

THE ROLE OF WORK IN THE LIFE SATISFACTION
OF EMPLOYED MOTHERS

by

DEBORA LEE CLOUGH

B.A., North Adams State College, 1979

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1982

Approved by:



Major Professor

SPEC
COLL
LD
2668
.T4
1982
C668
C.2

ALL202 254282

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
Examination of the Role of Work in People's Lives . .	3
Quality of Life Research	6
Work-Life Satisfaction in Men	8
Work-Life Satisfaction in Women	9
Research Concerns: Questions of Causation	11
A Possible Moderator: Personal Occupational Importance	12
Employed Mothers: Ambivalence versus Ambition . . .	15
Mother's Perceptions Before/During Work- Force Involvement	17
Males and Females: Socialization and Influence	19
Repercussions of the Dual-Occupation Family	22
Divergent Occupational Meanings: Society as Culprit	23
Overview of the Present Investigation	24
Summary of Literature	24
Description of Purpose	25
Hypotheses	26
Work Satisfaction	26
Life Satisfaction	27
The Relationship Between Work Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction	28
Career versus Job	29
Summary of Hypotheses	30

METHOD	34
Subjects	34
Measuring Instruments	34
Job Satisfaction	35
General Job Satisfaction Question	35
Job Descriptive Index	35
Life Satisfaction	35
Cantril's Self-Anchoring Scale	35
Life Satisfaction Questionnaire	37
Personal Data	38
Demographic Information	38
Legitimacy Interview	39
Procedure	39
Qualitative Data Analysis	41
Additional Data Reclassification	43
Demographic Variables	43
Role Inclusion Section	44
RESULTS	46
Characteristics of the Sample	46
General Overview	48
Satisfaction/Legitimacy: Intra-Index Relationship .	49
Satisfaction Index: Work	49
Satisfaction Index: Life	51
Qualitative Analyses	52
Satisfaction Index: Work-Life Relationship	53
Legitimacy Index: Socialization	54
Legitimacy Index: Norms	56

Qualitative Analyses	58
Legitimacy Index: Female Role Involvement	60
Satisfaction and Legitimacy: Inter-relationships	62
Satisfaction Index: Work	63
Hypothesis (1a): Norm perceptions	63
Hypothesis (1b): Role involvement	64
Hypothesis (1c): Underemployment	65
Satisfaction Index: Life	65
Hypothesis (2a): Socialization	65
Hypothesis (2b): Norm perceptions	66
Hypothesis (2c): Role involvement	66
Hypothesis (2d): Interactions--responses of males and females	66
Work-Life Satisfaction Relationship	67
Hypothesis (3a): Socialization	68
Hypothesis (3b): Norm perceptions	68
Hypothesis (3c): Role involvement	69
Quadrant analysis of the work-life satisfaction relationship	70
Occupational Designation: Career versus Job	72
Hypothesis (4a): Work (and life) satisfaction	72
Hypothesis (4b): Socialization	73
Hypothesis (4c): Norm perceptions	74
Hypothesis (4d): Role involvement	74
Qualitative Analyses	74
DISCUSSION	76

Relationships Between Measures of Satisfaction . .	79
Indices of Work Satisfaction	79
Indices of Life Satisfaction	80
Relationship Between Work Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction	82
Item Intercorrelations of Legitimacy Measures . . .	84
Legitimacy Index: Socialization	84
Legitimacy Index: Norms	85
Relationships Between Indices of Legitimacy and Satisfaction	89
Legitimacy and Work Satisfaction	89
Legitimacy and Life Satisfaction	91
Legitimacy and the Relationship Between Work and Life Satisfaction	93
Occupational Designation: Career versus Job	95
Methodological Analysis: The Autopsy Results	97
Reflecting upon Social Science Research	100
Theoretical and Practical Implications: Analysis of Results	104
Avenues for Future Intervention	106
Avenues for Future Research	108
REFERENCES	112
FOOTNOTES	120
TABLES	121
APPENDICES	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, and perhaps most important, I wish to thank the couples who participated in this research. For allowing me a brief glimpse into their busy, sometimes frustrating, but often fulfilling, lives, I gratefully wish to acknowledge their contribution. My assistants, Jim Connizzo, Bill Lucius, Jerry Ludlow, and Myles Williams, interviewed respondent husbands. The outcome of their work has added an interesting facet to this study, and I thank them for their efforts.

Members of my committee provided suggestions which influenced all phases of this research project. Dr. Ron Downey not only noted theoretical and statistical trouble spots, but was quick to provide encouragement at the same time. Dr. Ann Bristow encouraged me to explore issues and orientations which, I believe, have enhanced the quality of this thesis. My major advisor Dr. Frank Saal managed to convey his confidence that my abilities were sufficient to surmount the ever-present difficulties encountered while working on this project. Through Skip's example, I have learned more about not only research skills and the research process, but also about the role patience and perseverance play in research development and execution.

Finally, to my friends and family, all I can say is thank you! Thanks for listening to me and advising me, but most of all for being there when I needed you.

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Characteristics of the Sample
- Table 2: Relationships Among Work Satisfaction Measures
- Table 3: Principal Component Analysis of Work Satisfaction Measures
- Table 4: Relationships Among Life Satisfaction Measures
- Table 5: Principal Component Analysis of Life Satisfaction Measures
- Table 6: Components of Life Satisfaction
- Table 7: Relationships Among Measures of Work and Life Satisfaction (Females)
- Table 8: Relationships Among Measures of Work and Life Satisfaction (Males)
- Table 9: Sample Characteristics: Maternal Employment
- Table 10: Relationships Among Socialization Variables
- Table 11: Relationships Among Norms of Significant Others
- Table 12: Principal Component Analysis of Norms of Significant Others
- Table 13: Elaboration of Normative Prescriptions
- Table 14: Percentage of Respondents Mentioning Role Types of Female Role Involvement
- Table 15: Correlations Between Male's and Female's Role Involvement Responses
- Table 16: Intercorrelations of Role Involvement Measures
- Table 17: Correlations Between Norm Perceptions and Respondent Work Satisfaction

- Table 18: Significant Correlations of Individual
'Significant Others' and Work Satisfaction
Measures ($p < .05$)
- Table 19: Correlations Between Norms (Males) and Work
Satisfaction (Females)
- Table 20: Correlations Among Role Involvement and Female
Work Satisfaction
- Table 21: Significant Multivariate Relationship Between
Socialization Experiences and Life Satisfaction
(Females)
- Table 22: Correlations Between Legitimacy Variables and
Female Life Satisfaction
- Table 23: Principal Component Analysis of Standardized
Work-Life Satisfaction (D^2) Indices (Female)
- Table 24: Relationships Between Legitimacy Variables and
Female Work-Life Satisfaction
- Table 25: Relationships Between Legitimacy Variables and
Female Work-Life Satisfaction
- Table 26: Significant Correlations Between Role
Involvement and Specific Female Work-Life
Satisfaction Measures ($p < .05$)
- Table 27: Mean Responses to Global Socialization and Norm
Indices as a Function of the Relationship
Between Female Work and Life Satisfaction
- Table 28: Relationships Between Career-Job Designation and
the Work and Life Satisfaction of Females

**Table 29: Relationships Between the Work and Life
Satisfaction of Females Engaged in Careers**

**Table 30: Relationships Between Occupational Legitimacy
and Occupational Designations**

Table 31: Respondent Definitions of Career and Job

The Role of Work in the Life Satisfaction of Employed Mothers

The manner in which the various facets of life are combined to influence overall satisfaction with life may reflect not only personal but societal values and priorities. It has long been assumed that one's work holds a central role in the achievement of personal satisfaction. Historically, occupational selection has often meant the inheritance of an identity. Researchers investigating the relationship between job and life satisfaction in males have revealed a relationship wherein one complements the other. In the past, women's work (particularly that of married women) was assumed to revolve around the family. If women did indeed focus their emotional energy upon family commitments, it is not surprising that studies examining the relationship between occupational and life satisfaction in women found one to be independent of the other.

Social norms regarding appropriate female occupational behavior have changed. Paid employment has become more socially acceptable, even for women with husbands and children. One probable cause of this is the sheer ubiquity of maternal employment. In 1958, 37.6% of American married

women with children between six and seventeen years of age were employed (US Department of Commerce, 1980). Twenty years later, that percentage rose to 57.2%. During the 1950's, women with pre-school children were especially rare in the workplace. In 1958, only 18.2% of mothers with children younger than 6 years of age were employed. In 1979, 43.2% of the mothers in this category were employed. Currently, many full-time mother-homemakers are reporting reverse harassment---denigration of motherhood as a full-time occupation. Christine Davidson (1982), in a Newsweek commentary, retorted:

Women who want to work should--and without a 1950s condemnation from anyone. But I think we should not move from the narrow-mindedness of the '50s to another kind of narrowness in the '80s. Mothers who choose to stay at home should not feel they have to justify their decision.

The purpose of the present investigation is to examine the work-life satisfaction relationship of working mothers in light of shifting societal norms. The satisfaction relationship is hypothesized to be related to past and present exposure to this lifestyle which diverges from the traditional "two parents-one breadwinner" family structure. Specifically, the present research examines the influences of the working mother's socialization experiences, and her perception of societal and personal norms and roles, upon the relationship between occupational and life satisfaction.

Examination of the Role of Work in People's Lives

Though intuitively straightforward, the importance of a job in people's lives has proven difficult to determine empirically. Contradictory results have consistently emerged. Two classical studies upon this question; both research projects focused on male factory employees.

Dubin (1956) defined a central life interest as "an expressed preference for a given locale or situation in carrying out an activity" (p. 132). Through the Central Life Inventory, he presented respondents with a list of activities with an apparently equal likelihood of occurring at work, within the community, or at a neutral location. Participants selected the response with which they most agreed. Job-oriented individuals were defined as those selecting a predominance of responses where work was the preferred locale to carry out most activities.

Twenty-four percent of all workers were labeled as job-oriented in their life interests. Only 9% of the sample preferred the informal group life centered around the job. When considering the functional importance of the workplace to individuals, people tended to focus upon the organization's technological aspects and requisite formal participation networks. Dubin (1956) concluded that most workers have a well-developed sense of attachment to work and the workplace without a corresponding sense of total

commitment to it.

Kornhauser (1965) interviewed male automobile assembly line workers to ascertain personal feelings concerning themselves, their problems, hopes, satisfaction and worries. The most prevalent, salient ideas (those topics stressed or repeatedly mentioned) included the job, the family, and economic conditions. Personal economic concern was a salient idea for 61% of those interviewed; the job was salient for 58%, and the family was important for 55%. These results suggest that the job is an important facet of a person's life.

It is essential to note that these studies are not necessarily contradictory. To eliminate the job as a person's central life interest is not to say that the job is unimportant, although many have interpreted it in that way (Bedeian & Marbert, 1979). The two studies also solicited different kinds of information. Dubin (1956) determined the one preferred location for carrying out an activity, while Kornhauser (1965) focused upon components contributing to inner happiness and turmoil. The quest for "the most important" may mask the complexity of components from which one derives satisfaction.

According to Payton-Miyazaka and Brayfield (1976), work satisfaction can be related to life satisfaction in six possible ways. They may be: (1) incompatible (the

two are in continual irreconcilable conflict); (2) independent (one has no relationship with the other); (3) compensatory (deficiencies in one are made up for by an abundance of the other); (4) instrumental (one is primarily a means by which to acquire desired things represented by the other); (5) reciprocal (one affects the other and vice versa); and/or (6) integrative (the two are so closely fused as to make separate consideration impossible).

Most research in this area has utilized either male populations or samples believed to be representative of American adults, with no separate analyses conducted for females. Life satisfaction has most often been determined either: (1) by a single-item question regarding general life satisfaction; or (2) as a composite score derived from adding such components as general present satisfaction, satisfaction over time, family or marital satisfaction, leisure satisfaction, residence satisfaction, and health status. Job satisfaction has usually been determined by responses to a general "how satisfied are you with your job" question, or through use of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). Results have been generally consistent across the methods.

Research examining the relationship between work and life satisfaction has focused upon various segments of the adult working population. First, 'quality of life'

research has investigated the satisfaction relationship in typically large samples, in conjunction with a plethora of demographic variables. Due, in part, to the large sample sizes, findings generated with this approach have been quite reliable. Second, exclusively male samples have been the focus of investigation by other researchers. Though not of central relevance to the present study, examination of this research provides one with a broader knowledge base from which to evaluate empirical questions and answers concerning strictly female samples. Third, research has examined the relationship between work and life satisfaction in females. Studies of this sort are particularly relevant to the current investigation.

Quality of Life Research

A positive, moderate, and statistically significant relationship between job and life satisfaction has been found in representative American samples. Social indicator researchers studying representative samples of adults working full-time have found work-life satisfaction correlations ranging from .21 to .43 (Andrews & Withey, 1974; Bamundo, 1977; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976; London, Crandall, & Seals, 1977; Near, Rice, & Hunt, 1978; Rice, Near, & Hunt, 1979). Frequently, the correlation between job and life satisfaction is compared to alternative social indicators. For example, London et al.

(1977) found that job satisfaction in males (collapsed across race, age, education, and socioeconomic status) accounted for 11.2% of the total variance of life satisfaction scores; satisfaction with leisure accounted for 6.2% of the total variance in males' life satisfaction.

For the sample in general (collapsed across conditions of sex as well as the aforementioned variables), however, leisure items were a better predictor of quality of life than were job-related items.

Bamundo (1977) found stronger work-life satisfaction relationships to be associated with higher education, marriage, higher income, self-employment, and higher occupational levels. Vredenburg and Sheridan (1979), in a two year study, found that of the total life satisfaction variance explained, approximately 8.5% was explained by job satisfaction during both years; 1.6% and 3.5% were explained by marital status in each of the two years. Other statistically significant components evident in only one of the two surveyed years included hierarchical job level, current residence, family income, parents' income, sex (males exhibited a greater relationship, $r^2=.009$), and religion.

In an examination of components of work and extra-work satisfaction, Rice, Near, and Hunt (1979) concluded:

Work-related variables do have some impact on life satisfaction. The subjective (job satisfaction) and objective (tenure and prestige) account for 11-13% of

the variance in life satisfaction (depending on which regression procedure is used).... It appears that general life satisfaction can be influenced by work-related variables, even when one partials out the effects of extra-work variables. (pp. 617-618)

Work-Life Satisfaction in Men

Other research, utilizing samples of males within specific occupations, has also produced moderate positive correlations between job and life satisfaction. Male samples have included civil service managers (Brayfield, Wells, & Strate, 1957), factory foremen (Iris & Barrett, 1972; Orpen, 1978), factory employees (Trafton, 1978), university employees (Kavanaugh & Halpern, 1977), and engineers (Bedeian & Marbert, 1979).

Many studies have focused upon an examination of psychological variables that may moderate the relationship between work and life satisfaction. In examining the effect of the importance of specific job factors to the individual upon the relationship between job and life satisfaction in factory foremen, Iris and Barrett (1972) concluded:

Those men who were in a work environment that provided little job satisfaction...were more likely to be dissatisfied with other aspects of their life if they felt aspects of the job such as promotions, supervision, and work to be important for their job satisfaction. (p. 303)

For this reason, they stated that importance of job aspects may moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

Bedeian and Marbert (1979) revealed that engineers' self-perceptions may serve as a significant moderator between: (1) overall life satisfaction and satisfaction with co-workers; and, (2) overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with both co-workers and supervision. They suggested the absence of an association between job and life satisfaction for those low in self-esteem.

Work-Life Satisfaction in Women

Of central interest to this study is the relationship between work satisfaction and life satisfaction in women. Few studies of working women have considered work satisfaction as a dependent variable. The prevalent assumption seems to be that gender is not a determinant of job satisfaction. Weaver (1978) described limitations in this assumption:

A number of influences believed to affect job satisfaction may have highly similar effects on male and female workers when the influences of several other variables are held constant..... In a given situation, however, if the sexes are unequally affected by the determinants of job satisfaction, such as by differential wages or prestige, or if other influences such as societal norms differentially intervene between job satisfaction and these determinants, then sex differences in job satisfaction can be expected. (p.270-271)

Differences in societal gender-related norms are still prevalent. Frequent repercussions accompanying the entrance of women into the work force include inconsistencies between personal and societal norms, role

conflict, and role overload (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969). Thus, in circumstances where differential societal treatment is likely to occur, differences in male/female job satisfaction would not be surprising.

The question that remains is the nature of the relationship between a woman's job satisfaction and her general life satisfaction. Empirical investigation is inconclusive. London, Crandall, and Seals (1977) found that, whereas job satisfaction accounted for 2.0% of the total life satisfaction variance in women, satisfaction with leisure accounted for 20.6% of the total variance. Brayfield, Wells, and Strate (1957) found no significant relationship between job and life satisfaction in female civil servants (most of whom were clerical workers). In contrast to the sampled males (the majority of whom were managers), the females more frequently mentioned that the job provided neither excitement nor the opportunity to work off emotions. In addition, many of the women, reportedly not working out of economic necessity, were performing at a level expected and approved of by their families.

In a replication of the Brayfield et al. (1957) study, Kavanaugh and Halpern (1977) sampled comparable sectors of male and female university employees. They found an average correlation (based on the utilization of a variety

of scales) of .37 for males and .41 for females. There was no statistically significant relationship between occupational hierarchical level and the job-life satisfaction correlation for men and women.

Research Concerns: Questions of Causation

The positive correlation between work and life satisfaction found consistently with men, and occasionally with women, supports the reciprocal and instrumental models, and perhaps even the integrative model if one assumes that the lower-than-perfect correlations are due to measurement error rather than "real" differences. That is, satisfaction in one domain relates positively to satisfaction in the other, and vice-versa. The size of the correlation suggests that many other components, in addition to job satisfaction, combine to influence life satisfaction, and/or vice-versa. Kornhauser (1965) found that satisfaction with life correlated with job satisfaction ($r=.58$), family and home satisfaction ($r=.67$), leisure satisfaction ($r=.40$) and community status ($r=.23$).

The correlations undoubtedly result from a very intricate network of direct and causal connections. Job satisfaction is part of this system of interdependent feelings; it is positively linked, though to a moderate degree, with each of the other measures of satisfaction. The relationships are thus consistent with an interpretation that conceives favorable or unfavorable job feelings as carrying over to produce corresponding feelings in other sectors of life... The correlational evidence is congruent with a 'spillover' interpretation as opposed to a 'compensatory' interpretation of job feelings in

relation to non-work aspects of life. (pp. 205-207)

Weaver (1978) presented the inverse interpretation:

The considerable interdependence among domain variables suggests that happiness is based on satisfaction in a number of different parts of life, that the employee whose happiness is significantly related to job satisfaction is also likely to experience satisfaction in other parts of life as well. Thus happiness seems to be a generalized phenomenon, according to which employees are either generally satisfied or generally dissatisfied across a broad totality of life. (pp. 838-839)

On the other hand, in response to the suggestion that it is not "spillover" of work satisfaction, but another, more central satisfaction (family?) that causes the positive correlations, Orpen (1978) stated:

The suggestion that 'other' factors are causing covariation of work and nonwork satisfaction points to the need for further research that could profitably investigate whether the stronger causal effect from work to non-work satisfaction only holds for employees for whom their jobs represent a 'central life interest,' and not for employees, like those studied by Dubin (1956) and Goldthorpe (1966), whose main concern is with gratification outside the work setting. (p. 532)

A Possible Moderator: Personal Occupational Importance

Much of the recent research has thus suggested that a relationship between work and life satisfaction may be contingent upon the importance of the occupation to the individual. Perhaps the perceptual distinction between having a job and having a career may be equivalent to the distinction between the job being unimportant and important to the individual. Rapoport and Rapoport (1972) made the

distinction between dual-career and dual-worker families (the latter of which includes families in which one spouse has a career, the other a job). This distinction hinges upon the degree of personal commitment (eg. jobs may be taken solely for economic reasons) and the continuity of employment (eg. jobs are more subject to interruption, lacking the clear developmental stages and accumulation of expertise).

Personal commitment and high importance--these terms convey comparable subjective states initiated, in part, by the occupation. A similar concept, job involvement, has been defined by researchers in two ways (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977): (1) as a performance--self-esteem contingency, wherein work performance affects the self-esteem of the involved worker; and (2) as a self-image component. Neither of these definitions comfortably fits within this paper's focus, for both perceive of the "involved" worker as one to whom the job attains a central role in personal identification. Kanungo (1979) has defined job involvement in a manner more amenable to the present discussion. "Work involvement is viewed as a generalized cognitive (or belief) state of psychological identification with work insofar as work is perceived to have the potentiality to satisfy one's salient needs and expectations" (p. 131). It has been suggested (Brayfield, Wells, & Strate, 1957) that

no correlation between job and life satisfaction exists in women because the job is less important to women.

Holahan and Gilbert (1979) asked married mothers employed full-time at a university to classify their current positions as either a job or career. Those who described their work as a career were found, on the average, to report significantly more commitment to their careers, $F(1,38)=15.06$, $p<.001$, and a higher level of work aspiration, $F(1,37)=4.40$, $p<.05$. Those who described their positions as careers also reported greater support from their spouses than those who categorized themselves as holding a job, $F(1,37)=5.99$, $p<.05$. It was suggested that spouse support may be a crucial variable for the reduction of role conflict for working women. Further, it was hypothesized that if non-career working women received the same degree of spouse support as the career women, they may also have experienced reduced role conflict. Alternately, may it not be equally correct to suggest that these non-career working women would, in turn, perceive themselves as having a career rather than a job?

