants able

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Variable Measures

	Sample Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Gender Role Conflict Scale-I	118.14	28.99	62 - 191
Job-Family Role Strain Scale	30.20	5.79	18 - 44
Marital Satisfaction Inventory Revised-Global Distress Scale	2.61	4.33	0 - 22
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure	32.27	4.72	21 - 45

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Categorical Variable Measures

	Total sample (N = 70)
Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short	
Androgynous	14 (20.0)
Feminine	26 (37.1)
Masculine	14 (20.0)
Undifferentaited	16 (22.9)
Quality of Life Inventory	
Very Low	6 (8.6)
Low	5 (7.1)
Average	44 (62.9)
High	15 (21.4)

Note. Values in parentheses reflect percentage of total sample size (n/N). Means and standard deviations were not computed for categorical variables.

to be categorized into one of four categories including androgynous, feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated. The sample consisted of 20.0% (n=14) individuals scoring as androgynous, 37.1% (n=26) individuals scoring as feminine, 20.0% (n=14) individuals scoring as masculine, and 22.9% (n=16) individuals scoring as undifferentiated.

Quality of Life as measured by the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) categorizes participants into one of four categories including very low, low, average, or high overall quality of life. The sample consisted of 8.6% (n=6) individuals scoring as very low, 7.1% (n=5) individuals scoring as low, 62.9% (n=44) individuals scoring as average, and 21.4% (n=15) individuals scoring as high. Thus the majority of participants reported an average overall quality of life.

Bivariate Analyses

Bivariate Analyses for Demographics

Pearson correlational analyses were conducted to assess the association between demographic characteristics. The correlational coefficient between each pair of variables allows for evaluation of the degree of association between each variable pair.

Table 4 presents the entire demographic variables correlation matrix. Only general significant relationships between demographic variables will be discussed here. Interpretations of correlations and effect sizes are all based on Cohen's (1992) description of small, medium, and large effect sizes for R^2 of .02, .13, and .26 respectively. Age of participants was highly correlated with months married ($\underline{r} = .89, p < .01$) which is indicative that the older the participants are the more likely they are to be married. Age of the participants was also highly correlated with having a child ($\underline{r} = .70, p < .01$), with older participants being more likely to report having a child. Age was also highly correlated with income of participant ($\underline{r} = .30, p < .05$) and moderately correlated with income of the spouse ($\underline{r} = .25, p < .05$) with older participants correlated with higher levels of income for both the participant and her or his spouse.

Level of education was highly correlated with spouse's level of education ($\underline{r} = .44, p < .01$) where higher level of education for the participants was associated with higher level of education for the participants' spouses. Level of education was also moderately negatively correlated with job category ($\underline{r} = -.26, p < .05$) with higher level of

education negatively correlated with lower job status categories such as service, maintenance, and technical positions instead of faculty, professional, or executive job statuses. Level of education was also highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .28, p < .05$) with income indicative that higher education levels are associated with increased incomes.

Spousal level of education was also highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .27, p < .05$) with income of spouse, with higher levels of education being associated with higher income levels. The category of the participants' job of spouse was also moderately correlated ($\underline{r} = -.25, p < .05$) with income of spouse, with higher levels of income correlated negatively with lower job status categories such as service, maintenance, or technical job status categories instead of faculty, professional, or executive job status categories.

The number of months the participants were married was highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .68, p < .01$) with having a child, such that the longer participants were married the more likely they were to have a child.

The individual income of the participants was highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .27, p < .05$) with the individual income of the spouses, with higher levels of income of the

participants associated with higher levels of income for the participants' spouses.

Bivariate Analyses for Measures

Table 5 presents the Pearson correlational analyses conducted to assess the association between the various measures, including the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), Marital Satisfaction Inventory Revised-Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997), and Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994). The correlation coefficient between each pair of measures allows for evaluation of the degree of association between each measure pair.

Table 4

Correlations Among Demographic Variables

	Sex	Age	Ethnic- ity	Partici- pant Education	Spouse Educ- ation	Partici- pant Income	Spouse Income	Months Married	Job Cate- gory	Spouse Job Category	Parent- al Status
Sex	-										
Age	.059	-									
Ethnicity	.202	.244*	-								
Participant Education	.209	-.003	-.044	-							
Spouse Education	-.011	-.014	.157	.438**	-						
Participant Income	-.122	.301*	-.060	.275*	.240*	-					
Spouse Income	.218	.253*	-.056	.177	.271*	.265*	-				
Months Married	-.027	.889* *	.149	-.098	-.063	.205	.228	-			
Job Category	-.163	.051	.179	-.257*	-.062	-.188	-.102	.093	-		
Spouse Job Category	-.173	.044	.184	-.202	-.145	-.114	-.246*	.041	.231	-	
Parental Status	.062	.698* *	.210	-.151	-.138	.218	.238*	.677**	.175	.084	-

Note. *p<.05 **p<.01

Table 5

Correlations Among Measures

	Gender Role Conflict Scale	Job- Family Role Strain Scale	Marital Satisfaction Inventory- Revised GDS	Quality of Life Inventory
Gender Role Conflict Scale	-			
Job-Family Role Strain Scale	.287*	-		
Marital Satisfaction Inventory- Revised GDS	.266*	.025	-	
Quality of Life Inventory	-.348**	.059	-.435**	-

Note. *p<.05 **p<.01

Scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) were highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .28, p < .05$) with the scores on the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), with higher levels of gender role strain associated with higher levels of job-family role strain. The Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) scores were also highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .27, p < .05$) with scores on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997), with higher levels of gender role conflict associated with increased marital distress. The Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) scores were also highly negatively correlated ($\underline{r} = -.35, p < .01$) with the scores on the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994), with higher gender role conflict associated with decreased overall quality of life.

Scores on the Job Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), as previously discussed, were highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .28, p < .05$) with scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) but uncorrelated ($\underline{r} = .03, p > .05$) with scores on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997), or the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) ($\underline{r} = .06, p > .05$).

