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ABSTRACT

The numerous mutual benefits that can result from a successful corporate transfer experience are addressed here. The reasons for refusal by an increasingly large number of executives and their families to be transferred are examined in addition to an exploration of the substantive organizational, personal and familial costs that are usually incurred in an unsuccessful transfer.

The effects of transfer on a spouse's familial, career and social roles are discussed. It is believed and well supported that attention to these aspects would have a great impact on the outcome of the transfer itself. Thus, it is proposed that with a better understanding and awareness of spouses' needs and the problems facing them in event of transfers, greater care can be exercised in selecting those spouses who, because of their willingness to move, would suffer minimum role disruptions. Central to this proposal are the identification of those economic, psychological and other factors which cause trauma in cases of corporate transfer, and the relation of these factors to the willingness of spouses to accept their husbands' transfers.

A sample of 164 spouses who had been transferred at least once with their husbands served as the sample for the principal statistical analysis. Another group of 176 spouses who had also been transferred at least once with their husbands served as the
sample for cross-validation purposes. Multiple correlation analysis and tests for differences in means were used in both groups (i.e. working and non-working spouses) to explain the variance in the spouses' willingness to move.

In the working spouse group, spouses' satisfaction with their present location appears to be the primary predictor of their willingness to move, while the locus of control of the non-working spouses seems to be the primary predictor of their willingness to move.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Many companies in today's complex economy are dependent upon a highly mobile working force. Transfers have become a familiar part of corporate life for both older executives who work for big companies and for younger managers in many organizations.

Each year, more than 300,000 employees in the U.S. alone are transferred by their companies (Stillman, 1979). Numerous benefits and costs associated with corporate transfers have been well addressed both in the popular press and in management-oriented literature (Perham, 1970; Industry Week, 1971, 1973a; Schein, 1971; Business Week, 1972; Jaffe, 1972; Tiger, 1974; Edstrom and Galbraith, 1977; Pinder and Das, 1979).

A. Benefits Gained from Corporate Transfers

Jaffe (1972) maintains that transfers have been used to fulfill the following explicit organizational purposes:

(1) To meet manpower needs which arise as a result of mergers, acquisitions, product diversification, organizational realignment, and changes in organizational structure and/or technology.
(2) To promote the "cross-fertilization" required for success in higher-management/decision-making positions.

(3) To allow new or growing businesses some flexibility in staffing and in coping with excess and unnecessary talents as a consequence of the consolidation of operations.

(4) To increase employees' competence by broadening their experiential base.

(5) To generate a greater commitment and loyalty on the part of the employees toward their companies.

In addition, Jaffe (1972) states that transferees have an opportunity to extend their insight and to develop their skills through transfers so that they can better prepare themselves for intra-organizational advancement. The processes through which corporate transfers may interact with personal development were well discussed by Pinder and Walter (1984). However, this conventional wisdom linking transfers and development has recently been challenged by Brett (1984), who argues that little personal development results from job transitions because one tends to seek the easiest way out of the routine disruptions by re-enacting old routines.

In summary, benefits may be gained both by the organization and by the employee as a result of a successful transfer. As pointed out by Jaffe (1972), Heizer (1976) and Foegen (1977), corporate transfers meet a number of mutual objectives in the manpower and organizational development programs of many corporations, and promotion-oriented employees often accept the necessity of frequent relocation.
B. Costs Incurred from Corporate Transfers

Whether corporate transfer policies justify the organizational and human costs associated with them is now being questioned in many areas, and certain steps are being taken to alleviate the more obvious difficulties that arise as a result of employee relocation.

The estimated cost to a typical company of reimbursing an employee and his family for moving expenses, including sale of the family's home, is about $16,000 (Administrative Management, 1979). The actual cost of transferring an employee from one city to another increases yearly, a direct result of inflation on moving costs.

The personal costs are also heavy. Greene (1972) states that the social and psychological strains that accompany a move are severe and have a deleterious effect on an employee's well-being, personal stability, and overall satisfaction with the transfer. Furthermore, a manager and his wife and children may have considerable difficulty adapting to a new community; resulting dissatisfactions and frustrations may give rise to serious personal and organizational problems, and even create "performance obstacles" (Greene, 1972).

A different type of organizational cost now occurs: loss as a result of ineffectual performance (Industry Week, 1971a, Nation's Business, 1973). This cost, less obvious than that of direct transfer expenses, is a major concern both to the corporation and to the employee. Some transferees wonder whether the opportunities and rewards for themselves and their
families that may result from their willingness to move outweigh the emotional costs associated with such an uprooting.

Nevertheless, some transfers are inevitable, and many corporations are trying to make moves as painless as possible. A variety of monetary inducements are offered by numerous companies. In addition, more and more companies are turning to outside relocation service firms for professional assistance in order to make geographic relocation as quick and easy as possible. Professional services include buying employees' homes, transporting their household goods, and helping them select a new home in their new location (Stillman, 1979). However, these efforts are not sufficient to promote a move if the employee and his family have decided, on other grounds, not to move (Foegen, 1977; Wong and Halpin, 1977).

C. Growing Reluctance to Accept Geographical Transfers

Many executives show an increasing reluctance to accept job transfers involving a move to a new location (Murray, 1971; Industry Week, 1973b; U.S. News and World Report, 1975; Business Week, 1976; Howard and Boyd, 1976). A survey of 617 major American firms in 1975 found some 42 percent of the companies under study experienced refusals, an increase of ten percent in one year (Maynard and Zawacki, 1979). More and more executives and their families are refusing to be uprooted, even when the transfer leads to promotion and increased salary. At one time, however, an up-and-coming executive never turned down a request on the part of his corporation to transfer, believing (rightly or
wrongly) that such refusal would result in a limitation of his potential for further success. Now more managers are willing to risk disapprobation; increasingly they choose to leave a company rather than agree to a transfer (Time, 1978).

In a study for the Detroit Free Press in 1974, E. Jennings observed that between one-third and one-half of all managers preferred to stay in their present locations, an observation that is confirmed in a recent study conducted with one of Canada's largest companies. The results of the Canadian study (Howard and Boyd, 1976) showed that 48 percent of the managers and supervisors surveyed were unwilling to move from their current locations. Costello (1976) believes the percentages to be up sharply from prior years.

D. Resistance to Transfer: A Matter for Concern

Why do employees turn down offers that would usually be a step up the corporate ladder? In the past, the major reason for the reluctance of employees to accept transfer was thought to be an economic one, caused by too frequent relocations and by the financial pinch resulting from countless upheavals and resettling (Murray, 1971; Industry Week, 1973b; U.S. News and World Report, 1975; Business Week, 1976; Howard and Boyd, 1976). The economic factor remains important (DiDomenico, 1978a). But a growing literature acknowledges that much of the reluctance to move stems from personal and family concerns (Pinder, 1978). Possibly in response to this,
more companies are considering the adequacy of their transfer policies (Perham, 1970; Business Week, 1972; Tiger, 1974), and they are no longer placing total emphasis upon economic factors (Pinder, 1978).

Although there are many reasons for the increasing resistance to transfer, three areas of concern are believed to be the major factors:

(1) Changing values. In the past it was taken for granted that an aspiring executive would uproot his family in order to benefit from the career opportunities that a transfer offered. The request to transfer was seen as recognition of a high level of competence, and implied promises for promotion and ultimate success. Traditionally, corporate transfers were rarely refused. However, this situation appears to be changing as younger executives and their spouses revolt against the stress and insecurity of the mobile society. Such a change reflects a fundamental shift in values (Howard and Boyd, 1976).

Grass (1978a) states that employees under age 35 have a different set of priorities from their older counterparts, who still march to the company drum and accept transfers as a means of rising through the ranks. Young executives are not willing to accept the disruption of their lives resulting from transfers. James E. Wall, Vice President of Celanese Corporation, describes this new set of attitudes as it pertains to American corporations: "The balance has definitely shifted
away from saluting the company and marching off to Timbuctu toward a greater emphasis on family and life style" (Time, 1978).

In other words, the new breed of executives has an increasing interest in the quality of life. Money is no longer the paramount concern. Such aspects as location and permanence demand consideration; a stable home life and a safe environment rank high on the list of priorities.

(2) Economic costs. But very often the economics are not favourable. One of the most frequently mentioned concerns is the financial cost of moving. Very often the increase in salary is quickly consumed by the cost of relocating even when a company provides all the fringe benefits listed in Figure 1. A recent study of one large Canadian company showed a great reluctance among employees to change locations when the company's reimbursements for moving were seen as inadequate, or when the move was to a higher cost location and no immediate or adequate adjustment in salary was offered (Business Week, 1976a). Howard and Boyd (1976) also found that the two items most often cited in turning down a transfer were financial.

DiDomenico (1978a) states that an employee with a proven and respectable track record, who has already contributed to the success and profit of the company, deserves the most comfortable transfer the corporate transfer budget will allow. Various attempts have been made to compare differences in housing costs between specific cities, but such data are
Besides packing and transportation of household goods, a generous company will also provide other assistance. While the following list is not exhaustive, it is suggestive of the kinds of assistance offered.

To move a second automobile at company expense.
To move a boat at company expense.
To move belongings from a second residence (i.e., summer home)
To move an unlimited weight of belongings.
To move objects of high value, such as statues or paintings.
To move pets.
To move recreation and lawn equipment.
To move such things as antiques, motorcycles, campers, etc.
To store some possessions.
To provide maid service at either the old or the new home.
To guarantee sale of the employee's former residence.
To purchase employee's house if no buyer can be found in a reasonable time.
To refund any variance between price of the former house and the price of similar house in the new city.
To pay for drapes, carpeting, etc. in the new house, if such cannot be moved.
To pay for alterations to drapes, carpeting etc. if moved to new city.
To pay employee the difference between former rent and similar new rental quarters, if applicable.
To reimburse any increased income tax incurred as a result of move.
To supply other aid (i.e., help with mortgage loans, other loans, realtor's fees, bonus).

Figure 1. The Provision of Fringe Benefits for the Relocating Employee
difficult to obtain and measure on an objective basis. With many variables (neighbourhood, distance to schools and shopping, etc.) affecting housing prices, and with subjective judgements involved, few relocation policies can meet or respond to an individual's needs (DiDomenico, 1978a). And regretably few Canadian companies make an appropriate effort to help their employees adjust to the more obvious difficulties of transfer. Only 14 percent of the 350 companies studied by the Conference Board in Canada pay outright housing subsidies for locational price differentials in comparable facilities, and only 7 percent of the companies provide rent subsidies in the same location (Grass, 1978).

(3) **Heavy human costs.** Although new challenges in new surroundings may broaden an individual's insight and enhance his growth potential, a transfer can have negative effects on employees and on their wives and children.