Holahan and Gilbert (1979) concluded:

The mean pattern of mean life satisfaction scores from the job and career groups indicated that the career group received comparably high satisfaction from all four roles (work, spouse, parent, self as self-actualizing person). In marked contrast, the job group reported much less satisfaction from their work roles than from their family roles.... This difference raises the possibility that women in the job group may be less willing to relinquish the

responsibilities and associated rewards of their roles as wives and mothers.... The increased demands of the role expansion situation could also result in activities performed for personal benefit, leading to their greater conflict involving the self-role and their lessened satisfaction from the self-role as well. (p. 89)

Employed Mothers: Ambivalence versus Ambition

Much has been written and discussed regarding the influx of women into the work force. A trend began at the turn of the century in which women resisted the traditional path that society dictated their lives were to follow (Filene, 1974). In the ensuing years, however, the movement slowed to a standstill. Women perceived their options as either-or situations: to marry and raise a family or to pursue a career. Glorification of the occupations of mother and housewife encouraged women to once again follow a traditional path (Oakley, 1974). World War II initiated rapid re-entry of women into the work force. At the war's conclusion, many returned to the home. Others, married and single, remained on the job, creating what some have termed a social revolution within our country (Filene, 1974).

In 1950, 28.3% of American married women with children 6 to 17 years of age were working. The rate rose to 39% in 1960, to 49.2% in 1970, and to an impressive 57.2% in 1978 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). Of those working in 1978, 67.3% were working full-time. More than one-half of the married women between the ages of 25 and 34 presently

living with their spouses were employed as of 1978; 45.4% of those 35 to 44 years of age were employed.

Employed women tend to have significantly fewer children than non-employed women, even when socio-economic status, race and education are held constant (Beckman, 1978). Compared to non-working mothers, working mothers differ in size of family (smaller families), social status (relatively higher socio-economic status), educational level (more education), age of offspring (relatively older offspring) and ethnic background (less likely to come from strong sex-role socializing heritages) (Siegel & Haas, 1963). The highest labor force participation rates were for women with four years of college or more; the lowest rates were for those with eight years of schooling or less. Though a greater percentage of black than white women work (U.S. Department of Labor, 1975), the proportion of families with multiple earners is lower for blacks than whites. Labor force participation is lowest for women of Spanish origin.

Discussion of three important components of successful maternal employment follows. Briefly, external (environmental) as well as personal conditions and concerns often influence a woman's occupational pursuits. Second, past and present socialization experiences (including spouse support) have been found to influence the ease with which a woman can engage in rewarding occupational activity. A

related concern, role stress, is a frequent negative repercussion of the dual-occupation lifestyle which can limit the satisfaction a woman may gain through employment. These factors constitute the basis from which ambition and/or ambivalence will later develop.

Mother's Perceptions Before/During Work-Force Involvement

The decision to work is a function of motivators (eg. the need for money, creative and social limitations of the housewife-mother role, various personality factors) and facilitators (eg. structural freedom within the housewife-mother role, family/community/self attitudes toward employment, job possibilities) (Hoffman, 1963). "Money" has been the most traditional response to the question frequently asked of women, "Why do you work?" This answer may encompass such diverse aspects as the need to maintain a standard of living deemed appropriate, financial desires to purchase coveted possessions, economics (working and thus purchasing commercial goods is more economical than remaining home and creating home-made items), and guilt about not working. Bringing home a paycheck is seen by society as a sign of competence, a tangible contribution to the family. Other motivators may include the perceived change in roles accompanying the youngest child's entering school, and dissatisfaction with the often tedious role of housekeeper and mother. Personality factors such as need for achievement, for self-actualization, and for gratifica-

tion may act as a third type of motivator.

In a study of married professional women, Poloma and Garland (1971) found a preponderance of two types of family structures. In the traditional family, the wife's career was equivalent to a hobby, or viewed as similar to a neighbor's volunteer activities. The wife's principal role was that of wife, mother, and homemaker. The husband was clearly seen as the income-earning member of the couple, with the wife's earnings not put toward family needs. The neo-traditional family differed in that, as a rule, the wife's income was necessary to maintain the family's present standard of living. The wife was still expected to see that the home ran smoothly and that all needs were cared for, although the husband may have assisted her with domestic tasks.

The wives reported a high degree of satisfaction in combining a career with either a relatively traditional or neo-traditional family life. Many of them expressed the belief that they had 'the best of both worlds'--the joys of wifedom and motherhood coupled with a profession which they enjoyed. Most stressed the fact that they did not 'have' to work. (Poloma & Garland, 1971, p. 539)

Similar sentiments were expressed in a cross-cultural study examining French and American professional women (Brizzard, 1978). Two themes emerged from interviews with the women: a concurrent commitment to both professional and domestic roles, and the second-place status of the woman's career. The subordinate emphasis upon career emerged in two respects: (1) the career was viewed as

secondary in importance to that of the husband; and (2) the role of mother and wife held priority over that of professional.

According to working mothers, rewards of work include social interaction with other adults, greater challenge and achievement, esteem or independence, economic benefits, mental stimulation, and 'in world time' (Beckman, 1978). Costs of work include time demands, children's (presumably unmet) needs, the routine, and the fatigue involved in being both a housewife and employee.

Males and Females: Socialization and Influence

Socialization of the female has an effect upon her later career choice and commitment. Family backgrounds of successful women or those with high career aspirations were found to consist of a mother either happy in a career or unsatisfied as a traditional homemaker (Altman & Grossman, 1977; Frieze, 1978). Fathers tended to be supportive of their daughters' career ambitions (Frieze, 1978).

According to Oliver (1975), although career women subjects more highly identified with their fathers, they indicated significantly less acceptance by their fathers than did homemaking subjects. In explanation, Hoffman (1972) is cited for her suggestion of "overhelp," that is, parental behaviors which interfere with the development of independence in girls. If less father acceptance is interpreted as lesser nurturance, then this parental attitude could

have influenced the development of greater needs of independence and achievement, creating, as a consequence, an expressed desire for an uninterrupted career.

Successful women, or those with high career aspirations, married late in life or remained single, and had either no children or postponed having children until after establishing their careers (Hennig & Jardim, 1976). They returned to work soon after giving birth to their children, and their husbands supported the idea of a woman possessing a career. Personality characteristics included: (1) non-traditional values; (2) enjoyment of solitary activities; (3) discussions of goals with female friends; and (4) tomboy characteristics as a child. Research supports the hypothesis that professional women tend to be more highly androgynous than homemakers (Brizzard, 1977; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979).

St. John-Parsons (1978) looked at ten dual-career families in which the women interrupted their careers minimally or not at all to have children. The wives tended to be either only children or had few siblings with whom intense sibling rivalry existed. Though there was a lack of familial harmony, they tended to be close to one parent or relative. The husbands, also with few or no siblings, were from less emotionally tense homes. They came, almost without exception, from socioeconomically poorer backgrounds than their wives. All husbands supported their

wives in their career endeavors.

If a dual-career family is one where both heads of the household pursue their professional careers and at the same time maintain a family life together that includes children, then this family pattern is a minority one in our culture. It is deviant in the sense that our culture presupposes that only one spouse will be involved, on a more or less exclusive basis, with the care of a home and children, and that that spouse will be female. (St. John-Parsons, 1978, p. 31)

Spouse support has been found to be crucial to a married woman's career pursuits. Studies have examined various needs and stresses (personal, marital and occupational) of dual- versus single-career couples (Burke & Weir, 1976; Booth, 1977; Heckman, Bryson, & Bryson, 1977), and allocation of household tasks (Szinovacz, 1977). Oversimplified typologies which attempt to characterize the nature of dual-occupation families include: (1) husbands of working mothers (Curtis, 1976); and (2) the husband-wife dyad (Bird, 1979). Mortimer, Hall, and Hill (1978), in describing the "two-person career," offered an alternative example of husband non-support of female employment. A two-person career is one in which the wife's family role is widened to include many activities the purpose of which is to assist and enhance her husband's occupation (eg. upper-level management). The husband's career involvement, which at times involves considerable strain, may require highly sex-segregated and inflexible divisions of labor within the home, diminishing the likelihood of the wife's employment.

Repercussions of the Dual-Occupation Family

Role conflict is often seen as a by-product of the working mother's roles (Hall, 1975; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Robison, 1978; Szinovacz, 1977). As has previously been discussed, mothers entering the work force tend to add a role rather than reconstruct existing roles. No research has been generated that suggests why this is the case, but much has examined the effects of this upon the woman. Role conflict is described as any situation in which incompatible expectations are placed upon a person due to position membership (Sales, 1978). Hall (1975) found a strong relationship between the existence of conflict and the number of roles in which one engages. Sixty-one percent of those women maintaining one or two roles, 81% of those with three roles, and 91% of those with four or more roles reported experiencing role conflict. Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) isolated five categories of stress in dual-career families: (1) role overload; (2) discrepancy between personal norms and social norms--the difference between what the couple feels is right for themselves and the norms held by those around them; (3) dilemmas of identity--fundamental characteristics of the self often stemming from sociocultural definitions of work and family as intrinsically masculine and feminine, respectively; (4) altered social network systems as a function of working, in that friendships are formed on a couple basis with associates

tending to be similar to themselves with respect to the wife's occupational involvement; and (5) role cycling conflicts that periodically erupt between the two careers.

Much has been written concerning coping strategies, abilities to cope, antecedents to coping behavior, etc. Coping strategies vary from restructuring the roles through confrontation with one's role senders to attempting to better perform all roles (see Hall, 1972, 1975; Katz, 1978).

Divergent Occupational Meanings: Society as Culprit

Working women and, more specifically, working mothers tend to encounter different socialization experiences, societal norms, and personal role demands and conflicts than their male counterparts within the working world. It would therefore not be surprising to discover that work plays a different part in women's general satisfaction with life than it does in men's. On the other hand, the job's importance to the women may play a key role in the relationship between work and life satisfaction.

The importance of spouse support in maternal employment has been repeatedly discovered. Rather than independent components, however, job importance and spouse support may be inextricably bound. Holahan and Gilbert (1979) reported that career women (versus job holders) were

more likely to report spouses supporting their careers. Note that the women were reporting perceptions of their husbands' attitudes. It is possible that these were largely limited by the degree to which the women themselves accepted the legitimacy of working.

According to Lashuk and Kurian (1977), perceived failure to conform to a set of expectations seen as legitimate may result in negative internal sanctions. The legitimacy variable was found, through factor analysis, to consist of three components: (1) egalitarianism--non-egalitarianism; (2) rejection-acceptance of dominance of the father within the family; (3) acceptance-rejection of the traditional view of women's place in society.

Overview of the Present Investigation

Summary of Literature

Past research has consistently revealed a relationship between work and life satisfaction with males; research findings focused upon female samples have been less consistent. Rice, Near, and Hunt (1980) observed that gender is confounded with such variables as anticipatory socialization to work, expectations for success, and time spent in household duties. Any one or a combination of these variables may account for the differential satisfaction relationships. Such conjecture has not been systematically evaluated, however. Literature examining

characteristics of "successful" working women provides additional support for the aforementioned conjecture. This research, however, has relied almost exclusively upon the women reporting their perceptions of others' viewpoints through traditional quantitative methodologies. Previous work-life satisfaction relationship research has also depended almost exclusively upon rating scales. Unfortunately, those components which currently make up the evaluation of one's life by dual-occupation couples is unknown. Therefore, discussion of the work-life satisfaction relationship has been set in very abstract terms. Discovery of those components may provide a context within which to understand respondents' life satisfaction.

Description of Purpose

The present investigation examines the relationship between work and life satisfaction of working mothers. The extent to which perceived work-role legitimacy relates to the satisfaction relationship is of central interest. Perceived worker role legitimacy is defined by socialization experiences, norm perceptions of significant others, and description and evaluation of personal role involvement. It is believed that exclusive reliance upon the woman's perceptions of others' responses to her employment may be misleading. Spouse support has been described as essential to successful career development; therefore the

perceptions of the spouse are examined in as much detail as those of the wife, for his may be equally influential upon the satisfaction she can achieve through work and life in general. Finally, previous dependence upon quantitative methodology is believed to achieve no more than a superficial investigation of the problem. Discussions with respondents are expected to elucidate the dynamics underlying the dual-occupation lifestyle.

Hypotheses

Work Satisfaction

As previously discussed, work satisfaction has been found to relate to life satisfaction in men; however, this relationship is less frequently evident in women (Brayfield et al., 1957; London et al., 1977). Others have noted the changing mores of appropriate maternal behavior and roles, observing the same moderate positive relationship in women that has been found in men (Kavanaugh & Halpern, 1977). Under certain circumstances, this positive relationship is anticipated. It is expected that the extent to which the woman perceives social norms as supportive will modify her expressed work satisfaction. Perceived social norms according to the husband may influence the wife's work satisfaction, as well. Work satisfaction may be influenced by the number of roles held, as well as their perceived personal demands (mental and physical). It is expected

that the extent to which the woman perceives of herself as underemployed will negatively influence her job satisfaction.

Life Satisfaction

Poloma and Garland (1971) reported that women in a traditional or neo-traditional family unit were highly satisfied in combining career and family. The women believed that they had "the best of both worlds"--motherhood and a satisfying career. One may infer that one's perception of "best" is based upon socialization experiences and perceived social support in achieving this "best." Relationships between socialization experiences and life satisfaction and between perceived norms and life satisfaction are expected.

Rapoport and Rapoport (1969), in reviewing stressful circumstances in dual-career families, first focused upon the dilemmas of role overload. According to the authors:

The overload issue seems to arise acutely as a stress when both members pursue careers. The strains are felt first in relation to leisure and recreational activities, which are often sacrificed very early; second, in relation to the children and the degree and quality of relationships with them or in relation to one's work. (pp. 12-13)

Although Hall (1975) found a monotonic relationship between the number of roles in which one engages and the existence of role conflict, it is anticipated that perceived number and demands of roles will reflect a curvi-

linear relationship with life satisfaction. That is, too few or too many demanding roles will relate to lower life satisfaction.

Shifting role demands require continued adjustments for women. At each transition point, they have to learn new behaviors that must be meshed with other pre-existing role obligations. Role transitions are further complicated when people in one's social network refuse to acknowledge a status change. (Sales, 1978, p. 160)

The relationship between the perceived norms of the husband and of the wife is anticipated to affect life satisfaction. That is, if they agree upon how society views working mothers, higher life satisfaction is expected than that evident upon disagreement. Further, a relationship between the husband's perception of his wife's roles and the wife's perception of her roles is expected to influence life satisfaction.

The Relationship Between Work Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction

It is hypothesized that the work-life satisfaction relationship will be moderated by the degree to which the woman perceives paid employment as a legitimate component of her identity. In other words, it is anticipated that socialization experiences, perceived societal norms, and role demands will influence the satisfaction relationship. This relationship may be inherent within the demands of requesting general life satisfaction judgments from

individuals. The scales' endpoints (best-worst; satisfied-dissatisfied) are subjectively anchored. Where else can components of ideal and anti-ideal come from but past and present experiences and general guidelines of acceptability?

The significances and meanings a person assigns to all aspects of the environment within which he attempts to carry out his puposes are learned in the course of experience. Essentially a person tries from infancy on to construct for himself a pattern of assumptions that will increase the correspondence between what he perceives in the environment around him and what this environment turns out to be when he acts within it to experience some intended consequence. (Cantril, 1965, p. 11)

Again, the existence of a two-person career may negatively influence the wife's work-life satisfaction. In fact, the degree to which the husband perceives work as a legitimate expression of identity (according to socialization,...) may influence the relationship between work and life satisfaction of his wife. Mortimer, Hall, and Hill (1978) concluded by suggesting that socialization experiences of the man may enhance the likelihood of his selecting a highly sex-typed occupation engendering traditional sex-role norms and negative attitudes toward the employment of his wife.

Career versus Job

Previous correlates to components of job satisfaction in males have included the perceived importance of job elements (Iris & Barrett, 1972). As an extension, the

importance of the job itself to the individual may affect work satisfaction. Importance in this study is defined by whether the woman perceives of her occupation as a career or job.

Holahan and Gilbert (1979) found that wives who described themselves as possessing a career expressed a greater degree of spouse support than did those classifying their occupations as jobs. It is suggested here that husband support may be related to the manner in which a wife will categorize her occupation. It is anticipated that the husband's socialization experiences, perceived norms, and perception of his wife's role demands may predict his wife's subjective occupational classification as accurately as her own perceptions.

Summary of Hypotheses

Briefly, this investigation is designed to evaluate the following hypotheses concerning work satisfaction, life satisfaction, the work-life satisfaction relationship, and the career versus job distinction.

1. Work satisfaction

- a. A positive relationship is expected between the perceived norms of female respondents and their work satisfaction. Norms perceived as supportive of employed mothers are expected to relate to higher work satisfaction.

- b. Extensive role involvement is expected to be associated with lower work satisfaction.
- c. Perceived underemployment is anticipated to be associated with relatively low work satisfaction.

2. Life satisfaction

- a. Supportive socialization experiences of male and female respondents are expected to be associated with greater life satisfaction in females. Supportive experiences are defined as those which supported the work status of the mother.
- b. Supportive norm perceptions of male and female respondents is predicted to be associated with greater female life satisfaction. Supportive norm perceptions are defined as those in which maternal employment has been deemed acceptable.
- c. Perceived number and demand of role commitments is expected to negatively relate to life satisfaction.
- d. An interaction (the degree of congruence) between male and female respondents' perceptions (norms and/or role involvement) is expected to relate to life satisfaction of

female respondents. Congruence between males' and females' perceptions are expected to relate to greater female life satisfaction.

3. Work-life satisfaction relationship

- a. Supportive socialization experiences of female respondents are anticipated to relate to a greater relationship between work and life satisfaction. Male respondents' socialization experiences are expected to relate to the satisfaction relationships of their wives such that supportive experiences relate to higher satisfaction.
- b. Norm perceptions of male and female respondents are expected to be associated with the satisfaction relationship such that supportive norm perceptions relate to higher satisfaction.
- c. Role involvement of the woman as described by the male and female respondents is anticipated to relate to the work-life satisfaction relationship. Women viewed as active with a greater proportion of job-related roles (perceived demanding and important) are expected to indicate a greater relationship between work and life satisfaction.

4. Occupational Designation: Career versus job
 - a. Female respondents characterizing their occupations as careers are predicted to report greater work satisfaction. Male respondents describing their wives' work as careers are expected to be wed to women reporting greater work satisfaction.
 - b. Male and female respondents' socialization experiences are expected to relate to the designation of the wife's occupation such that those with supportive experiences describe it as a career.
 - c. Norm perceptions of male and female respondents are anticipated to be associated with occupational designation such that those perceiving supportive norms describe it as a career.
 - d. Role involvement of the wife as described by male and female respondents is expected to relate to occupational designation such that those with comparatively more job-related roles (labeled important and demanding) describe it as a career.

METHOD

Subjects

Twenty families with at least one child living at home comprised the sample for this study. Fathers worked full-time; mothers also worked full-time (32 hours per week or more) outside of the home. Approximately 1000 women were contacted through their places of employment. These sites included a midwestern university, a bank, and a local business. Contact was made either through a form letter or an article in the organization's newsletter. The notice (see Appendix A) briefly described the study, requirements for participation as a subject, and time demands inherent in participation. If the target person was interested in learning more about the study or wished to participate, she was asked to contact the experimenter. Through subsequent telephone contact, additional information was supplied and participation was encouraged. At this time, the interview was usually scheduled. Whenever possible, husbands and wives were interviewed during the same time period (although each was interviewed separately). With four couples, this was not possible, so the two were interviewed on different days. Participants were then instructed not to discuss the study with the spouse yet to be interviewed.

Measuring Instruments

Job Satisfaction

General Job Satisfaction Question. (See Appendix B)

Although phrased in a variety of ways, many studies (particularly social indicator research) have utilized a single-item measure of job satisfaction similar to that used in this study. The question read "In general, how satisfied are you with your job"? A five-point rating scale, ranging from "completely satisfied" to "completely dissatisfied," was provided.

Job Descriptive Index. Gaining in popularity in psychological literature, the JDI has become a common measure of job satisfaction. Satisfaction with five areas of the job are measured (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969): the work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, and co-workers. There are lists of adjectives or short phrases presented for each area, and the participant indicates the appropriateness of each phrase with respect to his/her job. If the phrase applies, he/she marks "Y" (yes); if the phrase is inapplicable, the respondent writes "N" (no). If he/she cannot decide, "?" is the appropriate response.

Life Satisfaction

Cantril's Self-Anchoring Scale. (See Appendix C)

This instrument was developed as a means to discover the spectrum of values people in a variety of cultures are

concerned with, and the means by which personal lives are evaluated. Respondents describe as the top anchoring point wishes and hopes, the realization of which would constitute for them the best possible life. The bottom anchor is represented by worries, fears, and preoccupations--components of the worst possible life. Utilizing an eleven-point ladder, the "ladder of life," respondents are asked to indicate where they presently stand on the ladder, in the context of top and bottom rungs as previously defined. They are also asked about beliefs as to where they will be five years in the future. Thus, all ratings are anchored within the individual's conception of reality.

Several reservations must be noted: (1) The ratings people assign themselves are entirely subjective. It is naive to expect one person's "5" to mean the same thing as another's. All rankings are embedded within the perceived reality of the respondents; (2) There are no claims that the Self-Anchoring Scale gets at everything it is important to know about the person. It is likely that problems/desires which are highly personal or socially unacceptable will remain unknown; and (3) Individuals do not mention aspects of life which are taken for granted (Cantril, 1965).

