

SEX ROLE ORIENTATION:
ITS POSSIBLE IMPACT ON THE
MARITAL SATISFACTION OF DUAL CAREER COUPLES

by

Suzanne Kenney

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Counselling Psychology)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard.

The University of British Columbia

March 1982

© Suzanne Karen Kenney, 1982

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Counselling Psychology

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date March 20, 1982

Abstract

This study investigated the influence of sex role orientation on the marital satisfaction of dual career couples. The conceptual framework upon which the investigation was based was drawn from literature dealing with role change and symptomatic stresses in the lifestyle of dual career couples.

The sample consisted of 46 dual career couples drawn from a large urban area on the West Coast of Canada.

Three sets of hypotheses were explored, all using marital satisfaction as the dependent variable. The specific hypotheses were as follows: (1) the marital satisfaction of androgynous couples is higher than the marital satisfaction of sex role stereotypic couples in dual career couples; (2) the marital satisfaction of androgynous men is higher than the marital satisfaction of sex role stereotypic men in dual career couples; (3) the marital satisfaction of wives of androgynous men is higher than the marital satisfaction of wives with sex role stereotypic husbands in dual career couples.

The hypotheses were tested by the self administration of two inventories to both members of each couple. Bem's Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) was used to identify sex role orientation and a subscale of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) was used to measure marital satisfaction. An individual was considered androgynous if he or she scored above the median on both masculine and feminine subscales of the BSRI. Androgynous dyads were those couples in which both partners were androgynous. A

female participant was considered sex role stereotypic if she scored above the median on the feminine subscale and below the median on the masculine subscale of the BSRI. The reverse situation applied to male participants. Sex role stereotypic dyads were those couples in which both partners were sex role stereotypic.

To test the hypotheses, the t-test of the difference between means for independent groups was performed. Hypothesis 1 was not sustained suggesting that the marital satisfaction of androgynous couples was not significantly greater than the marital satisfaction of stereotyped couples. Support was obtained for Hypotheses 2 and 3 at the .05 level of significance. These results suggest that the marital satisfaction of the androgynous male was significantly higher than the marital satisfaction of a sex role stereotypic male. In addition, the hypothesis that the marital satisfaction of the wives of androgynous husbands was higher than the marital satisfaction of wives of sex role stereotypic husbands was supported. In the supplementary analysis, Pearson r correlation coefficients were used to explore the relationship between typologies on the BSRI and the scores and subscores on the DAS.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	ii
List of Tables	vi
Acknowledgements	viii
 CHAPTER ONE	
Introduction	1
General Statement of the Problem	1
Significance of the Study	3
Definitions of Key Terms	6
Limitations	8
Overview of the Study	8
 CHAPTER TWO	
Review of the Literature	9
Introduction	9
Changing Roles: The Shift From a Traditional to an Egalitarian Orientation	10
Factors Influencing the Maintenance or Rejection of Traditional Roles	11
Difficulties Inherent in the Transition	12
Symptomatic Stresses	14
Models for Change	18
Strategies for Implementing Change	20
Androgyny: A Flexible Alternative	22
Conclusion	23

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology	26
Sample	26
Instruments	30
Bem Sex-Role Inventory	30
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	36
Data Collection	39
Data Analysis	40

CHAPTER FOUR

Results	45
Statistical Analyses of Hypotheses	45
Supplementary Analyses	48
Summary of Results	54

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Discussion and Implications	56
Summary	56
Discussion of Findings	58
Discussion of Supplementary Analysis	62
Methodological Limitations	64
Implications and Suggestions for Future Research	65
Conclusions	67
Bibliography	69
APPENDIX A: Family Background Sheet	73
APPENDIX B: Bem Sex-Role Inventory	77
APPENDIX C: Dyadic Adjustment Scale	80
APPENDIX D: Letter of Transmittal	85

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Married Women's Participation in the Labour Force in Canada, in Accordance With Educational Level Attained	1
Table 2: Frequency (Percent) Distributions of Experimental Subjects Within Various Categories	28
Table 3: Classification of Respondents	33
Table 4: Division of Couples Into Categories According to Their Sex Role Orientation	42
Table 5: Significance of the Difference Between Means for Androgynous and Sex Role Stereotypic Couples on Scores of Marital Satisfaction Using a t-Test .	46
Table 6: Significance of the Difference Between Means for Androgynous Males and Sex Role Stereotypic Males on Scores of Marital Satisfaction Using a t-Test	47
Table 7: Significance of the Difference Between Means for Wives of Androgynous and Sex Role Stereo- typic Men in Scores of Marital Satisfaction Using a t-Test	48
Table 8: Pearson r Correlation Coefficients for Scale and Subscale Scores: Averaged Scores for Couples (n = 46)	49

Table 9:	Pearson r Correlation Coefficient for Scale	
	and Subscale Scores: Female Scores ($n = 46$) . . .	51
Table 10:	Pearson r Correlation Coefficient for Scale	
	and Subscale Scores: Male Scores	53

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my thanks to my thesis committee. My chairperson, Dr. John Friesen, who acted as both my research and clinical advisor, has offered me sincere support and encouragement in my professional development as a clinician and researcher. Dr. Harold Ratzlaff has taught me all I know about statistics and patiently contended with my anxiety about "numbers." Although Dr. Sharon Kahn was on sabbatical during the latter stages of my thesis, I appreciated her assistance during the preliminary stages of my research.

To the dual career couples who participated in my research, I am extremely appreciative. Needless to say, their contribution was the essence of this thesis. To Paul, my partner in a dual career marriage, I am especially thankful for his ongoing support throughout the creative process of my completing a graduate degree.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The structure of the family is being reshaped by dual career couples who no longer view the traditional marital arrangement as viable. The husband as breadwinner and the wife as homemaker no longer represent the stereotypic norm as increasing numbers of married women become members of the labour force. This change would suggest a redefinition of sex role behaviours within the marital dyad with a new formula required for distributing the division of labour. A shift from a traditional to an egalitarian relationship seems imminent.

General Statement of the Problem

Dual career couples of today have been socialized within a value system that has endorsed a traditional relationship between husbands and wives. Few egalitarian role models have existed for these social innovators. Rather than seeking out more adaptive behaviours to meet their needs, dual career couples have reverted to known sex role stereotypic behaviour. A rigid definition of what is appropriate male or female roles is juxtaposed onto a lifestyle that requires the flexible sharing of tasks. Attempts by these social innovators to experiment with cross sex behaviour is often met by scorn and ridicule.

A sense of bucking the system confronts dual career couples and reverting to traditional divisions of labour seems to represent the most socially accepted alternative. Thus the working wife continues to

assume the role of homemaker in addition to maintaining her position as a breadwinner. An underlying resentment accompanies this demanding dual task; and although husbands are quick to support the notion of equality, congruence may not exist between what husbands announce as their belief system and how much time they are prepared to put into household tasks. Thus egalitarianism, although espoused as a theoretical ideal, appears to fall short of being an empirical reality.

The homeostasis of the family system is in a state of imbalance with old traditional divisions of labour no longer suitable for the new demands of dual career couples. The resulting dissonance is manifested in the often described stresses of the dual career couple, for example, overload, environmental sanctions, multiple role cycling, etc. (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1978). The thrust of the present investigation is to examine an underlying factor that may influence the degree to which dual career couples are able to alleviate these stresses. This process involves looking beyond the symptomatic stresses and examining the influence of sex role orientation on the marital satisfaction of dual career couples. Perhaps such an exploration can contribute to an understanding of how an obsolete traditional division of labour can be abandoned and how the restructuring of the family system can begin.

Restructuring the family system is not easy because of its resistance to change. Laws do not exist to sanction equality within the privacy of the marital dyad nor are marital dynamics monitored to ensure that an equitable division of labour actually exists. In this respect, the occupational sphere is further ahead in demonstrating egalitarian-

ism. The evolution of the family will be a longer, more painful process. Changes in the intimate interactions between husbands and wives will require a more thorough remapping of sex role orientations than has been required in the workplace. The struggle to achieve egalitarianism is a difficult one when dual career couples are required to make the changes from within rather than being forced to do so by legislation.

Significance of the Study

The interpersonal dynamics of dual career couples represent a new stage in the evolution of the family; and, as such, their relationship becomes a rich testing ground for observing how change occurs. Although dual career couples have existed in the past, the consideration of their lifestyle as a viable alternative is recent. Their increasing numbers are demanding attention.

The dynamics of dual career marriages may provide the connecting link between what was (traditional) and what will be (egalitarian). In a sense, they are pioneers for families of tomorrow, and may contribute to the creation of a new hybrid species, one in which men and women will hopefully be freed to explore all of their capabilities rather than being restricted to what has been called gender appropriate. The stresses that accompany this transition may be perceived as being related to the newness of this social pattern rather than being inherent to the lifestyle itself (Holmstrom, 1972).

The dual career couple arrangement, although seen for some time as a variant lifestyle, is becoming more and more evident as a viable alternative. As economic and ideological factors contribute to women's

returning and remaining in the workplace, the problems inherent to the dual career lifestyle will demand more attention. Institutional changes are in evidence as can be seen in the expansion of day care facilities and the pressure for more flexible time schedules. Politically numbers talk and the voices of dual career couples will be attended to as they comprise a growing proportion of the labour force.

In 1977, 44.1% of married women were in the work force in Canada (Women's Bureau, 1977); and, if the present growing trend continues, the percentage will undoubtedly increase. This percentage represents a marked increase over the 1967 rate of 28.3%. These figures tend to debunk the myth of the traditional system as representing the national norm. Interestingly, the likelihood of women opting for participation in the labour force tends to increase with their educational level with the 1976 Census providing confirmatory data (see Table 1).

The recognition of the dual career couple's impact on social change is being seen. Family theorists are beginning to conceptualize new stages in the family life cycle as the existing frameworks become anachronistic. Counselling strategies are being revised to accommodate the new and different demands of the dual career couple. Role theorists are already replacing rigid definitions of what are stereotypically male and female behaviours with the broader concept of androgyny.

The lifestyle of dual career couples is receiving a lot of attention in both professional journals and the popular press. The tendency of researchers has been to focus their attention on the stresses inherent to the lifestyle. These stresses, however, are merely symptomatic

Table 1

Married Women's Participation in the Labour Force in Canada
in Accordance With Educational Level Attained*

Educational Level Attained:	Less Than Grade 9	9-10	11	12-13	Post Secondary Not University	Some University	University Degree
Participation in the Labour Force (percentage)	29.0	39.5	45.0	50.5	53.5	58.0	64.0

* Female population 15 years and over in occupies private dwellings in which the women are married and the husband is present in the home. Included in the percentages given are women with and without children.

From: Census of Canada. Labour Force Activity by Marital Status, Age and Sex, Catalogue 94-805, Bulletin 5.6. Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, 1978.

of underlying issues. As discussed above, this investigation addressed the underlying issue of sex role orientation and its effect on the marital satisfaction of these social innovators. The specific questions being addressed were:

1. Is the marital satisfaction of androgynous couples higher than the marital satisfaction of sex role stereotypic couples in dual career couples?
2. Is the marital satisfaction of androgynous men higher than the marital satisfaction of sex role stereotypic men in dual career couples?
3. Is the marital satisfaction of wives with androgynous husbands higher than the marital satisfaction of wives with sex role stereotypic husbands in dual career couples?