The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) scores, as previously discussed, were highly correlated ($\underline{r} = .27, p < .05$) with scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) and were uncorrelated ($\underline{r} = .03, p > .05$) with scores on the Job Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). In addition, the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) scores were highly negatively correlated ($\underline{r} = -.44, p < .01$) with the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) scores, with increased marital distress associated with decreased overall quality of life.

Lastly, scores on the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) were highly negatively correlated ($\underline{r} = -.43, p < .05$) with scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), uncorrelated ($\underline{r} = .06, p > .05$) with scores on the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981) and highly negatively correlated ($\underline{r} = -.44, p < .01$) with scores on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997).

Scale Reliability

Reliability analyses were conducted to evaluate internal consistency scale reliability. Although previous studies reported moderate to high scale reliabilities of

.75-.97, internal consistency reliability analyses were also conducted in the present study as well in order to evaluate the scale reliability for this particular sample population as well.

The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) was .83, indicating good reliability. The test constructor (Phinney, 1992) reported that dozens of studies have shown good reliability on the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992), with alphas typically above .80 across a wide range of ethnic groups and ages. Thus, the current sample's alpha reliability coefficient is high and consistent with previous studies reported alphas.

The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) was .86, indicating high reliability. The BEM test manual, as well as numerous other studies, reports the short form of the BEM to have good reliability with alphas typically above .85 (Bem, 1981). Thus, the current sample's alpha reliability coefficient is high and consistent with previous studies' reported alphas.

The Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) had a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .88, indicating

high reliability. The Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) has been reported by numerous studies to have good reliability with alphas typically above .80 (O'Neil et al., 1986). Thus, the current sample's alpha reliability coefficient is high and consistent with previous studies reported alphas.

The Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981) had a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .84, indicating high reliability. The Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981) has been reported to have good reliability with alphas typically above .80 (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). Thus, the current sample's alpha reliability coefficient is high and consistent with previous studies reported alphas.

The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) had a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .88, indicating high reliability. The Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) has been reported to have good reliability with alphas typically above .85 (Snyder, 1997). Thus, the current sample's alpha reliability coefficient is high and consistent with previous studies reported alphas.

The Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) had a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .77, indicating good reliability. The Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) has been reported to have good reliability with alphas typically above .75 (Frisch, 1994). Thus, the current sample's alpha reliability coefficient is good and consistent with previous studies reported alphas.

Nunnally (1978) suggested that only alpha coefficients greater than .70 should be utilized for statistical analysis. With all the Cronbach alpha coefficients in the present study exceeding .70, all scales were used in the data analyses.

Scale reliability was also examined by the positive values of all the corrected item-total correlation coefficients, indicative that the items on the scales were consistent with the performance of other items on the scales. In addition, the majority of the "alpha if item deleted" values were lower than the overall alpha coefficients for the scales, indicative that deleting that item would lower the overall alpha coefficient scale reliability. For the items with an "alpha if the item is deleted" value that was higher than the overall alpha coefficient scale, the difference was very minimal.

Primary Analyses

The primary analyses investigated the three research questions proposed in Chapter I. The following discussion will restate the research questions and the hypotheses and state the results found for each question. All the data was entered and analyzed using SPSS for Windows, a statistical data analysis software package. A MANOVA statistical analysis procedure was used to test the hypotheses that participants scoring in the androgynous category, according to the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981), would demonstrate lower gender role strain and job-family role strain and higher marital satisfaction and overall life satisfaction than participants scoring in the feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated categories on the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form instrument. With the independent variable gender ideology being categorical, a multivariate analysis of variance was used for the data analyses. The criterion variables included gender role strain, job-family role strain, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction. Post-hoc analyses were conducted each time significant results were found using Tukey to examine the overall significant differences in greater detail.

Research Question 1

Do dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less role strain than individuals with androgynous gender ideologies, as measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) and Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981)?

It was hypothesized that feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated gender ideology groups would have higher role strain than the androgynous gender ideology group. This question was addressed using multivariate analysis of variance to evaluate the difference in the androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated groups on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) and Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981).

Table 6 presents the results of the multivariate analysis of variance for gender ideology predicting gender role strain. With regard to gender role conflict, the multivariate analysis of variance suggested that for the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), the hypothesis was only partially supported. Initial results suggested that gender role conflict significantly differed between

the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) gender ideology groups, $F(3, 63) = 6.84, p < .001$. The Multivariate analysis of variance was significant ($R^2 = .26, p < .001$), with the Bem Sex Role Inventory-short form (Bem, 1981) explaining 26% of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) for a large effect size.

Table 7 presents the post-hoc analyses conducted using Tukey as the significance test in order to clarify significant differences between the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) gender ideology groups on gender role strain. Upon closer examination, the androgynous group was significantly different than the masculine group ($p = .009$) and the undifferentiated group ($p = .016$) on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), with the androgynous group reporting significantly lower role strain than the masculine or undifferentiated groups. However, there was no significant difference in the feminine group and the androgynous group at the $p < .05/6$ Tukey adjustment level thus leading to the conclusion that hypothesis one was only partially supported.

Table 8 presents the results of the multivariate analysis of variance for gender ideology predicting gender job-family role strain.

Table 6

*Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology
Predicting Gender Role Strain*

Variable	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Gender Role Strain	13499.20	3	4499.73	6.84	.00**	.26
Error	39446.54	60	657.44			
Total	52945.74	63				

Note. **p*<.05 ***p*<.01

Table 7

*Specifics of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender
Ideology Predicting Gender Role Strain*

Variable		<i>p</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>
Gender Role Conflict Scale (Androgynous Gender Ideology)	Feminine	1.000	-3.76
	Masculine	.009**	-33.67
	Undifferentiated	.016*	-29.77

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 8
*Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology
 Predicting Job-Family Role Strain*

Variable	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Job-Family Role Strain	127.14	3	42.38	1.20	.32	.06
Error	2120.97	60	35.35			
Total	2248.11	63				

Note. **p*<.05 ***p*<.01

With regard to job-family role strain, multivariate analysis of variance suggested that for the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), the hypothesis that the androgynous group would have lower role strain than the feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated groups was not supported. Initial results suggested that job-family role strain was not significantly different between the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) gender ideology groups, $F(3, 63) = 1.20, p > .05$. The multivariate analysis of variance was not significant ($R^2 = .06, p > .05$), with the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) explaining only 6% of the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981) for a small effect size.