(a) **Consequences for the Transferred Employee** - The employee himself experiences further harassments in addition to those mentioned above. He often lacks an understanding of what the move means in terms of his career because he has had limited involvement in his career planning. In addition, he has to adjust to the demands of his new job, a process both
taxing and challenging, and one which can lead to severe strain if the employee fails to cope adequately with his new milieu or is distracted by family anxiety. Murray (1971) states that adjustment can be especially difficult in widely diversified companies. Managers moving to company headquarters frequently feel they have lost authority and independence when they move from a rather independent role to an interdependent role as part of the top management team (Schein, 1971; Marshall and Cooper, 1976). Not only must the manager learn about his new job, he must also become familiar with the social and psychological climate of his new work environment. Brett (1981) states that the transfer itself disrupts old routines and requires the establishment of new ones. Although the costs of social and psychological readjustment are difficult to determine accurately, they are considered to be substantial (Tiger, 1974).

Some managers face another dilemma once they accept the offer of transfer: they are often expected to move some months before their families. Because such separation often poses a conflict between the manager's own needs to develop competence at the new job and the needs of his family as it copes with the anxieties raised by the prospect of transfer, geographical transfer frequently causes marital crises. The findings of Marshall and Cooper (1976) confirm that family separation is a crisis point in marriage. However, Brett's study (1982) found that mobile husbands and wives were more satisfied with their married life than stable ones. It is not clear whether this is
inconsistent with Marshall and Cooper's findings or whether crisis points result in more stable marriages.

Although some employers are aware that the multiple anxieties of separation and transfer interfere with job performance, others actually encourage this period of separation. The rationale for this is that a temporary separation causes less distress to job effectiveness than the eroding action of family harangues during the period of upheaval. Such reasoning overlooks the pressure on an employee who is sensitive to the isolation and trauma experienced by his temporarily abandoned family.

(b) Consequences for Children - The necessity of adjusting to new and complex environments as a result of a geographic transfer can be a challenging and stimulating growth experience. Children who do benefit from their experience of a transfer perform better in school than non-mobile children (Inbar, 1976). However, most children neither appreciate nor benefit from the developmental opportunity provided by a transfer. Parents in Marshall and Cooper's study (1976) reported that their children were resentful and rebellious about moving. While all children suffer from disruption of the household and parental relationships, children between the ages of 6 and 19 are less tolerant of transfers than their younger siblings. In general, school-aged children are more opposed to corporate transfers than either of their parents. Their negative attitude
reflects their concern for acceptance by their peers in a new location, and an amorphous fear as to the expectations and requirements to be met at a new school. In addition, Olive et al. (1976) maintain that moving is most distressing when it comes at the time of other developmental crises such as establishing boy-girl relationships and/or striving for an identity. The damage of transfer to children is best summed up by Tiger (1974): "American business is disenchanting the sons and daughters of its own executives, and in some degree impairing potential effectiveness of the executives themselves."

More and more parents are aware of the damage to the children resulting from a transfer. They worry about whether their children will be admitted into top-ranking universities after graduating from high schools with questionable standards (Business Week, 1976). Student (1976) has found a high degree of stress and tension in families not satisfied with the educational standards of their communities.

Since a child's attitude will affect the whole family, children's objections to moving may well have an impact on their parents' decision regarding accepting a transfer.

(c) Consequences for Spouses - Whenever the company decides to move an executive to another location, the wife, unlike her husband who takes his prestige with him when transferred, must start over to establish herself in a
new community.* In addition, she has to cope with all the upheavals resulting from the transfer, to be at times both mother and father to children if the transfer requires a period of separation from her husband and at the same time give support to her husband (Olive et al., 1976; Vandervelde, 1979). Brett (1981) comments that geographic transfer accompanied by social mobility (i.e. the move from being, say, a lower middle class urban wife to an upper middle class suburban wife), implies a more drastic discontinuity than mere geographic transfer, and creates a substantially greater adjustment problem for the wives. Many wives are willing to go through the stress and pain of readjusting because they believe that the acceptance of a transfer will mean progress for their husbands within the company and that turning down a transfer will consequently damage their careers (Jones, 1973; Olive et al., 1976; Brett and Werbel, 1978). Triebal (1972) explains that some sources of stress imposed on spouses by a transfer lie in the differences, fundamental or conditioned, between men and women in western society. The "nest-building" instinct, common to many women,动机们 them to make their houses the focus of the family, a warm, secure fortress in an alien world. However, Vandervelde (1979a) points out that eventually the emotional reserve required by this activity

* For the purposes of this study, all transferees' spouses will be referred to as being female since 96% of the transferees' spouses in the sample were female.
becomes exhausted; the instinct becomes traumatized by constant repetition.

Stillman (1979) identifies another major reason for executives turning down transfers despite a high level of professional assistance: working spouses whose career development would be adversely affected by their husbands' transfers. Working wives usually have to forfeit their jobs when husbands are transferred (U.S. News and World Report, 1975). Tiger (1974) states that these wives suffer in new jobs because they lack seniority and because they are unable to provide their employers with the continuity they may seek in higher management. Transfer difficulties are increasingly insurmountable as a spouse attains executive status in her own field.

Stoess (1973) found that many organizations believe that the executive's wife is extremely important to the success of the executive and of the company. This attitude is borne out by a survey which found that the inability of the wife to adapt was among the six major causes of job failure of overseas managers (Ivancevich, 1969). Costello (1976) found that three of the ten reasons given most frequently by executives who declined a geographic transfer are directly related to family affairs, and that two out of these three reasons concern the spouses.

Accordingly, organizations should evaluate the wife's willingness to move as a matter of regular company policy when
considering offers of transfer. Until recently, however, little empirical research has been done to determine the extent of the economic, psychological and sociological impact of transfer policies on the transferred employees' spouses or the factors which influence the spouses' willingness to be transferred. Many organizations seem to be in great need of this type of information: Baker (1976) reported that 53 percent of the respondents in his study stated that an attempt was made to determine whether the wife was willing to go overseas, but only one respondent firm confirmed that it administers a psychological test to the wife of a candidate for overseas assignment.

E. The Purpose of This Study

Organizations whose staffing policies have grown on transfer as a strategy for manpower planning or as a means of compensating for poor manpower planning must find a better way to accomplish the objectives at minimum costs. These costs have an ultimate bearing upon organizational life, upon organizational continuity, and upon the ability of the organization to reap the benefits attributed to the transfer of the employees and their families. Although many suggestions are made in articles regarding the alleviation of transfer trauma, greater care in selecting those to be transferred remains a continuing challenge to organizations.

The purpose of this thesis is to test hypotheses relating the major difficulties arising from transfers to spouses'
willingness to accept transfer. The ultimate aim of the study is to establish a method of appraising needs and problems that are more sensitive than the system in current use.

The study will examine existing literature on employee transfer and will develop and test a multivariate model designed to predict spouses' willingness to move. Chapter Two reviews the literature on the effects of transfer on spouses and generates several research questions, which together substantiate the need for the investigation. Chapter Three develops a number of hypotheses concerning the factors which determine spouses' willingness to accept transfers, along with a detailed description of the groups and methods used in this study. Chapter Four reports the results of the study. Finally, Chapter Five discusses results and their implications for companies who transfer their employees, and it presents some possible methodological shortcomings of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

EFFECTS OF TRANSFERS ON SPOUSES: LITERATURE REVIEW

How true is it that most corporate wives are willing to go through the stress and pain of readjusting to another location in order to accommodate their husbands' needs as well as the wishes of the corporation? On the one hand, Brett and Werbel's (1978) findings indicate that most corporate wives still have a positive attitude toward transfers. For example, only 14 percent of Brett and Werbel's sample said they would discourage their husbands from accepting a geographic transfer, and only 3 percent of the same sample would encourage their husbands to leave their present jobs if they were asked to move again.

On the other hand, Burke's (1974) findings suggest that there is substantial dissatisfaction regarding transfers on the part of corporate wives. When questioned about their feelings on corporate transfers, for example, 51 percent of Burke's sample indicated that they would react negatively to a transfer, and 5 percent of the wives said they would encourage their husbands to leave the company if they were asked to relocate. These findings are supported by other research, which indicates that wives are reluctant to go along with their husbands' decision to accept a transfer (Seidenberg, 1973; Foegen, 1977; Mullally, 1979; Vandervelde, 1979). Thus, the majority of evidence suggests that
few wives endorse their husband's job transfer unreservedly, and few see a transfer as being a great opportunity for which they are willing to be uprooted.

A. Why an Increasing Number of Corporate Wives Resist Transfer

Vandervelde (1979b) states that a typical corporate wife is a woman whose own needs and happiness will be fulfilled primarily through her husband. Her husband's career equates directly with her own financial and emotional security. Therefore, when her husband decides to accept his company's offer of a geographic transfer, she moves with her husband automatically according to his desires and needs. Seidenberg (1973) examined the pressures from family and the community that prompt a spouse to maintain the status quo. Her failure to live up to the expectations of a typical corporate wife exposes a spouse to persecution from her husband's family and from her own, from friends and even from her children on the grounds that she has failed to support her husband and has, in effect, deserted him. Thus, she can no longer claim support from him. In summary, the traditional wife not only does not have a career of her own, she behaves according to the strictures imposed on her by her community and supports her husband without question.

Although the "typical " executive wife is still very much in evidence, many corporate wives demand more say in
decisions affecting their own lives. This situation has resulted from changes in attitudes among present-day women.

(1) **New concerns and role models.** Women's new sense of independence has recently surfaced as an important factor behind their reluctance to move. The following concerns appear to be increasingly important:

(a) the need to make independent decisions governing her way of life.

(b) the opportunity to channel her talents and abilities into areas other than domestic ones.

(c) the ability to control her home and work environment.

(d) the desire to share family responsibilities and household routines equitably with her husband.

(e) the importance of her concerns being recognized and considered within her husband's corporation.

These concerns are so important that organizations should consider them thoroughly when framing transfer policy. Women's consciousness of their new role model leads corporate wives to question certain corporate traditions, particularly corporate transfer policies. Berkwitt (1972) maintains that the corporate wives' resistance to moving is probably the most obvious sign right now of their self-definition. This response of spouses requires that the corporate world see corporate wives
not simply as an extension of their husbands but as independent people.