Definition of Key Terms

Several terms will be mentioned in this thesis whose definitions are being provided to facilitate the reader's understanding of the study.

Dual career couples:	Marital dyads in which both partners are employed on a full time basis, i.e., forty hours per week.
----------------------	---

Androgynous individuals:	<p>Individuals who report that they enjoy the freedom to engage in whatever behaviours are situationally appropriate regardless of gender role prescriptions. These individuals are identified as being androgynous on Bem's Sex Role Inventory, i.e., they would register high masculine-high feminine scores.</p>
--------------------------	---

Androgynous couples:	Couples in which both partners are identified as being androgynous on Bem's Sex Role Inventory, i.e., both partners will register high masculine--high feminine scores.
Sex role stereotypic individuals:	Individuals who report a high degree of either stereotypic masculine or feminine traits with a low degree of the opposite, with the behaviour being gender appropriate.
Cross sex behaviours:	Behaviours demonstrated by women that have traditionally been labelled masculine and vice versa.
Marital satisfaction:	An ever changing process with a qualitative dimension which can be evaluated at any point on a continuum from very satisfied to dissatisfied (Spanier, 1976).
Flexible:	Androgynous behaviours.
Inflexible:	Sex role stereotypic behaviour which restricts individuals from exploring opposite sex behaviours.
Feminine:	An adjective to describe behaviour that is traditionally associated with women.
Masculine:	An adjective to describe behaviour that is traditionally associated with men.
Traditional relationships:	Relationships in which the partners have adopted sex role stereotypic behaviours.

Egalitarian relationships: Relationships in which there are two jobs for the wife and two jobs for the husband, i.e., the joint allocation of tasks as homemaker and breadwinner is shared.

Limitations

The participants in this study were not randomly selected; therefore, the results may only be considered relevant to the subjects studied and may not be generalizable to other dual career couples. Results are further limited by the canvassing of a volunteer sample, a sample that may have a response set that differs from an involuntary population.

Overview of the Study

An introduction of the study has been presented in Chapter One. The conceptual foundation for this research is provided in Chapter Two, which contains a review of the relevant literature. This chapter concludes by stating the research hypotheses. Chapter Three outlines the methodology of the study and will be followed in Chapter Four and Five by a presentation of the results and a discussion of the implications arising out of these findings as well as suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The structure of the modern family is being stretched and reshaped to accommodate many new, alternate life styles. An examination of the impact of this process is not an easy task because as Rapoport and Rapoport (1975) explain the private life of a family is so intractable. Intimate relationships are deeply rooted in personal history and difficult to subject to governmental regulations.

In Chaffee's (1940) portrayal of the family, the institutional aspects represent a cell wall which encapsulates the dynamic protoplasm within and protects the private aspects of the family from scrutiny. Group expectations and controls are reflected in this protective covering and give the family a certain rigidity. Chaffee describes the internal, private aspects as the exciting idiosyncratic part of the family that is determined by the habits and dispositions of its members and the roles they assume.

As the dynamic elements within exert pressure, the institutional shell begins to crack and the gradual reshaping of the family occurs. One manifestation of this process is reflected in the creation of the dual career marriage as a viable alternative to the more traditional option of the man as breadwinner, and the woman as homemaker. This cracking of the shell cannot take place without trauma and thus dual career couples, as social innovators, are confronted with the pain of

redesigning their modern marriage.

From Chaffee's (1940) viewpoint, the difficulties of these social innovators are seen as transitional and the restoration of balance would be expected as they move through a stage in social evolution toward a more symmetrical arrangement (Bailyn, 1978). If, on the other hand, the redesigning of the modern marriage is viewed from a sociobiological perspective, as espoused by Lionel Tiger, attempts to cope with the present predicament are futile. Balance will not be regained until women return once again to their proper role as homemakers, and men as breadwinners (Bailyn, 1978).

Changing Roles: The Shift from a Traditional to an Egalitarian Orientation

The emergence of a dual career relationship would suggest the corresponding adoption of an egalitarian ideology within the marital dyad. However, the couples studied by Holmstrom (1972) were a long way from equality although they deviated a great deal from traditional norms. Poloma (1971) describes egalitarianism as a myth with only one woman out of fifty-three cases in her study reporting an egalitarian status. Gronseth (1978) supports the myth of egalitarianism in describing the double role, overworked, employed housewife as the rule rather than the exception.

As suggested by Richardson (1979), the traditional relationship with its high segregation serves to eliminate any competition between husband and wife that might contribute to marital discord and endorses male supremacy. This segregation of roles creates a static situation

which impairs alterations as life situations change (Bailyn, 1978). For dual career couples, this rigidity is problematic in a relationship that requires flexibility. In a sense, the retention of traditional guidelines in dual career couples juxtaposes an outmoded framework on a new, constantly shifting lifestyle.

Factors Influencing the Maintenance or Rejection of Traditional Roles

Svinovacz (1977) attributes the degree of joint versus high segregation of tasks to the role expectation of each family member as well as previous role patterns in the families of origin. The normative orientation of the couple's social network and the availability of sources of support are also considerations.

Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) report that families moving from well integrated urban working class neighbourhoods to new individualistic housing developments in suburban areas are more likely to be freed from traditionally defined sex types and new patterns of sharing emerge. Androgynous parents in Defrain's (1979) study reported that role models, the Women's Liberation Movement, caring for children before their own were born and earlier experience running a household were factors that enabled them to jointly participate in parental responsibility. In Haas' sample (1978), the achievement of an egalitarian relationship was based on the pursuit of goals that could not be reached through a traditional role model as well as detachment from sources of traditional norms such as parents and religion. Few of the traditional barriers to an egalitarian arrangement existed, for example, inflexible jobs, lack

of adequate day care; and support was provided by role sharing friends within a liberal community.

Facilitating husbands contributed to the successful running of egalitarian households in Rapoport and Rapoport's (1973) study of dual career couples. They provided moral support and approved of their wives working. They felt that they must make their families ideal models and did all possible to help their wives. Assisting wives with problems at work, equal sharing of domestic tasks, giving wives a job or introducing them to clients were examples of various ways in which the husbands helped. The family benefited by experiencing financial comfort and security. Moreover, the family environment was enriched and children gained increased independence.

Additional advantages of choosing an egalitarian life style (Haas, 1978) were reflected in an increase in the spouses' self development as well as improved husband-wife and parent-child relations. The women gained leisure time and experienced greater economic independence. The men became more self sufficient around the house.

Difficulties Inherent in the Transition

The conditions outlined above give some indication of what factors may influence the attainment of an egalitarian ideology within a dual career couple. However, this principle of equal sharing is not accomplished without difficulty. According to Bailyn (1978) more energy is required than with the role designated alternative because the guidelines are not implicit. In a sense, the dual career couples who opt for

an egalitarian relationship, are engaging in an experiment with social change. They are working out patterns of living together that are without clear precedent (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969).

Parolius (1975) suggests that many women will experience considerable anxiety as they are caught between conflicting definitions of appropriate sex role behaviour. The women she surveyed perceived that men wanted traditional females and were caught in the bind of having attitudes that they believed men would reject. The women in Arnott's (1972) study attempted to maintain congruence between their role behaviours, and the role preference of their husband in the following ways. Conservative women tended to do so by self deception and adjustment, moderates through self deception and expectation of marital adjustment and liberals through tolerance in anticipation of change.

The process of change may be lengthy and painful since behaviour change often lags behind attitude as situational variables exert greater pressure on behaviour than attitude, and hampers the dual career couple's transition into a true egalitarian partnership. Egalitarian behaviour will continue to lag behind until both women's self image and the societal image of women changes. In the meantime, the couples will continue to experience the stresses that are symptomatic of placing an outmoded traditional framework on a relationship that required flexibility.

Symptomatic Stresses

Dual career couples, by departing from traditional patterns, encounter a variety of resistances, from practical timetabling difficulties to problems associated with critical attitudes toward them

(Rapoport and Rapoport, 1978). Five categories of stress described by Rapoport and Rapoport are: Overload, Environmental Sanctions, Personal Identity and Self Expression, Social Network Dilemma and Multiple Role Cycling.

1. Overload. There is considerable strain associated with both partners sustaining demanding occupational roles (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969). Each look to one another for support which is not always available due to conflicting demands. Moreover, there is a certain amount of psychic strain involved in placing high importance in two major areas of life, namely, home and work. With no wife to do back-up work at home, domestic tasks have to be either redistributed or neglected.

2. Environmental Sanctions. Rapoport and Rapoport (1975) report that in the workplace, women are caught in the expressiveness versus instrumentality dilemma. Women fear being expressive because it has been equated with non-instrumentality, and cited as a feminine quality that interferes with production. Holmstrom (1972), in interviewing dual career couples, described other issues that arise. Employers expect employees regardless of their sex to subordinate their family activities to work demands. Few options exist for employees to work less than full time and interrupted work histories are looked upon suspiciously. Mobility is an expected part of business with family members expected to follow without question. Moreover, for certain jobs, two people are expected to be available to fulfill the duties associated with one job, for example, the salesperson who must entertain prospective clients.

In the community, working women encounter inequality of role designation (Bryson and Bryson, 1977) which is reflected in the assumption that the professional woman should have as large a community oriented life as non-working women. The dual career couple are placed in a position of deciding how much energy they are prepared to exert into restructuring their relationships with these social institutions or less formal groups and networks. They seem to have two options: become self reliant or move toward total compliance with the expectations of others (Bryson and Bryson, 1971).

3. Personal Identity and Self Expression. According to Rapoport and Rapoport (1971), dual career couples of today have been socialized in values of thirty years ago. As the husband and wife depart from the standard pattern of behaviour, with the wife as homemaker and the husband as breadwinner, the wife, in particular, may be defensive about following her chosen career. When individuals are pushed into a pattern which is too discrepant with their sense of a personal identity, defensive behaviour begins to develop. Each person has a tension line beyond which it becomes difficult to step, and compromises need to be worked out within the framework of this line.

The discrepancy between personal and social norms may be resolved but the dilemma may be reactivated at critical transition points either in the family or career life cycle of either partner. The birth of the first child may create pressure for the woman to remain at home, or a job prospect for the man may cause him to feel that his wife should follow, of course.

Simply stated, as the couple reshape their life style, they are opting to deviate from the sociocultural definition of work and family (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969). In addition to fighting societal expectations, they must also contend with their own internalized self concept as husband provider-father and wife-mother. Deviation from these roles often brings criticism and pressure from those close to them (Safilios-Rothschild and Dijkers, 1978).

4. Social Network Dilemma. According to Rapoport and Rapoport (1969), the potential friendship pool for the dual working couple differs from that of the traditional couple. Friends from the wife's working environment are most prominent in that other working women provide environmental support to sustain the dual career couple pattern. Neighbourhood contacts are often inappropriate because the working wife has little in common with her non-working neighbours. Wives of husband's colleagues fall into the same category. Kin relationships decrease except when there are clear responsibilities or compatibilities, for example, Grandma may be the surrogate parent. The couple's divergence from expected norms can cause tension to arise between them and their kind. There is a tendency to form friendships on a couple basis.