Research Question 2

Do dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) have more or less marital satisfaction than individuals with androgynous gender ideologies, as measured by the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997)?

It was hypothesized that the feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated gender ideology groups would have lower

marital satisfaction than the androgynous gender ideology group. This question was addressed using a multivariate analysis of variance to evaluate the differences in the androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated groups on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997).

Table 9 presents the results of the multivariate analysis of variance for gender ideology predicting marital satisfaction. With regard to marital satisfaction, the multivariate analysis of variance suggested that for the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) the hypothesis that the androgynous group would have higher marital satisfaction than the feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated groups was not supported. Initial results suggested that marital satisfaction was not significantly different between the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) gender ideology groups, $F(3, 69) = 1.49, p > .05$. The Multivariate Analysis of Variance was not significant ($R^2 = .06, p > .05$), with the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) explaining only 6% of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) for a small effect size.

Table 9

*Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology
Predicting Marital Satisfaction*

Variable	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Martial						
Satisfaction	81.91	3	27.30	1.49	.23	.06
Error	1208.68	66	18.31			
Total	1290.59	69				

Note. **p* < .05 ***p* < .01

Research Question 3

Do dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less overall life satisfaction than individuals with androgynous gender ideologies, as measured by the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994)?

It was hypothesized that the feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated gender ideology groups would have lower overall life satisfaction than the androgynous gender ideology group. This question was addressed using a multivariate analysis of variance to evaluate the difference in the androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated groups on the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994).

Table 10 presents the results of the multivariate analysis of variance for gender ideology predicting life satisfaction. With regard to life satisfaction, the multivariate analysis of variance suggested that for the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), the hypothesis was only partially supported. Initial results suggested that overall life satisfaction significantly differed between the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981)

gender ideology groups, $F(3, 69) = 2.61, p < .05$. The Multivariate Analysis of Variance was significant ($R^2 = .11, p < .05$), with the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) explaining 11% of the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) for a small effect size.

Table 11 presents the post-hoc analyses conducted using Tukey as the significance test in order to clarify significant differences between the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981) gender ideology groups on life satisfaction. Upon closer examination, the androgynous group was significantly different than the masculine group ($p = .077$) and the undifferentiated group ($p = .092$) on the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) with the androgynous group reporting significantly higher life satisfaction than the masculine or undifferentiated groups. However, there was no significant difference in the feminine group and the androgynous group at the $p < .05/6$ Tukey adjustment level thus leading to the conclusion that hypothesis three was only partially supported.

Ancillary Analyses

Ancillary analyses were conducted in order to determine whether the criterion measures of the Gender Role

Table 10

*Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Ideology
Predicting Life Satisfaction*

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p	R ²
Quality of Life	612.87	3	204.29	2.61	.05*	.11
Inventory						
Error	5170.33	66	78.33			
Total	5783.20	69				

Note. *p<.05 **p<.01

Table 11

*Specifics of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender
Ideology Predicting Life Satisfaction*

Variable		<i>p</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>
Quality of Life Inventory (Androgynous Gender Ideology)	Feminine	.160	6.19
	Masculine	.077*	8.21
	Undifferentiated	.092*	7.69

Note. * $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$

Conflict Scale-Short Form (O'Neil, 1986), the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997), and the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) differed as a function of some demographic variables within the sample. To test this, MANOVA's were conducted using the demographic variables as the independent variable with all hypothesized construct measures as the criterion variables.

Biological Sex

With regard to biological sex, the initial results suggested that role strain significantly differed between males and females, $F(1, 64) = 13.72, p < .001$. The results were significantly different ($R^2 = .18, p < .05$), with biological sex explaining 18% of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986) for a medium effect size. Post-hoc analyses were conducted using Tukey as the significance test in order to clarify significant differences between the male and female groups. Upon closer examination, the male group was significantly different than the female group ($p = .001$) on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil,

1986), with the males reporting significantly higher role strain than the females.

With regard to biological sex, the initial results suggested that marital satisfaction significantly differed between males and females, $F(1, 64) = 3.91, p < .05$. The results were significantly different ($R^2 = .06, p < .05$), with biological sex explaining 6% of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) for a small effect size. Post-hoc analyses were conducted using Tukey as the significance test in order to clarify significant differences between the male and female groups. Upon closer examination, the male group was significantly different than the female group ($p = .05$) on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997), with the males reporting significantly lower marital satisfaction than the females.

With regard to biological sex, the initial results suggested that life satisfaction significantly differed between males and females, $F(1, 64) = 5.25, p < .05$. The results were significantly different ($R^2 = .08, p < .05$), with biological sex explaining 8% of the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) for a small effect size. Post-hoc analyses were conducted using Tukey as the significance

test in order to clarify significant differences between the male and female groups. Upon closer examination, the male group was significantly different than the female group ($p=.03$) on the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) with the males reporting significantly lower overall life satisfaction than the females.

Income

Income was also examined to see if any significant differences were indicated on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997), and the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994) based on the participants' income range. There were no significant differences found.

Parental Status

Lastly, ancillary analyses examined the impact having children had on the participants' scores on the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986), the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997) and the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994). With regard to having a child or not only one

significant difference was found with higher number of children being highly correlated ($r = .27, p < .05$) with increased overall life satisfaction on the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994).

Summary of Results

The preliminary analyses indicated that all of the measures used in the study were highly reliable.