Andrews and Crandall (1976) examined the validity of measures of self-reported well-being. The ladder scale

(9-rung self-anchoring ladder) had a median validity coefficient of .70 when compared with results obtained through five other measures of satisfaction. Fifty percent of the variance was identified as valid (a reflection of the intended measure); in addition, 20% could be attributed to influences other than those the measures were designed to tap--error variance affected by the other measures as well. (The remaining 30% of the variance was due to random error.)

By way of evaluation, Robinson and Shaver (1969) observed:

Cantril's technique both controls for and obscures variations due to individual differences in aspiration levels. However, open-ended material dealing with choice of standards for 'best' and 'worst' possible life conditions provides rich ancillary information on the types of factors that people consider responsible for satisfaction or dissatisfaction. (p. 15)

Life Satisfaction Questionnaire. (See Appendix B)

This was modified from Kornhauser's (1965) interviews of automobile assembly-line workers. London, Crandall, and Seals (1977) capsulized Kornhauser's exhaustive interview procedure into three general questions; these were used in the present study. The three components of satisfaction included: general life satisfaction, satisfaction with family, and satisfaction with non-work activities. The aforementioned components were chosen due to their prevalence in the literature, as well as their high

correlations to life satisfaction (London et al., 1977; Vredinburgh & Sheridan, 1979). In addition to the initial general life satisfaction question, subjects were asked to specify those components that went into their assignment of general life satisfaction scores. The combination of intuitively derived components is a common operational definition of life satisfaction.

Comparison of satisfaction scores presumes that all individuals have some zero point or baseline (Payton-Miyazaka & Brayfield, 1976). There seems to be some agreement, however, that this is not the case. Rather, experienced satisfaction is a function of the discrepancy between aspirations and achievement. Payton-Miyazaka and Brayfield (1976) concluded that felt satisfaction is a necessary but not sufficient index of life quality. They mentioned the Self-Anchoring Scale (Cantril, 1965) as a possible solution, in that it provides a check against drawing misleading inferences from reported satisfaction.

Personal Data

Demographic Information. (See Appendix D) The data sheet requested information that has been found to relate, in some instances, to a woman's pursuing a career. This information included age and educational experiences of the respondent and her husband, information on offspring, occupational information (type of job, hours, tenure), and

a synopsis of previous work experience.

Legitimacy Interview. (See Appendix E) This consisted of questions concerning socialization experiences, as well as perceptions of normative expectations, role behavior, and occupational meaning. Questions required either single-word responses or were open-ended, allowing for verbalization of feelings, perceptions and values.

Procedure

A brief introduction outlining characteristics of the study, as well as encouraging frank discussion of controversial issues, led into discussion of the tasks to be completed (see Appendix F). Confidentiality of personal (as well as the couple's) responses was reinforced. The wives were interviewed by the author (female). Concurrently (for 16 of the 20 couples), husbands were interviewed by a male assistant. Four male assistants participated during this phase of the study. The same-sex pairings for interviewing was adopted for two reasons. First, it was hoped that this procedure would facilitate freer expression of viewpoints that might be perceived as diverging from that of a female graduate student (ie. negative opinions concerning maternal employment). A second and related reason was the expectation that rapport could more quickly be developed between interviewers and respondents of the

same sex.

Initially, women were asked to provide the aforementioned demographic information. Subjects (both male and female) were then administered the Life Satisfaction Questionnaire, General Job Satisfaction Question, Job Descriptive Index, and the Self-Anchoring Scale. So as to limit experimenter bias, the first three measures mentioned were given to subjects to fill out privately. That is, subjects read the questions themselves and responded in writing. Due to the general nature of the Self-Anchoring Scale, it was verbally administered. Similarly, the Legitimacy Interview was conducted orally.

It may be noted that first a general, non-directive measure of the two types of satisfaction was obtained. The second measure entailed discussion of more specific components leading to satisfaction (or its absence). This order was intended to limit the extent to which subjects felt compelled to search for a "right" answer that assured feelings of response consistency.

Participants were then guided through the Legitimacy Interview. These questions concerned personal and social norms, socialization experiences, and assumed roles. Factual questions required simple responses; opinion questions were open-ended, so as to avoid the impression of "correct" answers. Verbal responses to questions were

tape-recorded with the respondent's permission, in order to ensure greater accuracy upon subsequent coding.

One of four male assistants interviewed the spouses of the working mothers. Job and life satisfaction was assessed first, followed by a discussion of personal socialization experiences. The husbands were then asked to describe perceived norms regarding the appropriateness/acceptability of mothers employed outside of the home. Finally, those roles that were currently maintained by their wives were described by the husbands. The couple was thanked for their participation in the study (Appendix G). Any questions and/or concerns were discussed at this time.

Qualitative Data Analysis

The following open-ended questions required qualitative rather than quantitative analysis: components of general life satisfaction, conceptions of one's best and worst possible lives, descriptions of normative expectations (nine items), and definitions of the term(s) career and/or job.

Components and conceptions of life satisfaction/dissatisfaction, normative beliefs, and career-job distinctions were examined through thematic content analysis. This procedure assumes that statements or assertions made by separate individuals may be categorized

into common themes. Thus, after compiling all statements relevant to a question, common dimensions underlying separate responses are identified. After extensive category delineation (definition, addition, deletion), a list of category definitions and individual respondents' statements broken down into unique assertions were given to groups of naive subjects (see Footnote 1).

Participants were asked to assign each statement to the most appropriate category. The modal category response identified that assertion's category assignment for future analyses. Specifically, if at least 75% of the subjects selected the same category for an item, the statement was assigned to that category. If, in addition, the remaining 25% of the respondents chose the same different category, the statement was defined as a combination of the first and second most frequently mentioned categories. A statement was also defined as a combination of two categories when the sum of the response percentages of the two categories equalled or exceeded 75%. In general, if three or more categories were required to reach the criterion of 75% of the responses, the statement was declared uncodable and was not used. There was one exception: The category themes for the life satisfaction questions were developed so that subjects were instructed to identify two categories (rather than just one) if the statement referred to one's family in

general (family= relationship with children + marital relationship). During coding of these responses, an additional category theme was included as long as it was clear that most subjects were identifying the statement as pertinent to the 'family' categories.

Subjects also placed assertions concerning career and job meanings into defined categories. So as to more clearly assess the meaning of the wife's occupation to her and to her husband, only those statements describing her perceived occupational role were coded. Thus, for a woman describing her occupation as a career, only career-relevant assertions were coded.

Within the normative expectations section, additional themes were identified which required no subjective classification analysis. Examples include proportion of co-workers/friends presently experiencing the dual-occupation lifestyles, the gender of the respondent's supervisor, the inapplicability of any requested reference person, etc. The researcher coded assertions into these categories when relevant.

Additional Data Reclassification

Demographic Variables

Respondents provided demographic information through open-ended questionning. So as to facilitate description of the sample, this information was restructured in a

manner consistent with the research questions asked. Thus, 'essay' responses were transformed into 'multiple-choice' data. For example, respondent occupations are divided into six categories: professional with an advanced degree (eg. university faculty, architect), administrator (eg. manager, office manager, firm vice president), service personnel (eg. librarian, policeman, counselor), technical worker (eg. data control, research assistant, production planner), semi- or unskilled worker (eg. animal caretaker). Also transformed were educational background, hours worked per week, and length of time on the job. Maternal job history is defined as the number of years the woman reported being employed, including the tenure of her present position. Note that the variable is influenced both by the respondent's age, as well as the starting point of her resume. Though women were asked to start with what they considered their first "real" job, these ranged from summer jobs to professional positions. Also, no distinctions were made between full-time and part-time employment. Last, the number of occupational interruptions were noted. Notice that zero interruptions may mean that the woman has always worked, or that she never worked before her present job. Again, part-time/full-time variations did not warrant inclusion as interruptions.

Role Inclusion Section

Data gathered from the interviews required the following restructuring in order to make them useful for group analysis. Types of roles identified by subjects were classified similarly to the aforementioned thematic content analysis procedure. The researcher classified the role types, since a relatively extensive familiarity with the respondent was frequently necessary to achieve moderately accurate categorical assignment. For example, only a person familiar with the respondent could determine whether the role "nurse" was the woman's career, or if it was one of her family-caretaking roles. For the same reason, the researcher was deemed the one most appropriate to classify each role as job- or non-job relevant.

During the interview, respondents rank-ordered the roles according to: (1) how demanding they were; and, (2) how important they were. As total number of roles mentioned was confounded with assigned rank, the rank-orders were dichotomized. The higher ranked half of the roles were labeled demanding/important; the remainder were coded non-demanding/unimportant. Based upon the above distinctions, the following information was extracted: (1) percentage of roles labeled job-related; (2) percentage of roles deemed demanding which are job-related; (3) percentage of roles identified as important which are job-related.

RESULTS

Characteristics of the Sample

As previously mentioned, all research participants were married and living with their spouse at the time of the interview. In addition, each of the twenty couples had at least one child living at home. In fact, couples had between one and six offspring, ranging in age from infancy to adulthood. Approximately 54% of the offspring were female; 46% were male.

The average respondent's age was 37 years; ages ranged between 27 years and 53 years. Seventy-eight percent of the men had at least a Bachelor's degree; 28% possessed a PhD (see Table 1). Of the women, 60% had earned at least a Bachelor's degree; 20% had PhD's. Considerably more of the remaining women than the remaining men had ended their education after high school.

The majority of women interviewed were in occupations classified as professional with an advanced degree (typically, university faculty), or skilled, technical positions (see Table 1). Several were in clerical posts and service occupations. Similarly, almost one-third of the men were classified as professional with an advanced degree. Unlike the women, another 37% of the men were administrators. Workers in semi- and unskilled occupations

were severely underrepresented; other occupational groups were adequately represented.

While one-fourth of the women reported working more than 40 hours per week, 42% of the men exceeded 40 hours of work per week. In many cases, it was difficult for respondents to estimate the average number of hours worked per week due to the extensive independence of some occupations (eg. university faculty). Time clocks are not punched and work-related tasks like reading and writing need not be done on the job.

Eighty-four percent of the men (as well as almost one-half of the women) had been employed in their present positions more than 5 years. Of the remaining women, the majority had been in their present positions less than one year (see Table 1). Most of the women had been active in the labor force for many years. Work histories ranged in duration from five years to 22 years. The mean length of time employed was 13.65 years. Thirty percent of the women indicated one employment interruption; twenty percent reported two interruptions. Fifty percent of the women indicated no work history interruptions. Again, this includes both women who have worked continuously over a number of years and those who had never worked prior to their present position. Only 10% of the women reported their present job as their first, however. Almost 50%

reported being employed at 3 jobs or less. Twenty-five percent indicated an employment history of six or seven previous jobs, the maximum number of jobs mentioned (see Table 1).

As can be observed, many of the women did not ostensibly halt employment during pregnancy. Many took advantage of maternity leaves, returning to work one week to three months after the child's birth. Others, by virtue of the unique benefit afforded educators, planned child-birth for late spring, allowing the mother the entire summer off the job.

General Overview

The present investigation elicited quantitative data requiring examination at two analytic levels. First, each index of satisfaction and perceived occupational legitimacy is comprised of several questions/measures. Determining the inter-relationships among these index components represented the first level of analysis. Second, indices of work and life satisfaction are expected to relate to measures of occupational legitimacy. Description of these expectations is contained within the hypothesis section of the Introduction. Investigation of these relationships represented the second level of analysis. Interview discussions yielding qualitative data are a second type of information elicited by the present study. The structure

of the Results section follows the aforementioned pattern. "Qualitative" findings are interspersed within the presentations of related "quantitative" results.

Satisfaction/Legitimacy: Intra-Index Relationships

Satisfaction Index: Work

Work satisfaction was measured with: (1) a general question concerning job satisfaction; (2) the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), consisting of subscales examining reported satisfaction with occupational tasks, promotion opportunities, coworkers, supervision, and pay. Generally, respondents indicated satisfaction with their occupations. The modal response on the five-point general job satisfaction scale (1=very dissatisfied, 5=very satisfied) was 4, however responses ranged across the entire scale.

Table 2 illustrates the different relationships among work satisfaction components for men and women. In men, General Job satisfaction was related to JDI subscales pay, promotion, and supervision, while in women it was related only to coworker satisfaction. Female satisfaction with coworkers also related to JDI task and pay satisfaction. In men, coworker satisfaction correlated with task and supervision satisfaction. With women, pay satisfaction related to satisfaction with supervision, while with men it related to satisfaction with promotion. All the significant correlations were in the positive direction.

Principal component analysis of the sample's work and life satisfaction responses suggested two work satisfaction dimensions (see Table 3). These two dimensions accounted for 62% of the total variance. They included: (1) JDI subscales task and coworker were combined (through summation of the two subscale scores) to create the variable JDI-PERSONAL. These subscales represent the integration of occupational factors which can be evaluated (to some degree) apart from the parameters of the organization; (2) JDI pay, JDI promotion, JDI supervision, and General Job loaded heavily on the first dimension extracted. The three JDI measures were combined (through summation of the three subscale scores) to create JDI-SITUATION. This variable can be perceived as an evaluative composite of situational constraints inherent within the job, thus under diminished personal control. It was decided to look at General Job as a third index of work satisfaction, rather than combining it within JDI-SITUATION. The five JDI measures may be conceptualized as tapping specific dimensions of work satisfaction. General Job, however represents a global index of work satisfaction. Of interest in the present study is whether a global measure of work satisfaction behaves differently than more specific indices. Further analyses were based upon the following work satisfaction measures/composites:

JDI-PERSONAL, JDI-SITUATION, and General Job.

Satisfaction Index: Life

Life satisfaction was assessed through use of five questions, representing two general indices. The Cantril Self-Anchoring Scale (to be referred to as Cantril throughout the remainder of the paper) requested respondents to indicate present and anticipated future satisfaction. The second general index required respondents to describe general life satisfaction, as well as non-work and family satisfaction.

Across gender, the three indices of general satisfaction with life (general life satisfaction, non-work satisfaction, family satisfaction) were positively correlated with one another, although the relationships were stronger among males (see Table 4). The Cantril-present and Cantril-future measures positively correlated with one another within both genders, albeit much stronger for women. In both men and women, Cantril-present satisfaction related to general life satisfaction; male responses also indicated a relationship between Cantril-present and non-work satisfaction.

Principal component analysis of life satisfaction measures indicated two dimensions (see Table 5). These two dimensions accounted for 77% of the total variance. They included: (1) Cantril-present and Cantril-future satisfac-

tion were combined (through summation of scale responses) to create CANTRIL; (2) general life satisfaction, non-work satisfaction, and family satisfaction combined in the variable LIFE satisfaction.

Generally, the sample indicated over-all satisfaction with life. Modal responses on the three components of LIFE satisfaction (five-point rating scales: 1=dissatisfaction, 5=satisfaction) were 4, with mean satisfaction ratings ranging from 3.30 (non-work) to 3.70 (general life). The average level of Cantril-present satisfaction was 6.82; it rose to 8.05 in the projection of future satisfaction (Cantril-future). Cantril-present responses ranged from 1 to 9 on the 11-point scale; Cantril-future responses ranged from 3 to 10. There were no statistically significant gender differences.

Qualitative Analyses. Respondents verbally elaborated upon the life satisfaction rating scales. Females tended to specify more components of life satisfaction than males (see Table 6). The following are observations based upon analysis of these discussions: (1) most males and females mentioned 'occupation'; (2) at least half of the females commented upon the 'marital relationship' and 'relationship with children,' while very few males mentioned these components; (3) comparable numbers of males and females mentioned 'economic status' and the 'family' (in general);

(4) few males commented upon 'lifestyle.'

Cantril's life satisfaction index required respondents to describe their best and worst possible lives. Findings of the best possible lives included: (1) males most frequently mentioned 'economic status' and/or 'occupation'; (2) 30% of the males also mentioned 'family'; (3) the majority of females mentioned 'relationship with children'; (4) many females also mentioned 'economic status,' 'marital relationship,' 'lifestyle,' and 'occupation.' Generally, worst possible life descriptions were less agreed upon by the sample. Worst possible life results included: (1) males most often mentioned 'economic status,' 'occupation,' and personal or familial 'health'; (2) females mentioned 'relationship with children' more frequently than any other category; (3) several females commented upon 'health,' 'economic status,' 'occupation,' and a 'marital relationship'-'health' combination (see Table 6).

Satisfaction Index: Work-Life Relationship

Components of work satisfaction had a more marked relationship with the life satisfaction of women than that of men (see Tables 7 and 8). Although pay satisfaction did not relate to the various measures of life satisfaction in males, it significantly correlated with general life satisfaction, Cantril-present, and Cantril-future measures in females. General Job satisfaction related to the two

Cantril measures for both genders; it also correlated with family satisfaction for the males. All significant work-life correlations were positive, supporting a complementary rather than compensatory relationship between work and life satisfaction.

Legitimacy Index: Socialization

Within the present study, early experiences with maternal employment are indicated by whether or not the respondent's mother was employed during the respondent's youth, and the evaluative perceptions of that occupational involvement/non-involvement by the respondent's mother, father, and him- or herself at that time. Further information provided elaboration upon the type and extent of the respondent's mother's workforce participation.

Maternal occupational involvement, and the perceived evaluation of that involvement by the respondent and her/his parents, were the focus of investigation here. Approximately 60% of the respondents reported employed mothers. The majority of those employed either: (1) worked full-time throughout the respondent's youth (32%); (2) worked full-time only after the children were in school (27%); or (3) had an employment history not amenable to classification (23%) (see Table 9). Many of those who reported non-employed mothers mentioned maternal involvement in unpaid employment positions either as a community

volunteer or as a partner in a family-owned business (eg. farm, store). Approximately one-half of the employed mothers worked in clerical/sales positions, almost one-fifth were managers, and, unlike the respondent sample, 14% were in semi- and unskilled positions. None were 'professionals with advanced degrees.'

In general, the respondents reported personal and parental satisfaction with the mother's work status (whether or not she was employed), however responses ranged across the entire scale (\bar{x} mother= 4.32; \bar{x} father=3.95; \bar{x} self=3.70). The modal response of perceived mother and father satisfaction was 5 (complete satisfaction); the respondent (self) modal response was 3 (neutrality).

Male respondents tended to report greater father satisfaction when the mother did not work than when she did (see Table 10). Similarly, male respondents themselves indicated greater satisfaction when their mother did not work outside of the home. Last, male respondents' viewpoints related to their perceived viewpoint of their father. Perceived satisfaction of the mother was not related to her work status or the reported viewpoints of her husband or son (see Table 10). Female respondents also indicated a relationship between perceived father support and maternal employment status; fathers were more often satisfied when the mother was not employed outside of the

home. Additionally, the female respondents' self evaluations related to those of their mother and their father (see Table 10).

Legitimacy Index: Norms

Respondents were asked to describe normative prescriptions transmitted to them through "significant others." These "significants" were defined by researcher and respondent. The researcher provided the respondent with the following list of people/groups to discuss: his or her spouse, friends, mother, father, supervisor, coworkers, society in general, and him or herself. Additionally, each respondent was encouraged to mention individuals not specifically identified by the researcher who are important to him/her or to the family.

In general, prescriptions perceived by respondents were supportive of mothers working full-time if that was the mother's choice. Mean scale responses on the five-point scale (1= it is never okay, 5=it is always okay) ranged from 3.054 (norm-father of respondent) to 4.225 (norm-respondent him/her self). Respondents were asked to specify additional significant others not provided by the researcher. Of those mentioning others, 24% specified their children, 18% identified in-laws, 31% mentioned relatives in general, and 27% specified others in general. Since these significant others are not consistent across

subjects, these responses were not utilized in further analyses.

According to Table 11, perceived norms of the female respondent's husband positively related to those of her friends, mother, and her personal viewpoint. Norms of her father negatively correlated with the norms of her coworkers, implying that women reporting a non-supportive father perceived support among their coworkers and/or vice versa. Perceived norms of society were not significantly related to those of any significant others.

Male respondents tended to report a relationship between perceived norms of their spouses and those of their friends. In addition, perceived norms of mother and father were positively correlated, as were perceived norms of supervisor and coworker. The male respondent's personal viewpoint related to no others (see Table 11).

Female respondents tended to report spouse perceptions highly congruent with their own. This pattern was not observed with male respondents. Further analysis revealed no relationships between: (1) male norms as expressed by the male respondent and his wife, $r(18) = 0.034$, $p > .05$; or (2) female norms as expressed by the female respondent and her husband, $r(18) = 0.218$, $p > .05$. In other words, there was no relationship between how males said they felt about maternal employment and how their wives said their husbands

felt; the same finding emerged concerning the views of female respondents.

Principal component analysis was performed on the normative perception responses of the entire sample (see Table 12). Two dimensions emerged (Varimax procedure) which accounted for 52% of the total variance: (1) norm-US consists of the sum of responses to norm-spouse, norm-mother, norm-father, norm-self; (2) norm-JOB consists of the sum of responses to norm-supervisor and norm-coworkers. In addition, since norms of friends did not exhibit simple structure, it and the norms of society were treated independently.

Qualitative analyses. Respondents were asked to elaborate upon prescriptions or evaluations each "significant other" seemed to reflect concerning maternal presence in the workplace (see Table 13). Only comments that were deemed codable (as previously explained in the method section) were further examined. Also, although a respondent may have verbally dwelt upon a certain response category, he/she was credited with making only a single comment within the particular category. Respondents frequently mentioned viewpoints scattered throughout several categories; the individual was then credited with a comment within each category mentioned.