5. Multiple Role Cycling. Hall and Hall (1979) discuss the problems related to the couples' synchronizing the career cycle with the family life cycle:

Career Cycle

- (1) Exploration and Trial
- (2) Getting Established and
Advancing
- (3) Midcareer
- (4) Late Career

Family Life Cycle

- (1) The Couple
- (2) Expanding Circle
- (3) Peak Period
- (4) Full House
- (5) Shrinking Circle
- (6) Empty Nest

In a conventional marriage, the husband's position on the career trajectory is the major concern, with the family life cycle fitting in accordingly. However, when two people are moving through the career life cycle, complications arise, for example, conflict can be generated in the relationship between a person in midcareer and one in early career. They are at different places on the career trajectory with one still in the take-off stage while the other has begun to level in terms of work involvement (Hall and Hall, 1979). This problem is symptomatic of the woman returning to work after an interrupted work history.

Ramifications of the Stresses

The most obvious ramifications are divorce or the wife's relinquishing her career (Holmstrom, 1972). The third theoretical possibility is the husband's relinquishing his career although this is an empirical rarity. A more multi-faceted adjustment to each other with two outside jobs clicking with two inside ones (Young and Willmott, 1973) will add pressure to the marital dyad. Moreover, financial independence will facilitate the distressed couples' withdrawal from marriage. However,

Coser and Rokoff (1971) suggest that a high degree of interdependence between home and work, with partners creating substantial commitment to each other, militates against divorce and separation.

Tension will result because of the unsatisfactory resolution of the dissonance between ideals and behaviour (Bebbington, 1973) and resentments will arise. Some men will feel threatened and some women guilty (Hall and Hall, 1979) with hostility being pent up and resentments building when the relationship is not equitable. The majority of dual career relationships will continue to be tarnished by resentment until the couples move along the continuum of social evolution from their present coping stage to a creative adaptation phase.

Models for Change

According to Holmstrom (1972), the change taking place within the family may be viewed from a pluralist, assimilationist or hybrid perspective. Pluralists support the continuation of marked differences between groups whereas assimilationists aspire to have minority groups lose their distinct characteristics and become absorbed into the mainstream of society. The hybrid option changes both the dominant and minority group. This model can be compared to the retention of traditional values versus the adoption of male characteristics versus the implementation of an androgynous arrangement.

Scanzoni's (1979) strategies for changing men's family roles present another viewpoint of the dilemma of changing to an egalitarian ideology. In his conflict perspective, women are seen as the oppressed

group wanting change whereas the dominant male group resists. This is similar to the pluralist typology described above. In the altruistic strategy, men are expected to change because it is just and moral. In the self interest category, men are encouraged to change because they would be better off. To facilitate change, Scanzoni suggests the flexible use of all three strategies at the appropriate time.

Regardless of the perspective through which change is viewed, Rossi (1964) comments that unlike any other type of social inequality, sex is the only instance in which the subjugated group lives in more intimate association with its oppressor than with other members of its group. Therefore, it would appear that shifting from the present way of coping to an egalitarian division of labour is not going to be an easy task unless the oppressor and the oppressed cooperate. The task of modifying the present situation will involve eliminating or modifying both the situations that are causing stresses as well as the couple's way of responding (Hall and Hall, 1979).

The movement from a submissive-dominant arrangement (traditional) to an interdependent relationship (egalitarian) in which more symmetrical family needs are activated, requires that men and women become able to see previously forbidden parts of themselves (Berger, 1979) and expand their definitions of what is deemed appropriate masculine and feminine behaviour. Two adequate self sufficient adults will learn that the giving goes both ways and look for a balance--an equilibrium that is flexible enough to allow for shifts in situations of stress (Cohen, 1974). This balance of interdependence rather than the imbalance of a

traditional relationship (Arnott, 1972) suggests, takes pressure off the nuclear family and reduces pressures which have led to increased marital and family problems in past years.

Strategies for Implementing Change

1. Structural and Personal Role Redefinition. Katz (1978) suggests that a structural role redefinition is required which involves delegating responsibility to others or negotiating with senders about expectation. In addition, her personal role redefinition strategy necessitates prioritizing role obligation which may require a re-evaluation of existing values. Katz found that women from non-traditional upbringings were significantly more likely to choose the effective strategies just described whereas women from traditional backgrounds were more likely to choose the super mom method, namely, taking on two jobs as homemaker and breadwinner, overloading themselves rather than sharing the burden with husbands.

2. An Explicit Division of Labour. Despite a preference for a more egalitarian pattern (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1976), the conventional model will continue to be reasserted during stressful periods. Therefore with western ideology offering little support for the dual career egalitarian pattern, Gowler and Legge (1978) suggest that couples need to make explicit many of the assumptions and expectations each partner holds so that under the pressure of overload the couple does not revert to an asymmetrical pattern, or alternatively, the dissolution of the relationship. Gowler and Legge go on to say that the couples need to

make explicit what mutual rights and obligations both partners think they should have in relation to a specific issue. Secondly, they need to determine what they think they can practically undertake. The resulting division of labour, possibly made explicit in a written contract, may be more logically based on pragmatic reasons such as availability of time, skill, interest and enjoyment rather than on traditional presumptions (Holmstrom, 1972).

3. Segmenting Work and Home Life. Within the marital dyad, couples are segmenting their work and home life by strengthening the boundaries between familial and occupational responsibilities. Alternatively, couples are opting for an independent relationship in which each follows his or her optimal career path and the couple adapts to the consequences that ensue.

4. Recycling Stages. Couples are also recycling stages in work and family events, for example, couples are waiting until their mid-30's to have their first child at a time when both are securely established in their respective careers (Bailyn, 1978).

5. Occupational Mobility. Holmstrom (1972) recommends that couples embarking upon a dual career relationship are better off when both have occupational mobility, namely, can practise their trade in a wide variety of places, for example, a free lance writer rather than a sanskrit specialist.

6. Institutional Changes. Institutionally, the dual career couples may lobby for changes in procedures, for example, more flexibility in work schedules, improved day care facilities (Defrain, 1979;

Berger, 1978); better paying part time jobs with adequate fringe benefits, jobsharing arrangements (Defrain, 1979; Bailyn, 1978; Arkin and Dobrofsky, 1978).

The dual career couples seem to be making changes from the inside-out (redefinition of roles) and outside-in (lobbying for institutional changes) in their attempt to establish a place for themselves in a social fabric that has different designs for their living. The process may be facilitated by letting go of masculine and feminine stereotypic behaviour and adopting an androgynous orientation that allows for increased flexibility.

Androgyny: A Flexible Alternative

In examining the stresses and coping strategies of dual career couples, the underlying assumption exists that the narrower the band of behaviour a couple considers 'manly' or 'womanly', the fewer will be their options in meeting the demands of their lifestyle (Weingarten, 1978; Holmstrom, 1972). Weingarten suggests that a belief in androgyny is helpful.

Androgyny has been defined by Bem (1976) as a condition in which "a person would have no need to limit his or her behaviors to those traditionally defined as 'sex appropriate' but would have the psychological freedom to engage in whatever behavior seemed most effective at the moment, irrespective of its stereotype as masculine or feminine" (p. 48). To Downing (1979) androgyny is manifested in situationally appropriate behaviour and flexibility which reflects a state of psychological health.

The androgynous individual is presumed to engage in cross sex behaviours without dissonance and empirical studies have undertaken to demonstrate this. For example, Bem (1976) hypothesized that sex typed individuals would actively prefer sex appropriate activities and resist sex inappropriate activities. This would persist even in a situation when their preference would incur some cost. In addition Bem hypothesized that sex typed individuals would experience discomfort if they did attempt to participate in cross sex behaviour.

Conclusion

As dual career couples engage in cross sex activities that may be required by their demanding life style, role conflict often emerges. Women tend to make the transition more easily in that they have more to gain. For husbands, there seems to be liabilities. Husbands of working women report greater job pressure and dissatisfaction with their jobs, marriages and various aspects of their lives. They report poorer psychological and physical health than their counterparts who are in traditional relationships (Burke and Weir, 1976). As husbands become involved in cross sex activities, they lose their active support system and take on what was once considered women's work. The husbands are also called upon to play a supportive role for their wives and their central position is eroded. Their relative lack of preparedness for crossing traditional sex roles may go as far as to contribute to severe identity problems. This transition, however, will seemingly be easier for men who are androgynous as may be manifested by their experiencing

greater marital satisfaction. Similarly, androgynous dual career couples may experience a higher degree of marital satisfaction than their traditional counterparts in that their role flexibility would enable them to handle more effectively the variety of demands that are inherent to their lifestyle.

Goldstein's hypothesis (1978), in her study of one hundred and twenty-six dual career couples, was that the marital satisfaction of wives in androgynous dyads would be greater than the marital satisfaction of wives in non-androgynous dyads. She suggested that couples in which both members were willing and able to perform both instrumental (masculine) and expressive (feminine) behaviour would most likely be adaptive to the dual career life pattern and the wives would more likely be satisfied with their marriages. This hypothesis was supported.

In Goldstein's analysis of her study, she comments that given the fact that time management and home responsibility have been identified as key areas contributing to the role strain experienced by dual career wives (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971), it is quite possible that task sharing is a major factor related to the difference in marital satisfaction between wives in androgynous dyads and wives in non-androgynous dyads. Also, the emotional adaptability of integrating both instrumental and expressive characteristics may enable androgynous dyads to support the emotional needs of their spouse more successfully.

Goldstein also hypothesized that the more androgynous, the more liberal and the less job involved the husbands are, the greater the marital satisfaction of the wives would be. The hypothesis was sus-

tained. The same logic can be applied to the analysis of this hypothesis as the one outlined above, namely, that an androgynous husband would provide flexible task sharing behaviour as well as emotional support to his wife. The psychological support resulting from the emotional adaptability that androgynous husbands can offer seems to increase the wives chances for marital satisfaction.

Using Bem's Sex Role Inventory and the Marital Satisfaction Subscale of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale the following hypotheses were tested in this investigation:

1. The marital satisfaction of androgynous couples will be higher than the marital satisfaction of sex role stereotypic couples in dual career couples.
2. The marital satisfaction of androgynous men will be higher than the marital satisfaction of sex role stereotypic men in dual career couples.
3. The marital satisfaction of wives of androgynous men will be higher than the marital satisfaction of wives with sex role stereotypic husbands in dual career couples.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This chapter presents the research design of this investigation including the selection and characteristics of the sample, the instruments used to measure the variables, and the procedures utilized in data gathering and analysis.

Sample

The participants in this study were forty-six dual career couples where both partners were working full time. Restrictions based on type of occupation, duration of marriage, length of work history, age, number of children, etc., were not applied in order to promote heterogeneity within the sample. The couples were sampled from a large urban area on the Canadian West Coast and were voluntary participants.

The volunteer couples for this study were obtained in a variety of ways. A women's professional group was approached and a request made for volunteers. The researcher also made contact with acquaintances and asked them to suggest couples who might volunteer their time. In addition, students were approached in a graduate programme at the university. None of the participants were known to the researcher.

Basic demographic data, obtained by means of a Background Information Sheet (Appendix A), are summarized in Table 2. Inspection of the table reveals that the largest percentage of both female and male participants in any single category fell into the 30-39 year age range

(48 and 52 percent respectively). This group of subjects may have combined those couples who had become well established in their careers through an early career start as well as those who may have begun their careers in their late twenties or early thirties after a prolonged period of education. This second possibility is supported by the percentage of both female (37%) and male (47%) participants who had post graduate education. Seventy-four percent of the couples had been married for ten years or less suggesting that possibly the adjustment phase of marriage was still in progress particularly for the nineteen couples (41%) who had been married for less than five years. Possibly the initial stresses of adjustment were exacerbating the difficulties that may have been related to the dual career lifestyle.