The primary analyses indicated that hypothesis one was partially supported, with the androgynous gender ideology group scoring significantly lower on gender role conflict than the masculine and undifferentiated gender ideology groups but not significantly lower than the feminine gender ideology group. The first hypothesis that the androgynous gender ideology group would have significantly lower job and family role strain than the feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideology groups was not supported. The second hypothesis that the androgynous gender ideology group would have significantly higher marital satisfaction than the feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated groups was not supported. Results from the third hypothesis that the androgynous gender ideology group would have a significantly higher overall life satisfaction than the feminine, masculine, and

undifferentiated gender ideology groups was partially supported. The androgynous gender ideology group did significantly have higher overall quality of life than the masculine or undifferentiated groups but did not have significantly higher overall quality of life than the feminine gender ideology group.

The ancillary analyses indicated that there were no significant differences on the measures based on the participants' income level. However, there were significant differences between males and females, with males reporting significantly higher gender role conflict, significantly higher marital dissatisfaction, and significantly lower overall life satisfaction. Lastly, participants having higher numbers of children were significantly associated with higher overall life satisfaction.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the current study was to investigate the relationships between gender ideology and role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction. More specifically, gender ideology was explored as a predictor variable for role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction for individuals in dual-career couples.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section reviews the research questions and hypotheses presented in Chapter I and discusses the results related to the relevant research literature. The second section discusses the limitations and strengths of the present study. The third section discusses the clinical application of the study for mental health professionals working with dual-career couples. The fourth section discusses recommendations for future studies.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

Do dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less role strain than individuals with androgynous gender

ideologies as measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O-Neil, 1986) and the Job-Family Role Strain Scale (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981)?

Research Hypothesis Question 1

Dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies would be associated with higher levels of role strain than dual-career individuals with androgynous gender ideologies.

Discussion of Research Question 1 Results

This study found that gender ideology was partially associated with role strain. Specifically, the androgynous gender ideology group scored significantly lower than the masculine and undifferentiated gender ideology groups on gender role strain as predicted. However, the androgynous gender ideology group did not score significantly lower than the feminine gender ideology group.

This finding is consistent with Silverstein, Auerbach, and Levant's (2002) research indicating dual-career individuals experience role strain because of gender stereotypes they have adapted from societal expectations and norms. The androgynous gender ideology group which does not adhere to the traditional gender norms and expectations is reporting less gender role strain than the

masculine or undifferentiated gender ideology groups which are less flexible in their gender norms and expectations.

However, the feminine gender ideology group is not reporting significantly more role strain than the androgynous gender ideology group. According to Saginak and Saginak (2005), the gender stereotypes and family and work responsibilities are becoming redefined by society as society moves forward from its outdated gender perceptions. They explain that it is becoming more acceptable for males to be involved in home and child care and females to progress in the workforce.

It is possible that those scoring in the feminine gender ideology category do not exhibit the higher gender role strain because they and their partners are already involved in both household and work responsibilities since all participants and partners had full-time jobs. It seems plausible that individuals scoring in the feminine gender ideology category who are not working would demonstrate higher gender role strain because they are restricted to traditional female responsibilities of housework and childcare. However, this study did not include individuals not employed outside of the household so this subgroup of feminine gender ideology individuals likely to score higher

on gender role strain than androgynous individuals was not present in the current study.

Another explanation for the lack of significant differences on gender role strain between the androgynous and feminine gender ideology groups could be the sample. The sample consisted of a large representation of psychologists who are likely over representing the feminine gender ideology group. They could be negotiating family and work responsibilities similarly to the androgynous gender ideology group resulting in less gender role strain than expected in the feminine gender ideology group.

Role strain according to the competing demands of work and family was also not significantly different between the androgynous gender ideology group and the feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated gender ideology groups. The lack of relationship between the gender ideology and social role strain construct is in contrast with similar earlier studies that have indicated the importance of degendering household and work responsibilities to effectively balance work and family roles and decrease role strain (Haddock, et al., 2001; Saginak & Saginak, 2005).

One explanation for the present results could be that individuals classified as androgynous, feminine, masculine,

and undifferentiated gender ideologies are similar at negotiating family and work role responsibilities leading to similar role strain amongst the various gender ideology groups. Additionally, if the individuals' gender ideology expectations match what is actually occurring behaviorally in the work and family roles it is possible that we may not see significant differences in the gender ideology groups on social role strain. Greenstein (1996) found that expectations and perceptions of fairness in dividing household labor were more important than actual fairness for marital quality of couples. A matched pairs couples design in future research would be helpful to assess which work and family responsibilities are being done by whom in the couple, the differences in the gender ideology expected and actual responsibilities, and how the individuals' expectations and gender ideology affect the actual behavioral couples' patterns, role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

In sum, gender ideology was partially associated with gender role strain, with androgynous gender ideology individuals scoring lower on gender role strain than masculine or undifferentiated gender ideology individuals. However, androgynous individuals did not score

significantly lower than feminine gender ideology individuals on gender role strain. In addition, gender ideology was not significantly predictive of social role strain in this study.

Research Question 2

Do dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less marital satisfaction than individuals with androgynous gender ideologies, as measured by the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised Global Distress Scale (Snyder, 1997)?

Research Hypothesis Question 2

Dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies would be associated with lower levels of marital satisfaction than dual-career individuals with androgynous gender ideologies.

Discussion of Research Question 2 Results

This study found that gender ideology was not associated with marital satisfaction. Specifically, the androgynous gender ideology group showed no significant differences from the feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideology groups on marital satisfaction.

This finding is interesting because it is inconsistent with Saginak and Saginak's (2005) theory that the gender ideologies that men and women are socialized to believe influence couples' marital satisfaction. Researchers have indicated that sharing the demands of worker and family roles affects marital satisfaction for both men and women (Burly, 1995; Zimmerman et al., 2003).

It is plausible that the androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated gender ideology individuals similarly share responsibilities for the worker and family roles leading to no significant differences in marital satisfaction. Another explanation again is the possible lack of differences in the individuals' gender ideology expectations and their actual work and family behavioral role responsibilities in the couple which should be measured in future studies with a matched couples' paired design. Greenstein (1996) discussed the importance of expectations and perceptions of fairness rather than actual fairness on marital quality. Significant differences in the gender ideology groups on marital satisfaction may not have been found if the individuals' gender ideology expectations matched the actual behaviors of the couple.