(2) Dual-career couples. Ginzberg (1977) maintains that the single, most outstanding economic phenomenon of our century is the large number of women who are either already in the work force or currently entering the work force. The present labour force is composed of a substantially greater percentage of women than at any time in the past (Waldman, 1970a). Surveys conducted by Statistics Canada confirm the observation that there has been a marked difference in work force participation rates of females in recent years. In the period between 1966 and 1976, the work force participation rate of women rose from roughly 34 percent to 45 percent with the greatest increase in the age group of 25 to 45. The participation rate of this age group in the work force increased by 59 percent over the same period and accounted for the bulk of the overall work force increase (Statistics of Canada, 1979). This increase is primarily a reflection of the increased tendency of married women under forty-five years of age to enter the work force. Although it is difficult to estimate the percentage of married professional women in the work force, that percentage probably parallels the general tendency of increased numbers of women entering the total work force.

Maynard and Zawacki (1979) define the dual-career couple as one in which both partners pursue careers as well as family roles. Most of these careers involve occupations that require a
high degree of commitment, have a developmental character and confer substantial personal rewards.

Dual-career couples have become increasingly common for the following reasons:

(a) The proportion of young couples (with or without children) who prefer two pay cheques has increased during a period of serious inflation. The ethic of "quality of life" stimulates the trend of dual-career couples because two incomes can be a key to liberation and new life/career choices.

(b) The growing consciousness of women's independence has recently surfaced as an important factor behind the dual-career couple trend. Many women, while appreciating their husband's career involvement, expect recognition of their own career aspirations. Furthermore, an increasing number of women are becoming career-oriented and are beginning to look outside their homes and their husbands' careers for personal fulfillment.

(c) Women are better educated than they were thirty years ago. Mullally (1979) states that along with finding a husband while at college, most executive wives also get their degree. In addition, many young women enter college with a strong commitment to a profession and continue their education to the post-doctoral level. Now, too, more women are updating their education to qualify for specific careers. A survey done by Harold Lazarus, Professor of Management at New York University's Graduate School
of Business Administration, shows that a significant number of women 35 years old and over in the middle- and upper-income group return to school.

As a rule, educational attainment measured in years of schooling has a distinct influence on the percentage of wives in the work force. One of the wives participating in Mullally's (1979) study asked, "Why cover all that talent with a bushel basket? And if you are educated, why suppress it?"

In summary, there is a clear trend of increased labour force participation by married women. More and more employed men and women are part of dual-career families. Maynard and Zawacki (1979) maintain that the problem of geographic transfer remains a critical issue for dual-career families.

B. The Effects of Transfers on the Roles of Wives

Whenever the company decides to move a married male employee to a new location, the geographic transfer may affect the wife's family role, career role, and social role. The effects of a transfer on the transferred executive's spouse have received a great deal of attention from the popular press, business magazines and scholarly journals (Berkwitt, 1972; Triebal, 1972; Bensahel, 1975; Bell, 1977; Price, 1979; Vandervelde, 1979a; 1979b; Brett, 1981; Brett, 1982).

(1) Effects on her family role. When a transfer requires the father to be separated from his family for a
period of time, the wife has to be both mother and father to their children. In other words, she takes on the responsibilities usually associated with her husband's role: chores, decision making (especially social decisions) and children's discipline. One effect of enforced separation is that the wife on her own becomes more practical because she has to cope with problems that she normally would not see to when her husband is present. If she is uncertain as to an action, she will often have to seek help from experts, who are usually strangers. If she is shy, she must overcome it. Her new responsibilities may lead to changes in her attitudes and self-perceptions. And when she joins her husband, the question of whether and how she should relinquish the roles she has adopted in his absence creates frustrations and uncertainties. Brett (1981) states that the disruption of learned and valued behaviour as a result of separation and reintegration in the event of a transfer may cause the corporate wife to have feelings of loss or of lack of control, which will have to be resolved before adjustment to the move can be accomplished. Transfers can also affect a wife's extended family role. When a transferred woman has to move away from aging or ill parents, she may experience guilt and role conflict.

(2) Effects on her career role. There is conflicting evidence about the effects of a transfer on the corporate wife's career role. On one hand, the responses made by working
women in both Burke's study (1974) and Brett and Werbel's study (1978) suggested that working was not related to their attitude toward transfers because those who were working were no more negative about future moves than those who were not working. And Brett's study (1982) indicates that mobile wives believe they have better chances for promotion than stable wives. However, interpreting this result is difficult since they also were reported to believe what seems to be inconsistent with this, that they are less secure in their jobs. On the other hand, many researchers argue that working women experience almost total career role disruption as a result of job transfers (Pahl and Pahl, 1971; Schein, 1971; Seidenberg, 1973; Marshall and Cooper, 1976; Pinder, 1981). And many urge companies to recognize the special problems of a working wife in the event of a transfer (Foegen, 1977; Maynard and Zawacki, 1979; Mullally, 1979; Stillman, 1979). Brett (1981) believes that these rather incongruous data must be interpreted in the context of the way working women define their primary roles. Transfer does not seem to be a problem for those who consider their "wife and mother" roles to be more important than their personal and career roles. However, transfer is a definite problem for those wives who are committed to building their own careers.

Working wives who are professionally trained must commit themselves to several years in one position. Frequent, hasty moves because of their husbands' transfers make it difficult and very often impossible for them to find opportunities in
employment that are commensurate with their training and experience. Young wives who have just entered a career field and who are called upon to move find disruption at such an early stage a hinderance to advancement.

One alternative to the transfer problem mentioned by Maynard and Zawacki (1979) is to have a "commuter marriage" in which the dual-career couples take jobs in different cities. Not only are commuter marriages not easy, but they also entail strong liabilities. A satisfactory commuter marriage calls for a level of commitment and maturity that few couples can provide, and a large number of such marriages that have occurred as a result of transfer end in divorce (Maynard and Zawacki, 1979).

(3) Effects on her social role. Packard (1972) maintains that mobile women develop few social attachments (such as with schools, churches, neighbours) and few close friends in order to protect themselves against their inevitable loss when they move. However, in Brett and Werbel's study (1978), the more mobile women belonged to a greater number of social organizations than the less mobile women. It is suggested that there is no real conflict between these two findings: since a more mobile woman will recognize through experience the need to establish her identity in a new community, it is not surprising that she belongs to more social organizations than the less mobile woman. At the same time, since they know they may be unsettled within a few months,
they probably will not be inclined to "settle in". It is not surprising, then, to see them avoid developing friendships when they are faced with the prospect of starting all over again in another strange place. Therefore, the crux of the matter is not how many social organizations these women belong to, but rather how much they feel that they belong to those organizations. Burke (1972) found that 34 percent of the wives in his sample felt they had not made any close or lasting friends in their new neighbourhoods, a finding which clearly demonstrates the effects of transfers on women's social role. And Brett's study (1982) confirms their dissatisfaction with social relationships.

Many highly mobile wives are also faced with the problem described by a wife in Seidenberg's book (1973):

> It takes about a year really to get into a new place and make some friends, so if I start right away, there could be about three years to enjoy the fruits of my efforts. If we're transferred again after a year or so, those efforts will have been in vain, but if I don't try and we're not transferred, it would mean another four years of isolation. (P.18)

(4) **Effects on her mental and physical health.** While some newspaper and magazine articles (Packard, 1972; Seidenberg, 1973) claim that mobile wives suffer more mental and physical health problem than stable wives, Brett's study (1982) indicates that this is not a problem.
Summary of Literature Review

This review indicates that there is a reluctance on the part of corporate wives to accept their husbands' transfers and that the factors influencing this reluctance are numerous and diverse. But to date, no thorough study has been made of precisely what those factors are. Chapter Three identifies a number of such factors and develops hypotheses relating them to the willingness of spouses to accept husbands' transfers.
Kerlinger (1979) defines a hypothesis as a conjectural statement about the relations between two or more variables. Hypotheses are generated here regarding the relationship between the willingness of the transferred employee's spouse to move again (which serves as the dependent variable in the study) and the following independent variables: the spouse's working status, the spouse's total number of transfer experiences, the importance of accepting the transfer to the transferred employee, the spouse's overall satisfaction with the company's transfer policy, the length of settlement in her current residence, her satisfaction with her present location, the presence in the household of school-aged children, and her scores on indices measuring job involvement, company commitment, extraversion-introversion, upward striving, authoritarianism, and locus of control.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the theoretical justifications for a general hypothesis and for each of the independent variables in each of two populations (working spouses and non-working spouses). This discussion is followed by a brief explanation of the conceptual justification for positing a relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable. Finally, a summary of hypotheses to be tested is
presented. The independent variables selected for the purpose of this study are intended to be of use in understanding what factors determine the "willingness" of the spouse to move again. It is assumed that the less likely a spouse is to be affected by familial, personal and social disruptions, the more willing she is to be transferred with her husband.

A. Working Status of the Spouse*: A General Hypothesis

Many researchers support the common view that working wives no longer willingly give up their jobs just because their husbands are transferred, and those who concur with their husband's decisions to move in order to save their marriage, often experience almost total career role disruption (Pahl and Pahl, 1971; Schein, 1971; Seidenberg, 1973; Marshall and Cooper, 1976). Foegen (1977) further states that these working wives often have a difficult time re-establishing their careers or simply finding a job in a new community because they lack seniority and because they will be unable to provide their employers with the desired continuity. For these reasons, a working wife will be less likely to welcome an offer to move than a non-working wife. Accordingly, it was hypothesized that working wives would be less willing to move than non-working wives.

* This variable also serves as a moderator variable to divide the sample into two groups (working spouses and non-working spouses) in order to allow for individual analysis of each group in relation to the dependent variable. Further discussion of this point can be found in the next major section, "Methodology."
B. Specific Hypotheses for the Working Group

Eight of the twelve hypotheses in the working group will be discussed under the section "Common Hypotheses for Both Groups." The remaining four hypotheses are particularly relevant to the working group and are discussed below.

(1) Job Involvement

The extent to which an individual's work is associated with self-concept, motivation, ego feelings, and the fulfillment of psychological needs (e.g., affection, love, etc.) has been discussed widely by organizational theorists and social psychologists (Maslow, 1954; McGregor, 1960; Vroom, 1964). This relationship was further explored by Lodahl and Kejner (1965), who developed a theoretical definition for it. They labelled this relationship "job involvement," defined as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self image" (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965, p. 24). Thus, a job-involved individual may be characterized as a person "for whom work is a very important part of life, and as one who is affected very much personally by his whole job situation: the work itself, his co-workers, the company, etc." (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965, p. 25). In contrast, a non-job-involved person "does his living off the job. Work is not an important part of his psychological life. His interests are elsewhere, and the love of his self-image, the essential part of his identity is not greatly affected by the kind of work he does or how well he does it" (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965, p. 25).
Katz and Kahn (1966) conclude that an individual who prepares to accept fully the organizational demands placed upon him by his membership in the organization must be job-involved.

