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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The family is the most basic and universal institution and, as such, has been the object of sociological analysis since the beginnings of sociology in the 1830's. Even the "founding fathers" of the discipline, whose primary concerns were in the area of social organization and social change, found the time to comment on the significance of the family for the individual and society. Auguste Comte, for example, who was not considered to be a family sociologist, made some efforts in his theoretical writings to explain the functions and importance of the family. Comte saw the family as "the true social unit" of the social system, not the individual (Comte, 1896: 281). He also wrote of the socialization purposes of the family. "It is by the avenue of the family that man comes forth from his mere personality, and learns to live in another, while obeying his most powerful instincts" (Comte, 1896: 281). In relation to the family, women, and work, Comte's positivism saw women working as the affective
element in society; but the family was "their highest and most distinctive sphere of work" (Comte, 1865: 248).

Emile Durkheim, although he published little on the subject, was also interested in the family as a unit of analysis in sociology (La Capra, 1972). Durkheim approached the study of the family from a view, similar to Comte's, that the family is a social institution and as such there is a relationship between it and other social institutions in society. He foresaw that the structure of the family would change and the functions would be accomplished by other social institutions (Wolfe, 1960).

The Marxian approach to the family differs greatly from the views of Comte or Durkheim. Karl Marx wrote of the differences in families in the social classes. He states in the Communist Manifesto (1848): "the bourgeoisie has torn away from the family the sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relations to a mere money relation" (Marx, 1848, p.13). Also, "in its completely developed form the family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians or the public prostitution" (Marx, 1848, p.32). Marx, then, viewed the family in a strictly economic framework. The family was held together by the presence of money and did not exist in the absence of money.
Around the 1950's, sociologists began to systematically study the family. Traditional approaches to the family have dealt with the forms of the family, kinship structure, patterns of mate selection, functions of the family, and cross-cultural comparisons of the family as an institution. Traditional family theory revolved around the functions of the family, the changes within, and the necessity of the traditional family functions which were economic, status giving, educational, religious, recreational, protective, and affectational. Several well known sociologists have developed ideas on the state of these functions and the family (Zimmerman, 1947; Ogburn, 1938; and Parsons, 1965). Ogburn (1938), for example, theorized about the changing functions of the family, and contended that many of the functions had been removed from the home. Parsons (1965), on the other hand, noted that some functions of the family may have changed, but the family was still a functioning unit in society.

Typical of other analyses in traditional family studies of the past were James Bossard's (1932) or Robert Winch's (1958) studies on mate selection, Nimkoff's (1965) writings on cross-cultural comparisons, and Parson's (1943) work on kinship systems in the United States.

More recently, sociological concerns have shifted to the
changes within the family or alternative lifestyles to the traditional family. Studies on divorce and divorce rates such as Glick and Norton's studies (1971), premarital cohabitation (Macklin, 1978), and studies on single parent families (Gongla, 1982) have been a focus in family sociology. Of growing concern in the area of family sociology, as well as the sociology of work, has been the increased frequency of married women in the occupational system on a permanent career basis (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969). As history notes, some women have always worked outside the home; the difference in recent decades is the increased likelihood that married women will work continuously throughout the family life cycle and will work in more career oriented occupations. The increased participation of married women in the work force has changed the traditional structure of the family – one where the working husband had a wife who did not work outside the home.

Recent research has been focused on one specific type of employment of wives, that of careers. Studies have examined women's work career patterns and wages (Van Velsor and O'Rand, 1984); marital stability (Booth et al., 1984); and the effects of career women's labor force participation on husbands' marital adjustment (Booth, 1979). Studies also have discussed the career patterns of both spouses and the
changes and effects of differing spousal occupational combinations on the family. The dual career family type specifically, as it is compared to the traditional family, is addressed heavily in recent sociological research (Sekaran, 1983b; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; and Fava and Genovese, 1983). Although it is suggested to be on an increase due to the increase of women working and is the focus of a substantial amount of recent research, the dual career family type is not the most prevalent family type in the American population. There appears to be a "gap" in sociological writings in addressing the various family types. In fact, most have not been addressed or even identified. It is one purpose of this thesis to identify all the husband-wife family types and their frequency. A second purpose is to present some of the prevalent family types and to compare them to the traditional husband-wife family type on several aspects of marriage.