In sum, gender ideology was not significantly predictive of marital satisfaction in this study.

Research Question 3

Do dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory-Short Form (Bem, 1981), have more or less overall life satisfaction than individuals with androgynous gender ideologies as measured by the Quality of Life Inventory (Frisch, 1994)?

Research Hypothesis Question 3

Dual-career individuals with feminine, masculine, or undifferentiated gender ideologies would be associated with lower levels of overall life satisfaction than dual-career individuals with androgynous gender ideologies.

Discussion of Research Question 3 Results

This study found that gender ideology was partially associated with life satisfaction. Specifically, the androgynous gender ideology group scored significantly higher than the masculine and undifferentiated gender ideology groups on life satisfaction as predicted. However, the androgynous gender ideology group did not score significantly higher than the feminine gender ideology group on life satisfaction.

This finding is consistent with Bonebright, Clay, and Ankemann's (2000) research that indicated work and family strain leads to decrease life satisfaction. As hypothesized, the androgynous gender ideology group which does not adhere to the traditional gender norms and expectations is reporting higher life satisfaction than the masculine or undifferentiated gender ideology groups which are less flexible on their gender norms and expectations. However, the feminine gender ideology group is not reporting significantly lower life satisfaction than the androgynous gender ideology group.

It is plausible that the feminine gender ideology group experiences similar life satisfaction to the androgynous gender ideology group because they are engaging in both feminine expectations as well as masculine norms of working full-time. Another explanation again is the large percentage of psychologists in the sample that may over represent the feminine gender ideology group and negotiate roles and expectations similarly to the androgynous gender ideology group resulting in no statistically significant differences in the androgynous and feminine gender ideology groups on life satisfaction.

In sum, gender ideology was partially associated with life satisfaction with the androgynous gender ideology group scoring higher life satisfaction than the masculine or undifferentiated gender ideology groups. However, the androgynous gender ideology group did not score significantly higher than the feminine gender ideology group on life satisfaction.

Limitations and Strengths

Limitations

There are several limitations and strengths to the current study that must be considered when interpreting the results. First, with respect to generalizability, the sample is predominately Caucasian and most of the sample had earned an advanced college degree, thus representing a highly educated population. The results can only be generalized to similar samples. However, attempts were made to increase the diversity demographics of research on dual-career couples. The current study does contain more diversity demographics than many previous dual-career couple studies but increased diversity demographics are needed in future studies. The sample also included a large number of psychologists which could over represent the androgynous and feminine gender ideology groups and explain

the similarities in reporting on gender role strain and life satisfaction for these two groups. Nevertheless, the results can be compared to previous dual-career couple studies with similar samples.

Secondly, the study utilized only self-report measures, which are subject to participants' limited self-awareness and to responding in a socially desirable manner. Although anonymity of responses was utilized to decrease the socially desirable response sets, some participants may still have responded in a socially desirable manner on self-reports.

Several demand characteristics could have influenced the study's results. Demand characteristics are cues regarding the nature of the research including the instructions given to the participants in the consent to participate information sheet and the recruitment letter. Some participants may have also compared their responses with their spouses and influenced each other's responses, thus affecting the self-reports.

A fifth limitation is that there was no measure of work and family role expectations and how these relate to gender ideology and actual role behaviors within a matched pairs couples design. Future studies should research how

the gender ideologies, work and family role expectations, and actual work and family role behaviors of each individual in the couple match and the impact these have on the role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction of dual-career couples.

A sixth limitation is selection bias in that those who chose to participate could have been significantly different than those who chose not to participate. However, due to the anonymous data collection procedures it was not possible to determine if there were significant differences from the respondents and non-respondents.

Lastly, the response rate was lower than desired with a 22% return rate. Given the nature of the research on dual-career couples which have heavy time demands and responsibilities it makes sense that the response rate would be lower than desired. In addition, the study was designed to be comprehensive--including multiple variables on dual-career couples--and thus required a lengthy response packet which likely also affected the response rate.

Strengths

The present study has several strengths that allow it to make a unique contribution to the empirical literature

investigating dual-career couples gender ideology, role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

First, the purpose of the present study was to contribute to the dual-career couples' literature by investigating the associations between gender ideology and role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction. The research questions in the present study are unique and no studies to date have empirically investigated these variables in association to one another with individuals in dual career couples. Thus, the present study makes an original contribution to the literature.

Secondly, the sample utilized had increased diversity demographics compared with previous studies on dual-career couples, which had investigated primarily the Caucasian population and restricted job positions.

The present study also looked at numerous demographic characteristics and their associations with each other as well as their association with role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction. This exploration was quite thorough compared with previous studies on dual-career couples.

Clinical Applications

With dual-career couples comprising the most common family type, it is important for mental health professionals, employers, and policy makers to understand the unique challenges of this population (Haddock et al., 2001; Saginak & Saginak, 2005.) Dual-career couples and families are increasingly seeking counseling to balance work and family demands and responsibilities (Saginak & Saginak, 2005). Haddock & Bowling (2002) discussed the increasing number of couples on caseloads that were struggling with balancing work and family. Numerous researchers have discussed the consequences of family and work role strain including burnout, decreased family and occupational well-being, job and life dissatisfaction, illness, depression, and marital distress (Hayes & Mahalik, 2000; Perrewe & Hochwarter, 1999; Good et al., 1996; Pleck, 1995; Good & Mintz, 1990).

However, when dual-career couples are able to share responsibilities and negotiate degendered roles they experience the benefits of dual-career couples including increased self-esteem and an independent identity for women (Barnett & Baruch, 1985) and decreased financial pressure and increased opportunities for family involvement for men

(Barnett and Rivers, 1996). The literature clearly supports the importance of egalitarian roles for marital satisfaction (Haddock et al., 2001) and life satisfaction (Bonebright, Clay, and Ankenmann, 2000).