General response trends indicated intense conflict between positive and negative aspects of maternal employment. The potential positive attitudes reflected through perceived importance and/or necessity of the additional income were tempered by some form of traditional value statements (these ranged from the concept that, by virtue of her sex, a woman belongs in the home, to the nagging concern of potential harm to family members resulting from maternal employment). The finding that both coexist (frequently within the same respondent as perceived viewpoints of others and/or him- or herself, as well as across respondents) suggests the lack of clear normative prescriptions. Another frequently selected category conveyed the idea that maternal employment was not an issue, that it was in fact the norm. This may indicate resignation on the part of the perceived (significant others) and/or perceiver (respondent) to this inherent conflict.

Female respondents more frequently mentioned that maternal employment permits a woman to utilize training and/or facilitates self-growth than male respondents when discussing the views of spouse, friends, mother, and father, suggesting the topic may be generally more salient for women than for men (ie. men may agree with the statement when explicitly questioned, but fail to initiate the topic). Neither gender tended to mention either the idea

that maternal employment could aid family relationships or that being a working mother was irrelevant unless parental/marital status affected job performance (see Table 13).

Societal norm perceptions of female respondents were more consistent than those of male respondents or those made concerning remaining significant others. Sixty-five percent of the female respondents indicated that society (to some extent) still embraced the concept that a woman's central responsibility was to the home; only 15% of the males responded similarly. Several respondents, male and female, specified the central responsibility of the home, indicating, however, that it was the couple's responsibility rather than the woman's alone. Forty-five percent of the female respondents (as opposed to 20% of the male respondents) indicated that maternal employment was not a societal issue. Finally, 35% of the female respondent (20% of the males) reported the importance of a second income to family economics according to society in general.

The majority of those mentioning the gender of their supervisors had male superiors; more women than men reported female supervisors. Many mentioned that societal prescriptions concerning maternal employment have changed over the years. Several respondents spoke of similar attitudinal changes within their parents (see Table 13).

Legitimacy Index: Female Role Involvement

A variety of information was obtained during this phase of the interview. Respondents described roles within which the female was involved. (Either the female respondent described her own roles or the male respondent discussed the roles of his wife.) Respondents were also asked to indicate how demanding and important each role was believed to be. Finally, each spouse was asked to compare the husband's occupation to that of the wife on the dimensions of economic importance to the family (referred to within the tables as Importance-Pay) and personal psychological importance (referred to within the tables as Importance-Psychological).

Respondents mentioned between three and 15 roles currently maintained by the mother within each family. Table 14 illustrates the types of roles mentioned and the percentage of males and females describing roles of each category/type. The home maintenance role was mentioned by almost all respondents. More males than females mentioned the worker role, yet it was salient to both genders. Females more frequently than males mentioned extended family and non-family personal relationships.

As previously described, the three variables constructed for role analysis were: (1) percent of roles mentioned by the respondent which could be termed job-related (henceforth referred to as PCT-JOB); (2)

percent of roles labeled demanding by respondents which were job-relevant (PCT-DEM); (3) percent of roles labeled important by respondents which were job-related (PCT-IMP).

Since both male and female respondents were reporting perceived role behavior of the female, the relationships between respondent role descriptions were investigated. According to the data reported in Table 15, couples' role descriptions in terms of the aforementioned variables were statistically unrelated. When examining the relationships between the five role variables in female respondents, relatively strong relationships emerged between PCT-JOB and PCT-DEM, PCT-JOB and PCT-IMP, and PCT-DEM and PCT-IMP (see Table 16). Male respondents also exhibited correlations between PCT-JOB and PCT-DEM, PCT-JOB and PCT-IMP, and PCT-DEM and PCT-IMP. Also, male respondents who reported wives with proportionally more job-related important roles described the greater economic importance of their own occupations as compared to that of their wives (Imp-Pay).

Satisfaction and Legitimacy: Inter-relationships

As previously described, this level of analysis builds upon the foundation provided in the last section. The present investigation hypothesized a number of relationships between measures of occupational legitimacy and satisfaction indices. To provide a cohesive, yet comprehensive review of the findings, this section structurally

mirrors the hypothesis section (see Introduction).

Specific hypotheses are addressed through use of the satisfaction and legitimacy variables as defined in the previous section of the Results. The reader may wish to periodically review these sections.

Satisfaction Index: Work

Hypothesis (1a): Norm perceptions. In general, norms of significant others as perceived by female respondents did not relate to work satisfaction (see Table 17). One exception emerged: (1) perceived norms of society positively correlated with JDI-SITUATION (the summed scores of JDI subscales pay, promotion, and supervision). Further examination revealed that this was due to a norm-society--JDI-supervisor correlation. Table 18 consists of all the significant correlations between individual (rather than composite) measures.

Though not hypothesized, it was found that, in a few isolated instances, male respondents' normative perceptions related to their own work satisfaction (see Table 17). Norm-US (the summed responses of norm-spouse, norm-mother, norm-father, and norm-self) correlated positively with JDI-PERSONAL. This appears to be due to the positive correlation between norm-father and JDI-coworkers. Norm-JOB (the summed responses of norm-supervisor and norm-coworkers) was positively related to General Job

satisfaction (the single item satisfaction index). Further analysis revealed norm-coworkers and General Job satisfaction correlated. Finally, norm-society was positively related to JDI-PERSONAL (or more specifically, JDI-task).

Table 19 contains correlations between male respondents' normative perceptions and their wives' reported work satisfaction. The perception of society's norms by male respondents related to the work satisfaction of their wives. Thus, a husband perceiving supportive societal norms tended to have a wife with higher work satisfaction.

Hypothesis (1b): Role involvement. Multiple regression equations, utilizing the predictors PCT-JOB, PCT-DEM, PCT-IMP (as defined by both male and female respondents) were generated to test this hypothesis; all were non-significant (see Appendix H). As previously mentioned, these predictor variables were highly correlated, thereby posing the multicollinearity problem. Although statistically non-significant as a function of the one-tail significance test, the large negative correlation suggested that lower work satisfaction may have been associated with those female respondents who labeled a higher proportion of work-related roles personally important (see Table 20).

Hypothesis (1c): Underemployment. Underemployment was conceptualized in two ways in the present investigation: (1) the extent to which the job failed to satisfy those needs which initiated the female's entrance into the work force; and (2) the degree to which the female's present position is inappropriate, given her previous work experiences. Those perceiving need satisfaction (associated with conceptualization (1) above) reported greater job satisfaction than those indicating less congruence between anticipated and present need fulfillment (JDI-PERSONAL, $r(18) = 0.627$, $p < .005$; General Job satisfaction, $r(18) = 0.398$, $p < .05$). In addition, as expected, those who perceived themselves as under-employed tended to report lower work satisfaction (JDI-PERSONAL, $r(18) = 0.460$, $p < .05$).

Satisfaction Index: Life

Hypothesis (2a): Socialization. Indices of female respondents' socialization experiences combined to account for 55% of the variance of LIFE satisfaction, $F(1,15) = 4.505$, $p < .06$ (see Table 21). There was also a significant positive correlation between the female's self evaluation of her mother's work status and her life satisfaction (see Table 22). According to Table 22, there are no relationships between male respondents' socialization experiences and their wives' life satisfaction.

Hypothesis (2b): Norm perceptions. In general, norm perceptions of female and male respondents neither singly, nor in combination, related to females' reported life satisfaction (see Table 22 for zero-order correlations; see Appendix I for multiple regression equations). More specifically, one bivariate correlation emerged statistically significant; norm-society as perceived by male respondents positively correlated with female life satisfaction (see Table 22).

Hypothesis (2c): Role involvement. In general, indices of role involvement as perceived by female and male respondents failed to singly, or in combination, describe the life satisfaction of females (see Table 22 for zero-order correlations; see Appendix I for multivariate analyses). There was one exception to the above statement; PCT-IMP (percent of important roles deemed job-related) as described by male respondents was positively related to female life satisfaction.

Hypothesis (2d): Interactions--responses of males and females. Though anticipated to be important, the interaction between male and female respondents' norm perceptions accounted for only small, non-significant portions of the variance in female life satisfaction indices. Interactions between spouse responses to the indices of role involvement failed to account for any

unique variance in measures of female life satisfaction (see Appendix I).

Work-Life Satisfaction Relationship

The following data manipulations were necessary in order to investigate the relationship between work and life satisfaction as a criterion to be predicted by the legitimacy variables. First, the indices of work and life satisfaction of female respondents were standardized. Second, each standardized measure of life satisfaction was subtracted from each standardized work satisfaction index. Third, these difference scores were squared (D^2) to eliminate the positive/negative value distinction. Last, the D^2 work-life indices were subjected to principal component analysis (Varimax rotation procedure) (see Table 23). The combination of statistical analysis and researcher intuition/interests led to the creation of the following measures: (1) a composite (JOB--CANTRIL) of JDI-PERSONAL--CANTRIL and JDI-SITUATION--CANTRIL; (2) a composite (JOB--LIFE) of JDI-PERSONAL--LIFE satisfaction, JDI-SITUATION--LIFE satisfaction, and General Job--LIFE satisfaction; (3) General Job--CANTRIL. Sixty percent of the total variance was explained by the first two dimensions. The variables were created so that the larger

the value, the greater the discrepancy between work and life satisfaction. The smaller the value, the greater the congruence (the less the discrepancy) between the female respondent's reported work and life satisfaction.

Hypothesis (3a): Socialization. Both the father's perceived evaluation of the mother's work status and the respondent's own evaluation of her mother's work status negatively correlated with female work-life satisfaction discrepancies (see Table 25). Thus, a woman who supported her mother's work status (and/or whose father supported her mother's status) reported less discrepancy between work and life satisfaction.

Generally, male respondents' socialization experiences failed to describe the work-life satisfaction of their wives (see Table 25 for zero-order correlation of individual variables; see Appendix J for multivariate analyses of the combined socialization variables). Within one measure of female work-life satisfaction discrepancy, 47% of the variance was accounted for by male socialization experiences, though once again it was statistically non-significant, $F(1,14) = 2.843$, $p > .05$ (see Table 24). It was found that male respondents whose mothers had worked had wives with less discrepancy between work and life satisfaction.

Hypothesis (3b): Norm perceptions. Considered

together, norm perceptions of female respondents failed to account for a statistically significant portion of the variance of female work-life satisfaction discrepancy. Individually, norm-coworkers was negatively related to the work-life satisfaction discrepancy. Thus, females who described coworkers as supportive to mothers in the work force tended to report less discrepancy between work and life satisfaction. On the other hand, two strong positive correlates to the work-life satisfaction discrepancy included norm-father and norm-coworkers, providing contradictory conclusions.

The normative perceptions of male respondents accounted for up to 59% of the variance in the work-life satisfaction discrepancy measures of their wives, though all equations were statistically non-significant (see Table 24). Two bivariate correlations, however, were found to be statistically significant. Norm-father and norm-coworkers negatively correlated with the wife's work-life satisfaction. Once again, a large positive correlation between norm-supervisor and female work-life satisfaction discrepancy suggests caution in interpreting findings (see Table 25).

Hypothesis (3c): Role involvement. Role involvement as described by male and female respondents did little to elaborate upon the female work-life satisfaction

discrepancies (see Table 25 for zero-order correlations between the individual variables and female work-life satisfaction; see Appendix J for multivariate analyses of the combined variables and female work-life satisfaction). Table 26 consists of the significant correlations between role indicants as described by male and female respondents and the individual (rather than composite) indices of the work-life satisfaction discrepancy. PCT-IMP negatively correlated with JDI-PERSONAL--CANTRIL, suggesting that those reporting a higher proportion of job-relevant important roles experienced less discrepancy between work and life satisfaction.

Quadrant analysis of the work-life satisfaction relationship. A critical limitation of the D^2 measure of relationship between work satisfaction and life satisfaction is its inability to discriminate between those reporting both high work satisfaction and high life satisfaction and those reporting both low work satisfaction and low life satisfaction. In both cases, the relationship between work and life satisfaction is high (thus, the D^2 value is low), however the influence of legitimacy may differ within these two subdivisions of the sample. The following analysis was completed to address this problem.

In order to further interpret the D^2 measure of relationship between female work and life satisfaction,

four work satisfaction-life satisfaction quadrant were developed. Specifically, each measure of female work satisfaction was summed to provide an overall index of work satisfaction. Likewise, indices of female life satisfaction were summed to create a global life satisfaction index. Each of these indices were divided at the median, creating high satisfaction and low satisfaction groups. Four quadrants were derived from this procedure: (1) high work satisfaction-high life satisfaction (n=7); (2) high work satisfaction-low life satisfaction (n=2); (3) low work satisfaction-high life satisfaction (n=2); (4) low work satisfaction-low life satisfaction (n=7). The bivariate correlation between overall work satisfaction and overall life satisfaction was statistically significant, $r(16) = 0.55, p < .01$.

Global indices of socialization experiences and norm perceptions of male and female respondents were computed by summing the individual predictors. Quadrant means were calculated for the global indices of socialization experiences (of males and females) and the global indices of norm perceptions (of males and females) (See Table 27). The group means of high work satisfaction-high life satisfaction quadrant were compared statistically to those of the low work satisfaction-low life satisfaction quadrant. It was found that females in the high satisfac-

tion quadrant reported significantly greater support of the mother's work status than did those in the low satisfaction quadrant, $t(12)=2.66$, $p<.05$. All other comparisons were statistically non-significant (socialization (male): $t(12)=1.02$, $p>.05$; norms (female): $t(12)=0.39$, $p>.05$; norms (male): $t(12)=1.23$, $p>.05$). Thus, the perceived norms concerning support of maternal employment did not differ as a function of quadrant membership.

Occupational Designation: Career versus Job

Male and female respondents were asked to classify the wife's occupation as a career or a job, orally elaborating upon the meaning of each and describing ways in which they differ.

Hypothesis (4a): Work (and life) satisfaction.

Though not previously discussed, the relationship between occupational designation and female life satisfaction shall be dealt with concurrently with a review of the findings pertaining to work satisfaction. The career-job designation of female respondents related to measures of reported work and life satisfaction (see Table 28). Women reporting careers tended to also indicate greater general life satisfaction, CANTRIL satisfaction, General Job satisfaction, and JDI-pay satisfaction. Males describing their wives' occupations as careers tended to be associated with females reporting greater job (JDI-task) satisfac-

tion. In addition, there was a large but statistically non-significant (due to the one-tail significance test) correlation between JDI-promotion and the career-job distinction. Males describing their wives' occupations as careers may also have been associated with females reporting less satisfaction with promotional opportunities.

Of the female respondents describing their occupations as careers, JDI-task and JDI-coworkers (the components of JDI-PERSONAL) positively related to LIFE satisfaction (see Table 29). Unfortunately, the inadequate sample size of female respondents describing their occupations as jobs prevented a comparative analysis. Similarly, male respondents designating their wives' occupations as careers were associated with women portraying relationships between JDI-task, JDI-coworkers, JDI-SITUATION, and LIFE satisfaction. Again, the sample size specifying 'job' was inadequate to provide a meaningful comparison.

Hypothesis (4b): Socialization. In general, the career-job designation of female respondents related to neither the socialization experiences of male nor female respondents (see Table 30). Male respondents' career-job designation related to the male's and female's father's perceived attitude toward his wife's work status. Those describing supportive fathers tended to have spouses who described their wives' occupations as careers.

Hypothesis (4c): Norm perceptions. In general, the career-job designation of female respondents related to neither male nor female respondents' perceived normative prescriptions (see Table 30). An exception, norm-US (the summed responses to norm-spouse, norm-mother, norm-father, and norm-self) as described by male respondents related to their career-job designations (those perceiving supportive norms tended to designate their wives' occupations as careers).

Hypothesis (4d): Role involvement. Role involvement as described by male and female respondents did not, in general, relate to the career-job designation of female respondent (see Table 30). However, the designation made by male respondents related to all role involvement dimensions as described by female respondents. Those whose husbands mentioned careers tended to reveal a higher proportion of: (1) job-relevant roles; (2) job-relevant roles labeled demanding; (3) job-relevant roles labeled important.

Qualitative Analyses. Career definition most frequently included the concept of self-involvement, either solely or in combination with the potential for challenge and/or enjoyment (see Table 31). Self-involvement refers to one's long-term relationship to his/her occupation, commitment, and/or the potential for growth and self-

exploration. Many respondents also focused on 'professionalism,' ie. occupations which require training and/or allow personal latitude in occupational activities.

One half of the women identifying their occupations as jobs described them in terms of their required financial aspect rather than any enjoyable component. Male respondents also referred to the short-term nature of the involvement and the lack of advancement or change. No overlap emerged between categories which could be termed job descriptors and those classified as career descriptors, implying the relative independence of the two terms to the lay-public.

DISCUSSION

Findings were classified as presented in the hypothesis and results sections: (1) work satisfaction; (2) life satisfaction; (3) the work-life satisfaction relationship; and (4) the career-job distinction. The following are general observations:

Work satisfaction

1. There was some support for the anticipated relationship between the perceived norms of female respondents and their work satisfaction. Perceived norms of the husband tended to relate to his work satisfaction and to that of his wife.
2. The anticipated relationship between females' role involvement (or perceived involvement) and their work satisfaction received little confirmation.
3. Perceived underemployment was related to lower work satisfaction.

Life satisfaction

1. Combined indices of socialization experiences of female respondents related to life satisfaction. Spouse socialization experiences failed to relate to wife's life satisfaction.
2. There was little support for the hypothesized rela-

tionship between perceived norms of husbands or wives and life satisfaction.

3. Female role involvement related to life satisfaction. Those mentioning (and whose husbands described) a higher proportion of job-related roles, identifying more important and demanding roles as job-relevant, described greater life satisfaction.
4. There was little evidence that husbands' and wives' perceived norms or perceived female role involvement interacted so as to influence the life satisfaction of female respondents.

Work-life satisfaction relationship

1. The socialization experiences of female respondents influenced the work-life satisfaction relationship. Those reporting "supportive" experiences (parents and self support the mother's employed status) exhibited a less discrepancy between work and life satisfaction indices. More specifically, those reporting high work and life satisfaction tended to indicate significantly greater familial support for the mother's work status. No such result was found between male respondents' socialization experiences and their wives' work-life satisfaction.
2. Perceived norms of male and female respondents significantly related to work-life satisfaction

discrepancy measures. The direction of these relationships fluctuated between positive and negative, however with no patterns evident.

Neither the perceived norms of the males nor those of the females differed within the quadrants representing possible relationships between female work and life satisfaction.

3. Perceived female role involvement explained little of the variance associated with indices of work-life satisfaction discrepancy.

Career-job distinction

1. Those female respondents who described their involvement in paid employment as careers (and whose husbands mentioned their wife's career) tended to indicate greater work and life satisfaction than those who designated their (wife's) occupation as a job.
2. Socialization experiences of male and female respondents did not relate to occupational designation.
3. Neither norm perceptions nor role involvement of female respondents related to occupational designation.
4. Males perceiving more positive norms and those describing more job-relevant roles that they labeled important tended to describe their wife's

occupation as a career rather than a job.

The present section suggests interpretations of the aforementioned results. Integration of the results with previous studies has been made particularly difficult because of the dearth of relevant research. Thus, interpretations of findings have been presented as hypotheses. Further research is required in order to more systematically examine the validity of these hypotheses.

Relationships Between Measures of Satisfaction

Indices of work satisfaction. Little research has examined the covariation of dimensions of work satisfaction for males or females. Satisfaction with pay and coworkers repeatedly correlated with the other work satisfaction dimensions for females. Consistent with this, previous research has discussed the importance of work-related interpersonal relationships to the work satisfaction of females (Andrisani & Shapiro, 1978). The importance of pay as a correlate of other JDI measures may reflect the one reason traditionally considered legitimate for female work-force participation: the alleviation of family financial pressures. Thus, other JDI dimensions may have been evaluated by female respondents within the context of that "legitimate" concern. The relationship of JDI indices and General Job satisfaction may have tapped those

dimensions perceived salient to one's personal evaluation of work satisfaction. With females, General Job correlated with only JDI-coworkers, supporting the aforementioned importance of interpersonal relationships. With males, General Job correlated with pay, promotion, and supervision, traditional indices of a man's success on the job.

Indices of life satisfaction. Kornhauser (1965) reported relationships between general life satisfaction, non-work satisfaction, and family satisfaction. The present findings supported these results. The two items of Cantril Self-Anchoring Scale (Cantril-present and Cantril-future) were highly correlated. General life satisfaction correlated with only Cantril-present, however. In explanation, perhaps components of one's best and worst possible life (end-anchors of the Cantril measures) were perceived as constant over time. Several of these components may have been future-oriented components. The phrasing of general life satisfaction may have encouraged respondents to consider only here-and-now components. Overlap between the here-and-now components inherent within Cantril-present and general life satisfaction may account for the positive correlation between these measures. The absence of here-and-now components for evaluation in Cantril-future may explain the lack of correlation between

general life satisfaction and Cantril-future.

Reported present and future life satisfaction (according to the Cantril measures) of the present sample were only slightly higher than those reported by Watts (1981), whose representative American sample consisted of 1,596 adults. The mean Cantril-present response of the Watt (1981) study was 6.4; the present investigation revealed a mean response (on the 11-point scale) of 6.82. The mean Cantril-future response within the Watt study was 7.6; within the present study, it was 8.02.