Twenty-six couples (56%) had children as compared to twenty couples (44%) who did not which provided a good representation of families with and without children. The largest percentage of couples in any single category (39%) reported that their approximate joint income was more than \$49,999.00 suggesting that participants could afford to hire employees to help with child care and household tasks; however, only ten of the twenty-six couples with children (38%) had child care assistance. The necessity of having child care assistance would be dependent on the age of the children, information that was not requested in the questionnaire. Sixteen couples (35%) had assistance with household tasks.

In the occupational category, the highest percentage of participants fell into the professional category, twenty women (43%) and eighteen men (39%) respectively. The men in this sample had a longer work

Table 2

Frequency (Percent) Distributions of Experimental
Subjects Within Various Categories

		<u>n</u>	Under <u>30</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	Over <u>60</u>		
<u>Age</u>	Wives:	46	15(33)	22(48)	8(17)	1(2)	0		
	Husbands:	46	5(11)	24(52)	15(33)	2(4)	0		
	Total	92	20(22)	46(50)	23(25)	3(3)	0		
<hr/>									
		<u>n</u>	High School	Univer- sity	Post Grad- uate	Tech- nical			
<u>Education</u>	Wives:	46	7(15)	14(31)	17(37)	8(17)			
	Husbands:	46	5(11)	14(31)	22(47)	5(11)			
	Total	92	12(13)	28(31)	39(42)	14(14)			
<hr/>									
		<u>n</u>	Less Than <u>5 yrs.</u>	<u>5-10</u> Years	<u>11-15</u> Years	<u>16-20</u> Years	<u>21-25</u> Years	More Than <u>25 yrs.</u>	
<u>Years Married</u>		46	19(41)	14(31)	4(9)	6(13)	2(4)	1(2)	
<hr/>									
		<u>n</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	More Than <u>3</u>		
<u>Number of Children</u>		46	20(44)	8(17)	7(15)	6(13)	5(11)		
<hr/>									
		<u>n</u>	Less Than <u>19,999</u>	20,000 to <u>29,999</u>	30,000 to <u>39,999</u>	40,000 to <u>49,999</u>	More Than <u>49,999</u>		
<u>Approximate Joint Income</u>		46	3(6.5)	3(6.5)	10(22)	12(26)	18(39)		
<hr/>									
		<u>n</u>	Profes- sional	Sales	Office Work	Mana- ger	Tech- nical	Stu- dent	Other
<u>Occupation</u>	Wives:	46	20(43)	3(6.5)	9(19.5)	4(9)	4(9)	4(9)	2(4)
	Husbands:	46	18(39)	2(4)	9(19.5)	3(7)	9(19.5)	4(9)	1(2)
	Total	92	38(41)	5(5)	18(20)	7(8)	13(14)	8(9)	3(3)

		<u>n</u>	<u>1-5</u>	<u>6-10</u>	<u>11-15</u>	<u>16-20</u>	<u>21-25</u>	<u>More Than 25</u>
<u>Years</u>	Wives:	46	16(35)	14(30)	9(20)	5(11)	2(4)	0
<u>Employed</u>	Husbands:	46	8(17)	13(28)	5(11)	15(33)	3(7)	2(4)
	Total	92	24(26)	27(29)	14(15)	20(22)	5(5.5)	2(2)

		<u>n</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6-11 Months</u>	<u>1-5 Years</u>	<u>6-10 Years</u>	<u>11-15 Years</u>	<u>More Than 15 Years</u>
<u>Time</u>	Wives:	46	32(70)	1(2)	5(11)	7(15)	1(2)	0
<u>Remaining</u>	Husbands:	46	38(93)	4(9)	3(6)	1(2)	0	0
<u>at Home</u>								
<u>While Spouse</u>								
<u>Worked</u>	Total	92	70(76)	5(5)	8(9)	8(9)	1(1)	0

history with the largest number, 15 (33%) checking the 16-20 year category as compared to the sixteen women (35%) who checked category 1-5 years. The shorter working history of some of the women may have reflected the tendency for some women to remain at home while their children are young. This possibility was supported with 12 women in comparison to only 4 men reporting that they remained at home from 1-15 years while their spouses worked.

In summary, the sample used in this study tended to be a group of professional couples who were under the age of forty and married less than ten years with a joint income in the \$49,999.00 plus range. There was a mixture of families with and without children. This sample seems representative of couples who are on the evolutionary edge of change without having adequate role models.

Instruments

BEM'S SEX ROLE INVENTORY (B.S.R.I.)

Bem's Sex Role Inventory (B.S.R.I.) (Appendix B) was used to categorize the respondents into four types:

- (1) sex role stereotypic
- (2) sex reversed
- (3) androgynous
- (4) undifferentiated

The further assignment of couples into groups will be described in the section on Data Analysis.

The B.S.R.I. is a single adjective checklist in which individuals respond on a 7-point Likert scale as to how well each of the sixty characteristics items describe them. Three subscales (masculinity, femininity and social desirability) involve twenty items each. The personality characteristics on the masculinity and femininity scales were selected on the basis of their identification as sex typed, socially desirable traits. The social desirability index was included to provide a larger context for the other two scales and is composed of items judged to be neutral in terms of sex role stereotyping.

Upon completion of the inventory, the responses in each subscale are tabulated, using the numerical value checked on the Likert scale, with each participant being assigned a total masculinity and total femininity score. Masculinity and femininity scores equal the mean self rating for all endorsed masculine and feminine items respectively. Both can range from one to seven. The androgyny score reflects the relative amount of masculine and feminine characteristics that the respondent includes in his or her self description.

Bem suggests three systems for determining the sex role typology of the respondents once their scores have been tabulated. For the purposes of this investigation, the median cutoff scoring technique will be used to place persons into one of the sex role quadrants described in

Table 2 with the scores of the total sample (both men and women) being divided at the median on both the masculinity and femininity scales.

The following classification system is then applied:

- (i) masculine is defined as high masculine--low feminine
- (ii) feminine is defined as high feminine--low masculine
- (iii) androgynous is defined as high masculine--high feminine
- (iv) undifferentiated is defined as low masculine--low feminine

Reliability

Through the use of coefficient alpha, a measure of internal consistency, the reliability of the B.S.R.I. was assessed to be: masculinity, $r = .86$; femininity, $r = .80$ (Bem, 1974).

Test-retest reliability coefficients were assessed as masculinity, $r = .90$; femininity, $r = .90$; social desirability, $r = .89$ (Bem, 1974).

Validity

Content Validity. Judges, who consisted of one hundred undergraduates at Stanford (half male, half female), selected items for the masculinity and femininity scales if they were judged to be more desirable in American Society for one sex than for the other. A personality characteristic qualified as masculine if it was independently judged by both male and female judges in the sample to be more desirable for a man than a woman ($p < .05$) (Bem, 1974).

Construct Validity. Gaudreau (1977) factor analyzed the B.S.R.I. in order to establish its construct validity. The results indicated that the B.S.R.I. successfully discriminated between masculine males and feminine females. When the items were factor analyzed, they loaded

Table 3
Classification of Respondents

		Masculinity Score	
		Above Median	Below Median
Femininity Score	Above Median	Androgynous	Feminine
	Below Median	Masculine	Undifferentiated

From: Scoring Packet, Bem Sex Role Inventory, Revised 4/76.

on two common factors, appropriately named masculinity and femininity. Wiggins and Holzmüller (1978) correlated the B.S.R.I. with the masculinity and femininity scales from the Adjective Checklist and observed that they were closely related: masculine measures, $r = .87$; feminine measures, $r = .73$. A series of behavioural validation studies reported by Bem and her co-workers (Bem, 1975; Bem and Lenney, 1976), indicate that the sex role styles assessed by the B.S.R.I. are capable of predicting subjects' choices of sex stereotypical activities, thus lending support to the predictive validity of the instrument.

Criticisms

The instrument has been criticized for being non-specific in that the context in which the description is to be perceived is not specified (Wiggins and Holzmüller, 1978). For example, the adjective "helpful" may be interpreted by some as responsibility within the familial environment whereas others may quantify their helpfulness within an occupational setting. The problem of non-specificity is also seen in the lack of comparison groups in the instrument. A self-rating attribute scale entails comparison and a lack of same allows free reign for the respondent's selection of a comparison group (Locksley and Colten, 1979).

Word connotation introduces another weakness in that men and women may not interpret the behaviour that accompanies the adjectives in the same way (Locksley and Colten, 1979). "Gentle" may be perceived as two different constructs by men and women. In addition, the adjectives are criticized for being directional, i.e., the B.S.R.I. uses desirable inter-

personal behaviours to the exclusion of undesirable interpersonal behaviours (Wiggins and Holzmüller, 1978).

Kelly and Worell (1977) label the measurement scale of the B.S.R.I. inferior in that an interval scale would permit more precision than the typological approach they perceive that Bem uses. The present researcher would argue that the B.S.R.I. can be more accurately described as quasi-interval in that the categories suggested by Bem do more than merely categorize and order the participants as in an ordinal scale. However, Bem's scale does not discern equal differences between objects as a thermometer does; therefore, eliminating the possibility of its being an interval scale. Instead, the scale bridges the gap between ordinal and interval, thus being appropriately called a quasi-interval scale.

Although a considerable amount of criticism has been noted in the literature, the B.S.R.I. has been used prolifically and demonstrates sufficient reliability and validity to warrant its use in this investigation.

Suitability

The B.S.R.I. is seen as appropriately assigning sex role typologies to the respondents in the study under investigation. This decision was arrived at by reviewing the literature and noting its use in similar studies. Moreover, Bem's definition of the construct androgyny is seen as relevant to the study of a life style that requires flexibility in using a wide variety of behaviours. The ease of completing this inventory is an asset in that it was used with a volunteer sample in which subjects responded to the B.S.R.I. on a self-administered questionnaire basis.

* * *

THE DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE (D.A.S.)

The dyadic satisfaction subscale of the D.A.S., developed by Graham B. Spanier in 1976, was used to measure the dependent variable, marital satisfaction. The total dyadic adjustment score and the remaining subscores were used in the supplementary analysis. Spanier indicates in the scale description that the subscales can be used alone without losing confidence in the reliability or validity of the measure.

The instrument consists of thirty six items that can be completed in a few minutes with the overall resulting score of dyadic adjustment ranging from 0-151. Additional scores are derived from the following subscales: Dyadic Consensus, Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Cohesion and Affectional Cohesion.

Spanier defines dyadic adjustment as a process, the outcome of which is determined by the degree of troublesome dyadic differences, interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety, dyadic cohesion and dyadic satisfaction. More simply stated, dyadic adjustment is an ever changing process with a qualitative dimension which can be evaluated at any point in time on a continuum from well-adjusted to maladjusted. Using marital adjustment as the dependent variable for this investigation would have constituted a broader measure of the quality of a relationship in that dyadic satisfaction is just one component of the total adjustment score. However, the compliance factor that may be inherent in a woman's socialization process could result in a high degree of adjustment without an equally high degree of satisfaction. In the

supplementary analysis of this investigation, an examination of how dyadic adjustment, satisfaction and consensus scores correlate with sex role orientation contributed to a further understanding of this concern.