While researchers have studied social role strain, gender role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction and discussed the importance of degendered roles and responsibilities for dual-career couples, no studies have examined gender ideology. Saginak and Saginak (2005) called for researchers to investigate how gender ideologies and the gender socialization process perpetuate the challenges faced by dual-career couples in balancing work and family.

The current study indicates there are partial associations between gender ideology and gender role strain and life satisfaction for dual-career couples. Mental health professionals working with dual-career couples should assess the socially constructed gender norms and expectations internalized by individuals into a gender ideology as the possible source of challenges experienced by the dual-career couple.

Recommendations for Future Research

First, although research on dual-career couples has received increasing amounts of scholarly attention during the past decade, research on dual-career couples is still in the early stages of development. Additional research is needed on diverse large samples including different ethnicities, sexual orientations, socioeconomic statuses, and different job positions in various employment settings before generalizations of the associations between gender ideology, role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction can be generally stated. However, the increasing literature on dual-career couples suggests there are associations between gender ideology, role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Secondly, additional research should investigate the associations between gender ideology, social role strain, gender role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction using multiple measures of the constructs and a large sample to further investigate the associations and develop a comprehensive path analysis statistical model related to balancing work and family life for dual-career couples.

It is also important to include measures of expected and actual work and family role responsibilities and to assess the affect of gender ideology on the expected and actual roles and responsibilities and the mediating or moderating affect this may have between gender ideology and gender role strain, social role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Additionally, future research should utilize a matched pairs couples design to examine the gender ideologies, work and family role expectations, and actual work and family role behaviors to assess how individuals within dual-career couples interact to affect role strain, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Lastly, the multivariate analysis of variance used in this study supported the partial association between gender ideology and gender role strain and life satisfaction. Cross validation of these results using additional samples would be beneficial.

REFERENCES

- Antill, J. (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 45-55.
- Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K. (1985). Women's involvement in multiple roles and psychological distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 135-145.
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., Raudenbush, S. W., & Brennan, R. T. (1993). Gender and the relationship between job experiences and psychological distress: A study of dual-career couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 794-806.
- Barnett, R. C., & Rivers, C. (1996). *She works, he works: How two-income families are happy, healthy, and thriving*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1975). Sex-role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 634-643.
- Bem, S. L. (1978). Beyond androgyny: Some presumptions

- prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. In J. Sherman & F. Denmark (Eds.), *Psychology of women: Future directions and research*. New York: Psychological Dimensions.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). *Bem Sex-Role Inventory professional Manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. (1976). Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 1016-1023.
- Bohen, H. H., & Viveros-Long, A. (Eds.). (1981). *Balancing jobs and family life*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bonebright, C. A., Clay, D. L., & Ankenmann, R. D. (2000). The relationship of workaholism with work-life conflict, life satisfaction, and purpose in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 469-477.
- Bruch, M. A. (2002). Shyness and toughness: Unique and moderated relations with men's emotional inexpression. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 28-34.
- Burley, K. A. (1995). Family variables as mediators of the

- relationship between work-family conflict and marital adjustment among dual-career men and women. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 483-499.
- Campbell, J. L., & Snow, B. M. (1992). Gender role conflict and family environment as predictors of men's marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology, 6*, 84-87.
- Campbell, M., Steffen, J., & Langmeyer, D. (1981). Psychological androgyny and social competence. *Psychological Reports, 48*, 611-614.
- Cheng, C. (1999). Gender role differences in susceptibility to the influence of support availability on depression. *Journal of Personality, 67*, 439-467.
- Cinamon, R.G., & Rich, Y. (2002). Profiles of attribution of importance to life roles and their implications for the work-family conflict. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 212-220.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*, 98-101.
- Coontz, S. (June 2000). *Inventing today's families*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Family Therapy Association, San Diego, CA.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Eckenrode, J. & Gore, S. (Eds.) (1990). *Stress between work and family*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Fein, M. L. (1990). *Role change: A resocialization perspective*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Fein, M. L. (1992). *Analyzing psychotherapy: A social role interpretation*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Frisch, M. B. (1994). *Quality of life inventory manual and treatment guide*. Minneapolis, MN: Pearson.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, T., & Friedman, D. E. (1996). The role of employers in addressing the needs of employed parents. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*, 111-136.
- Gilbert, L. A., & Scher, M. (1999). *Gender and sex in counseling and psychotherapy*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goldenberg, I., & Goldenberg, H. (1984). Treating the dual-career couple. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 12*, 29-37.
- Good, G. E., & Mintz, L. B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 69*, 17- 20.
- Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., O'Neil, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M. A., DeBord, K. A., Bartels, K. M., & Braverman, D. G. (1995). Male gender role conflict:

Psychometric issues and relations to distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42, 3-10.

Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M., DeBord, K. A., Bartels, K. M., & Bartels, K. M. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 75, 44-49.

Green, B., & Kendrick, D. (1994). The attractiveness of gender type traits at different relationship levels: Androgynous characteristics may be desirable after all. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 20, 244-253.

Greenstein, T. N. (1996). Gender ideology and perceptions of the fairness of the division of household labor: Effects on marital quality. *Social Forces*, 74, 1029-1042.

Haddock, S. A. (2002). A content analysis of articles pertaining to therapeutic considerations for dual-income couples (1979-1999). *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 30, 141-156.

Haddock, S. A., & Bowling, S. (2002). Therapists'

approaches to the normative challenges of dual-earner couples: Negotiating outdated societal ideologies.

Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 13, 91-120.