Contradictory conclusions were drawn from investigation of life satisfaction and dissatisfaction components. First, one should note the response diversity associated with each gender; concerns such as financial, familial, and occupational were mentioned by members of both sexes. On the other hand, focus upon only the most predominant responses of each gender revealed traditional gender-relevant concerns. For example, males most frequently mentioned economic and occupational components; females most often mentioned relationships with children. Sex-role socialization may initiate development of primary concerns specifically appropriate to each gender, however its influence may decrease as one attempts to elaborate upon the potpourri of experiences inherent in evaluation of one's life.

Relationships between work satisfaction and life satisfaction. Previous research has revealed relatively small relationships between work and life satisfaction with female samples. The present results failed to support these findings. Female work-life satisfaction correlations ranged from -0.21 to 0.51 when traditional satisfaction indices were used. The Cantril Self-Anchoring Scale, used very infrequently in satisfaction research, was adopted because of its explicit conception of life satisfaction as an individual-based construct. Female work-life satisfaction correlations rose to 0.75 with this scale. Thirty percent of the work-life satisfaction correlations were statistically significant (at the .05 level). Satisfaction with pay and coworkers were the work satisfaction indices that most frequently correlated with life satisfaction. Male work-life satisfaction correlations ranged from -0.19 to 0.41. Thirteen percent of the possible work-life satisfaction relationships were statistically significant.

As previously mentioned, these results are somewhat discrepant with past results (Rice, Near, & Hunt, 1980). Several hypotheses may be generated to address this discrepancy. None of the earlier studies cited utilized multiple measures of each type of satisfaction. Perhaps introduction of a series of measures influenced responses. This could take the form of order biases or bias as a

result of the item redundancies. Generally, the presentation of redundant questions appears senseless. As a result, respondents may have reinterpreted later questions in an effort to differentiate them from earlier ones. Single questions might have been interpreted, thus responded to, differently. Another factor may be the selected population. Most studies examining the role of work in life satisfaction utilized representative American samples of working people or focused upon single occupations. Subject variables such as marital and familial status were rarely examined. The present population consisted solely of married parents employed full-time. Perhaps this sample of American workers defies the general trends. Or, perhaps the non-representative nature of the present sample when compared with the target population of all dual-occupation families explains the discrepancy between previous and present research. The present sample is heavily represented by well-educated, white, Anglo-Saxon, professional adults.

Although the relative importance of work in the lives of males and females may differ from that reported in past research, it is important to note that, once again, all large, potentially significant correlations were positive, supporting the "spillover" hypothesis. Perhaps most interesting, the combination of a very general work

satisfaction question and general life satisfaction questions (associated with the Cantril instrument) resulted in the highest work-life satisfaction correlations. This may more strongly support the "spillover" hypothesis in that responses to specific questions pertaining to components of satisfaction may tap only a relatively small proportion of the variance shared by the global constructs.

Item Intercorrelations of Legitimacy Measures

Legitimacy Index: Socialization. Male respondents' self-evaluation of the work status of their mother related to their father's perceived evaluation and their mother's occupational status. For those male respondents whose mothers were employed, lower satisfaction with her work status was reported for father and son (respondent). In retrospect, the male respondent may have identified his father's viewpoint as most relevant to his own. The self-evaluation of the female respondents, on the other hand, was related to the perceived viewpoints of both their mother and father, but not to their mother's work status. Work status may have been less salient to the young women than others' perceived attitudes and behaviors toward that status. As a result of the increased likelihood of someday being in a similar situation, females may have attended to almost all potentially relevant information concerning maternal employment (non-employment) in an attempt to gauge

benefits and repercussions of the lifestyle.

The father's viewpoint for both male and female respondents correlated with maternal occupational status; fathers were perceived as more satisfied when mothers were not employed outside of the home. On the other hand, perceived mother's viewpoints were not related to their occupational status. This may suggest that, in the past, females were the first to accept the legitimacy of their employment. Although, as research has demonstrated, spouse support is important to a married female's success in the work force, in the past it was obviously absent for many females. Caution must be assumed in the interpretation of the present section; each result was based solely upon the retrospective perceptions of the offspring respondents.

Legitimacy index: Norms. It was interesting to note that, for female respondents, the perceived viewpoint of their husbands related to that of their friends, their mothers, and themselves. At least in the female respondent's perception (if not reality), it appeared that a fairly strong support group had been constructed. The importance of spouse support has been well-documented (Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). The present results provided a unique perspective from which to examine this question, in that it appeared that spouse viewpoint was linked to viewpoints of friends (presumably a social support network)

and viewpoints of the female respondent's mother (the traditional female role model). If a husband was perceived of as supportive, the female respondent linked a social support network to that perception. Conversely, the female respondent perceiving non-supportive norms and whose husband also was perceived of as viewing norms as non-supportive had a delegation of significant others which presumably mirrored this non-support, explaining or justifying her own negative viewpoints (at least from her perspective).

Norm perception of male respondents, to some extent, resembled the perceptions of their wives. Spouse norm perceptions of male respondents correlated with norm perceptions of their friends (which probably were the friends considered by female respondents). Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) noted that dual-occupation couples tended to seek and socialize with other dual-occupation couples. The one critical difference between this finding and that concerning norm perceptions reported by female respondents was the lack of a relationship between the male respondent's norm perceptions and those he reported for his wife. In addition, the norm perceptions that male respondents attributed to their wives were not related to the wives' self-reported norm perceptions. Likewise, the norm perceptions that female respondents attributed to their

husband did not relate to the husbands' self-reported norm perceptions.

This finding may be interpreted in two ways: (1) Respondents lied about their own and/or their spouse's norm perceptions. This explanation seems unlikely, since respondents provided somewhat detailed rationales for their answers; (2) Each person tended to misperceive the beliefs of his or her spouse. Subconscious distortion of reality may have occurred for a variety of reasons. For example, potentially important cues may have been ignored, resulting in inadequate information upon which to base perceptions. One may have focused attention upon solely those cues which supported his or her personal viewpoint. It might be hypothesized that males' misperceptions were due to less concern or ability to ascertain relevant cues to their wives' perceptions, whereas females may have focused upon solely those behaviors of their spouse supporting personal stances.

One underlying concern of the present investigation was to discover whether norms concerning the propriety of the dual-occupation lifestyle exist within current society. According to the responses of the present sample, the answer is an unequivocal "yes." This answer, however, contains a contradiction in objectives. The importance of a second income (to the husband, family, and society in

general) was repeatedly mentioned. At the same time, traditional value statements (a woman belongs in the home) consistently emerged. In short, on one hand both parents should be employed so as to maintain an adequate standard of living; on the other hand, one parent (often, but not always, the mother) should be available at any time she or he is needed by the family. Whether or not most people (particularly men) perceived the inherent contradiction was unclear. Female respondents were more likely to describe instances of the contradiction than were males.

Better Homes and Gardens (Keating, 1982) published the results of a survey of 32,500 people (80% females) concerning the effect of work upon American families. Results of that study complemented the present investigation. For example, when questioned about the attitude of one's employer toward and/or effect upon family life, 75% of the respondents mentioned that the supervisor had either little effect (40%) or that he or she was sensitive and supportive of the employee's family life (35%). The present investigation also revealed perceived employer support of the dual-occupation lifestyle.

Thousands of the survey respondents supplemented their returned questionnaires with letters which elaborated upon general issues or particular questionnaire responses. Letter writers describing areas of conflict or stress

resulting from the two-occupation lifestyle identified primarily home-related (rather than job-related) concerns: family expectations, child care concerns, parental responsibilities, household responsibilities, financial pressures, and too little time to complete required tasks. The traditional female nature of these concerns (child and home care) was tempered by consideration of financial pressures, a finding supported by the present investigation.

Relationships Between Indices of Legitimacy and Satisfaction

Legitimacy and work satisfaction. Past research has found that norm perceptions, particularly those of one's spouse, influence female work satisfaction (Andrisani & Shapiro, 1978). The present investigation indirectly confirmed this finding in three ways: (1) the male respondent's perception of society's viewpoint was positively correlated with his wife's work satisfaction; (2) those males who described their wife's occupation as a career tended to be associated with females reporting greater work satisfaction; and, (3) there was a positive correlation between spouse viewpoints as perceived by the wife and her work satisfaction. At no time did the male respondent's self-evaluation directly relate to his wife's work satisfaction. However, each of these indirect

relationships may be a result of spouse behavior changes (from which the wife perceived support).

The prevalence of negative correlations (which, although large, were statistically non-significant as a result of the one-tail significance test) between the female respondents' norm perceptions and their reported work satisfaction was unanticipated. Perhaps those with supportive social networks were more likely to perceive and resent gender-related occupational inequities. This, of course, rests upon the assumption that such inequity (unfair pay, promotion policies) exists within organizations. For example, female respondents with friends supportive of maternal employment may have been more likely to notice inequity in pay, leading to their expressed dissatisfaction. On the other hand, those with non-supportive friends may have devalued their own worth to the organization, thus perceiving any compensation as appropriate.

Andrisani and Shapiro (1978) found that underemployment of females was related to lower work satisfaction. In the present study, two types of perceived underemployment were investigated: (1) the congruence between perceived skills and experiences and occupational demands (the traditional definition of underemployment); and, (2) the congruence between anticipated and actual

fulfillment of job-related needs. The second type of underemployment was added to address the claim that women don't look for utilization of skills from their jobs. For example, if a woman was working solely for "pin money," the underutilization of her skills would be irrelevant as long as she received the "pin money" she desired. The present investigation found that both skill/experience congruence and need fulfillment related to higher work satisfaction. It should be noted that, for most female respondents, need-related requirements altered from the time they first entered the workforce. Most entered the labor force in order to alleviate financial pressures; over time, they developed additional job-related needs for fulfillment, enjoyment, and challenge.

Legitimacy and life satisfaction. Previous research has concluded that the family backgrounds of successful women (or those with high career aspirations) consisted of a mother either happy in a career or unsatisfied as a traditional homemaker (Altman & Grossman, 1977; Frieze, 1978). Presumably these women perceived career development as an appropriate behavior for females. This belief was generalized in the present study to hypothesize a relationship between socialization experiences and life satisfaction. It was found that those female respondents with "supportive" socialization experiences tended to

report greater life satisfaction. The present definition of "supportiveness" deviated from that suggested by past research. It was decided that acceptance of the mother's work status, whether she was employed or not (pro-choice), would relate to greater life satisfaction. This hypothesis was confirmed. In particular, those female respondents who believed that their mothers had been satisfied with their work status reported greater life satisfaction. It appeared that, rather than maternal work status as an important variable, the mother's acceptance of her life "influenced" the satisfaction of her daughter.

Although a relationship between husband's socialization experiences and female life satisfaction was anticipated, its absence seems reasonable upon further analysis. The leap in logic required by the aforementioned hypothesis was too large. Since it is unlikely that a male respondent would perceive of repercussions resulting from his mother's work status as relevant to his own future experiences, the potential impact of non-supportive (or supportive) socialization experiences upon him in later life (never mind their impact upon his wife) is ambiguous.

The lack of a relationship between the norm perceptions of significant others as described by male and female respondents and female life satisfaction was

surprising; few explanations for this finding have been developed. During the interview, respondents sometimes stated that the opinions of others really did not matter to them. In addition, if dual-occupation couples tended to select friends with similar lifestyles and values, direct support may be unnecessary, since the propriety of the lifestyle has already been confirmed. Active coping strategies are probably adopted to adjust discrepancies between behavior and attitudes (both personal and those attributed to significant others). This process could account for the present findings. (Further discussion of this idea is presented later within this section.)

Legitimacy and the relationship between work and life satisfaction. The anticipated relationship between the socialization experiences of female respondents and their work-life satisfaction discrepancy was supported. Those females who perceived their parents and themselves as satisfied with the mother's work status (probably employed) indicated less discrepancy between work and life satisfaction. In fact, those generally satisfied reported more supportive socialization experiences than those generally dissatisfied. One might hypothesize that, for those females with "supportive" backgrounds, work played a more positive role in life satisfaction (and/or vice-

versa). Presumably, those whose background supported the mother's employment status experienced greater security in accepting the legitimacy of their own worker role. This may increase the likelihood of integration of the worker role into one's life.

The fairly large, positive correlations between work-life satisfaction discrepancies and norm-father (and co-workers) for female respondents suggested important limitations of the hypotheses. The implications of positive correlations, however, were difficult to discern. This finding suggested that female respondents whose fathers (coworkers) were viewed as supportive, experienced greater discrepancy between work and life satisfaction. In essence, those with fathers (coworkers) supportive of maternal employment reported a compensatory relationship between work and life satisfaction; those perceiving non-supportive fathers (coworkers) reported a complementary relationship. Although one could postulate reasons for the direction of this unanticipated result, no rationale has addressed why the positive relationship significantly emerged for only the norm perceptions of female respondents' fathers and coworkers.

Likewise, interpretation of the relationship between male respondents' norm perceptions and their wife's work-life satisfaction discrepancy cannot be offered. Once

again, perceived supportive norms related to a compensatory satisfaction relationship.

Occupational Designation: Career versus Job

Examination of the extent to which designation of the female's occupation moderated the relationship between work and life satisfaction was not possible (too few people described the female's occupation as a job). Designation was found, however, to relate to each type of satisfaction independently. Perceived "career" women reported greater work and life satisfaction. Respondents described a career as an occupation which required self-involvement (commitment, long-term participation), enjoyment and challenge, and, to some, could be characterized as a profession. Male respondents describing their wife's occupation as a career tended to be associated with females who reported greater satisfaction with the content (tasks) of their occupations. One wonders whether male occupational perceptions indirectly caused the wife's reported satisfaction or whether her aforementioned satisfaction resulted in the male's perception of his wife's occupation as a career. Of course, some other variable could account for both.

In general, socialization experiences did not relate to occupational designation. One exception, perceived viewpoint of the male respondent's father and father-in-law

concerning his mother's (mother-in-law's) work status, related to his occupational designation of his wife's occupation. Those fathers who supported their wife's work status were associated with male respondents who described their wife's occupation as a career. The process of parent-child role modeling may be responsible for the consistency with which same-sexed parent-child combinations have been statistically significant. For example, the son (the male respondent) learned from his father and his father-in-law (at least as perceived by his wife) the degree to which support or acceptance of his wife's occupational status was appropriate.

Only the male respondent's norm perceptions related to his occupational designation (of his wife's career). According to NORM-US (the summed responses of norm-spouse, mother, father, and self), those male respondents who reported that the aforementioned significant others were supportive described their wife's occupation as a career. Or, perhaps once the husband believed that his wife possessed a career (suggesting that he accepted the legitimacy of her occupational involvement), others adjusted their own norm perceptions. After all, if a woman's husband could accept his wife's workforce involvement, how could anyone else denigrate workforce participation for women? The non-significance of

relationships between legitimacy variables and the occupational designation of female respondents suggest that perceived legitimacy may be a less salient cue or factor in determining the designation of one's occupation.

Methodological Analysis: The Autopsy Results

The strict empiricist would question the validity of almost all facets of the present investigation. First, subjects were not randomly selected by the researcher. Rather, hundreds of women were contacted by letter or by organizational newsletter. The research was briefly described and they were asked to reply to the researcher's request. Of the many contacted, twenty couples agreed to participate. Such difficulties in obtaining a sample were naively unanticipated. There is no way, after-the-fact, to ascertain in what ways participants differed from non-participants. Hypotheses include: (1) the sample is more biased toward highly educated men and women than the population contacted; (2) the issue was viewed as an important concern to both the husband and the wife participants; (3) most husbands were accepting of their wife's occupational status and the couples gave the impression of having discussed with each other the concerns of dual-occupation families; and, (4) one or both of the participant spouses were interested in psychological research.

Inadequate sample size is probably the most glaring dilemma about which the empiricist would express concern. Many of the statistical analyses were of questionable value as a result of the small sample size. Ideally, data from many more couples would have been appropriate. Practically, it was not possible.

Third, all procedures involved self-report. It was decided that the most logical mode of investigating people's lives, experiences, viewpoints, and ambitions was to ask them. Psychologists have long expounded upon the dilemmas of self-report: social desirability, deceit, experimenter bias, etc. In defense of the procedure, intensive questioning frequently seemed to limit mindless statements of socially desirable answers, as well as experimenter distortion of what was being communicated. Respondents were asked to do more than simply select a number on a rating scale in this study; they were also asked to describe the rationale behind their answers. Many people expressed ideas different from what would probably be considered socially desirable, suggesting again that this was not a grave difficulty. To argue against any influence of social desirability, however, would be foolish.

Blatant dishonesty was probably less likely to occur in this study than in most others. Couples agreed to

participate with no more inducement than the ego-enhancement that comes from having one's perspective solicited. Also, there was the chance that his/her spouse, simultaneously sharing details of the couple's life, could contradict a blatant lie. Some couples described their experiences as unique, while others saw themselves as typical; all entered the situation willing to share their lives to an extraordinary degree. Rapport was established between interviewer and respondent.

Last, role involvement was not well defined. Quantification distorted the original meaning of this concept which was probably the reason for its consistent non-significance. Similarly, many of the demographic variables were constructed in such a way as to make further use impossible (they were nominal data and could not be meaningfully assigned ordinal values).

The results are extremely difficult to interpret as a result of the use of multiple measures of satisfactions. This was originally done to aid in relating present results to past research. In the past, researchers have promoted the use of multiple measures as a means by which to gain further understanding of the constructs under investigation.

According to the principal component analyses performed, neither the indices of work nor life

satisfaction tapped uni-dimensional constructs. For example, although the subscales of the JDI all purported to measure job satisfaction, they were subsumed under different factor analytic dimensions. The potential for deepening our understanding of the influence of other variables upon the multiple facets of these constructs is magnified. The increased complexity introduced with multiple measures, however, blurs to some extent the realization of this potential.

Reflecting upon Social Science Research

Many of the difficulties evident within the present investigation mirror dilemmas of all researchers of human behavior. Several points are worthy of consideration:

(1) All questions that warrant investigation by the social science community are not necessarily quantifiable. For example, much of the data in the present study did not lend itself to interpretation along even an ordinal scale. This severely limited the types of questions that could be answered statistically; in certain cases (eg. the concept of role involvement), the creation of inappropriate variables which could not quite capture the essence of the desired approach was required.

(2) According to Salancik (1979), researchers utilizing questioning procedures (rating scales,

questionnaires, structured interviews) are lured into an autoerotic trap:

Because we, as investigators, only ask questions, and the respondents do the answering, we assume there must be some substance beyond that which we put there. But we can deceive ourselves in two ways. First, and less serious, we sometimes forget that the responses we obtain may be created not only by the structures and processes of the respondent but also by the nature of our questions. Second, and more serious, is the deception that in order for us to ask a question we must put the question into words that both the respondent and we will understand. But, because we do so, we only learn about the things we understand.... Questions are the most direct form of gathering information from a new acquaintance. To ask someone, 'Do you like this town?' and to hear him answer yes is seductive, because it sounds as if something was learned. After all, the question was answered.
(pp 640-641)

The attempt was made in the present investigation to counteract the aforementioned weaknesses of current methodological approaches. The semi-structured interview encouraged respondents to elaborate at will upon interests, concerns, viewpoints, and experiences. Throughout the session, active rather than passive involvement was promoted. Discussion was generated throughout the interview. The product was a rich outpouring of information. Extensive information-gathering burrowed beneath the superficial "question--response--question" format previously described. In addition, elaboration of responses frequently provided a context from which non-quantifiable questions could be answered, either by repeatedly asking respondents for details or through

tentative construction of the social reality of subjects.

Qualitative data are not without drawbacks. Although semi-structured interviewing barely covers the tip of the qualitative methodology iceberg, few sources exist which guide the researcher in data coding and analysis. For example, thematic content analysis requires the investigator to isolate common themes within the data. How one defines a theme, separating a theme from non-theme, depends upon the investigator and the questions to be answered. What to do once the data are systematically coded is even more ambiguous. While the next phase requires synthesis of the material, this process is not explicitly defined. Also, the entire procedure of content analysis (interviewing, transcribing, coding, synthesizing) takes an inordinate amount of time.

As in quantitative analysis, researcher interests, biases, and perspectives may potentially intrude upon data generation as well as upon data coding and analysis. An attempt was made in this study to counteract the criticism that coded data were solely a reflection of the researcher's definition of social reality by having naive subjects place respondent assertions into thematic categories. Although the researcher selected the assertions to be coded and defined the categories, category assignment frequently failed to reflect researcher

preconceptions.

Qualitative analysis cannot eradicate all quantitative methodological flaws. Both techniques have their difficulties. Perhaps psychology's blatant bias against qualitative analysis is as ill-advised as its overwhelming acceptance of quantitative methodologies. Future researchers might strive for integration of methodologies, rather than rely exclusively upon any one technique. The potential complementarity of the two methodologies is evident from their stated goals: quantitative methodology aims for prediction and control (description represents a means to those ends)--qualitative methodology primarily aims for description and understanding; generalizing beyond the immediate situation is not a primary concern (Van Maanen, 1979).

In conclusion, Mintzberg (1979) expressed the methodological perspective of this investigation when he said:

While systematic data create the foundation for our theories, it is the anecdotal data that enable us to do the building. Theory building seems to require rich description, the richness that comes from the anecdote. We uncover all kinds of relationships in our 'hard' data, but it is only through the use of this 'soft' data that we are able to 'explain' them, and explanation is, of course, the purpose of research. I believe that the researcher who never goes near the water, who collects quantitative data from a distance without anecdote to support them, will always have difficulty explaining interesting relationships (although he may uncover them). Perhaps this has something to do with how our minds work. Those creative leaps seem to come from our

subconscious mental processes, our intuition.... We need to be 'in touch.' Increasingly in our research, we are impressed by the importance of phenomena that cannot be measured.... To miss this in research is to miss the very lifeblood.