Reliability

Reliability estimates of the D.A.S. and its subscales are as follows (Spanier, 1976):

Dyadic Adjustment Scale	$r = .96$
Dyadic Consensus Scale	$r = .90$
Dyadic Satisfaction Scale	$r = .94$
Dyadic Cohesion Scale	$r = .86$
Affectional Cohesion Scale	$r = .73$

Validity

The content validity of the D.A.S. was considered by three judges using the following criteria (Spanier, 1976):

1. Relevant measures of dyadic adjustment for contemporary relationships.
2. Consistent with the nominal definitions suggested by Spanier and Cole (1974) for adjustment and its components (satisfaction, cohesion, and consensus).
3. Carefully worded with appropriate fixed choice responses.

Only items that met the above criteria were included in the instrument.

Criterion-related validity (which encompasses both predictive and concurrent validity) was assessed by administering the scale to a sample of 218 married persons and 94 divorced persons. For each item, the divorced sample differed significantly from the married sample

($p < .001$) using a t-test for assessing differences between sample means (Spanier, 1976).

Construct validity (the extent to which a test measures a theoretical construct or trait) was established by determining whether the D.A.S. measured the same general construct as a well accepted marital adjustment scale, namely, the Locke-Wallace. The correlation between the two scales was .86 among married respondents and .88 amongst divorced respondents ($p < .001$) (Spanier, 1976).

Factor Analysis

The factor analysis performed on the instrument allowed the developers to conclude that the 32 items give a more or less complete indication of dyadic adjustment and that they can in turn be grouped into the four subscales that have been outlined, and deemed conceptually and empirically related to dyadic adjustment (Spanier, 1976).

Criticisms

Spanier (1976) does not claim to have adequately dealt with social desirability as a measurement issue but claims that recent research and critiques suggest that this limitation may have been overstated. Moreover, for the purposes of the present research it is hoped that anonymity counterbalanced a social desirability influence. A second problem the author mentions is whether the present scale can be considered a measure of individual adjustment to the relationship or the adjustment of the dyad as a functioning group. This problem has not been resolved.

Suitability

The D.A.S. is deemed a suitable instrument for use in this research. Viewing dyadic dynamics as a process seemed particularly relevant to a study that is examining relationships that are in a transitional state. The idea of the chameleon nature of the dual career relationship seems congruent with Spanier's definition of dyadic adjustment. In addition, special attention was given to ensuring that the items selected for the D.A.S. were relevant to the lifestyles of the 1970's. This consideration was of particular importance for the contemporary nature of the particular population under study, a population that is on the cutting edge of social change.

The ease in which the instrument can be administered was also a consideration in its selection, a criterion that is of importance when a volunteer sample is being used. Moreover, it can easily be incorporated into a self-administered questionnaire, another criterion that is of importance to this investigation.

* * *

Data Collection

The names of potential participants were given to the researcher through acquaintances or directly by the volunteers themselves. Subjects were mailed the necessary material which included:

- (1) a letter of transmittal (Appendix D)
- (2) two copies of each instrument with a symbol to identify male and female respondents (Appendix B and C)
- (3) a demographic sheet (Appendix A)

(4) a stamped envelope with the researcher's address typed on it

The letter of transmittal asked the respondents to complete the scales privately and without discussion with their partners. One partner in each couple was asked to fill out the demographic sheet in cooperation with the other partner. The anonymity and confidentiality of the results were stressed. All participants who indicated a desire to learn about the results of the study were informed that upon completion of the investigation they would be provided with an abstract of the study. A self-addressed postcard was mailed separately to the researcher to notify her of participants' interest in receiving an abstract.

Since most of the forms were returned anonymously, most respondents were contacted with follow-up reminders. As soon as the participant verified that the instruments had been returned, his/her name was deleted from the follow-up schedule. During the second week, a reminder was mailed to each couple. In addition, a telephone call was made to each subject during the third week.

Data Analysis

After data collection, the researcher had scores on the following independent variables:

- (i) femininity of the wife
- (ii) femininity of the husband
- (iii) masculinity of the wife
- (iv) masculinity of the husband

From these scores, using Bem's median cutoff scoring technique, the

respondents were assigned to one of the following typologies: masculine, feminine, androgynous or undifferentiated. A score on the Social Desirability Scale is not calculated because it served primarily to provide a neutral context for the masculinity and femininity scale. Once the individual participants were assigned to a typology, the couples, in turn, depending upon the combined typologies of the partners, were assigned to one of 16 categories (see Table 4). Data collected from couples falling into the undifferentiated or sex reversed category was not used in the initial analysis because of their irrelevance to the hypotheses being tested. Their scores were used in the supplementary analysis.

The continuous variable, marital satisfaction, represents the dependent variable of this study and was measured by the subscale marital satisfaction on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (D.A.S.), an assumed quasi-interval scale. The remaining subscales of the D.A.S. were included in the analysis of the data in the procedure involving a correlation of dependent and independent variables. Both the couple's as well as the individual's perception of the dyadic adjustment is of interest so when necessary the couple's adjustment score was arrived at by summing the partners adjustment data and dividing by two. A similar procedure was used with the subscales.

Hypothesis 1. The mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous couples (defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., will be higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the stereotyped couples (defined as inflexible).

Table 4

Division of Couples Into Categories
According to Their Sex Role Orientation

		<u>Females</u>			
		Androgy- nous	Sex Role Stereo- typic-	Sex Role Re- versed	Undiffer- entiated
<u>Males</u>	Androgynous	*Androgy- nous (flexible) Couples			
	Sex Role Stereotypic		*Sex Role Stereo- typic (inflex- ible) Couples		
	Sex Role Reversed				
	Undifferentiated				

* The designated boxes identify the categories that are relevant to this investigation. The scores of couples falling into the remaining boxes were discarded for the analysis of Hypothesis 1.

Statistical hypothesis:

$$H_0: \mu_f = \mu_i$$

$$H_1: \mu_f \neq \mu_i$$

with μ_f being the group mean of the flexible group

with μ_i being the group mean of the inflexible group

An independent groups t-test for the difference between means was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups at the .05 level of significance. The combined partners scores were used for this analysis, namely, one score per couple as described above.

Hypothesis 2. The mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous male (defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., will be higher than the mean score of the stereotyped male (defined as inflexible) regardless of what the female partner is.

Statistical hypothesis:

$$H_0: \mu_a = \mu_m$$

$$H_1: \mu_a \neq \mu_m$$

with μ_a being the group mean of the androgynous men

with μ_m being the group mean of the masculine men

The independent groups t-test for difference between means was used to determine if there was a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the two means.

Hypothesis 3. The mean marital satisfaction score of wives of androgynous husbands, as measured on the D.A.S., will be higher than the mean score of the wives of stereotyped husbands, i.e., masculine.

Statistical hypothesis:

$$H_0: \mu_{wa} = \mu_{wm}$$

$$H_1: \mu_{wa} \neq \mu_{wm}$$

with μ_{wm} being the group mean of the wives of stereotyped husbands
with μ_{wa} being the group mean of the wives with androgynous
husbands

The independent groups t-test for difference between means was used to determine if there was a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the two means.

Supplementary Analysis

This investigation moved beyond determining if there was a statistically significant difference between selected group means to exploring the correlation between typologies on the B.S.R.I. and the scores and subscores on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale using Pearson r since the data being treated was considered quasi-interval in nature. Both the couples' averaged scores and the separate husbands and wives' scores were used for these analyses.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

In the preceding chapter, the procedure for both data collection and analysis were presented. This chapter describes the results of the analysis for each of the hypotheses and the supplementary analysis.

Statistical Analyses of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 stated that the mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous couples (defined as flexible) as measured on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale would be higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the sex role stereotyped couples (defined as inflexible). Androgynous couples were defined as a case in which both wife and husband were above the median of the sample on both the masculinity and femininity scales of Bem's Sex Role Orientation Inventory. Sex role stereotyped couples were identified as those in which the husband had a masculinity score above the median and a femininity score below the median. The wives had a femininity score above the median and a masculinity score below the median. Undifferentiated and sex role reversed couples and individuals were eliminated. The median for Bem's Sex Role Orientation Inventory for the present investigation was 4.8 for femininity and 5.0 for masculinity, out of a maximum score of 7.0.

In analyzing the data, the t-test of the difference between means for independent groups was performed with a Type 1 error probability equal to .05. The null hypothesis was accepted (Table 5). From this

finding, it is concluded that the marital satisfaction of androgynous couples is not significantly greater than the marital satisfaction of stereotyped couples.

Table 5

Significance of the Difference Between Means
for Androgynous and Sex Role Stereotypic Couples on
Scores of Marital Satisfaction Using a t-Test

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	2-Tailed Probability
Androgynous Couples	4	83.00	6.055	0.319
Sex Role Stereotypic Couples	3	75.6667	9.292	

Out of the forty-six couples four and three fell into the category of androgynous and sex role stereotypic couples respectively. Although the androgynous couples had a higher mean, the difference was not statistically significant. The sex role stereotypic group was more variable in their scoring with a standard deviation of 9.292 as compared to the androgynous group standard deviation of 6.055.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous male (defined as flexible) as measured on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale would be higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the sex role stereotypic male (defined as inflexible) regardless of what the female partner was.

In analyzing the data, the independent groups t-test of the difference between means was performed with a Type 1 error probability set at .05. The null hypothesis was rejected (Table 6). From this finding,

it is concluded that the marital satisfaction of the androgynous male is significantly higher than the marital satisfaction of a sex role stereotypic male.

Table 6

Significance of the Difference Between Means for
Androgynous Males and Sex Role Stereotypic Males on Scores
of Marital Satisfaction Using a t-Test

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	2-Tailed Probability
Androgynous Males	10	42.9	4.175	.018*
Sex Role Stereotypic Males	16	37.6250	6.438	

* $p < .05$

The androgynous males had a mean of 42.9 which was significantly higher than the sex role stereotypic males' mean of 37.625. Standard deviations of the two groups reflect that sex role stereotypic males in the sample showed a greater variability in their scores (6.438) as compared to their androgynous counterparts (4.175).

Hypothesis 3 stated that the mean marital satisfaction score of wives of androgynous husbands, as measured on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, would be higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the wives of sex role stereotypic husbands. Androgynous and stereotyped individuals were identified and dealt with in the manner described in Chapter Three.

In analyzing the data, the t-test for independent groups was made to determine the significance of the difference between means with a

Type 1 error probability set at .05. The null hypothesis was rejected (Table 7). From this finding, the hypothesis that the marital satisfaction of the wives of androgynous husbands is higher than the marital satisfaction of wives of sex role stereotypic husbands is supported.

Table 7

Significance of the Difference Between Means
for Wives of Androgynous and Sex Role Stereotypic Men
on Scores of Marital Satisfaction Using a t-Test

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
Wives of Androgynous Men	10	42.3	2.359	3.115*
Wives of Sex Role Stereotypic Men	16	36.1875	7.176	

* Cochran Cox Modified t-test, significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level, from Ferguson, G., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, 5th Edition, p. 182, McGraw Hill, 1981.

The wives of androgynous males had a mean of 42.3 which was significantly higher than the wives of sex role stereotypic males' mean of 36.1875, with a 2-tailed probability of .005. There was a considerable difference in the standard deviation of the variables with wives of sex role stereotypic men in the sample having a wide spread. Their range of scores reflects a broader variety of responses.