Haddock, S. A., Zimmerman, T. S., Ziemba, S. J., & Current, L. R. (2001). Ten adaptive strategies for family and work balance: Advice from successful families. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 27, 445-458.*

Hayes, J. A., & Mahalik, J. R. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological distress in male counseling center clients. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1, 116-125.*

Kirchemeyer, C. (1996). Gender roles and decision making in demographically diverse groups: A case for reviving androgyny. *Sex Roles, 34, 49-63.*

Lubinski, D., Tellegen, A., & Butcher, J. N. (1983). Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny viewed and assessed as distinct concepts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 428-439.*

Martin, H. J., & Ramanaiah, N. V. (1988). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem sex-role inventory. *Psychological Reports, 62, 343-350.*

McGuire, P. A. (1999, May). Worker stress, health reaching critical point. *APA Monitor, 30, p. 1.*

Moore, D. S., & McCabe, G. P. ((1989). *Introduction to the*

- practice of statistics*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Norrell, J. E., & Norrell, T. H. (1996). Faculty and family policies in higher education. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*, 204-226.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- O'Neil, J. M., Good, G. E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.) *A new psychology of men* (pp.164-206). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350.
- Perrewe, P. L., & Hochwarter, W. A. (1999). Value attainment: An explanation for the negative effects of work-family conflict and job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 318-326.
- Perrone, K. M., & Worthington, E. L. (2001). Factors influencing ratings of marital quality by individuals within dual-career marriages: A conceptual model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*, 3-9.

- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *The new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.
- Price-Bonham, S., & Murphy, D. C. (1980). Dual-career marriages: Implications for the clinician. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 6*, 181-188.
- Rose, A., & Montemayor, R. (1994). The relationship between gender role orientation and perceived self-competency in male and female adolescents. *Sex Roles, 31*, 579-595.
- Saginak, K. A., & Saginak, M. A. (2005). Balancing work and family: Equity, gender, and marital satisfaction. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 13*, 162-166.
- Sawrie, S., Watson, P., & Biderman, M. (1991). Aggression, sex role measures and Kohut's psychology of the self. *Sex Roles, 25*, 41-61.

- Shaver, P., Papilia, D., Clark, C., Koski, L., Tidwell, M., & Nalbare, D., (1996). Androgyny and attachment security: Two related models of optimal personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 582-597.
- Shimonaka, Y., Nakazato, K., Kawaai, C., & Shinichi, S. (1997). Androgyny and successful adaptation across the life span among Japanese adults. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 158*, 389-401.
- Silverstein, L. B., Auerbach, C. F., & Levant, R. F. (2002). Contemporary fathers reconstructing masculinity: Clinical implications of gender role strain. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 361-369.
- Snyder, D. K. (1979). Multidimensional assessment of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 41*, 813-823.
- Snyder, D. K., & Wills, R. M. (1989). Behavioral versus insight-oriented marital therapy: Effects on individual and interspousal functioning. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*, 39-46.
- Snyder, D. K. (1997). *Marital satisfaction inventory-*

revised. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

- Stake, J. (1997). Integrating expressiveness and instrumentality in real life settings: A new perspective on the benefits of androgyny. *Sex Roles, 37*, 541-564.
- Stevens, D., Kiger, G., & Riley, P. J., (2001). Working hard and hardly working: Domestic labor and marital satisfaction among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 514-526.
- Stewart, L. P., Cooper, P. J., Stewart, A. D., & Friedley, S. A. (2003). *Communication and gender*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Van Meter, M. S., & Agronow, S. J. (1982). The stress of multiple roles: The case for role strain among married college women. *Family Relations, 31*, 131-138.
- Vogel, D. L., Wester, S. R., Heesacker, M., & Madon, S. (2003). Confirming gender stereotypes: A social role perspective. *Sex Roles, 48*, 519- 528.
- Ward, M. C. (2003). *A world full of women. 3rd Ed.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Whisman, M. A., & Jacobson, N. S. (1992). Change in marital

adjustment following marital therapy: A comparison of two outcome measures. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 219-223.

Wilson, G. L., Bornstein, P. H., & Wilson, L. J. (1988). Treatment of relationship dysfunction: An empirical evaluation of group and conjoint behavioral marital therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56, 929-931.

Woodhill, B. M., & Samuels, C. A. (2003). Positive and negative androgyny and their relationship with psychological health and well-being. *Sex Roles*, 48, 555- 565.

Wubbenhorst, T. (1994). Personality characteristics of music educators and performers. *Psychology of Music*, 22, 63-74.

Zimmerman, T. S., Haddock, S. A., Current, L. R., & Ziemba, S. (2003). Intimate partnership: Foundation to the successful balance of family and work. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 31, 107-124.

APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT LETTER AND INFORMATION SHEET

Educational Psychology
Counseling Psychology Program
4225 Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4225
(979) 595-1772

March, 2004

Dear Fellow Aggie Employee,

Howdy! I hope this letter finds you well. My name is Jennifer King, and I'm a doctoral student at Texas A&M working on my dissertation project. I've done a lot of research on the challenges dual-career couples face with the competing demands of work and family. From my personal as well as professional experience, I know that as a member of a dual-career couple you're likely to feel like there is never enough time to get everything done that needs to be done and also have time to spend with your family.

You're receiving this letter asking you to participate in my study. I want to better understand the demands of work and family on dual-career couples. The Texas A&M University Budget, Payroll, and Personnel Office has joined me in this venture and has allowed me to present you my materials by providing me your campus mailing address.

I'm asking you to complete the enclosed materials at your earliest convenience, remove your campus mail address from the envelope so I will not be able to identify you with your responses, place the enclosed return campus mail address on the envelope, and drop the materials in any campus mailbox. Please do not include your name, since I want you to know that your responses are anonymous. In no way will responses be coded or linked to your identity. If you're not interested or unable to complete the information, please do not feel any obligation to do so. However, I would greatly appreciate it if you could send the materials back anyway since the measures are costly and I am working on a student's budget. In addition, if you are not married or living with your partner, I would also greatly appreciate it if you would send the uncompleted materials back through campus mail.

I am also interested in comparing couple information. If your partner is also employed full-time at Texas A&M or anywhere else and would be willing to complete the materials please call me at (979) 595-1772 or send me an e-mail at jenniferking@tamu.edu and I will send an additional set of materials to you that can also be returned anonymously with your materials as a couple.