It was therefore hypothesized that a job-involved working wife would be more conscious of her own organizational demands and would hence be less willing to accept her husband's transfer. (Here, we assume that the dual-career couple do not work for the same organization and are not transferred to the same location at the same time.)

(2) **Company Commitment**

Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) define "company commitment" as "the strength of an individual's identification with, and involvement in, a given organization" (p. 18). Jamal (1975) defines a company-committed person as one who is concerned about his company and willing to put in extra work. According to Porter et al. (1974) a company-committed person has the following characteristics (p. 604):

(a) A strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization's goals and values.

(b) A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization.

(c) A definite desire to maintain organizational membership.
The more committed a working wife is to her company, the more she will comply with the demands her company makes upon her. In fact, if she is committed to the goals of the company, she will have internalized the values characteristic of the company, and she will want to maintain her loyalty to "her" company. Accepting a transfer offered by "his" company would contradict her values and would show a lack of concern for the future of her company. Triebal (1972) states that the more a working woman's identity merges with her company, the more resistant she will be to any move suggested by the husband's company. It was therefore hypothesized that a working woman who is committed to her company would be less willing to accept any transfer opportunity offered by her husband's company.

(3) **Upward Striving**

Wollack, Goodale, Wijting and Smith (1971) developed the Survey of Work Values (SWV), a series of scales measuring attitudes toward work, based on a number of dimensions of the Protestant Ethic. Although considerable effort has been devoted to constructing instruments for the purpose of measuring work values (Super, 1957; 1962) and occupational values (Rosenberg, 1957; Kilpatrick, Cummings & Jennings, 1964), Wollack et al. (1971) argue that these scales are too global; they maintain that the SWV is directed toward separate areas of values and is limited to the construct of secularized Protestant Ethics with which work values seem to be closely linked. Upward striving is regarded as characteristic of the Protestant Ethic, and is a
sub-scale of the SWV. Wollack et al. (1971) define this construct as "the desire to seek continually a higher level of job and a better standard of living."

The more a working wife is concerned with achievement and power in a professional or business role of her own, the harder she will work to advance her own career. It was therefore hypothesized that a working wife who is upwardly striving would be less willing to accept any move suggested by her husband's company because it would jeopardize her own chances for advancement.

(4) Authoritarian Personality

Adorno et al. (1950) describe an authoritarian person as having strong needs not only of domination, but also of submission, and thus having great respect for authority. This respect for authority would help an individual reconcile any moral conflict resulting from the injustice that companies commit at times (Presthus, 1962). Hence, an individual scoring high on authoritarianism finds it easier to legitimate the existence of a company as a system in which authority, status, and responsibility are not always equally shared. The authoritarian individual's aim is to achieve the company's goals of growth, profit, survival and power; and she feels that if she is to succeed, she must accept such values with utter commitment. As a result of such feelings, an individual would do as she is told for the sake of the organization and for her own personal success. Thus, when an authoritarian working wife is confronted
with demands from her company to stay put while her husband is faced with a corporate transfer, she is unlikely to comply with the request of her husband or his company. Therefore, it was hypothesized that a working wife scoring high on authoritarianism would be less willing to move with her husband.

C. Specific Hypotheses for the Non-Working Group

There are no counterparts for the two independent variables "job-involvement" and "company-commitment" in the non-working group, so they have been deleted, leaving a total of ten hypotheses for the non-working group. Two specific hypotheses for this group will be discussed in the following section; the other eight hypotheses will be covered in the section dealing with hypotheses common to both groups.

(1) Upward Striving

A non-working wife, who usually sees her husband's career development as being an integral part of her life, will seek a better standard of living through a higher level of job achievement by her husband. It was therefore hypothesized that those non-working wives who were upwardly striving would be more willing to move than those who were not.

(2) Authoritarian Personality

A non-working wife scoring high on authoritarianism would probably be more amenable to a transfer. She would likely see her husband as head of the household and thus place his needs above
hers and be willing to do what he wanted. It was therefore hypothesized that an authoritarian non-working wife would be more willing to relocate if her husband were to receive a transfer opportunity.

D. Common Hypotheses for Both Groups

(1) Introversion/Extraversion

Hilgard, Atkinson and Atkinson (1971) describe a typical social introvert as a person who tends to withdraw, especially in times of emotional stress or conflict, an inclination toward shyness, and a preference for working alone. A typical social extravert seeks the company of other people, especially when under stress. Characterized as being very sociable, easy-going, conventional, well-dressed and out-going, an extravert prefers to deal with people rather than with things. Since the introvert tends to withdraw and prefers to stay in isolation when confronted with a stressful situation (such as a geographical transfer), the stressful aspects of transfers leave the introverted individual in a state of social isolation. As many social psychologists have pointed out, the psychological consequences of turning away from the basic social nature of society can be harmful. The problem becomes particularly severe when the wife has to move into a new environment with few or no previously established contacts to help ease the strains of assimilation. Seidenberg (1973) claims that the husband, because of his skill and credentials, is often immediately accepted at
work, and furthermore he may have already acquired contacts there. Thus, he can become assimilated into the new environment long before his wife gets to know her neighbours. One of the mobile women in Velsey's study (1972) states that "the woman who goes out and does something is going to adjust better than the one who sits around and feels sorry for herself." The social extravert will find it easier to face the task of building a new social life and a new personal community for herself without a predetermined role in the new environment than will the introvert. It was therefore hypothesized that extraverted wives would be more willing to move than introverted wives.

(2) **Locus of Control**

Some individuals tend to attribute events to their own actions, while others tend to attribute events to external factors that are beyond their control. Rotter (1954) proposed a scale for measuring this personality dimension. An individual's standing on the scale reveals the extent to which he sees events as being controlled internally (i.e., by himself), rather than externally (i.e., by other factors). Collins (1974) states that "the I-E scale measures a response bias, stereotype, or implicit personality theory; it reflects constant bias in the observer's judgements regarding the cause of good and bad things that happen to him" (p. 381). Thus, an individual scoring "internal" on I-E scale tends to believe that events occur as a consequence of his
personal actions and are under his personal control. Conversely, an individual scoring "external" tends to believe that the occurrence and outcome of events are totally unrelated to his personal actions and are beyond his personal control.

While four sub-scales in the I-E scale measure overall perception of locus of control, only one of these is relevant to this study, the difficult-easy world scale. Collins (1974) states that an individual scoring "external" on this particular sub-scale would believe that "the reinforcement schedule in his world is complex and difficult -- that is, he lives in a difficult world" (p. 387). Hence, if such a wife is offered an opportunity to move with her husband, she will most likely see the opportunity as leading to unnecessary difficulties which she would rather not confront, so she will show a negative reaction when confronted with transfer-related difficulties. It was therefore hypothesized that a person scoring "external" on the difficult-easy dimension would be less willing to move than one scoring "internal."

(3) Length of Settlement

It takes time for most people to develop a sense of belonging to social organizations, and to become known in a new community. Thus, it is not surprising for a recently transferred wife to find that her social relationship is superficial and constrained. Most non-working women establish their identities through their commitment to community activities, activities which
demand time and energy that a newly transferred spouse must initially spend on her family. Therefore, she cannot afford the involvement necessary to ensure community identification.

The longer a spouse stays in one place, the deeper her friendships will become and the more community identification she will have. Consequently, when a woman has established herself in the community and makes close friends, it is difficult for her to give this up when her husband's company wants him to move. It was therefore hypothesized that the longer the family has lived in its particular location, the less willing the spouse would be to accept a transfer.

(4) Total Number of Transfers Experienced by the Spouse

Jones (1973) maintains that there is an opportunity for growth in the moving experience. Some transferred employees' spouses in this study reported that, as a result of extensive transfer experience, they had become more adept at coping with stress, had become more flexible and adaptable, had broadened their range of interests, had developed skills at meeting people and making friends, and had become more understanding and accepting of other people, cultures and customs. The difference in the responses of those who were accustomed to moving about and those who were new to it is pronounced. A frequently transferred spouse will, because of her experience at adjusting to new circumstances, fit into new surroundings faster than a spouse who is less experienced. Consequently, more frequently
transferred spouses welcome a transfer more enthusiastically than less frequently transferred spouses. It was therefore hypothesized that the more transfers a spouse has experienced, the more willing she would be to move again.

(5) Spouse's Overall Satisfaction with the Company's Transfer Policy

Although an increasing number of employees are rejecting transfer opportunities for personal and familial reasons (Pinder and Das, 1979), the economic factors of the company's transfer policy remain very important (DiDomenico, 1978b). A recent study of one large Canadian firm showed that there was a great reluctance to move when the transferred family (particularly the spouse) was not satisfied with the company's expense allowance for moving, and when the family's standard of living was lower due to moving to a higher-cost location, with no immediate or adequate adjustment in salary (Business Week, 1976b). While the transferred employee is moving out of his old office and establishing himself in his new working environment, the spouse has to take on the responsibilities of selling the house, transporting the family's household goods, and selecting a new house in the new location. All these responsibilities can be arduous and can alienate her from the idea of moving, even though she liked the idea initially. Stillman (1979) states that many companies have turned to outside relocation service firms for
assistance with these responsibilities in order to make the transfer as quick and easy as possible for the transferred spouse. If these professional services solve her moving problems, and if she is happy with the monetary inducements offered by the company in exchange for a move, she seems to be more willing to move. It was therefore hypothesized that the more satisfied the spouse is with her husband's company's transfer policy, the more willing she would be to accept a transfer.

(6) Importance to the Transferred Employee of Accepting Transfers

An employee may accept a transfer for any of the following reasons:

(a) He wants to have an opportunity to extend his insight into his company and to develop his skills through the transfer so that he can better prepare himself for the possibility of intra-organizational advancement.

(b) He is ambitious and realizes that transfer probably will lead to promotion and status.

(c) He believes that his refusal of an offer to transfer would result in a limitation of his potential for further success in the company.

Since a husband's job is often the major source of income for the family, a spouse may be willing to give up some of her rights in order to accommodate a transfer if the acceptance of the transfer is important to the husband. It was therefore
hypothesized that the more important the transfer is perceived to be by the husband, the more willing the spouse would be to go along with her husband's decision to accept the transfer.

(7) **Satisfaction With Present Location**

Burke (1972) concluded from his study about the effects of job transfer on engineers' wives that the more favourable the wife's feelings were toward the present community, the more unfavourable her reaction would be to her husband's announcement that he was being transferred. On the other hand, if the spouse is living in a town or city which lacks facilities and amenities she desires (e.g., recreational facilities, special interest opportunities and associations, the type of schooling she wants for her child, and the type of special medical care she may require or like), she would welcome a move, particularly if the new location would provide the desired amenities. Pinder (1977) found that individuals moving to a new location perceived by them to be more desirable than their former location tended to be more satisfied with their transfer. It was therefore hypothesized in this study that the more dissatisfied a wife is with her present location, the more willing she would be to accept a transfer.