Supplementary Analyses

In addition to the above three hypotheses, supplementary analyses were performed to explore the correlation between typologies on the B.S.R.I. and the scales and subscales on the D.A.S. using Pearson r .

Both the couples' averaged scores and the separate husbands and wives' scores were used for this procedure (see Tables 8 - 10).

Table 8
Pearson r Correlation Coefficients for Scale and
Subscale Scores: Averaged Scores for Couples (n = 46)

	D.A.S.	Con- sensus	Aff. Exp.	Cohe- sion	Satis- faction	Femi- ninity	Mascu- linity
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	-	.90**	.62**	.48**	.78**	.43**	.38**
Consensus		-	.43**	.26*	.67**	.37**	.32*
Affectional Expression			-	.30*	.42**	.23	.16
Cohesion				-	-.01	-.11	.31*
Satisfaction					-	.61**	.26*
Femininity (B.S.R.I.)						-	-.09
Masculinity (B.S.R.I.)							-

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The above table examines the correlation between dependent and independent variables using the couples' averaged scores. Observations will be made in point form.

1. The high correlation between subscales on the D.A.S. and the total D.A.S. score was predictable given Spaniers' belief (Spanier, 1976) that Consensus, Affectional Expression, Cohesion and Satisfaction are concomitants of dyadic adjustment.

2. An anticipated correlation between consensus and cohesion did not occur (.26). A prediction might have been made that coming to a

consensus might contribute to the closeness or cohesion of a couple.

3. According to stereotypic views of feminine traits, a prediction might have been made that a high correlation would exist between affectional expression and femininity. This was not the case. Neither masculinity or femininity scores reflected any relationship with affectional expression.

4. Participants scoring high in femininity tended to have high satisfaction scores and vice versa (.61). In the case of masculinity scores, there was a weak relationship ($r = .26$). According to this sample, couples manifesting high femininity scores could expect to experience greater marital satisfaction. Possibly an inference could be made that the traditional nurturing, supportive traits associated with femininity contribute to the marital satisfaction of dual career couples.

5. No statistically significant relationship existed between masculinity and femininity scores. This reflects the lack of androgynous and sex role stereotypic couples in the study. A greater number of such participants would have resulted in a high positive or negative correlation respectively.

Table 9

Pearson r Correlation Coefficients for Scale and
Subscale Scores: Female Scores (n = 46)

	D.A.S.	Con- sensus	Aff. Exp.	Cohe- sion	Satis- faction	Femi- ninity	Mascu- linity
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	-	.85**	.53**	.27*	.82**	.27*	.41**
Consensus		-	.33**	-.06	.62**	.17	.36**
Affectional Expression			-	.03	.42**	.23	-.00
Cohesion				-	-.09	-.09	.24
Satisfaction					-	.30*	.29*
Femininity (B.S.R.I.)						-	.01
Masculinity (B.S.R.I.)							-

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The above table examines the correlation between dependent and independent variables using the female participants' scores. Again, observations will be made in point form.

1. The correlation between subscales in the D.A.S. and the total D.A.S. score is again high and predictable given Spanier's belief that the subscales are concomitants of dyadic adjustment. The only exception was cohesion (.27). In the women in the sample cohesion was not a factor in determining dyadic adjustment.

2. A prediction could be made that the compliance factor inherent in a woman's socialization process might result in a high degree of marital adjustment without an equally high degree of marital satisfaction.

This was not supported in the analysis given that a correlation of .82 was calculated for the relationship between marital satisfaction and the D.A.S., the latter being a measure of adjustment.

3. Once again, femininity and affectional expression scores did not correlate strongly (.23). The difference between the femininity/affectional expression and the masculinity/affectional expression correlation, however, is of interest with the latter being -.00. In examining the relative strength of the two relationships, bearers of feminine characteristics did perceive their relationships as being more affectionately demonstrative.

4. A relationship existed between the Consensus and Satisfaction scores (.62). For the female participants, coming to a consensus with their partners seemed to be a factor in determining the level of their marital satisfaction.

Table 10
Pearson r Correlation Coefficient for Scale
and Subscale Scores: Male Scores

	D.A.S.	Con- sensus	Aff. Exp.	Cohe- sion	Satis- faction	Femi- ninity	Mascu- linity
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	-	.93**	.68**	.57**	.64**	.38**	.30*
Consensus		-	.58**	.43**	.52**	.34*	.21
Affectional Expression			-	.36**	.33*	.13	.29*
Cohesion				-	-.14	.08	.29*
Satisfaction					-	.44**	.14
Femininity (B.S.R.I.)						-	-.20
Masculinity (B.S.R.I.)							-

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The above table examines the correlation between dependent and independent variables using the male participants' scores. Again, observations will be made in point form.

1. The correlation between subscales on the D.A.S. and the total D.A.S. score is again high. This relationship was predictable given Spanier's belief that the subscales are concomitants of dyadic adjustment.

2. For the male participants, a weak relationship did exist between Consensus and Cohesion (.43). A perception that spouses were in agreement (consensus score) did seem to contribute to the degree of perceived closeness in the relationship. The corresponding correlation

amongst the female participants was ($r = .06$). Possibly the view that stereotypically men tend to be less flexible and more controlling is reflected in this relationship, i.e., men need to have spouses in agreement with them in order to achieve closeness. This possibility is further supported given the relationship between consensus and satisfaction (.52).

3. A weak relationship was exhibited between the men in the sample who scored high on femininity and marital satisfaction subscore (.44). This correlation contrasted sharply with the marital satisfaction/masculinity relationship (.14). Possibly the increased flexibility of men who could engage in cross gender activities due to their feminine traits, enabled them to respond more adaptably to the dual career lifestyle and thus experience greater marital satisfaction.

Summary of Results

This study was designed to investigate three hypotheses, each concerned with correlates of marital satisfaction among dual career couples. In addition, a supplementary analysis was undertaken to determine the relationship among dependent and independent variables. The summary presents each hypothesis and the results obtained.

Hypotheses

1. The mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous couples (defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., is higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the stereotyped couples (defined as inflexible). This hypothesis was not sustained.

2. The mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous male (defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., is higher than the mean score of the stereotyped male (defined as inflexible) regardless of what the female partner is. This hypothesis was sustained.
3. The mean marital satisfaction score of wives of androgynous husbands, as measured on the D.A.S., will be higher than the mean score of the wives of stereotyped husbands, i.e., masculine. This hypothesis was sustained.

Supplementary Analysis

The correlations for scale and subscales are summarized in Tables 8 - 10.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Discussion and Implications

In the preceding chapter, statistical analyses and results were reported. This chapter contains a summary of the study, a discussion of the results and suggestions for future research.

Summary

A restructuring of the family is occurring as an increasing number of married couples choose a dual career lifestyle. The accompanying stresses inherent in their choice are not surprising given that few role models have existed for these couples. A tendency seems to exist for dual career couples to revert to known sex role stereotypic behaviour rather than to seek out more adaptive alternatives. The likelihood that these social innovators would instead engage in a flexible sharing of tasks seems related to how comfortably they can engage in cross gender activities. This possibility suggests that sex role orientation may influence the alleviation of stress in the lifestyle of dual career couples, and constitutes the basis for the present investigation. Specifically, the hypotheses tested were:

1. The mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous couples (defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., is higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the stereotyped couples (defined as inflexible).
2. The mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous male

(defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., is higher than the mean score of the stereotyped male (defined as inflexible) regardless of what the female partner is.

3. The mean marital satisfaction score of wives of androgynous husbands, as measured on the D.A.S., is higher than the mean score of the wives of stereotyped husbands, i.e., masculine.

Forty-six dual career couples participated in the investigation. These voluntary subjects were recruited from a women's group, from students in a graduate programme and through acquaintances of the researcher. Information gleaned from the Family Background Sheet, forwarded to the participants, suggests that the sample tended to be a group of professional couples, under the age of forty and married less than ten years. Their joint income tended to be in the \$49,999.00 plus range. There was a good mixture of families with and without children. This sample seems representative of the type of couple who are on the evolutionary edge of change without adequate role models.

Two self administered inventories (Bem's Sex Role Inventory and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale) as well as the Family Background Sheet were mailed to sixty-one couples with instructions to complete the inventories separately from their spouses (the Family Background Sheet could be completed jointly) and return them in a self-addressed envelope anonymously. Follow-up reminders were mailed and telephone calls made to increase the rate of return. Seventy-five percent returned the documents completed.

Participants were placed into four categories (sex role stereotypic, sex reversed, androgynous and undifferentiated) according to Bem's Sex Role Inventory. Couples were subsequently categorized into similar groups (Table 4). Scores of individuals and couples who fell into the sex reversed or undifferentiated groups were not used in the primary investigation but were used in the supplementary analysis.

The marital satisfaction subscale of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale represented the dependent variable of this study. The remaining subscales and total score of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale were included in the supplementary analysis, a correlation of dependent and independent variables.

To test the hypotheses, t-tests for significant differences between means were applied. In addition, Pearson r was used to correlate typologies on the Bem's Sex Role Inventory and the score and subscores of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Support was established for Hypothesis 2 and 3. In the next section, findings of the analysis for the hypotheses as well as the supplementary analysis will be discussed.

Discussion of Findings

In this section, results of each hypothesis will be discussed separately, followed by considerations of additional supplementary analyses.

Hypothesis 1 stated that the mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous couples (defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., is higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the

stereotyped couples (defined as inflexible). The hypothesis was not sustained.

The results call into question the theoretical rationale for this hypothesis, namely, that partners in a dual career relationship who can engage in cross gender activities without dissonance are more likely to experience greater marital satisfaction given that their lifestyle demands a flexible sharing of tasks. The lack of substantiation for the hypothesis may possibly have resulted from methodological considerations. The subject pool was extremely small (four androgynous couples and three sex role stereotypic couples). Moreover, the couples participating were volunteers. Both these factors make the generalizability of the results dubious.

There was a difference in the variability of the two groups with the sex role stereotypic couples' standard deviation being 9.292 compared to the androgynous couples' standard deviation of 6.055. The stereotypic couples tended to demonstrate more extreme scores than their androgynous counterparts, possibly reflecting their tendency to either be happy and compatible or dissatisfied and compliant in a dual career relationship in which stereotypic behaviours were demonstrated. The androgynous couples' scoring tended to reflect more homogeneity and moderation.

Bem's definition of the construct androgyny was pivotal to this investigation. Her definition presupposes the co-existence of high masculine and feminine qualities within an individual. Perhaps instead an additional dimension of androgyny exists beyond the joint effect of masculine and feminine subscores (Goldstein, 1978). If this were the

ERRATUM

Page 60a

1. Delete Lines 1 - 8 inclusive.
2. Insert the following between Lines 18 & 19:

Hypothesis 3 stated that the mean marital satisfaction score of wives of androgynous husbands, as measured on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, is higher than the mean marital satisfaction score of the wives of sex role stereotypic husbands.

case, then possible androgynous couples were not actually identified.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the mean marital satisfaction score of the androgynous male (defined as flexible), as measured on the D.A.S., is higher than the mean score of the stereotyped male (defined as inflexible) regardless of what the female partner is. This hypothesis was supported.