It is my hope that with your help, caring professionals will be better able to understand the experiences and needs of dual-career couples and to help employers implement family friendly work policies. If you would like to speak with me further regarding this study, please feel free to contact me using the above information. **I would be happy to speak with you.**

I greatly appreciate your time and valuable responses by participating in this cutting edge research. Your responses are important to me. I am hoping to have all surveys returned by May 31st. Once again, thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Respectfully,

Jennifer King, M.A.
Doctoral Student

Donna Davenport, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Licensed Psychologist

If at any time, you wish to speak with a caring professional, please feel free to contact either of the below references:

Counseling and Assessment Clinic	Donna Davenport, Ph.D.
4225 TAMU	1722 Broadmoor Drive
College Station, TX 77843-4225	Bryan, TX 77802
(979) 595-1770	(979) 774-7782

Dual-Career Couples' Study
Information Sheet

You have been asked to participate in a research study called Gender Ideology: Impact of Dual-Career Couples' Role Strain, Marital Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction. You were randomly selected from the Texas A&M University Employee Database. The purpose of this study is to learn more about how dual-career couples manage the demands of work and family. This study is being conducted through Texas A&M University as a part of a dissertation and will be conducted during 2004-2005.

1. **Procedures to be Followed:** In this study, you will be asked to complete one packet of written questionnaires. The initial questionnaire will contain demographic information. The following questionnaires will contain questions about the competing demands of work and family, marital satisfaction, life satisfaction, gender expectations, and gender roles within the family. The completion time for the packet should take less than 60 minutes.

2. **Voluntary Participation:** Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, in which case you can simply not return the completed packet through campus mail. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Texas A&M University.

3. **Anonymity:** Your responses will be completely anonymous. Nowhere on the materials will your name be requested. In no way will your responses be coded or linked to your identity.

4. **Benefits and Compensation:** You will have the opportunity to reflect on your work and family situation and the impact this may have on your possible role strain, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction. Reflection is likely to make you aware of strengths and areas for improvement in these areas being asked about. There are no other benefits guaranteed for participation.

5. **Risks:** There are no known risks associated with these procedures. Most of the items contained in these questionnaires deal with normal variation in thoughts and

behavior and generally are not disturbing. However, some questions may be considered sensitive. If there is a question that you do not feel comfortable answering, that question may be skipped without penalty. Couples with existing domestic problems may wish to not participate as some of the questionnaires may or may not be beneficial to the existing relationship. If you experience psychological distress as a result of having participated in this study, please feel free to contact the TAMU Counseling and Assessment Clinic (979-595-1770) or Dr. Donna Davenport (979-845-1831) for counseling services.

6. Your responses or scores will not be made available to any other person other than the researchers. You may contact either Jennifer King or Dr. Donna Davenport if you would like a copy of the study's overall findings.

7. Should you have any questions about this study, you may contact:

Jennifer King

Department of Educational Psychology

4225 Texas A&M University

College Station, TX 77843-4225

(979) 595-1772

jenniferking@tamu.edu

Dr. Donna Davenport

Department of Educational Psychology

4225 Texas A&M University

College Station, TX 77843-4225

(979) 824-1831

donna-davenport@tamu.edu

8. By returning the measures, you indicate that you have read and understand the explanation provided, have had all questions answered to your satisfaction, and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

9. This is your copy of the information sheet.

"I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board- Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, Office of

the Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067 or
mwbuckley@tamu.edu."

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Information

What is your gender? (Please circle one)

Male Female

What is your age group? (Please circle one)

24 or younger
 25-34 years
 35-44 years
 45-54 years
 55-64 years
 65 or older

What is your highest level of education?

(Please circle one)

Some high school	Completed GED
Graduated high school	Some college
Completed college	Some graduate work
Completed advanced degree	

What is your spouse/partner's highest level of education?

(Please circle one)

Some high school	Completed GED
Graduated high school	Some college
Completed college	Some graduate work
Completed advanced degree	

What is your marital status? (Please circle one)

Married Living with partner

****Note:** If neither of these apply, I would greatly appreciate it if you could send the materials back uncompleted through campus mail since the measures are costly and I am working on a student's budget

Length of time you have been married to or living with current partner: _____

Do you have children? (Please circle one)

Yes No

If Yes, how many children do you have? ____

What is the age and gender of each child?

Which of the following categories best describes your job?
(Please circle one)

Executive, administrative or managerial
Professional nonfaculty
Faculty
Secretarial/clerical
Technical/paraprofessional/skilled craft
Service and maintenance
Other: _____

How many hours per week are you usually employed outside home: ____

How many hours per week do you usually spend on household work: ____

Types of household activities you do: (example: laundry, cooking, cleaning, yard work, car maintenance, repairs, caring for children, paying bills/budget, etc.)

Which of the following categories best describes your spouse/partner's job? (Please circle one)

Executive, administrative or managerial
 Professional nonfaculty
 Faculty
 Secretarial/clerical
 Technical/paraprofessional/skilled craft
 Service and maintenance
 Other: _____

How many hours per week is your spouse/partner usually employed outside home: ____

How many hours per week does your spouse/partner usually spend on household work: ____

Types of household activities your spouse/partner does:
 (example: laundry, cooking, cleaning, yard work, car maintenance, repairs, caring for children, paying bills/budget, etc.) _____

Please circle your yearly income range:

Less than 15,000
 Between 15,000 and 26,000
 Between 26,000 and 41,000
 Between 41,000 and 61,000
 Between 61,000 and 81,000
 Between 81,000 and 100,000
 More than 100,000

Please circle your *spouse/partner's* yearly income range:

Less than 15,000

Between 15,000 and 26,000

Between 26,000 and 41,000

Between 41,000 and 61,000

Between 61,000 and 81,000

Between 81,000 and 100,000

More than 100,000

What is your ethnicity? (Please circle one)

Asian or Asian American Black or African American

Hispanic or Latino

White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American

American Indian/Native American

Mixed; Parents are from two different groups

Other: _____

VITA

Jennifer Jean King

19309 NE 22nd Lane
Hawthorne, FL 32640

Education:

University of Florida	Predoctoral Internship		August 2004- August 2005
Texas A&M University	Ph.D.	Counseling Psychology	December 2005
Michigan State University	M.A.	Counseling	May 2001
Vanderbilt University	B.S.	Economics, Psychology, and Sociology	August 1999