This thesis is an empirical attempt at a description of the currently prevalent family types. Propositions will be posited to suggest relationships between family types and several variables. The main issue in this thesis is whether the combinations of husband and wife occupational and employment type result in differences in three aspects of marriage: marital age, fertility and marital happiness. Does having a
career for women change the age at which women typically marry? Does having a career have any affect on men's marital age? Are there more children in a family type where the wife does not work or works less? Does whether the wife works in a career or job alter the number of children a family has? How is the occupational type of the husband related to the size of the family? And lastly, do some combinations of husband-wife family types report higher levels of marital happiness than others? These, as well as others, are issues and questions to be addressed in this thesis.

A typology of the structure of husband-wife families has been developed using a combination of occupational status and employment type of both the husband and the wife. Occupational status, defined as career or job, and employment type defined as full-time, part-time or not employed were considered in the development of the typology. This typology contains twenty-five possible combinations of occupational status and employment type.

Estimates of how prevalent each of the twenty-five various husband-wife family types are in the U.S. in the early 1980s are made. Then, the relationship between family type and marital happiness, number of children, and age at first marriage are examined for the six most common and important of these husband-wife family types.
The analysis examines differences among the six family types in fertility, marital age, and marital happiness. Marital happiness is analyzed in detail, controlling for fertility and gender.

Chapter two includes a brief review of the theoretical literature that is pertinent to important concepts in the thesis -- career, job, and marital happiness -- as well as a review of the recent literature on family types and characteristics. The research design and sample employed as well as the propositions to be tested and the statistical procedures used are described in Chapter three. The data analysis is presented in Chapter four. Chapter five contains a discussion of the findings and conclusions.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

With the increasing involvement of women in the work force, the traditional roles of women and men in the family and in the American occupational system have changed greatly. Married women are no longer confined only to the traditional female roles of wife and mother. More and more married women are seeking employment, of various types and degrees, outside the home. This increase in female employment has meant that the traditional role of the male as sole provider and wage earner for the family is no longer the exclusive role for men today. The result of these changes has made the study of the family and the relationship of spouses within the family and of family to the occupational system much more complex. The family is no longer a simple unit of a working husband and a housewife. There are a variety of types of employment outside the home that a wife or a husband can hold, from full-time to part-time status and from career to job. Thus, the combina-
tions of occupational status and employment type for husbands and wives within the family are numerous.

In the next section a discussion of occupational orientations is presented -- to be followed by the construction of a complete typology of husband-wife family types. After the different family types have been established, a review of the literature that suggests possible differences among several of the types will be presented.

**Occupational Orientations**

The sociology of occupations has as its main concern the examination of differences between "classes" of workers within the occupational system. The division of labor into differentiated occupational groups is the underlying theme in Emile Durkheim's *Division of Labor in Society* (1856). In this book, Durkheim discusses the prevalence of "organic solidarity" in which differences between functions of individuals in society exist as a result of the division of labor. The division of labor in American society today is very complex with a multitude of functions or occupations. How to classify these many occupations into categories or groups is a pivotal element of the study of sociology of occupations.

Many types of scales have been used to classify occupations in the past. Some are based on psychological
dimensions of work and workers (Barr, 1923), while others are socially or economically based (Edwards, 1943). Prestige scales have also been used to classify occupations in terms of the prestige ascribed to the occupation (Counts, 1925).

Several socioeconomic occupational scales have been discussed over the years. Alba Edwards, who developed occupational scales for the census, divided the occupations into six groups: unskilled workers, semiskilled workers, skilled workers and foreman, clerks and kindred workers, proprietors, managers and officials, and professional persons. It was contended that these classifications covered a large population group with distinctly different economic, intellectual, social, political standards of life.

The distinction made in this thesis is not between individual occupations, but between two larger occupational categories: careers and jobs. Pavalko (1971) has developed a scheme by which a theoretical distinction can be made between careers and jobs. In his discussion he uses the terms profession and occupation, rather than career and job, but these terms can be used interchangeably where a career is the same as a profession and a job is the same as an occupation. Careers and jobs can be placed in a hierarchy with careers at the top and jobs below. Pavalko (1971) discusses eight characteristics or dimensions that can be used to differen-
tiate between professions and occupations. Briefly, these characteristics or dimensions are theory or intellectual technique, relevance to basic social values, training period, motivation, autonomy, sense of commitment, sense of community, and a code of ethics (Pavalko, 1971).