The conceptual rationale for the above is that flexibility is required for the multiple demands of the dual career lifestyle. Accordingly those men who can engage in cross role activities are more likely to experience greater marital satisfaction than men who adopt a more rigid definition of what is male appropriate behaviour. These men might also have been able to support their partners' emotional needs thus enhancing the interaction between spouses and thus increase marital satisfaction.

The stereotypic males' more variable responses (with a standard deviation of 6.438) reflected a somewhat broader variety of reactions to the variable marital satisfaction than their androgynous counterparts with a standard deviation of 4.175.

The likelihood of wives of androgynous husbands experiencing higher marital satisfaction can be clearly conceptualized. The demands of the dual career lifestyle are such that both partners are required to take on a diversity of tasks. The tendency has been for the woman to continue her traditional tasks in addition to being a 'breadwinner'. This dual task can be exhausting. The wife of a man who is androgynous is more likely to find her husband assuming cross gender tasks without

dissonance. Accordingly, he is more likely to be flexible enough to take on responsibilities that have been traditional female roles, e.g., child care, and in the process equalize the burden of managing a household, an arrangement that is undoubtedly going to increase the marital satisfaction of the wife. Moreover, wives of androgynous men would likely receive greater emotional support from their husbands which seemingly would contribute to marital satisfaction.

There was a marked difference in the variability of the two groups with the wives of sex role stereotypic husbands having a standard deviation of 7.176 compared to their androgynous counterparts who had a standard deviation of 2.359. The wives of sex role stereotypic husbands' extreme scores may reflect their tendency to be either happy and compatible or dissatisfied and compliant. The wives of androgynous husbands, in sharp contrast, were homeogeneous in their responses reflecting a commonality in the amount of marital satisfaction they reportedly experienced.

Discussion of Supplementary Analysis

The couples' averaged scores were used in the initial correlation of dependent and independent variables. Consensus and cohesion, subscales of the D.A.S., did not correlate ($r = .26$) possibly suggesting that differences of opinions were tolerated amongst partners without a risk to the closeness of the relationship. A stereotypic view of feminine traits would have suggested a relationship between femininity and affectional expression which did not occur ($r = .23$). Femininity correlated with marital satisfaction in this analysis ($r = .61$) in contrast to masculinity's correlation with marital satisfaction ($r = .26$). Conceptual support for this relationship may be that the supportive traits associated with femininity contribute to the marital satisfaction of dual career couples.

The correlation of dependent and independent variables was repeated using the scores of the wives. High correlation between subscales on the D.A.S. and the total D.A.S. score was predictable given Spanier's (Spanier, 1976) belief that Consensus, Affectional Expression, Cohesion and Satisfaction are concomitants of dyadic adjustment. In this analysis, the cohesion subscale was an exception with a correlation of $r = .27$. An inference could be made that a resistance to cohesion might be a factor for androgynous women in dual career relationships. For sex role stereotypic women, a need for cohesion might be a factor. Accordingly, the cohesion score would be balanced out by this contrasting reaction resulting in a correlation coefficient that reflects no relationship.

A prediction could be made that the compliance factor inherent in a woman's socialization process might result in a high degree of marital adjustment without an equally high degree of marital satisfaction. This was not supported in the analysis given that a correlation of $r = .82$ was obtained for the relationship between marital satisfaction and the D.A.S., the latter being a measure of adjustment.

Once again, femininity and affectional expression scores did not correlate strongly ($r = .23$). The difference between the femininity/affectional expression and the masculinity/affectional expression correlation, however, is of interest with the latter being zero ($r = .00$). In examining the relative strength of the two relationships, bearers of feminine characteristics did have a relatively stronger relationship with affectional expression than those bearing masculine characteristics.

The correlation of dependent and independent variables was again repeated using only the husband's scores. For the male participants, a weak relationship did exist between Consensus and Cohesion ($r = .43$). A perception that spouses were in agreement (consensus score) did seem to contribute to the degree of perceived closeness in the relationship. Possibly the view that stereotypically men tend to be less flexible and more controlling is reflected in this relationship, i.e., men need to have spouses in agreement with them in order to achieve closeness. This possibility is further supported given the relationship between consensus and satisfaction ($r = .52$), a weak relationship but nevertheless, a relationship.

The men in the sample who scored high on femininity tended to score high on marital satisfaction ($r = .44$), albeit a weak relationship. This correlation contrasted sharply with the marital satisfaction/masculinity relationship ($r = .14$). Possibly the increased flexibility of men who could engage in cross gender activities due to their feminine traits, enabled them to respond more adaptably to the dual career lifestyle and thus experience greater marital satisfaction.

Methodological Limitations

The canvassing of a volunteer sample rather than using a random sample affects the generalizability of the findings to the general population. The heterogenous nature of the sample used suggests that other variables may have intervened in the relationship between androgynous and sex role stereotypic individuals and their marital satisfaction (e.g., the presence and number of children, the extent of work demands, self esteem, stage in the family life stage).

Bem's definition of androgyny was pivotal to this investigation and is based on the presupposition that high masculinity and femininity qualities co-exist within an individual. Perhaps a specific trait of androgyny beyond the joint effect of masculinity and femininity subscales exists which raises the question of whether androgyny was adequately measured (Goldstein, 1978).

Criticism of the B.S.R.I. has arisen as to the non-specificity of context for the traits listed (e.g., does helpful mean helpful in the workplace or at home). Word connotation presented another concern.

Perhaps participants interpret the behaviour connected with the traits differently.

The problem of social desirability was not considered in the D.A.S.; however, anonymous replies undoubtedly compensated in part for this limitation. A second problem area arises as to whether the D.A.S. can be considered a measure of the individual's satisfaction within the relationship or the individual's perception of the dyadic satisfaction of the relationship. This problem has not been resolved.

In executing the study, the small sample pool of androgynous and sex role stereotypic couples, four and three respectively, was lower than anticipated. With hindsight, however, the likelihood of this problem arising was predictable given that couples could fall into one of sixteen categories, instead of the four categories for individuals (see Tables 4 and 3 respectively). A much larger sample would have been necessary in order to attain a more adequate number of couples in the categories of interest to this investigation.

The supplementary analysis was correlational in nature. The reader should be cautioned that no "cause and effect" may be concluded from the results.

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

Some specific implications were pointed out in the previous section in the discussion of hypotheses. In this section, these implications and others that have emerged from this investigation will be consolidated and suggestions made for future research.

1. The existence of cottage industries in times past encouraged a fluid movement between the occupational and domestic spheres. A nebulous boundary divided public and private life. In contrast, the modern family has been viewed as a private institution, shrouded in secrecy. Monitoring, examining and legislating change within the family is a formidable task. A challenge for researchers and change agents (counsellors and educators) will be to penetrate the thick cell wall that protects the insular family of the 80's from scrutiny in a time of rapid change.

2. Specific stressors, unique to the lifestyle of dual career couples, have been described in this investigation as well as in a proliferation of books and articles on the subject. The tendency to juxtapose traditional roles onto a lifestyle demanding a flexible sharing of tasks has been identified as a possible underlying factor in exacerbating the stressors experienced. In contrast, a reduction in stress may come about if husbands in dual career relationships can become more androgynous thus providing these social innovators with a broader repertoire of adaptable behaviours. This possibility suggests that the sex role orientation of husbands in dual career marriages appears to be a pivotal factor in determining marital satisfaction.

3. The question arises as to whether the stressors described are inherent to the lifestyle or transitional in nature. Developmentally, the dual career lifestyle is in its infancy. Perhaps turmoil will subside once the lifestyle matures beyond its present pioneering status and becomes an established pattern of living. Longitudinal studies

are required to consider what will happen to the family of the 80's once the present painful restructuring phase is complete.

4. Innumerable variables beyond sex role orientation need to be considered in examining the underlying factors that alleviate or exacerbate stress in the dual career lifestyle. The partners' position on their respective career trajectories as well as career compatibility may be significant. Detachment from traditional norms such as living away from families of origin may influence dual career couples. Modern architecture may contribute to freeing inhabitants from traditional values by the creation of individualistic housing developments. The existence of support systems (friends, family or professional services such as day care) may enhance the quality of life for dual career couples. Personality constructs such as self esteem may play an important part in determining how well dual career couples cope with their chosen lifestyle.

5. Identifying specific factors that reduce stress in the dual career lifestyle will provide tools for counsellors and educators in their attempts to effect positive change within the family. As these social innovators restructure their lifestyle, family theorists will need to reconceptualize the life stages of the family. Role theorists will revise what is deemed appropriate behaviour for men and women.

Conclusions

The dual career couple seems to represent a new alternative for the family of the 80's. As such their lifestyle provides a rich testing ground for assessing the modern family in transition. The impact their

lifestyle is having on the social landscape is widespread. Support services such as day care centers are expanding. Surrogate parenting will begin to affect child rearing practice and possibly the societal view of childhood. Unions are demanding paid maternity leave and pressure is being applied to institute more flexible time schedules. Women's fashions are changing to address the needs of professional working women. New housing developments are being constructed with convenience built into the architectural design, and with location in close proximity to the workplace. The present investigation has only examined one specific aspect of the influences coming to bear on the dual career lifestyle, i.e., sex role orientation. An abundance of questions remain to be addressed by future researchers.

Bibliography

- Arkin, W., and Dobrofsky, L.R. Job Sharing. In R. Rapoport and R. Rapoport (Eds.), Working Couples. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978.
- Arnott, C.C. Husbands' attitude and wives' commitment to employment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 763-784.
- Bailyn, L. Accommodation of work to family. In R. Rapoport and R. Rapoport (Eds.), Working Couples. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978.
- Bebbington, A.C. The function of stress in the establishment of the dual career family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 530-557.
- Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, (2), 155-162.
- Bem, S.L. Sex role adaptability: one consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, (4), 634-643.
- Bem, S.L. and Lenney, E. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, (1), 48-54.
- Bem, S.L.; Martyna, W. and Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, (5), 1016-1023.
- Berger, M. Men's new family roles - some implication for therapists. The Family Co-ordinator, 1979, 28, (4), 638-646.
- Bryson, R., and Bryson, J.B. Professional couples: a content analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 36, 323-330.
- Burke, R.J. and Weir, T. Relationship of wives' employment status to husband, wife and pair satisfaction and performance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 279-287.
- Chaffee, I. Family disorganization. In M. Jung (Ed.), Modern marriage. New York: F.S. Crofts & Co., 1940.
- Cohen, M.B. Personal identity and sexual identity. In J.B. Miller (Ed.), Psychoanalysis and Women. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books 1974.

- Coser, R.L. and Rokoff, G. Women in the occupational world: social disruption and conflict. Social Problems, 1971, 18, 535-554.
- Defrain, J. Androgynous parents tell who they are and what they need. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, (2), 237-243.
- Downing, N.E. Theoretical and operational conceptualization of psychological androgyny: implications for measurement. Psychology of Women, Quarterly, 1979, 3, (3), 284-292.
- Gaudreau, P. Factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, (2), 299-302.
- Goldstein, E.S. The relationship of sex role self-concept, attitudes toward women, job involvement, and marital satisfaction in wives of dual career couples with children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, (12-B), 6196.
- Gowler, D. and Legge, K. Hidden and open contracts in marriage. In R. Rapoport and R. Rapoport (Eds.), Working Couples. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978.
- Gronseth, E. Work sharing: a Norwegian example. In R. Rapoport and R. Rapoport (Eds.), Working Couples. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978.
- Haas, L.L. Sexual equality in the family: a study of role sharing couples. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, (10-A), 6344.
- Hall, F.S. and Hall, D.T. The Two Career Couple. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison Wesley, 1979.
- Holmstrom, L.L. The Two Career Family. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1972.
- Katz, M. Antecedents of coping behavior in a role conflict situation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39 (3-B), 1534.
- Kelly, J. and Worell, J. New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: a critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, (6), 1101-1115.
- Locksley, A. and Colten, M.E. Psychological androgyny: a case of mistaken identity? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1017-1031.
- Parolius, A.P. Emerging sex role attitudes, expectations and strains among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 146-153.