(8) **School-Aged Children (6-19)**

Olive et al. (1976) found that school-aged children are more negative about moving than either of their parents. Seidenberg (1973) explains that, since most of us in growing up
cannot afford to lose the peer supports that we have, there is loneliness and even despair when these supports are taken away as a result of a geographic transfer. The situation is further complicated by factors of dating and mating, which become important in the teen years.

More and more parents are becoming aware of the damage to children resulting from a transfer; there is increasing evidence that even parents who themselves put more emphasis on the corporation than on the community are concerned about the effects of frequent transfers and moves on their children (Seidenberg, 1973; Business Week, 1976a; Marshall and Cooper, 1976; Student, 1976; Brett, 1981). The effect of any one child's attitude can be stressful for the whole family, and particularly the mother. It was therefore hypothesized that if the spouse had school-aged children, she would be less willing to accept a transfer.

E. Summary of Hypotheses to be tested

Working Status - A working wife would be less willing to accept her husband's organizational demand to transfer than a non-working wife.

Specific Hypotheses for the Working Spouse Group

Job Involvement - A more job-involved working wife would be less willing to accept her husband's transfer than a working wife who
is less job-involved.

**Company Commitment** - A working wife who is more committed to her company would be less willing to accept a transfer opportunity offered by her husband's company than would a working wife who is less company committed.

**Upward Striving** - A working wife who is more upwardly striving would be less willing to accept any move suggested by her husband's company than would a working wife who is less upwardly striving.

**Authoritarianism** - A working wife who scores high on authoritarianism would be less willing to move with her husband than a working wife who is low on authoritarianism.

**Specific Hypotheses for the Non-Working Spouse Group**

**Upward Striving** - Those non-working wives who are more upwardly striving would be more willing to move than those wives who are less upwardly striving.

**Authoritarianism** - An authoritarian wife would be more willing to accept her husband's organizational demand for transfer than a woman who is less authoritarian.
Common Hypotheses for Both Groups

**Introversion/Extraversion** - Extraverted wives would be more willing to move than introverted wives.

**Locus of Control** - Wives scoring "external" on the difficult-easy dimension would be less willing to move than wives scoring "internal."

**Length of Settlement** - The longer the wife has stayed in one place, the more unwilling she would be to accept a transfer.

**Total Number of Transfers Experienced by the Spouse** - The more transfers the wife has experienced, the more willing she would be to move.

**Spouse's Overall Satisfaction with Her Husband's Company's Transfer Policy** - The more satisfied a wife is with her husband's company's transfer policy, the more willing she would be to accept a transfer.

**Importance to the Transferred Employee of Accepting the Transfer** - The more important the transfer is perceived to be by her husband, the more willing the wife would be to go along with the husband's decision to accept the transfer.
Spouse's Satisfaction with Her Present Location - The more satisfied the wife is with her present location, the more unwilling she would be to accept a transfer.

School-Aged Children (6-19) - A wife with school-aged children would be less willing to accept a transfer than a wife without school-aged children.

Methodology

Subjects

A total sample of 750 individuals was randomly drawn from a population of employees (mostly managers) who had been transferred at least once by their present employers. The subjects of the present study were the spouses (mostly wives, see footnote, p. 13) of these employees who worked for six large Canadian companies in industries where personnel transfers are common (transportation, petroleum and retail sales). These spouses had been moved to and from many different cities and towns, as well as into and out of the United States and other countries.

Two separate surveys of three companies each were conducted. The first survey consisted of 295 mailings; the second survey, 455 mailings. Minor additions were made to the questionnaire after the first sample of three companies was surveyed in 1975 and before the second survey of three companies in 1976. The data from the first survey were used for
statistical analysis; the data from the second survey were used merely for cross-validation. One hundred and ninety-six usable sets of questionnaires, or 66 percent of the first sample, and 209 usable sets of questionnaires, or 46 percent of the second sample, were returned by the transferred employees. Therefore, the 405 responses represent a 54 percent overall response rate. Eighty-four percent of the respondents in the first survey had spouses who returned usable questionnaires (n = 164), and coincidentally 84 percent of the respondents in the second survey had spouses who returned usable questionnaires (n = 176). The mean age of the responding spouses was 36.1 years (S.D. = 8.76 years) in the first survey and 41.0 years (S.D. = 9.4 years) in the second survey.

Materials

The survey questionnaires designed to gather the data were developed after Dr. Pinder had conducted extensive interviews with several personnel managers who had a great deal of experience in dealing with transfers as well as with actual former transferees. In addition, the content of the questionnaires was influenced by earlier research of Pahl and Pahl (1971), Burke (1972; 1974) and Glueck (1974). Two questionnaires were developed: one was specifically designed for the transferred employee (see Appendix A), while the other was developed for the employee's spouse (see Appendix B). The second versions of these two questionnaires, used in the second survey,
can be found in Appendix C and Appendix D, respectively. The items included in the questionnaire for the spouses were based largely on the questionnaire designed for the transferred employees; some scales found in the transferred employees' questionnaires were not applicable to the spouses, and were thus eliminated from the spouses' questionnaires.

Independent Variables

Working Status - The working status of the spouse was measured by responses to a single question: "Since your transfer, have you been earning any income?" A "Yes/No" response format was provided.

Job Involvement - Lodahl and Kejner (1965) developed a Likert-type scale to measure the psychological dimension of job involvement. Over 100 statements relating to job involvement were initially developed based on information obtained from interviews, previous questionnaires, and associates in the field. After carrying out item analysis, Lodahl and Kejner reduced the total set of items to 20. Subsequently, Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) developed a shorter version of the scale. There are now only six items in the shortened scale, which appears in Figure 2. The response choices range from 7 (Strongly Agree) through to 1 (Strongly Disagree). Item 80 is scaled in reverse order. The
75. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.

76. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.

77. I live, eat, and breathe my job.

78. I am very much involved personally in my work.

79. I'm really a perfectionist about my job.

80. Most things in life are more important than work.

Figure 2: Item Content of Lodahl's and Kejner's Job-Involvement Scale
total score, which is the sum of the responses to the six scale items, indicates the degree of job involvement. Possible scores on this scale range from a minimum of 6 to a maximum of 42 points.

**Company Commitment** - To measure company commitment, Baba and Jamal (1976) compiled a scale, also presented in a Likert-type format, which consists of only four items. These are found in Figure 3. They developed Items 91 and 93 through their own research, but drew Items 90 and 92 from Porter's Organizational Commitment Scale (1971), and subsequently modified them to the present form. Each item is stated in such a way that a response indicating strong agreement with the stated item affirms a feeling of company commitment. The choices of response can be from 7 (Strongly Agree) through to 1 (Strongly Disagree). A high total score, being the sum of the responses to the four scale items, indicates a high degree of company commitment. The range of the scores is from a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 28 points.

**Upward Striving** was measured by a sub-scale of the Survey of Work Values (SWV), which measures the extent of one's aspiration to move upward in an organization (Wollack et al., 1971). A total of 91 statements, representing each sub-scale, were formulated on the basis of a review of the literature and suggestions from faculty and graduate students, all of whom had industrial experience. Item analyses were carried out, resulting in six sub-scales, each containing nine items. The method of
Figure 3: Item Content of Baba's and Jamal's Company Commitment Scale
reallocation was used to demonstrate that the six work values were discernably different from one another and that the items of the "Upward Striving" sub-scale measured the psychological dimension that it was intended to measure.

The "Upward Mobility" sub-scale of the SWV was used in its entirety in the questionnaire for collecting data for this study. The sub-scale, consisting of nine items, which also appears in a Likert-type format, is shown in Figure 4. The response choice ranges from 7 (Strongly Agree) through to 1 (Strongly Disagree). The total score for upward striving is the sum of responses to each of the nine items. The range of the possible scores is from a minimum of 9 to a maximum of 63.

Authoritarianism - Adorno et al. (1950) developed the California F (Fascism) Scale, to measure the psychological dimension called "Authoritarianism". Since the original F scale consisted of items tapping ethnic prejudice, such items were eliminated from the scale employed in the questionnaire for the purpose of this study. Thus, there are now twelve paired statements which are dichotomous in nature in the shortened scale, shown in Figure 5.

These statements are labelled "A" or "B" for each of the 12 numbered items. The selection of statement "A" for items 120, 121, 122, 123, 125 and 128 shows the subject's agreement with a statement describing the authoritarian trait and are each assigned one point. Likewise, the selection of statement "B" for the remaining items also depicts the subject's endorsement of a
81. Even if a man has a good job, he should always be looking for a better job.

82. In choosing a job, a man ought to consider his chances for advancement as well as other factors.

83. A man should always be thinking about pulling himself up in the world and should work hard with the hope of being promoted to a higher-level job.

84. If a man likes his job, he should be satisfied with it and should not push for promotion to another job.

85. The trouble with too many people is that when they find a job in which they are interested, they don't try to get a better job.

86. A worker who turns down a promotion is probably making a mistake.

87. A promotion to a higher-level job usually means more worries and should be avoided for that reason.

88. A well paying job that offers little opportunity for advancement is not a good job for me.

89. A worker is better off if he is satisfied with his job and is not concerned about being promoted to another job.

Figure 4: Item Content of Upward Mobility Sub-Scale of the SWV
117. A. It is highly unlikely that astrology will ever be able to explain anything.
   B. Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

118. A. If it weren't for the rebellious ideas of youth there would be less progress in the world.
   B. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

119. A. It would be a good thing if people spent more time talking about ideas just for the fun of it.
   B. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

120. A. What a youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
   B. In the long run it is better for our country if young people are allowed a great deal of personal freedom and are not strictly disciplined.

121. A. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
   B. There are times when it is necessary to probe into even the most personal and private matters.

122. A. The businessmen and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
   B. The artist and the professor are probably more important to society than the businessman.

123. A. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
   B. One of the most important things children should learn is when to disobey authorities.

Figure 5: Item Content of the California F Scale
124. A. Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.

B. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude and respect for his parents.

125. A. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country even in places where people might least expect it.

B. In spite of what you read about the wild sex life of people in important places, the real story is about the same in any group of people.

126. A. It's nobody's business if someone is a homosexual as long as he doesn't harm other people.

B. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

127. A. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best to face it and try to think it through, even if it is so upsetting that it keeps him from concentrating on other things.

B. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

128. A. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

B. It's all right for people to raise questions about even the most sacred matter.

Figure 5: Continued
statement indicating authoritarianism, and each one is assigned one point. The total score for the California F Scale is the sum of the points obtained by the individual. The score may range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 12.