Several of these characteristics clearly differentiate careers from jobs. These are the training period, autonomy, and a sense of commitment. The length of the training period necessary for entrance into the specific type of work is a characteristic of work that differentiates careers from jobs and is one of the most widely used to distinguish between the two. Careers require more extensive and specialized advanced training than jobs (see Parker et al., 1981). Career and professional occupations require more formal education than occupations or jobs; and the more specialized advanced training a worker has the more likely the work is to be classified as a profession.

Autonomy or lack of supervision by others is also a differentiating dimension of work (Pavalko, 1971). The more autonomous the work, the more likely it is to be seen as a career type. Jobs typically have greater amounts of supervision than careers. Related to the issue of autonomy is the existence of occupational hierarchies in the job type of occupation. (Caplow, 1954). In jobs, hierarchies of workers
tend to be intact and distinct; but such hierarchies tend to be less frequently found in career occupations. Also related to autonomy is power. Those in careers have more power in their occupation than those who have jobs.

A sense of commitment to work is also a characteristic which can be used to distinguish careers from jobs. Professionals and those in career types of occupations are likely to have a greater sense of commitment to their work; and the commitment tends to be of a long term nature (Pavalko, 1971). Parker et al. (1981) suggest that individuals pursuing careers have a high degree of commitment due to the time, energy and training that has been invested into the career. Those in jobs have lesser degrees of occupational commitment and can more easily change from one type of job to another.

The other characteristics identified by Pavalko (1971) are not utilized as often as dimensions on which to compare careers and jobs. However, since these dimensions do differentiate between careers and jobs a brief description of those characteristics follows.

Theory or intellectual technique refers to a systematic body of knowledge professionals must acquire to be a member of a specific professional group. This knowledge is a prerequisite for entrance into the group. Jobs are not based upon a specific body of knowledge. Another characteristic of
work that distinguishes careers from jobs is the relationship of the work to basic social values in society. The more relevant the work is to society's values the more likely the work is to be a career or of the professional type (Pavalko, 1971).

A motivational difference may also exist between work in careers and work in jobs. Although there is some disagreement on this point, some contend that the motivation toward work for career workers comes more from the services provided than from self-interest or from monetary gains received, whereas the reverse is alleged to be the motivating factor in the case of job types of workers. The long term commitment of the professions contributes to the development of a sense of community among the members of a profession. Those who work in careers have a sense of commonality, identity, and have similar values to others of the same profession. A final differentiating characteristic suggested by Pavalko is adherence to a specific code of ethics. Strict codes of ethics -- which specify functions, roles, or standards to be followed by the members of a profession -- are typically found in the career types of occupations. However, such codes are rarely found in job types of work (Pavalko, 1971).

There is, though, an element in the differentiation of a career versus a job not addressed by Pavalko is the con-
Continuity of careers. Careers for men and women are generally continuous in nature. For men, this element is almost always present. Women though, may, and many tend to, interrupt their career during the child bearing years (Allen and Kalish, 1984).

In summary, careers tend to be more demanding than jobs. They require stronger commitments, greater formal education, and more autonomous work environments. These requirements for a career may be important factors accounting for differences among family types. Career orientations of women are likely to create relationships between husbands and wives that are quite different from those where women do not have a career. Specific differences will be addressed following a presentation of family types.

**Family Types**

Typologies of families have been suggested in two recent research studies (Scanzoni, 1980; and Bird et al., 1984). Scanzoni suggests a tripartite typology for categorizing families into types, using income and job status of the husband and wife as the basis. These three family types are (a) the Head-Complement family type, which involves the wife not working outside the home; (b) the Senior Partner-Junior

---

1 The term "family type" is used here to define specific husband-wife families and is used to mean both couples with and without children.
Partner family type, where the wife was employed but the husband was the major earner; and (c) the Equal Partner family type, which is where both husband and wife are major earners for the family (Scanzoni, 1980). Bird, Bird, and Scruggs (1984), utilizing the typology suggested by Scanzoni, describe family types in a slightly different way. Their types include (a) the One-Career Family; (b) the Career-Earner Family; and (c) the Two-Career Family. The One Career family is one in which the husband is employed in a professional occupation or career and the wife does not work outside the home. The Career-Earner family is characterized by both the husband and wife working, but the husband is employed in a career position and the wife is employed in a job. Lastly, the two-career family consists of both the husband and wife pursuing full-time professional careers.

The two typologies described above are not exhaustive of the possible family types. Bird, Bird, and Scruggs describe only family types that involve the employment of husbands in careers and vary the wives employment, that is, career, job or no job. Scanzoni does not specify the occupational status of the husband or of the wife when she is working.