(pp 587-588)

Theoretical and Practical Implications: Analysis of Results

As findings in the present study were rarely statistically significant (in the same direction) across the multiple measures, caution in drawing conclusions is clearly warranted. Complete disregard of the results, however, would be hasty. Although the generalizability of these results can only be hypothesized, they may provide a reservoir of potential heuristics from which to develop a dynamic-oriented description of dual-occupation families. Under the assumption that the results accurately reflect the ideas of participants, the question of meaningfulness is addressed.

No attempt was made in this study to separate the "objective" from the "subjective." Many would argue that the distinction in anything but an ideal sense is meaningless, anyway. Respondents described experiences, viewpoints of others, and their own and others' activities, based upon their own perspectives. This distinction is critical. For example, when asked to describe how her mother felt about working mothers, the female respondent's answer may or may not have reflected how her mother actually felt. Rather, she described how she perceived

that her mother felt. (Again, the assumption underlying this discussion is that the results are accurate reflections of the way respondents felt and that their perceptions of reality are important cues to understanding their behavior.)

The point is that respondents interpreted the actions of others from their own perspectives. Application of results should address the observation that behaviors of others result in interpretations by the respondent; these interpretations, rather than the specific behaviors, are remembered and later recalled. Interpretations are the result of conscious and subconscious cognitions and emotions; examples include the actual behaviors of others, interpretation of others' behaviors by significant persons (eg. one's spouse, close friends, parents), and one's personal feelings concerning the issues being addressed. Each of these examples may influence the selection of specific behaviors upon which one focuses, which may ultimately lead to distortion of actual behaviors to be remembered for later interpretation.

Perhaps most important is the idea that behaviors of others may be interpreted from numerous perspectives. No one is necessarily more "correct" than another; the perspectives merely differ as a function of their inherent perceptual biases. Some perspectives, however, may be more useful than others. Experimentation with various

perspectives (through interpretation of identical behaviors from a number of vantages) may result in a greater understanding of one's own viewpoint. The benefits as well as the limitations of the perspective may be assessed.

Modification of the perspective is now possible; maximization of its benefits and elimination of its limitations are the goals of an intervention approach.

Avenues for Future Intervention

Facets of the present study may, potentially, have practical applications. Identification of contributors to dissatisfaction is the first step toward increased satisfaction, both inside and outside of work. For example, one might develop an intervention program which, as its primary objective, could confront newly employed mothers (or mothers considering employment) with the idea that their perceptions concerning the propriety of maternal workforce participation may limit the degree to which they will enjoy satisfaction from the various facets of life.

Obviously, the operating bias is that experienced satisfaction is a positive, and thus desirable, state. That which consistently diminishes or increases satisfaction is important from a pragmatic standpoint (solely by virtue of its influence upon satisfaction) as well as a from a theoretical stance (for it could lead to a fuller understanding of the evaluative interpretation of life's experiences).

Although the data from the present investigation may be too full of contradictions to facilitate immediate theoretical progress, virtually any findings may be useful at a heuristic level. They provide hints about what may be important and suggest appropriate avenues for intervention. To utilize a baseball analogy, if dissatisfaction could be described as a poor batting average, any clues which suggest means of improving one's ability to hit the ball provide an appropriate starting point for intervention. Of course, blind acceptance of an unsubstantiated hint may be as harmful as no hint at all.

The present investigation has suggested that perceptions of one's own and others' viewpoints and experiences relate to work, life, and the congruence of work and life satisfaction. The proposed key to intervention is at the level of the development of perceptions. Active intervention may most appropriately involve resolution of internal conflicts that influence the respondent's interpretations of actions or behaviors performed by him/herself and others. For instance, the first stage of intervention may involve awareness by the woman client that her (negative) perceptions concerning maternal employment may limit the extent to which she can achieve satisfaction from various facets of her life. Stage two may consist of discussing with the woman the nature and origin of her perceptions. Stage three may

revolve around discussion of the means by which one's perceptions can be changed (through altering either the behaviors of others or one's interpretations of those behaviors). During the fourth and final stage of intervention, experimentation with changing perceptions and evaluating their effects would occur.

Avenues for Future Research

Further reflection upon the results, incorporating quantitative as well as qualitative information, suggests an interesting hypothesis to explain the meager support for anticipated findings, particularly those involving the effect of perceived legitimacy upon the work-life satisfaction relationship. Contemplation of the value of the legitimacy portion of the interview (discussion of socialization experiences, norm perceptions, and role involvement) stirred the memory of several respondents' concern with misrepresentation of their experiences. For example, when describing socialization experiences, several respondents explicitly explained that, though their mothers were not employed during their youth (a situation which satisfied family members), there was recognition that appropriate behavior of the past was not necessarily currently appropriate. Thus, it was subtly suggested that the worker role "became" legitimate (and became recognized as such by all concerned) over the years.

During discussion of norm perceptions, respondents

often commented that, over time, particular reference group members had altered their evaluations of the propriety of a dual-occupation lifestyle for the couple under discussion. This may or may not have affected the person's viewpoint concerning maternal employment in general. The dynamic aspect of the development of perceptions remained elusive. Remember, most of the females in the present sample have been in the work-force for many years (work histories ranged from five to twenty-two years). In focusing questions upon the perceptions of the reference group members concerning maternal employment IN GENERAL AT ONLY THE PRESENT TIME, the evolving component of legitimacy remains uncaptured. It is this that may, in the end, provide the most information. Also left untapped are the dynamic aspects of adaptation to these norm perceptions. For example, many women mentioned the personal insignificance of other people's opinions concerning maternal employment. Although initially ignored, perhaps this statement merits further consideration. Successful adaptation to the worker role may require active involvement in structuring (or restructuring) one's psyche.

The concept of work "becoming" a legitimate role for a woman has not been addressed. Perhaps worker role legitimacy for mothers is meaningless when viewed as an end state. Rather, role acceptance is an on-going, evolving process. The monitoring of influential norm perceptions

may be one component of the development of legitimacy. The counter example is the development of acceptance (and possibly support) of one's worker role. Descriptions of husbands' viewpoints may best elucidate this point.

Several women explained that initially their husbands seemed to only notice the value of an additional income and/or the positive effect(s) upon their wives (thus, what was assimilated was the effect upon only their own lives). To further support this contention, female respondents tended to mention current psychological commitment to their work; this commitment was absent when the woman was first employed. Most respondent husbands had come to recognize that commitment within their wives.

Thus, it has been suggested that the search for appropriate placement of the worker role in a mother's life is a dynamic, on-going process. Legitimacy (as defined by socialization experiences, norm perceptions, and role involvement) may influence the process, as well as outcomes, during various phases of occupational involvement. One might hypothesize the influence of legitimacy to be especially intense during initial stages of role transition. At that point, the search for information (confirmation or disconfirmation of one's behavior) may be most pronounced. Also, psychological defense systems specific to the transition are probably relatively undeveloped. In the present study, the fact

that socialization experiences related to the congruence between work and life satisfaction suggests the relative importance of this factor (as it is narrowly defined) upon the process. The present results support the contention that spouse viewpoints relate to the success with which a woman can assume a work role and appropriately integrate it within the rest of her life.

References

- Altman, S.L. & Grossman, F.K. Women's career plans and maternal employment. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 1(4), 365-376.
- Andrews, F.M. & Crandall, R. The validity of measures of self-reported well-being. Social Indicators Research, 1976, 3, 1-19.
- Andrews, F.A. & Withey, S.B. Developing measures of perceived life quality. Social Indicators Research, 1974, 1, 1-26.
- Andrisani, P.J. & Shapiro, M.B. Women's attitudes toward their jobs: Some longitudinal data on a national sample. Personnel Psychology, 1978, 31, 15-34.
- Bamundo, P.J. The relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction: An empirical test of three models on a national sample. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38 (6-A), 3594.
- Beckman, L.J. The relative rewards and costs of parenthood and employment for employed women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1978, 2, 215-234.
- Bedeian, A.G. & Marbert, L.D. Individual differences in self-perception and the job-life satisfaction relationship. Journal of Social Psychology, 1979, 109, 111-118.

- Bird, C. The Two-Paycheck Marriage. New York: Pocket Book, 1979.
- Booth, A. Wife's employment and husband's stress: A replication and refutation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 37, 645-652.
- Brayfield, A.H., Wells, R.V., & Strate, M.W. Interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1957, 41, 201-205.
- Brizzard, R.H. Two days in one: Portraits of professional women with families in France and America. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38 (8-B), 3866-3867.
- Burke, R.J. & Weir, T. Some personality differences between members of one-career and two-career families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38 (3), 453-459.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfaction. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Cantril, H. The Pattern of Human Concerns. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Curtis, J. Working Mothers. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday & Co, Inc., 1976.

- Davidson, C. Working time and a half. Newsweek, 1982, (March 8), 16-17.
- Dubin, R. Industrial workers' worlds: A study of the 'central life interests' of industrial workers. Social Problems, 1956, 3 (3), 131-140.
- Filene, P.G. Him/Her/Self. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Janovich, 1974.
- Frieze, I.H. Achievement and non-achievement in women. In I.H. Frieze, J.E. Parsons, P.B. Johnson, D.N. Ruble, G.L. Zellman, Women and Sex Roles: A Social Psychological Perspective. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1978.
- Hall, D.T. A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college educated women. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 471-486.
- Hall, D.T. Pressures from work, self, and home in the life stages of married women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 121-132.
- Heckman, N.A., Bryson, R., & Bryson, J.B. Problems of professional couples: A content analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 323-330.
- Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. Managerial Woman. New York: Pocket Books, 1976.
- Hoffman, L.W. The decision to work. In F.I. Nye & L.W. Hoffman, The Employed Mother in America. Chicago:

- Rand McNally & Co., 1963.
- Holahan, C.K. & Gilbert, L.A. Interrole conflict for working women: Career versus job. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1979, 64, 86-90.
- Iris, B. & Barrett, G.V. Some relations between job and life satisfaction and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 301-304.
- Kanungo, R.N. The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 86 (1), 119-138.
- Katz, M. Antecedents of coping behavior in a role conflict situation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39 (3-B), 1543.
- Kavanaugh, M.J. & Halpern, M. The impact of job level and sex differences on the relationship between life and job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1977, 20 (1), 66-73.
- Keating, K. How is work affecting American families? Better Homes & Gardens, 1982 (February), 19-22+.
- Kornhauser, A.W. Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Lashuk, M. & Kurian, G. Employment status, feminism, and symptoms of stress: The case of a Canadian

- prairie city. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 1977, 2, 195-204.
- London, M., Crandall, R., & Seals, G.W. The contribution of job and leisure satisfaction to quality of life. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 328-334.
- Mintzberg, H. An emerging strategy of "direct" research. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 24 (4), 582-589.
- Mortimer, J., Hall, R., & Hill, R. Husband's occupational attributes as constraints on wife's employment. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1978, 5, 285-314.
- Near, J.P., Rice, R.W., & Hunt, R.G. Work and extra-work correlates of life and job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1978, 21 (2), 248-264.
- Oakley, A. Women's Work: The Housewife, Past and Present. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.
- Oliver, L. The relationship of parental attitudes and parent identification to career and homemaking orientation in college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 7, 1-12.
- Orpen, C. Work and nonwork satisfaction: A causal-correlational analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63 (4), 530-532.
- Payton-Miyazaka, M. & Brayfield, A.H. The good job and the good life: Relation of characteristics of employment

- to general well-being. In A.D. Biderman & T.F. Drury (Eds), Measuring Work Quality for Social Reporting. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.
- Poloma, M.M. & Garland, T.N. The married professional woman: A study in the tolerance of domestication. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 33, 531-540.
- Rabinowitz, S. & Hall, D.T. Organizational research on job involvement. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84 (2), 265-288.
- Rapoport, R. & Rapoport, R.N. The dual-career family: A variant pattern and social change. Human Relations, 1969, 22, 3-30.
- Rapoport, R. & Rapoport, R.N. Dual-Career Families. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Rice, R.W., Near, J.P., & Hunt, R.G. Unique variance in job and life satisfaction associated with work-related and extra-workplace variables. Human Relations, 1979, 32 (7), 605-623.
- Rice, R.W., Near, J.P., & Hunt, R.G. The job-satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: A review of empirical research. Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 1980, 1 (1), 37-64.
- Robinson, J.P. & Shaver, P.R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, Publications Division, University

- of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1969.
- Robison, E. Strain and dual-role occupation among women. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38 (7-A), 4385.
- Salancik, G.R. Field stimulations for organizational behavior research. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 24 (4), 638-649.
- Sales, E. Women's adult development. In I.H. Frieze, J.E. Parsons, P.B. Johnson, D.N. Ruble, & G.L. Zellman, Women and Sex Roles: A Social Psychological Perspective. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978.
- Siegel, A.E. & Haas, M.B. The working mother: A review of research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 513-542.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1969.
- St.-Johns-Parsons, D. Continuous dual-career families: A case study. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1978, 3 (1), 30-42.
- Szinovacz, M.E. Role allocation, family structure, and female employment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 781-791.
- Trafton, R.S. Measuring life satisfaction and its relation to satisfaction with work, family, and leisure.

- Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38 (10-B), 5081.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1979. 100th ed, Washington, D.C., 1979.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Social Indicators III. Washington, D.C., 1980
- U.S. Department of Labor, 1975 Handbook on Women Workers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor (Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau), 1975.
- VanMaanen, J. Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 24 (4), 520-528.
- Vredenburg, D.J. & Sheridan, J.E. Individual and occupational determinants of life satisfaction and alienation. Human Relations, 1979, 32 (12), 1023-1038.
- Watts, W. Americans' hopes and fears: The future can fend for itself. Psychology Today, 1981 (September), 36-48.
- Weaver, C.N. Sex differences in the determinants of job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1978, 21 (2), 265-274.

Footnotes

1. Eighty male and female college students from a mid-western university were given required experimental credit for participating in this phase of the research. Approximately 20 students at a time were provided with a packet containing statement lists, defined thematic categories, and directions instructing them to assign the one most appropriate category to each statement. The rationale behind this task was explained to subjects both before and after their participation. Many students identified dual categories rather than single ones while working with the life satisfaction response packet. As this was the first packet tested, it appeared that instructions were unclear. The instruction requiring single category assignment was emphasized with later samples and the problem virtually disappeared. As the responses of two subjects were obviously random, their data were discarded. All subject responses were recorded and modal response categories were identified.

Table 1
Education and Occupational Involvement of Respondents
(% of those responding)

	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>
1. Educational background		
High School Graduate	15.0	5.6
Some College	25.0	16.7
Bachelor's Degree	10.0	22.2
Master's Degree	30.0	27.8
Ph.D.	20.0	27.8
2. Occupation		
Professional with Advanced Degree	35.0	31.6
Manager, Administrator	5.0	36.8
Clerical/Sales	15.0	5.3
Service	15.0	10.5
Skilled, Technical	25.0	15.8
Semi- and Unskilled	5.0	-
3. Length of Time on the Job		
Less than 6 Months	5.3	-
6+ Months - One Year	26.3	5.3
1+ Months - Two Year	15.8	5.3
2+ Years - 5 Years	5.3	5.3
5+ Years - 10 Years	26.3	42.1
10+ Years	21.1	42.1

(continued)

(Table 1 Continued)

	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>
4. Number of Years Worked		
Mean	13.65	- ^a
Mode	10.	-
Minimum	5.	-
Maximum	22.	-
Standard Deviation	4.94	-
5. Number of Jobs Mentioned (including present one):		
One	10%	- ^a
Three	35	-
Four	10	-
Five	10	-
Six	10	-
Seven	10	-
Eight	15	-

Note. Unless specified otherwise, number of subjects was 20 for both males and females.

^aInformation was not collected for males.

Table 2
Relationships Among Work Satisfaction Measures

	<u>Task</u>	<u>PAY</u>	<u>PRO</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COW</u>	<u>JOB</u>
JDI Task		.08	-.03	.30	.44*	.27
Pay	.12		.53**	.14	.14	.42*
Promotion (PRO)	-.20	.22		.52**	.32	.42*
Supervision (SUP)	.15	.39*	.21		.57**	.48*
Coworkers (COW)	.57***	.57***	-.16	.26		.32
General Job (JOB)	.29	.34	.38	-.11	.40*	

Note. Entries above the diagonal refer to males; those below the diagonal refer to females.

* $p \leq .05$ (one-tail test)

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .005$

Table 3
Principal Component Analysis of
Work Satisfaction Measures

	<u>Dimension 1</u>	<u>Dimension 2</u>
JDI-task	-0.012	0.874*
JDI-pay	0.704*	0.160
JDI-promotion	0.801*	-0.328
JDI-supervision	0.616*	0.305
JDI-coworkers	0.324	0.788*
General Job	0.614*	0.329

*measure loads upon dimension $\geq .50$

Table 4
Relationships Among Life Satisfaction Measures

	<u>Life</u>	<u>NON-W</u>	<u>FAM</u>	<u>CT-PRES</u>	<u>CT-FUT</u>
General Life (Life)		.57***	.51**	.64***	.05
Non-work (NON-W)	.40*		.61***	.51**	-.14
Family (FAM)	.36	.49*		.28	0.0
Cantril-present (CT-PRES)	.41*	.36	.16		.56**
Cantril-future (CT-FUT)	.18	.29	0.0	.85***	

Note. Entries above the diagonal refer to males; those below the diagonal refer to females.

* $\underline{p} \leq .05$ (one-tail test)

** $\underline{p} \leq .01$

*** $\underline{p} \leq .005$

Table 5
Principal Component Analysis of
Life Satisfaction Measures

	<u>Dimension 1</u>	<u>Dimension 2</u>
General Life	0.738*	0.272
Non-work	0.816*	0.169
Family	0.843*	-0.075
Cantril-now	0.334	0.898*
Cantril-future	-0.035	0.946*

*measure loads upon dimension $\geq .50$

Table 6
 Components of Life Satisfaction
 (% sample providing response)

	<u>General Life</u>		<u>Cantril</u>			
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Best Life</u>		<u>Worst Life</u>	
			<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Marital relationship	5.0	50.0	15.0	30.0	15.0	10.0
Relationship with children	10.0	55.0	25.0	60.0	20.0	30.0
Family	35.0	40.0	30.0	20.0	15.0	5.0
Relationship with others	10.0	45.0	10.0	5.0	-	-
Health	10.0	20.0	10.0	15.0	20.0	20.0
Lifestyle	5.0	20.0	25.0	30.0	5.0	-
Living situation status	20.0	30.0	5.0	15.0	-	-
Economic status	40.0	40.0	55.0	40.0	25.0	20.0
Occupation	65.0	90.0	45.0	30.0	25.0	20.0
Societal/political trends	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	-	10.0
General outlook toward future	15.0	-	-	-	-	-

Table 7
Relationships Among Measures of Work and Life
Satisfaction (Females)

<u>Life/Work</u>	<u>Task</u>	<u>Pay</u>	<u>Promotion</u>	<u>Supervision</u>	<u>Coworker</u>	<u>General Job</u>
General Life	.31	.60***	.28	.28	.39*	0.0
Non-work	.27	.15	.10	.18	.31	.20
Family	.15	.04	-.02	.27	.51**	-.21
Cantril-present	.20	.55***	.28	-.03	.53**	.75***
Cantril-future	.10	.48*	.14	-.06	.44*	.72***

* $p < .05$ (one-tail test)

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .005$

Table 8
Relationships Among Measures of Work and Life
Satisfaction (Males)

<u>Life/Work</u>	<u>Task</u>	<u>Pay</u>	<u>Promotion</u>	<u>Supervision</u>	<u>Coworkers</u>	<u>General Job</u>
General Life	.13	-.03	-.01	-.07	.05	.21
Non work	-.19	-.14	-.16	.23	-.10	.29
Family	.06	.04	-.07	.23	.24	.41*
Cantril-present	.21	-.01	.22	.26	.05	.45*
Cantril-future	.48*	.23	.14	.16	.05	.47*

* $p < .05$ (one-tail test)

Table 9
 Sample Characteristics: Maternal Employment
 (% of sample responding)

1. Did your mother work outside of the home?		
	yes	57.5
	no	42.5
2. Mother's job history (if mother was employed)		
always worked full-time		31.8
worked full-time only after siblings were		
old enough to go to school		27.3
always worked part-time		9.1
continually rotated between non-employment,		
part-time, and full-time employment		9.1
none of descriptions apply		22.7
3. Mother's occupation		
	manager	19.0
	clerical/sales	52.4
	service	9.5
	skilled/technical	4.8
	semi- and unskilled	14.3

Table 10
Relationships Among Socialization Variables

	<u>Work Status</u>	<u>Mother-</u>	<u>Father-</u>	<u>Self-</u>
Maternal work status ^a		-.219	.652***	.468*
Mother's evaluation	-.263		.076	.264
Father's evaluation	.643***	.128		.515**
Self evaluation	.066	.560***	.493**	

Note. Entries above the diagonal refer to males; those below the diagonal refer to females.