**Social Extraversion-Introversion** - There have been numerous measures (i.e., sub-scales) of Eysenck's (1959) Maudsley Personality Inventory, Guilford's and Zimmerman's Temperament Survey, and Drake's (1946) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory claiming to measure the construct "Social Extraversion-Introversion." However, Bendig (1962) argued that no reliable and factorially valid scale measuring the social extraversion-introversion factor had been developed. After performing analysis on the earlier Inventories, Bendig compiled an inventory composed of items found in pre-existing scales measuring the construct and developed the 30-item social extraversion-introversion scale known as the Pittsburgh Scale of Social Extraversion-Introversion. Bendig (1962) maintained that the Pittsburgh scale of Social Extraversion-Introversion was an attempt to provide a more rigorous measure of the broad second-order personality factor of social extraversion-introversion (SEI). The scale of SEI consists of 15 items from Eysenck's MPI I scale, ten items from the MMPI's social extraversion-introversion scale, and five items from Guilford and Zimmerman's GZTS. The Pittsburgh Scale of SEI has been used in its entirety in the questionnaires used for the collection of data for this study, and is shown in Figure 6.
I am happiest when I get involved in some project that calls for rapid action.

I usually take the initiative in making new friends.

I would rate myself as a lively individual.

I would be very unhappy if I were prevented from making numerous social contacts.

I am inclined to keep in the background on social occasions.

I like to mix socially with people.

I am inclined to limit my acquaintances to a select few.

I like to have many social engagements.

I generally prefer to take the lead in group activities.

I would rate myself as a happy-go-lucky individual.

I am inclined to keep quiet when out in a social group.

I can usually let myself go and have a hilariously good time at a party.

Other people regard me as a lively individual.

I would rate myself as a talkative individual.

I am a good mixer.

Figure 6: Item Content of the Pittsburgh Scale of Social Extraversion-Introversion
144. I like to go to parties and other affairs where there is lots of loud fun.

145. I like to flirt.

146. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.

147. At parties I am more likely to sit by myself or with just one other person than to join in with the crowd.

148. I love to go to dances.

149. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.

150. I enjoy the excitement of a crowd.

151. My worries seem to disappear when I get into a crowd of lively friends.

152. I like parties and socials.

153. I am a carefree individual.

154. I make decisions on the spur of the moment.

155. I like wild enthusiasm, sometimes to a point bordering on rowdyism, at a football or baseball game.

156. I generally feel as though I haven't a care in the world.

157. I usually say what I feel like saying at the moment.

158. I nearly always have a "ready answer" for remarks directed at me.

Figure 6: Continued
The subject must indicate for each of the 30 items whether he believes it is a true or false statement. One point is given for each "True" response for all items except 133, 135, 139 and 147. For these items, one point is given for each "False" response. The range of the total score on the scale is from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 30, with a low score denoting introversion and a high score denoting extraversion.

Internal-External Locus of Control - There have been a number of scales developed by Rotter to tap the locus of control personality dimension. Rotter's (1966) Internal-External (I-E) forced-choice scale is employed most frequently by researchers. After an analysis of Rotter's I-E scale, Collins (1974) identified four distinguishable and relatively orthogonal sub-scales: (1) the difficult-easy world; (2) the just-unjust world; (3) the predictable-unpredictable world; and (4) the politically responsive-unresponsive world. Only the first sub-scale was employed in this study; the other three sub-scales were expected to be irrelevant. Therefore, the form of Rotter's I-E Locus of Control Scale used in the questionnaires includes only the Difficult/Easy Sub-scale consisting of eight Likert-type items, as shown in Figure 7.

All items are positively stated, and response choices range from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). A high total score, being the sum of the responses to the eight items, indicates an external score on this dimension of the
94. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
95. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
96. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
97. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
98. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes un-recognized no matter how hard he tries.
99. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
100. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
101. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Item Content of Rotter's I-E Locus of Control Difficult/Easy Sub-Scale.
Internal-External locus of control trait. The sub-scale score may range from a minimum of 8 to a maximum of 40.

Length of Settlement - The length of the spouse's settlement in her present location was measured by a question which read, "How many months has it been since you actually moved because of your last transfer?"

Total Number of Transfers Experienced by the Spouse - This was computed as the sum of the number of transfers the spouse had experienced since she was a child. This was measured by responses to two questions: "How many times have you been transferred by your spouse's company or by your own company?" and "When you were a child, how often did you move with your family from one home to another? (This includes moves within and between cities.) Estimate the number of moves your family made (while you lived with them) as accurately as you can."

Spouse's Overall Satisfaction with a Company's Transfer Policy - Pinder (1978) identified fourteen assistance provisions made by companies to offset the inconvenience of transfer. The list is by no means exhaustive of the usual assistance provisions for transfers, but it is adequate for measuring a spouse's satisfaction with the transfer policy of her husband's company. They are listed in Figure 8. The spouse's overall satisfaction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58. Travel allowances to look for new home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Temporary living expenses at new location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Travel allowances to old location after move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Allowances to move family/household goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Assistance in finding new home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Assistance in selling old home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Time off to move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Purchase agreement if can't sell old home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Financial assistance in buying new home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Payment of closing costs on new home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Payment of decorating costs in new home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. The raises given at time of transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Payment of difference in mortgage rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Time to prepare for the move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Item Content of Pinder's Assistance Provisions Scale
with the company's transfer policy was measured on a five-point scale ranging from 5 (Very Satisfied) to 1 (Very Unsatisfied).

Importance to the Transferred Employee of Accepting the Transfer - This was measured by asking the transferred employee to indicate on a seven-point scale ranging from 7 (Extremely Important) to 1 (Not Important at All) his answer to the following question: "In your opinion, how important is accepting a transfer as a means of moving upward in your company?"

Spouse's Satisfaction with Her Present Location - This construct was measured by asking the spouse to indicate on a scale ranging from 7 (Extremely Satisfied) to 1 (Extremely Unsatisfied) her answer to the following question: "In general, how satisfied are you (personally) with your new location?"

School-Aged Children (6-19) - This was measured by responses to two questions: "How many children did you have at the time of your last transfer?" and "List the ages of your children at the time of your last move (in years)?" If there is one or more children whose age is between six and nineteen, this variable was coded 1; otherwise, it was coded 0.

The Dependent Variable: Willingness of the Transferred Employee's Spouse to Move Again - This psychological dimension was assessed by the spouse's responses to the following two
items: "How happy would you be if your spouse were transferred again by his (or her) company?" and "What would you say are the chances in ten (10) that you would want your spouse to leave the company rather than transfer again?" Ten-point response formats were offered for each of these two items, ranging from "Extremely Happy" to "Extremely Unhappy" (for the first item) and "1" to "10" (for the second item). The two items were scaled in opposite directions and were intercorrelated ($r = -.33, n = 154, p < .001$). Scores on these two items were aggregated to yield a single index.

Procedures

Altogether, four separate mailings were made to each respondent at her home address. The first mailing contained a preliminary letter from Dr. Pinder (see Appendix E.1) and a letter from a senior personnel executive from her husband's company (see Appendix E.2) and was made approximately one week before the mailing of the questionnaires. The purposes of the researcher's letter were: (1) to acquaint the subjects with the project and with the purpose of the study; (2) to explain the possible implications the research would have and the benefits potentially gained by the company and by industry in general; (3) to stress that individual participation was voluntary in nature; and (4) to emphasize that all data would be anonymous and used in a confidential manner. The purpose of the personnel executive's letter was to inform the subjects of the company's endorsement of the project and to urge the participation.
The second mailing contained a letter from the researcher (see Appendix E.3), which reviewed briefly the purpose of the study and requested the transferred employee and spouse to complete their respective questionnaires independently; the two questionnaires; and a stamped envelope addressed to the researcher.

Subsequently, two follow-up letters (see Appendix E.4) were sent at intervals of one week to all subjects. They were reminded not to sign their questionnaires so as to aid in the acquisition of frank and reliable responses.

T-tests were used to test the significance of the difference between the mean "willingness to move" scores of spouses who were working as opposed to those who were not, and between the groups of spouses with and without school-aged children. The sample from the first survey was divided by the variable "working status" into two groups (working spouse and non-working spouse) in order to allow for step-wise regressions on each individual group. Finally, significant findings from the first survey were cross-validated in the sample from the second survey.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of the dependent variable and each of the independent variables for the total sample and for both the working and non-working subsamples. In general, the mean scores on all variables responded to by both the working spouses and non-working spouses were similar to one another. Table 2 presents Pearson correlation coefficients for these variables for both subsamples. Although lack of significant intercorrelations between most of the predictor variables attests to their relative independence, there were high intercorrelations between a few of the independent variables. Table 3 presents alpha coefficients for each of the personality independent variable scales in both working and non-working groups.

Although the mean score on "willingness to move again" was found to be higher among the 81 non-working spouses (M = 14.91; S.D. = 4.01) than among the 53 working spouses (M = 13.42; S.D. = 4.42), this difference was not significant by a one-tailed test (t = 1.54; N.S.). Similarly, the 73 spouses
TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR MAJOR VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Total</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Non-working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to move again</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>20.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company commitment</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward striving</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>39.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion &amp; Extraversion</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with transfer policy</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of settlement</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>29.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived benefits</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of transfer experiences</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with present location</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Aged Children (6-19)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n 134*  
53  
81

* Number of observations for variables in the complete sample varies somewhat in the case of some variables, due to missing values.
### TABLE 2(a)

**INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG PREDICTOR VARIABLES (WORKING GROUP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Job Involvement</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Company commitment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Upward striving</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Introversion/Extraversion</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Locus of Control</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Authoritarianism</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Satisfaction with transfer policy</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Length of settlement</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Perceived benefits</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Number of transfer experiences</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Satisfaction with present location</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) School-Aged Children (6-19)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05  
** ** p < .01
### Table 2(b)

**Intercorrelations Among Predictor Variables (Non-Working Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Upward striving</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Introversion/</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Locus of Control</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Authoritarianism</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Satisfaction with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer policy</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Length of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer experiences</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Satisfaction with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present location</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) School-Aged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children (6-19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05
** ** p < .01
TABLE 3

SCALE RELIABILITIES - ALPHA COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scales Responded to by the Working Spouses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Commitment</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion/Introversion</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control - Difficult/Easy Sub-Scale</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Striving</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scales Responded to by the Non-Working Spouses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion/Introversion</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control - Difficult/Easy Sub-Scale</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Striving</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
who did not have school-aged children tended to have a higher mean score on "willingness to move again" (M = 14.52; S.D. = 4.07) than the 81 spouses who had school-aged children (M = 14.06; S.D. = 4.66). However, this difference was also insignificant by a one-tailed test (t = .65, N.S.).