Most studies of family types do not distinguish between full and part-time career positions, or even between career and job occupations (Ridley, 1973; Booth, 1979; Sekaran,
1983a). It is likely that major differences exist between family types which are composed of two full-time career spouses and those composed of one full-time career and one part-time career spouse. If differences do exist, they will not be apparent to the researcher who does not control for full- and part-time work status.

Therefore, an exhaustive typology of married couples needs to include all types of employment (full-time, part-time or not working) and the status of the employment (job or career) for both husbands and wives. Figure 1 (shown on the following page) presents such a typology containing the twenty-five possible combinations of these considerations.

Previous research has not included all the possible types. In fact, many of the types have been ignored, possibly because many of the categories contain only a small percentage of American couples. National samples of the population, such as the one used in this thesis, yield too few cases in certain categories for more detailed analysis. However, one of the major contributions of this thesis is that here, for the first time, all the possible combinations have been identified; and, utilizing data from recent nationally representative General Social Surveys, the percentage of all economically active married couples falling into each of these twenty-five categories is estimated.
Figure 1. Exhaustive typology of family types, containing all possible combinations of career, job, no job for married couples.

1. HCF-WCF (husband career full-time-wife career full-time)
2. HCF-WCP (husband career full-time-wife career part-time)
3. HCF-WJF (husband career full-time-wife job full-time)
4. HCF-WJP (husband career full-time-wife job part-time)
5. HCF-WNJ (husband career full-time-wife no job)
6. HCP-WCF (husband career part-time-wife career full-time)
7. HCP-WCP (husband career part-time-wife career part-time)
8. HCP-WJF (husband career part-time-wife job full-time)
9. HCP-WJP (husband career part-time-wife job part-time)
10. HCP-WNJ (husband career part-time-wife no job)
11. HJF-WCF (husband job full-time-wife career full-time)
12. HJF-WCP (husband job full-time-wife career part-time)
13. HJF-WJF (husband job full-time-wife job full-time)
14. HJF-WJP (husband job full-time-wife job part-time)
15. HJF-WNJ (husband job full-time-wife no job)
16. HJP-WCF (husband job part-time-wife career full-time)
17. HJP-WCP (husband job part-time-wife career part-time)
18. HJP-WJF (husband job part-time-wife job full-time)
19. HJP-WJP (husband job part-time-wife job part-time)
20. HJP-WNJ (husband job part-time-wife no job)
21. HNJ-WCF (husband no job-wife career full-time)
22. HNJ-WCP (husband no job-wife career part-time)
23. HNJ-WJF (husband no job-wife job full-time)
24. HNJ-WJP (husband no job-wife job part-time)
25. HNJ-WNJ (husband no job-wife no job)

The six husband and wife family types identified as the most prevalent and relevant types of the 1980's are examined in Chapter Four. Sociological research has not addressed to any extent the differences among families in which the wife works in a career and families in which the wife works in a job, or the traditional family with the non-working wife. The following literature review examines areas where there may be
differences among families due to the wife's employment status. The areas to be included are the age at which a couple gets married, the number of children, income, and marital happiness. Research has suggested that the age at which couples get married is influenced by the their employment status or their anticipated employment status (Allen and Kalish, 1984; Ferber and Huber, 1979; and Rice, 1983). Generally, the marital rate for career women is lower; and those career women who do marry do so later than non-career women (Rice, 1983). The later age of marriage for career women can be explained by using the socio-economic theory of human capital (Becker, 1971). Human capital represents investments made by an individual in him/herself, such as education which is one of the major human capital resources. Money, time, and energy are also human capital investments (Kalleberg and Sorensen, 1979). Women who pursue careers are investing their time, energy and money into their education and eventual careers. If they married during this period, some of their human capital would be lost. Also, women who pursue careers tend to be working toward them through education during the normative marrying years (Allen and Kalish, 1984). Elder (1972) suggests that the timing of marriage is related to how the rewards and the costs of marriage are perceived during a specific period of life. The costs of marriage may
be viewed as high when educational goals are viewed as important. Ferber and Huber (1979) also found that highly educated women marry later than women with less education. Women who work at a job or who do not work at all, therefore, are expected to be the women who marry earlier. The implication is that later age at marriage would be more prevalent in those family types where the wife has a career. Ferber and Huber (1979) also suggest that professional men are "somewhat more likely" to marry later than non-professional men, but that the phenomenon is more pronounced for women. This difference may be the result of the different normative marrying period for men. Traditionally, men have tended to marry later; and, therefore, educational or career pursuits would not overlap with the normative marrying period.