^aMaternal work status: 1=employed, 2=not employed

* $p < .05$ (two-tail test)

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .005$

Table 11
Relationships Among Norms of Significant Others

	<u>SP</u>	<u>FR</u>	<u>MOM</u>	<u>DAD</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COW</u>	<u>SOC</u>	<u>Self</u>
Spouse (SP)		.506**	.435	.339	.116	.159	-.131	.270
Friends (FR)	.635***		.370	.066	.216	.242	.299	.190
Mother (MOM)	.616***	.507**		.685***	.176	-.086	-.047	.440
Father (DAD)	.350	.245	-.050		.244	-.200	-.281	.355
Supervisor (SUP)	.112	.045	.386	-.374		.670***	.014	-.207
Coworkers (COW)	-.116	.292	.331	-.467*	-.012		-.101	-.064
Society (SOC)	.065	.345	.081	.089	-.086	.254		-.327
Self	.572***	.306	.067	.101	.091	-.290	-.267	

Note. Entries above the diagonal refer to males; those below the diagonal refer to females.

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .005$

Table 12
Principal Component Analysis
of Norms of Significant Others

	<u>Dimension 1</u>	<u>Dimension 2</u>	<u>Dimension 3</u>
Spouse	0.8221*	0.1122	0.1455
Friends	0.5966*	0.2264	0.6190*
Mother	0.7442*	0.3160	0.0832
Father	0.6533*	-0.2957	-0.1665
Supervisor	0.1544	0.7667*	-0.2342
Coworkers	-0.1153	0.8021*	0.2546
Society	-0.1222	-0.0687	0.8839*
Self	0.6441*	-0.1506	-0.3098

*measure loads on dimension $\geq .50$

Table 13

Elaboration of Normative Prescriptions

(% of sample responding)

Significant other	Respondent sex	Inc ^a	Growth ^b	Aid Fam ^c	Trad ^d Value	Job Perf ^e	Normal ^f	Change opg	Most h Cohorts	Half i Cohorts	Few j Cohorts	Male k Sup	Female l Sup	No m Contact
Spouse	Male	20	25	-	45	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	10	35	-	40	-	5	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
Friends	Male	15	5	-	35	-	20	5	60	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	25	15	-	35	5	10	-	40	5	-	-	-	-
Mother	Male	10	5	-	40	-	10	10	-	-	-	-	-	15
	Female	15	25	-	35	-	5	20	-	-	-	-	-	-
Father	Male	20	-	-	35	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	25
	Female	15	10	-	45	-	10	15	-	-	-	-	-	25
Others	Male	5	-	-	20	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	20	-	5	30	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Self	Male	15	10	10	55	-	5	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	20	10	10	50	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supervisor	Male	10	5	-	5	-	15	-	-	-	-	45	5	-
	Female	5	-	-	25	10	10	-	-	-	-	45	25	-

(Table 13 Continued)

Significant other	Respondent sex	Inc ^a	Growth ^b	Aid Fam ^c	Trad ^d Value	Job Perf ^e	Normal ^f	Change opg	Most ^h Cohorts	Half ⁱ Cohorts	Few ^j Cohorts	Male Supk	Female Supl	No Contact ^m
Coworkers	Male	20	-	-	10	-	25	-	20	-	5	-	-	-
	Female	10	-	-	15	-	15	-	20	-	5	-	-	-
Society	Male	20	5	-	15	-	20	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	35	-	-	65	-	45	30	-	-	-	-	-	-

^aInc: income is helpful/necessary.

^bGrowth: utilize training, self-growth, do own thing.

^cAid Fam: aids family relationships.

^dTrad Value: at least one family member could be psychologically harmed by maternal employment--mother may/does belong at home.

^eJob Perf: irrelevant unless job performance is affected.

^fNormal: not an issue, considered normal

^gChange op: opinion altered over the years.

^hMost Cohorts: (more than half are in dual-occupation families)

ⁱHalf Cohorts: (about one-half are in dual-occupation families)

^jFew Cohorts: (less than one-half are in dual-occupation families)

^kMale Sup: male supervisor

^lFemale Sup: female supervisor

^mNo Contact: have not been in touch with the person for more than 5 years (e.g., death)

Table 14
Percentage of Respondents Mentioning Role Types
of Female Role Involvement

	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>
Home maintenance	95	90
House maintenance	40	30
Extended family relationships	25	5
Non-family personal relationships	45	10
Community involvement	60	50
Job-holder	65	90
Scholar	15	10
Individual--unique interests	30	20
Too fuzzy to determine	15	5

Table 15
Correlations Between Males' and Females'
Role Involvement Responses

	<u>Zero-order correlation</u>	<u>n</u> ^c	<u>p</u> ^d
PCT-JOB (M) ^a /(F) ^b	.219	17	.20
PCT-DEM (M)/(F)	-.188	16	.24
PCT-IMP (M)/(F)	-.342	14	.12
Importance-Pay (M)/(F)	-.220	19	.18
Importance-Psychological (M)/(F)	-.134	19	.29

^a(M): male

^b(F): female

^c: Unequal sample sizes are a result of missing data from one or both spouses.

^d: One tail test.

Table 16
Intercorrelation of Role Involvement Measures

	<u>PCT-JOB^a</u>	<u>PCT-DEM^b</u>	<u>PCT-IMP^c</u>	<u>IMP-PAY^d</u>	<u>IMP-PSYCH^e</u>
PCT-JOB		.796***	.739***	-.224	.010
PCT-DEM	.614**		.766***	-.076	-.337
PCT-IMP	.676***	.565**		-.550*	.053
IMP-PAY	.104	.301	.069		.125
IMP-PSYCH	.390	.210	.080	.161	

Note. Entries above the diagonal refer to males; those below the diagonal refer to females.

^aPCT-JOB: Percent of job-related roles

^bPCT-DEM: Percent of demanding roles labeled job-relevant

^cPCT-IMP: Percent of important roles labeled job-relevant

^dIMP-PAY: Job importance (pay)

^eIMP-PSYCH: Job importance (psychological)

* $p \leq .05$ (two-tail test)

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .05$

Table 17
Correlations Between Norm Perceptions
and Respondent Work Satisfaction

	<u>JDI-SITUATION</u>	<u>JDI-PERSONAL</u>	<u>GENERAL JOB</u>
<u>Female</u>			
norm US	-.291	-.210	-.198
norm JOB	.141	-.354	.182
norm SOCIETY	.429*	.050	.190
norm FRIENDS	-.053	-.434	-.227
<u>Male</u>			
norm US	.357	.422*	.010
norm JOB	.262	-.100	.575***
norm SOCIETY	-.192	.491**	.227
norm FRIENDS	.381	.323	.243

* $p \leq .05$ (one-tail test)

* $p \leq .01$

* $p \leq .005$

Table 18
Significant ($p < .05$) Correlations of Individual Significant
Others and Work Satisfaction Measures

	<u>Zero-Order Correlatins</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>p^a</u>
<u>Female</u>			
Norm-Father/JDI-Task	.418	17	.05
Norm-Supervisor/General Job	.476	19	.02
Norm-Society/JDI-Supervisor	.388	20	.05
<u>Male</u>			
Norm-Friends/JDI-Task	.380	20	.05
Norm-Father/JDI-Supervisor	.545	19	.008
/JDI-Coworkers	.396	20	.04
Norm-Supervisor/General Job	.754	18	.001
Norm-Coworkers/General Job	.510	20	.01
Norm-Society/JDI-Task	.676	20	.001
Norm-Self/JDI-Supervisor	.589	19	.004

^aOne-tail test

Table 19
Correlations Between Norms (Males) and
Work Satisfaction (Female)

	<u>JDI-SITUATION</u>	<u>JDI-PERSONAL</u>	<u>GENERAL JOB</u>
norm US	-.032	-.061	-.194
norm JOB	-.126	-.242	-.130
norm SOCIETY	.115	.454*	.510**
norm FRIENDS	.289	.225	.131

* $p \leq .05$ (one-tail test)

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .005$

Table 20
Correlations Among Role Involvement and
Female Work Satisfaction

<u>Female</u>			
	<u>JDI-SITUATION</u>	<u>JDI-PERSONAL</u>	<u>General Job</u>
PCT-JOB	-.326	-.114	-.002
PCT-DEM	-.327	-.026	-.106
PCT-IMP	-.500	-.118	.266

*p < .05 (one-tail test)

Table 21
 Significant Multivariate Relationship Between
 Socialization Experiences and Life Satisfaction (Female)

	<u>Cumulative multiple R²</u>	<u>F ratio</u>
LIFE Satisfaction		
self evaluation	.329	
maternal work status	.466	F(1,15) = 4.505, p < .06
father evaluation	.518	
mother evaluation	.546	

Table 22
Correlations Between Legitimacy Variables
and Female Life Satisfaction

<u>Legitimacy Variable: Gender</u>	<u>Cantril</u>	<u>Life Satisfaction</u>
<u>Socialization: Female</u>		
Maternal Work Status	.141	-.330
Mother's Evaluation	.235	.317
Father's Evaluation	.349	.198
Self-Evaluation	.185	.574**
<u>Socialization: Male</u>		
Maternal Work Status	-.024	.187
Mother's Evaluation	.337	.204
Father's Evaluation	-.169	.084
Self-Evaluation	.187	.122
<u>Norms: Female</u>		
Norm-US	-.283	.016
Norm-JOB	.139	-.058
Norm-Friends	-.196	.065
Norm-Society	.148	.070
<u>Norms: Male</u>		
Norm-US	-.158	.029
Norm-JOB	-.182	-.451
Norm-Friends	-.196	0.0
Norm-Society	.353	.462*

(continued)

(Table 22 Continued)

<u>Legitimacy Variable: Gender</u>	<u>Cantril</u>	<u>Life Satisfaction</u>
<u>Role Involvement: Female</u>		
PCT-JOB	.066	.265
PCT-DEM	-.244	-.089
PCT-IMP	.272	-.057
<u>Role Involvement: Male</u>		
PCT-JOB	.391	.068
PCT-DEM	.220	-.052
PCT-IMP	.453*	.198

* $p \leq .05$ (one-tail test)

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .005$

Table 23
Principal Component Analysis of Standardized
Work-Life Satisfaction (D^2) Indices (Female)

	<u>Dimension 1</u>	<u>Dimension 2</u>	<u>Dimension 3</u>
JDI-Personal -- Cantril	.912*	.340	.108
JDI-Situation -- Cantril	.959*	-.028	-.186
General-Job -- Cantril	-.090	.185	.880*
JDI-Personal -- Life Satisfaction	.030	.797*	.298
JDI-Situation -- Life Satisfaction	-.038	.657*	-.603*
General Job -- Life Satisfaction	.312	.636*	-.021

*measures loading on the dimension $\geq .50$

Table 24
Multivariate Relationships Between Legitimacy Variables
and Female Work-Life Satisfaction

Legitimacy Variable: Gender	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F ratio</u>
<u>Socialization: Female</u>		
* JOB--Cantril		
Self-Evaluation	.269	F(1,13) = 2.845, p > .05
Mother's Evaluation	.411	
Father's Evaluation	.451	
Maternal Work Status	.467	
<u>Socialization: Male</u>		
* General Job-Cantril		
Maternal Work Status	.164	F(1,14) = 2.843, p > .05
Self-Evaluation	.388	
Father's Evaluation	.437	
Mother's Evaluation	.467	
<u>Norm (general): Male</u>		
* JOB--LIFE		
Norm-JOB	.365	F(1,14) = 4.962, p < .05
Norm-US	.499	
Norm-Friends	.571	
Norm-Society	.586	

(Continued)

(Table 24 Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Norm-US: Male		
* General-Job--Cantril		
Norm-Spouse	.209	F(1,11) = 5.00, p < .05
Norm-Mother	.390	
Norm-Self	.586	
Norm-Father	.588	
Norm-Job: Male		
JOB--LIFE		
Norm-Coworkers	.382	F(1,15) = 4.355, p < .06
Norm-Supervisor	.384	
General Job--Cantril		
Norm-Supervisor	.266	F(1,15) = 5.410, p < .05
Norm-Coworkers	.436	

*R² values may be inflated due to saturation of the equations.

Table 25
Relationships Between Legitimacy Variables
and Female Work-Life Satisfaction

<u>Legitimacy Variable: Gender</u>	<u>JOB--Cantril</u>	<u>JOB-LIFE</u>	<u>General Job--Cantril</u>
<u>Socialization: Female</u>			
Maternal Work Status	-.215	.309	-
Mother's Evaluation	.022	-.084	.008
Father's Evaluation	-.494*	.080	.129
Self Evaluation	-.519*	.080	.115
<u>Socialization: Male</u>			
Maternal Work Status	-.193	.020	.404*
Mother's Evaluation	-	-.035	-.396*
Father's Evaluation	.122	-.285	.311
Self Evaluation	.050	-.143	-.229
<u>Norms: Female</u>			
Spouse	-	.173	.088
Friends	.312	-.017	.166
Mother	-	-.192	.159
Father	-	.346	.457
Supervisor	.316	.105	.268
Coworkers	.438	-.395*	-.175
Society	-.098	.321	.269
Self	-	.266	-.261

(Continued)

(Table 25 Continued)

	<u>JOB--Cantril</u>	<u>JOB--LIFE</u>	<u>General Job--Cantril</u>
Norms: Male			
Spouse	.203	.053	.457
Friends	.202	.287	.229
Mother	.192	-.170	-.184
Father	.118	-.538*	-.109
Supervisor	.054	.446	-.515*
Coworkers	.051	.618	-.038
Society	.161	.032	-.234
Self	.076	-.296	.367
<u>Role Involvement: Female</u>			
PCT-JOB	.154	-.308	-.018
PCT-Demanding	.108	-.285	.173
PCT-Important	.291	-.186	.195
Role Involvement: Male			
PCT-Job	-.161	-.112	.176
PCT-Demanding	.080	.062	.256
PCT-Important	.061	-	-.191

*p \leq .05 (one-tail test)

**p \leq .01

***p \leq .005

Table 26

Significant ($p \leq .05$) Correlations Between Role Involvement and
Specific Female Work-Life Satisfaction Measures

<u>Female</u>	<u>Zero-Order Correlation</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>p</u> ^a
PCT-IMP/JDI Personal -- LIFE Satisfaction	-.403	20	.04
<u>Male</u>			
Importance-Pay/JDI Personal -- Cantril	-.471	18	.02

^aone-tail test

Table 27

Mean Responses to Global Socialization and
Norm Indices as a Function of the Relationship
Between Female Work and Life Satisfaction

		<u>Work Satisfaction</u>	
		<u>high</u>	<u>low</u>
Life Satisfaction	Socialization (F)	14.00 ^a	13.00 ^b
	High SOCIAL (M)	11.87	15.00 ^c
	NORMS (F)	15.70	16.25
	NORMS (M)	15.86	14.1
	SOCIAL (F)	14.00 ^d	10.57 ^e
	SOCIAL (M)	12.00	10.43
	Low NORMS (F)	13.90	15.57
	NORMS (M)	15.00	14.86

Note. (F) refers to females; (M) refers to males

^aThe sample size within this quadrant is 7.

^bThe sample size within this quadrant, unless otherwise specified is 2.

^c_{n=1}

^dThe sample size within this quadrant is 2.

^eThe sample size within this quadrant is 7.

Table 28

Relationships Between Career-Job Designation
and the Work and Life Satisfaction of Females

	Designation According to Female	Designation According to Male
<u>Work</u>		
General Job	-.456*	-.202
JDI-Task	-.324	-.493*
JDI-Coworkers	-.300	-.310
JDI-PERSONAL	-.351	-.428*
JDI-Pay	-.431*	.020
JDI-Promotion	.169	.457
JDI-Supervision	.160	.259
JDI-SITUATION	-.020	.387
<u>Life</u>		
General Life	-.448*	-.253
Non-Work	-.299	-.203
Family	.088	-.212
LIFE Satisfaction	-.268	-.292
Cantril	-.602***	-.345

Note. Career = 1, Job = 2

* $p \leq .05$ (one-tail test)

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .005$

Relationships Between the Work and Life
Satisfaction of Females Engaged in Careers

	<u>"Cantril"</u>	<u>"LIFE Satisfaction"</u>
Career designation by females	(n=15)	(n=16)
General Job	.427	-.066
JDI Task	.225	.590**
JDI Coworkers	.265	.545**
"JDI PERSONAL"	.258	.594**
JDI Pay	.118	.083
JDI Promotion	.166	.019
JDI Supervision	.147	.309
"JDI SITUATION"	.205	.208
Career Designation by Males	(n=12)	(n=13)
General Job	.022	.220
JDI Task	.375	.582*
JDI Coworkers	.324	.633**
"JDI PERSONAL"	.361	.643**
JDI Pay	-.050	.268
JDI Promotion	-.234	.368
JDI Supervision	.395	.399
"JDI SITUATION"	.074	.496*

* $p \leq .05$ (one-tail test)

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .005$

Table 30
Relationships Between Occupational Legitimacy and
Occupational Designations (according to males and females)

Legitimacy Variable: Gender	<u>Designation by Female</u>	<u>Designation by Male</u>
<u>Socialization: Female</u>		
Maternal Work Status	.050	-.121
Mother's Evaluation	-.055	.026
Father's Evaluation	-.147	-.465*
Self Evaluation	-.021	-.005
<u>Socialization: Male</u>		
Maternal Work Status	.102	-.284
Mother's Evaluation	-.246	-.033
Father's Evaluation	.177	-.545**
Self Evaluation	-.191	-.218
<u>Norms: Female</u>		
Norm-US	.353	-.347
Norm-JOB	.100	.103
Norm-Friends	.342	-.198
Norm-Society	.340	-.252
<u>Norms: Male</u>		
Norm-US	-.303	-.451*
Norm-JOB	.122	.206
Norm-Friends	-.094	0.0
Norm Society	.244	.250

(Continued)

(Table 30 Continued)

	<u>Designation by Females</u>	<u>Designation by Males</u>
<u>Role Involvement: Female</u>		
PCT-JOB	-.218	-.487*
PCT-Demanding	-.238	-.436
PCT-Importance	-.366	-.570***
Importance-Pay	-.098	.142
Importance-Psychological	-.170	-.128
<u>Role Involvement: Male</u>		
PCT-JOB	.046	.137
PCT-Demanding	.211	.026
PCT-Importance	.092	.167
Importance-Pay	.163	-.150
Importance-Psychological	.033	-.303

*p \leq .05 (one-tail test)

**p \leq .01

***p \leq .005

Table 31

Respondent Definitions of Career and Job
(percentage of respondents describing term)

	<u>Career</u>		<u>Job</u>	
	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>
<u>Individual Themes</u>				
Self-Involvement	37.5	18.2	-	-
Temporary or short-term involvement	-	-	-	16.7
Occupational Advancement Opportunities	12.5	-	-	-
Lack of Advancement, Little Change	-	-	25.0	16.7
Challenging and/or Enjoyable	6.2	-	-	-
Financially required, not Necessarily Enjoyable	-	-	50.0	50.0
"Professional Status"	25.0	45.4	-	-
<u>Theme Combinations</u>				
Self-Involving/Challenging and Enjoyable	50.0	63.6	-	-
Self-Involving/Advancement Opportunities	6.2	-	-	-
Self-Involving/Professional Status	18.8	27.3	-	-
Advancement Opportunities/Challenging and Enjoyable	6.2	-	-	-

Appendix A: Letter Sent to Sample

Dear

Hello! I am presently a graduate student in Industrial Psychology and am in the process of gathering experiences and viewpoints of dual-occupation families, those in which both the husband and wife are employed full-time. My interest in this area stems from personal experiences encountered several years ago as my family adjusted to my mother's decision to return to the work force. I have contacted you in the hope that you and your husband will be able to assist me in pinpointing the specific needs and opinions of families in this lifestyle. Thus, I am interested in what you and your husband have to say!

If you agree to participate (you need not decide now), an interview will be arranged at a time and location which is convenient to both you and your spouse. At this interview, you will be asked to fill out a brief questionnaire concerning, in general, how things are going with you. Discussion of your views of the dual-occupation lifestyle will follow. Your spouse will be asked similar questions at the same time by my male colleague. The session will require approximately 45 minutes of your time.

Because you represent a segment of this part of working society, your experiences, views, and ideas will provide valuable insight into possible problems and solutions facing other dual-occupation families. Your responses to questions will be completely anonymous. It is your viewpoints, not you as individuals, that are the focus of my investigation. Though we will not discuss your remarks with your spouse, you are perfectly free to do so following the interview.

If you are (1) presently married and living with your husband, (2) you both work at least 32 hours per week and (3) you have at least one child living at home, I hope that you will agree to participate in this project, for only you will be able to provide me with valuable information relating to an issue which may be of interest to both of us.

A self-addressed postcard is provided to allow you to indicate whether you fit the above requirements and, if so, are interested in finding out more information about the project. Please send this card through Inter-campus mail. If you wish to contact me, I can be reached at 532-6850 (Psychology Department) or at home (539-3979). I hope to be in touch with you soon.

Thank-you for your time and cooperation!

Appendix B: Traditional Single-Item
Satisfaction Questions

1. Which of these statements comes nearest to saying how you feel about your life in general? Would you say you are:

(5)--completely satisfied
(4)--well satisfied
(3)--neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
(2)--a little dissatisfied
(1)--very dissatisfied

2. In answering the above question, in general terms what were the types of things you were thinking about? Please name all those elements which you utilized to determine your general life satisfaction.

1. Which of these statements comes nearest to saying how you feel about the way you spend your time when you're not working? Would you say you are:

(5)--completely satisfied
(4)--well satisfied
(3)--neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
(2)--a little dissatisfied
(1)--very dissatisfied

2. Thinking about your family and home life as they are now, which of these statements come nearest to saying how you feel? Would you say you are:

(5)--completely satisfied
(4)--well satisfied
(3)--neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
(2)--a little dissatisfied
(1)--very dissatisfied

1. Which of these statements tells best how you feel about your job? Would you say you are:

(5)--completely satisfied
(4)--well satisfied
(3)--neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
(2)--a little dissatisfied
(1)--very dissatisfied

Appendix C: Cantril's Self-Anchoring Scale

1. All of us want certain things out of life. When you think about what really matters in your own life, what are your wishes and hopes for the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the best possible light, what would your life look like then, if you are to be happy? Take your time in answering; such things aren't easy to put into words.
PERMISSIBLE PROBES: What are your hopes for the future? What would your life have to be like for you to be completely happy? What is missing for you to be happy? [Use also, if necessary, the words "dreams" and "desires"...]
OBLIGATORY PROBE: Anything else?