In order to determine the relationship between the independent variables and the willingness of a spouse to move again, Pearson correlations were computed between each independent variable and the dependent variable. These results are shown in Table 4. Among the working spouses, three variables -- "satisfaction with present location", "locus of control" and "number of transfer experiences" -- were significantly related to willingness to move, whereas for the non-working group, two variables -- "locus of control" and "authoritarianism" -- were significantly related.

"Locus of Control" was the only variable found to be significantly correlated with "willingness to move again" in both the working group (r = -.241; p < .05) and the non-working group (r = -.273; p < .05). The correlation's negative sign indicates that an individual scoring "internal" on the locus of control dimension would be more willing to move than would an individual scoring "external" on that dimension. Thus, the relationship in both groups suggests that the more internal the wife perceives the locus of control, the more willing she would be to move again.

A significant relationship was found between "satisfaction
TABLE 4

PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Working Spouses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Company Commitment</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Upward Striving</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Introversion/Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Locus of Control</td>
<td>-0.241*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Authoritarianism</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Satisfaction with company transfer policy</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Length of settlement</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perceived benefits</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of transfer experiences</td>
<td>0.243*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Satisfaction with present location</td>
<td>-0.551**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School-Aged Children (6-19)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Non-Working Spouses**                               |                    |
| 1. Upward Striving                                       | 0.108              |
| 2. Introversion/Extraversion                             | 0.063              |
| 3. Locus of Control                                      | -0.273*            |
| 4. Authoritarianism                                      | 0.169*             |
| 5. Satisfaction with company transfer policy             | 0.093              |
| 6. Length of settlement                                  | -0.098             |
| 7. Perceived benefits                                    | 0.138              |
| 8. Number of transfer experiences                        | 0.109              |
| 9. Satisfaction with present location                    | -0.115             |
| 10. School-Aged Children (6-19)                          | 0.067              |

* p < .05
** p < .01
with present location" and "willingness to move again" (r = -0.551; p < .01) in the working group. This suggests that the facilities, friends, neighbours, relatives, the spouse's job and her satisfaction with her present location influence her willingness to move again. The correlation's negative sign indicates that a spouse exhibiting satisfaction with her present location would be less willing to move than would a spouse exhibiting dissatisfaction with her present location.

Another significant, though weak, relationship emerged between "number of transfer experiences" and "willingness to move again" (r = 0.243; p < .05) in the working group. The correlation's positive sign suggests that a working spouse with more transfer experiences would be more willing to move than would a working spouse with little or no transfer experience.

The Pearson correlation analysis indicated a significant, though weak, relationship between the non-working spouse's authoritarianism and her willingness to move again (r = 0.169, p < .05). The correlation's positive sign suggests that a non-working spouse exhibiting a high degree of authoritarianism would be more willing to move than would a non-working spouse exhibiting a low degree of authoritarianism.

Table 5 gives the standardized beta coefficients from the multiple regression analyses. The beta coefficients give the amount of increase or decrease in the dependent variable per unit increase in their respective independent variable. These coefficients reflect the fact that the other variables in the equation have all been controlled. Of the 12 independent
Table 5

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF PREDICTORS OF TRANSFERRED EMPLOYEE'S SPOUSE'S WILLINGNESS TO MOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Working Group (n = 53)</th>
<th>Non-working Group (n = 81)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standardized beta</td>
<td>standardized beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with present location</td>
<td>-0.44*</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived benefits</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of transfer experiences</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion &amp; Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with transfer policy</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of settlement</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company commitment</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward striving</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Aged Children (6-19)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R (adjusted)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
variables in the working model, analyzed using a step-wise multiple correlation analysis, only one -- "Satisfaction with present location" -- was found to be a significant predictor of working spouse's willingness to move again (yielding a beta coefficient significant at the .01 level). The Pearson correlation between "Satisfaction with present location" and the dependent variable in the second sample was significant (r = .25 p < .05), and thus showed that the result could be cross-validated. The "locus of control" was significant in both groups according to their Pearson correlations reported in Table 4. But the beta coefficient of "locus of control" was found to be insignificant in the multiple regression analysis of the working group. The beta coefficient of "number of transfer experiences," which individually had a significant correlation with the dependent variable, was also found to be insignificant in the multiple regression analysis of the working group.

Of the 10 independent variables of the non-working model, analyzed using a step-wise multiple correlation analysis, only two were found to be significant predictors of non-working spouses' willingness to move (yielding a beta coefficient significant at the .01 level). These two were, in the order of their relative importance, "locus of control" and "authoritarianism." The Pearson correlation between "locus of control" and the dependent variable in the second sample was significant (r = .21, p < .05), and thus showed that the results could be cross-validated. However, authoritarianism could not be cross-validated.
Tables 2 (a) and (b) showed that the intercorrelations between "locus of control" and "satisfaction with present location" were significant in both the working and non-working groups. However, when the effect of "locus of control" was adjusted for the working group, the partial correlation coefficient between "satisfaction with present location" and the dependent variable was -.53; when the effect of "satisfaction with present location" was adjusted for the non-working group, the partial correlation coefficient between "locus of control" and the dependent variable was -.25. Thus, this post hoc analysis indicated that the earlier findings were not affected by the intercorrelation between the two variables "locus of control" and "satisfaction with present location."

To summarize, the working spouse's degree of satisfaction with her present location appears to be the primary predictor of her willingness to move again, while the non-working spouse's belief regarding locus of control seems to be the primary predictor of her willingness to move again.
Chapter V

DISCUSSION

In difficult economic times, the financial and human costs arising from the corporate transfer experience have a bearing not only on an organization's ability to reap the benefits attributed to relocating employees, but also on its ability to survive. Organizations need to know their employees and their spouses better in order to determine which couples are willing to be transferred. The present study focuses on understanding factors that might influence a spouse's willingness to be transferred. It is assumed that a spouse who is amenable to a transfer will experience a minimal degree of personal, psychological and familial disruption.

A. Hypotheses supported by the Data in the Present Study

Only two hypotheses were supported by the data. Given the observed importance of the "locus of control" and "satisfaction with present location" as predictors of transferee's spouse's willingness to move, post hoc comparisons on the dependent variable were carried out between those working spouses who were satisfied with their present location and those who were not, and between the "external" non-working spouses and the "internal" non-working spouses. T-tests were used to make
these comparisons by testing the significance of the difference between the mean "willingness to move" scores of those working spouses who were satisfied with their present location as opposed to those working spouses who were not, and of those "external" non-working spouses as opposed to those "internal" non-working spouses. The median split technique was employed to create the two aforementioned groups.

The mean score in "willingness to move again" was found to be lower among the 27 working spouses who were satisfied with their present location (M = 11.37; S.D. = 4.66) than the 33 working spouses who were not (M = 15.42; S.D. = 3.88). This difference was significant by a one-tailed test* (t = -3.68; p < .01). The mean score in "willingness to move again" was also found to be lower among the 49 "external" non-working spouses (M = 13.96; S.D. = 4.25) than the 43 "internal" non-working spouses (M = 15.84; S.D. = 3.72). This difference was also significant, though weaker, by a one-tailed test (t = -2.24; p < .02). These results supported the findings reported in Chapter 4.

* The relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable were explored using a one-tailed test since the relationships were hypothesized to be directional. The null hypotheses for each stated relationship say that the correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable = 0 (i.e. no relationship). The alternative hypotheses state that there is a significant correlation and give the direction of the hypothesized association between the independent and dependent variable (e.g. those working spouses who are satisfied with their present location are less willing to move again than those working spouses who are not).
From these results, the personnel manager who selects candidates for geographic transfer may assume the following: when the working spouse is not satisfied with her present location, she will see the geographic transfer as a desirable opportunity leading to further growth and experience of a better life style and quality of working life. Thus, her husband is the preferred selection for corporate transfer over an employee with a working spouse who is satisfied with her present location and the career opportunity that she experiences there.

Unlike the working spouse, who may be able to use her experience, professional status and contacts in her new location, the non-working spouse must start over again to establish herself in the new community with little or no support from her past. In addition, any geographic transfer is often associated with various role disruptions on the part of the spouse. These role disruptions, as described in Chapter Two, may cause her to have feelings of loss, uncertainty, and/or lack of control if she tends to attribute the coming of events as a result of the move to external factors that are beyond her control. Thus, if a non-working spouse scores "external" on the difficult-easy dimension of locus of control, she is less willing to move again than the "internal" non-working spouse, because the "external" non-working spouse sees the opportunity as leading to unnecessary difficulties, which she would rather not confront.
B. Critique of the Present Study

(1) Age Distribution and Possible Population Bias of the Sample

The mean score of the spouses' willingness to move again was 14.32 (S.D. = 4.29) out of 20. The sample's relatively high willingness to move might have been biased by its age distribution and the industrial representation.

(a) Age Distribution - The mean age of the responding spouses was 36.1 years (S.D. = 8.76 years) in the first survey and 41.0 years (S.D. = 9.4 years) in the second survey*. An examination of the age distribution reveals that an overwhelming majority of respondents were raised in the generation in which corporate spouses were more willing, in general, to consider the demands of their husbands' careers above all else. Furthermore, the husbands, who had a mean age of 37.59 years (S.D. = 8.20), would be caught in the midst of what Erikson (1963) has termed the "mid-life crisis." Pahl and Pahl (1971) have found persons of this age group less willing to take risks. Thus, the majority of husbands may not be willing to risk their corporate futures by refusing to transfer, and the majority of the spouses would probably be willing to move around as their husbands are transferred from one company location to another in their climb up the management ladder.

* Because these samples were taken eight years ago, the mean ages are now 44.1 years and 49.0 years, respectively.
(b) **Population Bias** - The results of a survey of 289 Canadian companies conducted by the Conference Board (1977) show that the petroleum products industry, the transportation industry and the retail trade industry are the three sectors of the economy with the highest rates of transfer. Relocation is frequent when companies are national and among the largest companies in their respective industries. Therefore, it is possible that the population studied in this research is biased through its over-exposure to the occurrence of frequent transfers, particularly when accepting transfer offers usually results in promotion. It seems logical to assume that, in general, committed spouses of those individuals who remain within the employment of such companies would be more willing to be transferred than would employees in other industries. Those spouses who are not willing to move would not be a part of the population because they would be inclined to disallow their husbands to enter such transfer-prone industries.

Therefore, it is believed that a different distribution of spouses' willingness to move would have been obtained if the sample had been a more representative cross-section of companies in which incidence of transfer spanned the spectrum from frequent to infrequent, and if a control group that lacked exposure to transfer experience had been used.