Family size also appears to be a factor which differs among family types. Researchers have found that, in family types where the woman pursues a career, families are smaller in size than the average American family (Bryson, et al., 1978; Tickamyer, 1979). One hundred and ninety-six psychologist couples were used as a sample in the Bryson et al. (1978) study of family size and dual career couples. They found a strong negative relationship between the rate of wives' employment and number of children present. Among the couples with no children, 84.8 percent of the wives were em-
ployed full-time. The rate of full-time employment declined significantly as the number of children increased; and only forty-eight percent of women with three or more children were employed full-time. Tickamyer (1979), in a study on women's fertility intentions, found that women expect to have fewer children if they have higher levels of education, are young, and are participants in the labor force. He also found that college educated working women and college educated young women have lower fertility intentions than those without a college education. He suggests that these women as a result of having higher incomes, better jobs, and higher status, are committed to non-family activities. Thus, the data from previous studies indicate that pursuing a career does have a negative effect on childbearing and family size.

Hayghe (1981) presented data showing that it is not just career employment that affects childbearing rates, but that any full-time employment of the wife decreases the number of children the couple has. Utilizing a sample collected by the Bureau of the Census, Hayghe compared the number of children in dual earner (both spouses working) and traditional earner (wife unemployed) families. He found that fifty-eight percent of dual earner families had children under eighteen, compared to sixty percent for the traditional earner family. This difference is not very noticeable,
but a larger difference was found when comparing the number of preschool children present in each of the family types. In dual earner families, forty-two percent had preschool children, compared to fifty-one percent in the traditional one career family. Thus, it seems that the dual career family has slightly fewer children, especially children under six.

Income as a differentiating variable among family types is not useful primarily because a two income family (e.g. dual career or dual earner) has just that, two incomes and is more likely to have a greater combined income than a one income family. Differences in husbands' earnings in relationship to wives' employment status has been discussed by Hayghe (1981). Earnings by husbands' in one earner families tended to be higher than earnings of husbands' in a two earner family. When the wife is employed, the husband's income is less than the husband's income in a two earner family (Hayghe, 1981).

When the wife works, a question arises concerning the determination of the status of the family. Parsons (1968) contended that when the husband's occupation provides more status than the wife's, the wife's occupation is seen as a supplement to the husband's status. When the wife's occupation is seen as subordinate and supporting, the husband's
role as status giver is unaffected and the stability of the family is maintained. But, when the wife's occupational status is greater than or equal to the husband's, then that role may be challenged and the stability of the family may be affected.

Parsons (1949) earlier suggested that inclusion of women in the occupational world is a disrupting factor to conjugal solidarity. The basis for Parsons' view lies in his ideas about sex-role segregation. For Parsons, sex-role segregation is a necessary function for marital stability. Sex-role segregation excludes women from the occupational world, a world where the male role is dominant and the female role is submissive. Basically, what Parsons is suggesting is that women in the occupational world threaten the male role or identity. Parsons makes a distinction between women working at a "job" and women with a "career." Women with "jobs" are less threatening than women with "careers." Women with careers can change the socio-economic status of the family unit, whereas women with jobs are not likely to earn enough to be that effective. Parsons suggests that career women create competition between spouses for economic status, which, in turn, creates marital instability.

Some of Parsons' sex-role segregation ideas may still have validity, but today more women are working outside the
home; and they have had impact on and have changed the family structure. Family structures today are more complex and varied. More wives have jobs and are pursuing careers. The nontraditional families are presented with conflicts and problems that traditional families never had. How these changes affect the marital happiness within various family types is a question to be addressed in this thesis.

**Marital Happiness and the Family**

Marital happiness is a product of many internal and external factors involving the family unit. The work status and involvement of both the husband and the wife is one determining factor of interest in this thesis. Also related to marital happiness is the number of children in a family and family income. The following section will include a discussion on marital happiness in general and in terms related to the family situation.

Marital happiness is a difficult term to operationalize because it does not have the same meaning for all spouses. Some research has been conducted on this topic in an attempt to identify specific dimensions of the marital relationship and then to create an objective scale or index of happiness. Other researchers recognize the subjectivity of the concept and seek a personal rating of their marital happiness in terms of very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy. Such
subjective evaluations obviously present problems, but they are the most widely used (see the General Social Survey, Davis, 1984).