2. Now, taking the other side of the picture, what are your fears and worries about the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the worst possible light, what would your life look like then? Again, take your time in answering.
PERMISSIBLE PROBE: What would make you unhappy? [Stress the words "fears" and "worries".]
OBLIGATORY PROBE: Anything else?

Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder (POINTING) represents the best possible life for you and the bottom (POINTING) represents the worst possible life for you.

3. Where on the ladder (MOVING FINGER RAPIDLY UP AND DOWN LADDER) do you feel you personally stand at the present time? Step Number _____

And where do you think you will be on the ladder five years from now?
Step _____

Ladder of Life

10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0

Appendix D: Demographic Information

Age _____

Husband's Age _____

Number of Children _____

Age of Child

Sex of Child

1.

2.

3.

4.

Education _____

Husband's Education _____

Occupation _____ Number of Hours Work/Week _____

How long have you been employed there: _____

Husband's Occupation _____ Number of Hours Work/Week _____

How long has he worked there: _____

Age at Marriage _____

Husband's _____

Work History (position title, location of employment, dates):

Appendix E: Legitimacy Interview

Section 1 : Socialization

1. Was your mother ever employed when you were growing up? Yes--No
[If yes, continue. If no, go to question 5b]
2. Please listen to the following list of occupational patterns. After hearing the complete list, we will review the choices--select the phrase which best describes your mother's employment history.
Do you remember her -----
 - a. Always working full-time?
 - b. Always rotating between full-time and part-time work?
 - c. Always working part-time?
 - d. Working full-time all the time only once your brothers and/or sisters were old enough to go to school?
 - e. Always working part-time once your brothers and/or sisters were in school?
 - f. Continually rotating between working full-time and part-time once your siblings were in school?
 - g. Continually rotating between non-employment, part-time, and full-time employment?
 - h. If none of these seem appropriate, please describe your mother's work history as well as you can.
3. What was your mother's occupation(s)?
4. The following is a list of frequently mentioned reasons why women have said they work. Use the following scale to state the extent to which the statement describes why you think your mother worked.
The statement is: not at all descriptive (1)----somewhat descriptive (2)
----very descriptive (3)
 - a. Financial necessity
 - b. To pay for various luxuries or extravagances--things not actually necessary but which made life nicer
 - c. In order to meet with other adults
 - d. Intellectual challenge
 - e. To get a sense of achievement, accomplishment
 - f. To fill in free time
 - g. Guilt for not contributing to the family income

Use the following scale to answer the next 3 questions. Did not like it at all (1)----disliked it somewhat (2)----neither liked it nor disliked it (3)----liked it somewhat (4)----liked it very much (5).

5. a. IF EMPLOYED. How much do you feel your mother liked working at her occupation? Notice the scale goes from 1 (did not like it at all) to 5 (liked it very much).
b. IF NOT EMPLOYED. How much do you think your mother enjoyed being a homemaker? Notice the scale goes from 1 (did not like it at all) to 5 (liked it very much).
6. How do you think your father felt about your mother being employed/not being employed? [Repeat scale if not understood]
7. How did you feel about your mother being employed/ not being employed? [Repeat the scale if not understood]

Are there any points upon which you would like to elaborate? Sometimes scales cannot fully capture experience, so if there are any details which you feel are important, please mention them.

Section 2: Norm perceptions

How do you think the following people in your life feel about married women with children working full-time at an occupation if it is what they want to do? Note the question refers to how they feel in general about working mothers, not how they feel about you specifically.

After discussing these persons' opinions as you see them, you will be asked to select a statement on a scale which summarizes your viewpoint. Scales are a handy way in which to compress a large amount of information into a single statement. This makes comparisons between answers easier. Obviously, categorizing life's experiences into a single statement requires oversimplification. Hopefully, general discussion of your viewpoints will expand upon reasons or experiences which explain the general representative statement you select in the end.

1. How do you think your husband/wife feels about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

Now please examine this scale: notice that it goes from 1 (negative) to 5 (positive) in terms of how one feels about mothers being employed. Select the number which best represents his/her/their viewpoint(s).

It is always wrong (1)----it is usually wrong (2)----no opinion (3)
 ----it is usually okay (4)----it is always okay (5).

2. How do you think your friends feel about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

Based upon your answer, select the scale number which best represents their viewpoint. Notice the scale goes from 1 (negative) to 5 (positive).

3. How do you think your mother feels about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

Based upon your answer, select the scale number which best represents her viewpoint. Notice the scale goes from 1 (negative) to 5 (positive).

4. How do you think your father feels about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

[Repeat scale if necessary]

5. How do you think your supervisor feels about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

6. How do you think your co-workers feel about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

7. How do you think others who are important in your life feel about married women with children working full-time at an occupation? Please specify the relationship of these people to you.

8. How do you think society in general feels about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

9. How do you feel about married women with children working full-time at an occupation?

Section 3: Role involvement

1. A role has been described as expectations that others have about a person based on the things he or she does with his or her time, one's positions. Some examples may include being a mother, cook, PTA member, Little League coach.... Please try to name the roles you/ your wife are presently engaged in.
2. Roles vary in the extent to which they make demands upon you. These demands may be in terms of time, emotions, planning,.... Attempt to combine the various types of demands and rank the roles you just mentioned in terms of how demanding they are upon you. Rank them from most to least demanding.

Now use the following scales to clarify how physically and mentally demanding each role is upon you /your wife. Physical demands are those which require one's physical presence--the amount of time your person spends executing this role. This is the Physical Scale to be used --the role is/has: no physical demands (1)---few physical demands (2)---somewhat physically demanding (3)---highly physically demanding (4).

Mental demands are those which require energy in thinking about the role--worrying, planning, anticipating. This is the Mental Scale to be used--the role is/has: no mental demands (1)---few mental demands (2)---somewhat mentally demanding (3)---highly mentally demanding (4).

Do you understand the distinction between physical and mental demands?
[If not, try to clarify it before using the scales for each role.]

3. Now try to rank those roles in terms of how important you feel each is to your / your wife's self-concept, the internal, psychological priorities of yours / hers.
4. According to you, how does your /your wife's occupation relate in importance to that of your husband yours in terms of financial considerations? Use this scale: always less important to me (1)----usually less important to me (2)----equally important to me (3)----usually more important to me (4)----always more important to me (5). Do you wish to elaborate on anything or do you feel the scale adequately represents your opinion?
5. According to you, how does your /your wife's occupation relate in importance to that of your husband /yours in respect to things other than financial considerations? Use the aforementioned scale [Reread it if necessary.] Do you wish to elaborate on anything or do you feel the scale adequately represents your feelings?
6. Did you /your wife work before having children? IF YES: Was it your intention to stop working upon the birth of your first child?
--If yes: Did you/she intend to sometime rejoin the work force? When?
--How long did you/she stop working upon the birth of your children?
- 7 Have your ideas about the roles and the relative importance of those roles in your /your wife's life changed since your children entered school?
If yes, in what ways? [ASK THIS IF THEY HAVE AT LEAST ONE CHILD IN SCHOOL.]

Section 4 : Career versus Job

1. Do you perceive of your /your wife's occupation as a career or job? Why?

2. Are you employed / Is your wife employed at what you feel to be an appropriate level or job given your / her experience?
--To summarize your opinion, use this scale: The job is: clearly inappropriate (1)----somewhat inappropriate/somewhat appropriate (2)----clearly appropriate (3).
3. Do you feel your / your wife's present position is satisfying those needs which initiated your / her entrance into the work force? Why?
Use this scale to summarize your opinion: The job: satisfies no needs (1)----satisfies some needs (2)----satisfies most needs (3)----satisfies all needs (4).

Note. The present questions were asked of both male and female respondents. When a slash occurs in a question, that noun or pronoun which comes before the slash is read to the wife; that which comes after the slash is presented to the husband.

Appendix F: Introduction and Instructions to Respondents

The focus of this study is upon dual-occupation families. Little research has looked at components of satisfaction with life in general within this growing segment of our population. In the past, employed mothers have been disapproved of by other, more "conscientious" parents. Others frequently commented upon their selfish disregard for their husbands' and childrens' welfare. Some believe this has changed--others believe the pressures and recriminations have just become more subtle. You who are going through the experience are best able to judge the extent and effects of societal norms, beliefs society has about what is good behavior and what is bad.

Thus, the purposes of this study are to discuss: (1) how satisfied you feel with your life in general; (2) components which add to or detract from life satisfaction; (3) internal and external pressures which accompany the two-occupation family.

To this I wish to add a few reassurances. Your responses will be anonymous and confidential. After collecting information, it is your responses which will be examined, not you as individuals. Your answers will be coded and classified by a subject number. Also, neither I nor my assistant will discuss with your spouse that which you say during the interview. If you wish to discuss questions with each other, that is your choice; we will not breach confidences.

We realize we may be touching upon controversial issues to which some have strong opinions. I stress there are no correct or predetermined desirable answers. This study will only be as good as your responses are sincere. Please try to feel comfortable expressing your feelings as honestly and openly as possible.

Appendix G: Closing Statement

Thank-you very much for your participation in this study. Dual-occupation families are the focus of this study. Although this is becoming the predominant lifestyle within our society, few studies have looked at this family structure in any kind of detail. You have added valuable input into the creation of a greater understanding of American family life.

The relationship between work satisfaction and life satisfaction is of particular interest to me. Two types of work satisfaction measures and two life satisfaction measures have been used to capture an accurate assessment of your satisfaction. The question of a relationship between the two is: does one's satisfaction at work influence satisfaction with life in general--that is, if one is satisfied with one's job, will he or she be more likely to be satisfied with life in general?

I am also interested in the extent to which socialization experiences, your perceptions of normative expectations and working mothers' roles have influenced who and what you are. We may be able to more fully understand who will see themselves as possessors of a career. We may also be able to discover more about how the growth of dual-occupation families may be affecting the life, work, (and the relationship between the two) satisfaction of individuals.

Do you have any questions or comments about the study?

Please do not discuss the interview or its contents with your friends, or particularly with your business associates, until my research has been completed. There is a chance that they may also be contacted by us for their participation.

Again, your answers are completely confidential--no responses will be linked with you personally from this time forth. Also, we shall not discuss your answers with your spouse or vice-versa. Should you wish to discuss the interview with each other, feel free.

Thank-you again for sharing your experiences with me. If you later think of any questions concerning the study, or have comments about it, you can reach me through the Psychology Department, Kansas State University.

Appendix H

Multivariate Analysis of the Relationship Between Role Involvement and Work Satisfaction

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F ratio</u>
JDI-SITUATIONAL		
PCT-IMP	.247	F(1,15) = 1.679, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.250	
PCT-JOB	.251	
JDI-PERSONAL		
PCT-IMP	.014	F(1,16) = 0.117, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.016	
PCT-JOB	.021	
General Job		
PCT-IMP	.071	F(1,16) = 1.230, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.168	
PCT-JOB	.187	

Appendix I

Multivariate Analysis of the Relationships Between
Legitimacy and Female Life Satisfaction

Socialization:

<u>Female</u>	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Cantril*		
Father Evaluation	.122	
Mother Evaluation	.158	F(1,14) = .737, p > .05
Self Evaluation	.172	
Maternal Work Status	.174	

Norms: Female

Cantril*		
Norm-US	.080	
Norm-Society	.100	F(1,14) = .527, p > .05
Norm-Friends	.111	
Norm-JOB	.131	

LIFE Satisfaction

Norm-Society	.005	
Norm-JOB	.010	F(1,15) = .060, p > .05
Norm-Friends	.014	
Norm-US	.016	

Norms: Male

Cantril*		
Norm-Society	.125	
Norm-JOB	.143	F(1,14) = 0.0, p > .05
Norm-US	.144	

(Continued)

(Appendix I Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Norms: Male		
LIFE Satisfaction		
Norm-Society	.213	F(1,15) = 2.461, p > .05
Norm-JOB	.367	
Norm-US	.387	
Norm-Friends	.396	
Norm: Female x Male		
Cantril		
Norm-US (F)	.080	F(1,15) = 1.430, p > .05
-US (M)	.092	
-US (F x M)	.222	
Life Satisfaction		
Norm-US (M)	.001	F(1,16) = 0.0, p > .05
-US (F x M)	.001	
Cantril		
Norm-JOB (M)	.033	F(1,15) = .469, p > .05
-JOB (F)	.042	
-JOB (F x M)	.086	
LIFE Satisfaction		
Norm-JOB (M)	.203	F(1,16) = 2.813, p > .05
-JOB (F)	.234	
-JOB (F x M)	.345	

(Continued)

(Appendix I Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Norms: Female x Male		
Cantril		
Norm-Society (M)	.125	F(1,15) = 1.48, p > .05
-Society (F)	.130	
-Society (F x M)	.252	
LIFE Satisfaction		
Norm-Society (M)	.213	F(1,16) = 1.987, p > .05
-Society (F)	.214	
-Society (F x M)	.256	
Cantril		
Norm-Friends (F)	.039	F(1,15) = .383, p > .05
-Friends (M)	.039	
-Friends (F x M)	.071	
LIFE Satisfaction		
Norm-Friends (F)	.004	F(1,16) = 2.277, p > .05
-Friends (M)	.004	
-Friends (F x M)	.299	
Norm-US: Female		
Cantril*		
Spouse	.063	F(1,12) = .282, p > .05
Mother	.073	
Father	.085	
Self	.093	

(Continued)

(Appendix I Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Norm-US: Female		
LIFE Satisfaction		
Spouse	.024	F(1,12) = .555, p > .05
Mother	.068	
Self	.108	
Father	.156	
Norm-US: Male		
Cantril*		
Spouse	.043	F(1,11) = .287, p > .05
Self	.057	
Mother	.075	
Father	.076	
LIFE Satisfaction*		
Spouse	.028	F(1,12) = .254, p > .05
Father	.058	
Self	.062	
Mother	.064	
Norm-JOB: Female		
Cantril		
Supervisor	.029	F(1,15) = .240, p > .05
Coworker	.031	

(Continued)

(Appendix I Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Norm-JOB: Female		
LIFE Satisfaction		
Supervisor	.023	F(1,16) = .184, p > .05
Coworker	.024	
Norm-JOB: Male		
Cantril		
Coworkers	.032	F(1,15) = .374, p > .05
Supervisor	.051	
Life Satisfaction		
Coworkers	.213	F(1,16) = 2.084, p > .05
Supervisor	.217	
<u>Role Involvement: Female</u>		
Cantril		
PCT-IMP	.074	F(1,15) = 2.221, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.307	
PCT-JOB	.308	
LIFE Satisfaction		
PCT-JOB	.070	F(1,16) = .003, p > .05
PCT-IMP	.173	
Role Involvement: Male		
Cantril*		
PCT-IMP	.205	F(1,10) = 1.424, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.249	
PCT-JOB	.299	

(Continued)

(Appendix I Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Role Involvement: Male		
LIFE Satisfaction*		
PCT-IMP	.039	F(1,10) = .588, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.146	
PCT-JOB	.150	
Role Involvement: Female x Male		
Cantril*		
PCT-IMP (M)	.205	F(1,10) = 3.079, p > .05
PCT-IMP (F)	.412	
PCT-IMP (F x M)	.480	
LIFE Satisfaction		
PCT-IMP	.038	F(1,12) = .351, p > .05
PCT-IMP	.050	
PCT-IMP	.082	
Cantril		
PCT-DEM (F)	.060	F(1,12) = .419, p > .05
PCT-DEM (M)	.091	
PCT-DEM (F x M)	.095	
LIFE Satisfaction		
PCT-DEM (F)	.008	F(1,12) = .165, p > .05
PCT-DEM (M)	.009	
PCT-DEM (F x M)	.040	

* R² values may be inflated due to saturation of the equations.

Appendix J

Multivariate Analysis of the Relationship Between Legitimacy and the Work-Life Satisfaction Relationship

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
<u>Socialization: Female</u>		
JOB--LIFE*		
Maternal Work Status	.096	F(1,14) = .647, p > .05
Father Evaluation	.120	
Self Evaluation	.155	
Mother Evaluation	.156	
General Job--Cantril*		
Father Evaluation	.017	F(1,14) = 0.0, p > .05
Self Evaluation	.020	
Mother Evaluation	.023	
<u>Socialization: Male</u>		
Job--Cantril*		
Maternal Work Status	.037	F(1,13) = 0.0, p > .05
Father Evaluation	.144	
Self Evaluation	.148	
JOB-LIFE*		
Father Evaluation	.081	F(1,14) = .620, p > .05
Maternal Work Status	.155	
Mother Evaluation	.163	
Self Evaluation	.171	

(Continued)

(Appendix J Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
<u>Norms: Female</u>		
JOB--Cantril		
Norm-JOB	.280	F(1,13) = 2.040, p > .05
Norm-US	.345	
Norm-Society	.376	
Norm-Friends	.386	
JOB--LIFE*		
Norm-JOB	.154	F(1,14) = 1.810, p > .05
Norm-Society	.302	
Norm-US	.315	
Norm-Friends	.341	
General Job--Cantril*		
Norm-Society	.072	F(1,14) = .581, p > .05
Norm-US	.129	
Norm-Friends	.140	
Norm-JOB	.142	
<u>Norms: Male*</u>		
JOB-Cantril		
Norm-Society	.161	F(1,13) = 1.270, p > .05
Norm-Friends	.202	
Norm-JOB	.256	
Norm-US	.281	

(Continued)

(Appendix J Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Norms: Male*		
General Job--Cantril*		
Norm-Society	.055	F(1,14) = 1.004, p > .05
Norm-Friends	.153	
Norm-JOB	.193	
Norm-US	.223	
Norm-US: Female		
JOB--Life		
Norm-Father	.120	F(1,12) = .768, p > .05
Norm-Self	.173	
Norm-Mother	.211	
Norm-Spouse	.218	
General Job--Cantril*		
Norm-Father	.208	F(1,12) = 1.473, p > .05
Norm-Self	.304	
Norm-Mother	.346	
Norm-Spouse	.349	
Norm-US: Male		
JOB--Cantril*		
Norm-Self	.076	F(1,10) = .827, p > .05
Norm-Father	.118	
Norm-Mother	.192	
Norm-Spouse	.203	

(Continued)

(Appendix J Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Norm-US: Male		
JOB--LIFE*		
Norm-Father	.290	F(1,11) = 2.779, p > .05
Norm-Mother	.364	
Norm-Self	.404	
Norm-Spouse	.442	
Norm-JOB: Female		
JOB--Cantril		
Norm-Coworkers	.192	F(1,14) = 2.929, p > .05
Norm-Supervisor	.295	
JOB--LIFE		
Norm-Coworkers	.156	F(1,15) = 1.513, p > .05
Norm-Supervisor	.168	
General Job--Cantril		
Norm-Supervisor	.072	F(1,15) = .844, p > .05
Norm-Coworker	.101	
Norm-JOB: Male		
JOB--Cantril		
Norm-Coworkers	.051	F(1,14) = .373, p > .05
Norm-Supervisor	.054	
Role Involvement: Female		
JOB--Cantril		
PCT-IMP	.084	F(1,14) = .463, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.089	
PCT-JOB	.090	

(Continued)

(Appendix J Continued)

	<u>Cumulative Multiple R²</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Role Involvement: Female		
JOB--LIFE		
PCT-JOB	.095	F(1,15) = .640, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.110	
PCT-IMP	.114	
General Job--Cantril		
PCT-IMP	.038	F(1,15) = .601, p > .05
PCT-JOB	.080	
PCT-DEM	.107	
Role Involvement: Male		
JOB--Cantril		
PCT-IMP	.026	F(1,9) = .510, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.132	
PCT-JOB	.145	
JOB--LIFE*		
PCT-JOB	.013	F(1,9) = .009, p > .05
PCT-DEM	.075	
General Job--Cantril*		
PCT-DEM	.066	F(1,9) = 3.009, p > .05
PCT-IMP	.449	
PCT-JOB	.474	

* R² values may be inflated due to saturation of the equations.

THE ROLE OF WORK IN THE LIFE SATISFACTION
OF EMPLOYED MOTHERS

by

DEBORA LEE CLOUGH

B.A., North Adams State College, 1979

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1982

The present investigation examined the extent to which a working mother's socialization experiences, perceptions of prevailing norms concerning maternal employment, and current role involvement related to reported work satisfaction, life satisfaction, and discrepancies between work and life satisfactions. Spouse experiences and viewpoints were also expected to relate to reported wife satisfaction(s). Twenty dual-occupation couples provided the previously described information during semi-structured interviewing. Female socialization experiences and work satisfaction-life satisfaction discrepancies related with one another; those describing experiences supporting the mother's work status reported less discrepancy between work and life satisfaction. Unexpectedly, female norm perceptions tended to negatively relate to work satisfaction. Partial support was found for the anticipated relationship between spouse experiences and perceptions and reported wife satisfaction(s). In general, it was concluded that a working mother's experiences and perception (as well as those of her husband) could potentially influence the degree of satisfaction she received from various facets of her life, affecting in addition the extent to which those facets of life relate with one another.