(2) **Variable Scale Reliabilities**

In general, the alpha coefficients for each of the personality scales in both working and non-working groups were
comparatively low. (The results were reported in the previous chapter.) Whereas an alpha score should reach the level of .80 in order to reflect acceptable internal homogeneity, only a few of the coefficients in this study met or approached this level. Thus, the internal homogeneity of the scales employed in the study was frequently too low to provide an adequate test of the measurement of their respective trait characteristics or to evaluate the impact on their likely correlations with the criterion.

This somewhat disappointing result led to examining the trait approach to developing these scales. Argyle and Little (1972) wonder if personality traits are the ultimate cause of consistent behaviour and subsequently have hypothesized that behaviour is a function not only of the person but also of the situations in which the behaviour occurs. Argyle and Little (1972) and other psychologists (Kelly, 1955; Mischel, 1968) consider the individual's cognitive construction of environmental stimuli as central to the structure of personality itself, as a major moderator variable in the relationship between personality dimensions and behaviour, and as the major factor facilitating flexible behaviour across various situations. Eventually, this cognitive construction will manifest itself in interactions between the individual and his situation.

The implications of the critique of the trait approach for this study are substantial because the willingness of the transferred employee's spouse to move was hypothesized to be
determined by a number of the spouse's personality traits. Particularly, the generation of hypotheses rests upon the assumption that the various personality traits studied are the sources of stable patterns of attitudes, which the spouse holds consistently across all situations. Moreover, while the low correlation coefficients in this study, which indicate weak associations between the personality traits and the dependent variable, may be partially due to the weak scale reliabilities, the poor result may also be partially due to the failure to account for the interaction between person and situation. Thus, the design of any future study should take into account the individual's cognitive construction of the particular stimulus, conditions of the transfer experience and their interaction with personality characteristics. Kelly's (1955) Personal Construct Theory and the Repertory Grid methodology may provide an interactional design for the development of an alternative research format. Although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to present and clarify how these methods could be used, interested readers should consult Goldberg (1979).

(3) Construct Validity of the Dependent Variable

Schwab (1980) defines construct validity as the correspondence between the conceptual definition of a variable (i.e., consideration, delegation, coercion, etc.) and the operational procedure used to measure or manipulate that variable. The measure of a spouse's willingness to move used
here may not have met the demands of construct validity. For example, in the first item of the scale, the relationship between willingness and happiness could be questioned: an individual could be willing, yet unhappy. (The same argument can also apply to the second item of the willingness scale: an employee would not necessarily have to leave the company if he is unwilling to move; some companies have other alternatives in their manpower planning.) Thus, it is possible that the scale employed in this study does not, in fact, measure the willingness of the transferred employee's spouse to move again. If this is so, the degree of variance in the scores might not be due to the variance in the willingness of the spouse to move again.

(4) Construct Validity of the Independent Variables - "Working Status"

One spouse can earn $100 per month, while another can earn $10,000 per month. The differences in their incomes could be due to their differing abilities, types of job, commitment and effort levels. Thus, the "yes and no" question which reads, "since your transfer, have you been earning any income?" is of dubious value in differentiating between a career spouse and a part-time working spouse. In view of the intention to prove that a career spouse would be less willing to move than a non-career spouse in the event of geographical transfer, the differences between a "career" and a "job" should be clearly defined and the questions should reflect these differences. For example: the spouse
should be asked, "Are you working full time or part-time?", "What is your income as a percentage of or in comparison to your husband's income?"

C. Conclusion

Although the basic criteria for the selection of transferees have in the past focused on the needs of the company, the suitability of the individual and the transfer-associated costs, it is proposed that these considerations be complemented by a thorough understanding and appraisal of the transferees' spouses' needs and problems. This study is an attempt to investigate possible predictors of transferees' spouses' willingness to move, in order to enable a company to exercise greater care in selecting individuals for corporate transfer. Its results indicate that the spouse's perception of the locus of control and her satisfaction with the present location affect her willingness to move. These results imply that companies should take steps to ensure that the spouse is consulted about the proposed transfer, so she feels she has some control over the decision and about the proposed transfer location, so that her satisfaction with her present location does not make her unwilling to move.
INTRODUCTORY LETTER FROM THE RESEARCHER

Dear Employee:

I am undertaking a large-scale survey of Canadian employees who have been transferred by their companies at least once, from one city to another. The purpose of the study is three-fold:

1. To study employees' attitudes toward transfers;

2. To study the differences in provisions made in the transfer policies of different Canadian corporations, and how these differences are reflected in differences in the post-transfer attitudes and adjustment of the transferee and his (or her) family;

3. To study the comparative costs and benefits to the company of its policies and practices regarding employee transfers.

Your company has expressed interest in my research and has agreed to participate. (See the enclosed letter from your company.) Consequently, they have given me the names and addresses of approximately 200 employees who have been transferred in recent years. Your name appeared in their sample, so I am requesting your support for my study.

Let me hasten to make two or three crucial promises to you. Should you agree to participate in my research, I will personally guarantee the following:

1. No member of your company will be told whether or not you participated.

2. No member of your company (or anyone else beyond myself and my research staff) will receive any information about your individual responses. In order to gather reliable and meaningful data, we must have your confidence in our handling of your responses - only then will you provide honest and frank answers.

3. Your company and others in your industry should benefit greatly by your support and participation. I intend to provide all participating companies with constructive criticisms and suggestions.
regarding their transfer policies, based on the aggregated findings of the study

4. Finally, if what we learn in this research is used to improve the transfer policies of Canadian corporations, individual transferees and their families should benefit.

Altogether, we are gathering data from employees from seven different corporations (approximately 1000 people, altogether). I believe the research should be of considerable value to Canadian management, transferees, and their families.

I will be mailing a large envelope to you in the near future. Enclosed will be the following things:

1. a questionnaire for you to complete;
2. a questionnaire for your spouse to complete;
3. a stamped envelope, addressed to me, personally, at the University of British Columbia.

I would appreciate it if you would complete and return the questionnaires to me as soon as is convenient for you. The questionnaire for you should require 60-90 minutes to complete; the one for your spouse should not require as much time.

I hope you will participate in my study, and I thank you for your time.

Cordially,

Craig C. Pinder
Assistant Professor of Organizational Behaviour.
LETTER FROM A SENIOR PERSONNEL EXECUTIVE OF THE COMPANY

Dear Sir or Madam:

Professor Craig Pinder from the University of British Columbia has invited our company to participate in a study concerning the use of transfer policies in the development of our managers and executives. The study will focus on transfers from two points of view: that of the company and that of the manager. Dr. Pinder is interested in systematically assessing the costs and benefits from the company's perspective of our transfer policies as well as the effects of transfers on the managers and their families.

As you know, our transfer policy is an important part of our management development and organization staffing programs. Consequently, we have agreed to cooperate with Dr. Pinder in his research. We have provided Professor Pinder with a list of corporate and transportation sector management who have been transferred during 1975. From this list your name was randomly selected.

In all, 500-600 managers from our company and other Canadian companies will be asked to participate by completing the questionnaire which you will be receiving shortly. Let me assure you that your decision concerning whether or not to participate is completely voluntary and that no one other than Dr. Pinder and his staff will have access to the responses you provide. However, we expect that our company and the other participating companies will benefit from what is learned from the combined data from the study.

I trust that you will respond to the survey questionnaire for the mutual benefit of our company and all future transferees. In the event that you have any particular question arising from your participation in this study which would be answered by an examination of the resultant report, the Director Personnel Development, Room 152, Windsor Station, would be happy to respond to such questions.

Yours truly,
Dear Employee:

By now you should have received a letter I sent to you announcing a nationwide survey I am conducting on the topic of employee transfers. In the same envelope as that letter was a second letter from a senior executive of your company explaining the benefit your company hopes to derive from my study. As you recall from those letters, your participation is voluntary, but we hope you will complete my questionnaires and return them to me. Let me repeat my personal guarantee of the anonymity of your personal responses. Your company will receive only the combined data from your fellow transferees.

Enclosed are two questionnaires: one for you and one for your spouse; plus a stamped envelope addressed to me at the University of British Columbia. Please complete your questionnaire and have your spouse complete the "Spouse's Questionnaire," and return them to me directly. We have found that the employee's questionnaire takes 60-90 minutes to complete; the spouse's questionnaire is shorter. Please ask your spouse to complete his (or her) questionnaire alone, independently of the answers you provide to your questionnaire. For the benefit I hope to provide the participating companies and their employees, I believe the effort you will invest by participating will be well spent.

Thank you for your help.

Yours truly,

Craig C. Pinder
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Commerce and
Business Administration
University of British Columbia

Enclosures
Dear Employee:

I hope that by now you will have received the questionnaires for my study on the reactions of Canadian employees to their companies' transfer policies. This letter is to remind you to complete and return the questionnaires to me directly at the University of British Columbia, using the stamped envelope I enclosed in the package I sent you. Again, let me repeat my guarantee for the privacy of the responses you provide in completing the questionnaires.

If you have already completed and returned your questionnaires, let me thank you for your assistance. I hope the results of my study will enable Canadian companies to learn more about the costs and benefits of their transfer policies, for the mutual benefit of the companies and their transferring employees.

Cordially,

Craig C. Pinder
Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration
U.B.C.


Bensahel, J. G. So Your Wife Wants To Go To Work? International Management, 1975, January, 30, p. 244.


Dun's Review. Pinpointing the Cost of Living for Executives. 1978, April, 111, 62-63.


Howard, J. H. and Boyd, M. New Managerial Attitudes on Geographic Mobility. The Canadian Personnel and Industrial Relations Journal, 1976, 23 (4), 33-42.


*Industry Week*. Many Manufacturers Tighten up on Their Transfer policies. December 6, 1971b, 188.


Jaffe, W. A. To Move or Not to Move (Employees)? *Industry Week*, January 31, 1972, 189.


Jennings, E. A study reported in the Detroit Free Press, Michigan State University, October 18, 1974.


Murray, T. J. The Trauma of the Transferred Executive. Dun's, 1971, May, 97, 40-43.


Personnel Journal. You were Saying...The Transfer's Physical Move--Does it Have to be a Headache? 1975, August, 54, 426-427.


Skinner, J. R. These Executives Won't Come Home. Dun's, 1972, November, 100, 77-130.


Statistic of Canada. Labour Force, 1979


Stillman, A. Working Spouses and Employee Relocation. The Personnel Administrator, 1979, February, 24, 55-56.


Tiger, L. Is this Trip Necessary? Fortune, 1974, 90, 139-141.