- Poloma, M.M. and Garland, T.N. The myth of the egalitarian family. In A. Theodore (Ed.), The Professional Woman. Massachusetts: Shenkman, 1971.
- Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. The dual career family, a variant pattern and social change. Human Relations, 1969, 22, 3-30.
- Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. Further considerations on the dual career family. Human Relations, 1971, 6, 519-533.
- Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. Family enabling processes: the facilitating husband in dual career families. In R. Gosling (Ed.), Support, innovation and autonomy. London, England: Tavistock, 1973.
- Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. Men, women and equity. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24, 421-432.
- Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. Dual career families re-examined. London, England: Martin Robertson & Co., Ltd., 1976.
- Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. Working Couples. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978.
- Richardson, J.G. Wife occupational superiority and marital troubles: an examination of the hypothesis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41, 63-73.
- Rossi, A.S. Equality between the sexes: an immodest proposal. In R.J. Lifton (Ed.), The Woman in America. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1964.
- Scanzoni, J. Strategies for changing male family roles: research and practice implication. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 435-442.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C. and Dijkers, M. Handling unconventional asymmetries. In R. Rapoport and R. Rapoport (Eds.), Working Couples. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978.
- Spanier, G.B. Measuring dyadic adjustment: new scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 28, 15-28.
- Spanier, G.B. and Cole, C.L. Toward clarification and investigation of marital adjustment. Revision of a paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations. Toronto, Ontario, 1974.
- Svinovacz, M.E. Role allocation, family structure and female employment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 36, 781-791.
- Weingarten, K. Interdependence. In R. Rapoport and R. Rapoport (Eds.), Working Couples. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978.

- Wiggins, J.S. and Holzmuller, A. Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, (1), 40-52.
- Women's Bureau. Women in the labour force, facts and figures. Conditions of Work, Labour Canada, Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, 1978.
- Young, M. and Willmott, P. The Symmetrical Family. New York: Pantheon Books, 1973.

Family Background Sheet

Instructions

1. It is important to complete the two inventories individually. Please do not share your answers.
2. The inventory copies with a red sticker (upper left-hand corner) must be completed by the female subject.
3. Read the directions carefully before answering each inventory.
4. The Family Background Sheet may be answered jointly or separately.
5. Make sure to return the following documents:
 - (a) Family Background Sheet (1 copy)
 - (b) Bem Inventory (2 copies)
 - (c) Dyadic Adjustment Scale (2 copies)

* * *

If you want to receive a copy of the research abstract summarizing the findings, indicate your name and address on this sheet. Return this coupon at a later date to the designated address.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Return to: Suzanne Kenney

Family Background Sheet

Your cooperation in providing all the answers is appreciated. Please be assured of anonymity and strict confidentiality.

1. Age:

<u>male</u>		<u>female</u>
_____	under 30	_____
_____	30 - 39	_____
_____	40 - 49	_____
_____	50 - 59	_____
_____	60 +	_____

2. Educational level:

<u>male</u>		<u>female</u>
_____	high school	_____
_____	university	_____
_____	post graduate	_____
_____	technical	_____

3. Number of years married:

_____	less than 5
_____	5 - 10
_____	11 - 15
_____	16 - 20
_____	21 - 25
_____	more than 25

4. Number of children:

_____	0
_____	1
_____	2
_____	3
_____	more than 3

5. Approximate joint income: _____ less than 19,999
 _____ 20,000 - 29,999
 _____ 30,000 - 39,999
 _____ 40,000 - 49,999
 _____ more than 49,999
6. Ethnic background: _____
7. Occupation: wife _____ husband _____
8. Number of years employed: wife _____ husband _____
9. Has there been any history of separation in your present marriage?
 _____ If yes, how long? _____
10. Have there been any periods during which either of you remained at home while the other partner worked? _____ If yes, please indicate the duration.
 wife _____ husband _____
11. Do you have assistance with child care other than from your spouse or your other children? _____ If yes, by whom is it provided and how many hours per week?
- 1) paid employee(s) _____ no. hrs./week _____
- 2) family member(s) _____ no. hrs./week _____
- 3) other(s) _____ no. hrs./week _____
12. Do you have assistance with household tasks? _____ If yes, by whom and how many hours per week?
- 1) paid employee(s) _____ no. hrs./week _____
- 2) family member(s) _____ no. hrs./week _____
- 3) other(s) _____ no. hrs./week _____

Thank you!

Bem Sex Role Inventory

(Bem, 1974)

BEM INVENTORY

Developed by Sandra L. Bem, Ph.D.

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____
 Phone No. or Address _____
 Date _____ 19 _____ *Omit* _____
 If a student: School _____ Yr. in School _____
 If not a student: Occupation _____

DIRECTIONS

On the opposite side of this sheet, you will find listed a number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics to describe yourself, that is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you each of these characteristics is. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Example: sly

Write a 1 if it is **never or almost never true** that you are sly.

Write a 2 if it is **usually not true** that you are sly.

Write a 3 if it is **sometimes but infrequently true** that you are sly.

Write a 4 if it is **occasionally true** that you are sly.

Write a 5 if it is **often true** that you are sly.

Write a 6 if it is **usually true** that you are sly.


Write a 7 if it is **always or almost always true** that you are sly.

Thus, if you feel it is **sometimes but infrequently true** that you are "sly," **never or almost never true** that you are "malicious," **always or almost always true** that you are "irresponsible," and **often true** that you are "carefree," then you would rate these characteristics as follows:

Sly	3	Irresponsible	7
Malicious	1	Carefree	5

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS, INC.
577 College Avenue Palo Alto, California 94306

©Copyright, 1978, by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. All rights reserved. Duplication of this form by any process is a violation of the copyright laws of the United States except when authorized in writing by the Publisher.

* 

Defend my own beliefs		Adaptable		Flatterable	
Affectionate		Dominant		Theatrical	
Conscientious		Tender		Self-sufficient	
Independent		Conceited		Loyal	
Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand		Happy	
Moody		Love children		Individualistic	
Assertive		Tactful		Soft-spoken	
Sensitive to needs of others		Aggressive		Unpredictable	
Reliable		Gentle		Masculine	
Strong personality		Conventional		Gullible	
Understanding		Self-reliant		Solemn	
Jealous		Yielding		Competitive	
Forceful		Helpful		Childlike	
Compassionate		Athletic		Likable	
Truthful		Cheerful		Ambitious	
Have leadership abilities		Unsystematic		Do not use harsh language	
Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Analytical		Sincere	
Secretive		Shy		Act as a leader	
Willing to take risks		Inefficient		Feminine	
Warm		Make decisions easily		Friendly	

	a	b	Class
R.S.			
S.S.			
		a - b	SS diff.

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

(Spanier, 1976)

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list. (Place a checkmark to indicate your answer.)

	<u>Always Agree</u>	<u>Almost Always Agree</u>	<u>Occasion- ally Disagree</u>	<u>Frequent- ly Disagree</u>	<u>Almost Always Disagree</u>	<u>Always Disagree</u>
1. Handling family finances	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Matters of Recreation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Religious matters	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Demonstrations of Affection	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Friends	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Sex relations	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Philosophy of life	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Amount of time spent together	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. Making major decisions	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. Household tasks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. Leisure time interests and activities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. Career decisions	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*Duplicated with the permission of Graham B. Spanier

-2-

	<u>All the time</u>	<u>Most of the time</u>	<u>More often than not</u>	<u>Occa- sionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
19. Do you confide in your mate?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. Do you ever regret that you married? (or lived together?)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
21. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
22. How often do you and your mate "get on each others' nerves"?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
23. Do you kiss your mate?		<u>Every Day</u>	<u>Almost Every</u>	<u>Occa- sionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
		<u>All</u>	<u>Most</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Very Few</u>	<u>None</u>
24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?		_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Less Than Once a Month</u>	<u>Once or Twice a Month</u>	<u>Once or Twice a Week</u>	<u>Once a Day</u>	<u>More Often</u>
25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

-3-

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Less Than Once a Month</u>	<u>Once or Twice a Month</u>	<u>Once or Twice a Week</u>	<u>Once a Day</u>	<u>More Often</u>
26. Laugh together	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
27. Calmly discuss something	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
28. Work together on a project	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

These are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Check yes or no.)

Yes No

29. _____ Being too tired for sex.

30. _____ Not showing love.

31. The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy", represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A Little Unhappy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------	---------------	--------------------	---------

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship? Place a checkmark on the appropriate line.

_____ I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.

_____ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.

_____ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.

_____ It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed..

_____ It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.

_____ My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

-4-

33. When disagreements arise, they usually result in:
Husband giving in ___ Wife giving in ___ Agreement by mutual give & take ___
34. In leisure time do you generally prefer: To be "on the go," ___ To stay
at home? ___ Does your mate generally prefer: To be "on the go," ___
To stay at home? ___
35. Do you ever wish you had not married?
Frequently ___ Occasionally ___ Rarely ___ Never ___
36. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would:
Marry the same person___ Marry a different person___ Not marry at all___

Letter of Transmittal

(participant's address)

Dear _____:

Over the past year, my interest in dual career couples has deepened as I have read journal articles and books, and discussed informally with working partners how they feel about their chosen lifestyle. Now I am reaching a new stage in my quest as I undertake my own research in the area of dual career couples. The research I am doing, under the supervision of a thesis committee of three professors, constitutes the final requirement for a Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology at The University of British Columbia. Your cooperation in helping me is greatly appreciated because, as innovators, you are on the cutting edge of social change which makes your lifestyle of particular interest to me.

The purpose of my study is to determine if there is a relationship between sex role orientation and dyadic satisfaction. At this time, I am unable to give you any additional information. In order to maintain the integrity of my results, you, as potential participants, are not to be given the details of my research. If you would like to receive a summary of my findings when my thesis has been completed, please indicate your name and address on the enclosed sheet, and return it to me separately and at a later date at the address provided. Do not send it with your research data so as to maintain anonymity.

Your participation in this study is, of course, voluntary. If you do not want to participate, please return the uncompleted documents in the return envelope. Otherwise, I would request that you follow the instructions provided. If the inventories are returned, I will assume that you are giving me your consent to use your data in my research. Anonymity is of importance so do not include your name, address or social insurance number or other identifying information with the material you return to me.

You and your partner are being asked to complete the Bem Sex Role Orientation Inventory and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale separately and privately. The Family Background Sheet, however, may be completed jointly or by one of you. Your participation will require approximately fifteen minutes.

I would like to thank you in advance for your help. Your cooperation is invaluable to this research, research that will hopefully contribute to

Continued ...

the growing body of knowledge that may provide you with insight as to how to deal with the challenging lifestyle you have chosen. Any inquiries you may have may be directed to the address or telephone number given below.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Kenney