Family sociologists have been interested in marital happiness as it relates to the stability of the family unit as a whole. The spousal relationship is vital to this stability. Studies on spousal interaction and marital happiness have suggested that several variables are related to interaction and happiness. These variables are work involvement, number of children, income and education.

Work involvement is an integral part of this thesis, especially in the cases where the wives are active working career women. Researchers such as White (1983) have found that the husbands and wives work involvement was negatively related to interaction, which, in turn, has a negative impact on happiness. Therefore, as work involvement increased, spousal interaction decreased and subsequently marital happiness decreased. It is clear that career occupations require more commitment or work involvement than other occupations; and if the relationship between work involvement and marital happiness is correct, then it is likely that career involvement may be negatively related to marital happiness.

The dual career couple is an example of highly involved work of both the husband and wife; and, therefore it should
show lower levels of happiness within the marriage. This relationship has been studied extensively in recent years (Holahan and Gilbert, 1981; Sekaran, 1983a; and Houseknecht and Macke, 1981).

Past research has revealed conflicting evidence about marital happiness in the dual career marriage (Hardesty and Betz, 1980; Houseknecht and Macke, 1981; Ridley, 1973). In Houseknecht and Macke's (1981) study the wife's career involvement is seen as having a negative effect on marital happiness, due to strong commitments to the career, which result in decreased amounts of attention toward the home or family. However, Bailyn (1970) contends that the marital relationship is viewed as happier or more satisfying in the dual career setting, due to the wife's self-fulfillment and independence in the occupational system.

The negative effects of wife's employment outside the home on the family has been suggested by Rapoport and Rapoport (1969). They have identified five dilemmas created by the stress involved in being a part of a dual career family life style. These dilemmas are 1) overload dilemmas, 2) norm dilemmas, 3) identity dilemmas, 4) social network dilemmas, 5) and, role cycling dilemmas. Both the negative and the positive aspects of the dual career family type and other types of families can be discussed using these five
When both husband and wife are career individuals, the tasks that were traditionally done by the wife now have to be divided somehow between the couple. Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) see this resulting in overloading which occurs when the dual career couple is overwhelmed by domestic problems of the care of the home, children or social arrangements. Overloading is especially acute for working women whose spouses are more traditional and do not share in the responsibility of household tasks. Bird, Bird, and Scruggs (1984) present data that compares family task sharing in their three family types which were discussed earlier. All husbands in their study were employed in careers. Overall, they found that husbands with employed spouses, especially spouses with careers, were more likely to share family tasks. Therefore, if husbands of employed wives tend to share in the family responsibilities, then the dilemma of overloading is less likely to be a source of conflict. Rapoport and Rapoport also suggest that overloading for both spouses is lessened by the convenience of outside help such as housekeepers and child care facilities.

Norm dilemmas involve the conflict between personal norms and social or societal norms. Career women have made personal choices to pursue a career, but they are under
constant pressure to lower their personal goals to conform to societal norms. These societal norms involve the woman's responsibility to her family, which is seen as lax if she has a career. In general, for women the family role can intrude into the work role, but the work role cannot intrude into the family role (Sekaran, 1983b). The working female has to deal with the traditional norms stating the mother/wife should be home with her children. The career mother has to somehow balance her feeling of wanting to or thinking she should stay home with the children and her desire for a career. Men also experience similar norm conflicts. The husband, due to traditional socialization, may feel that the wife should be at home with the children, but may also understand the importance of a career to his wife (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969, 1971).

Another dilemma that dual career couples face is the problem of identity. The male in American society has been socialized to be the caretaker of his family, the sole and best provider for them. When his wife contributes significantly to their socioeconomic status, the male may have feelings of failure when comparing himself to the traditional male role. Whether the wife has to work or just wants to work seems to make little difference. The female, on the other hand, has been socialized to be a homemaker, living her
life through her husband. Some women may feel conflict due to not matching the role prescribed for them (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969, 1976).

Dual career couples also face the problem of satisfying the members in their social networks. The dual career couple must somehow work their extended family and friends into their already very complicated and busy life. Dual career families tend to have fewer social network ties than the traditional family (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969, 1971).

The last dilemma faced by the dual career family is the problem of conflict between their roles in their occupation and their roles in the family, which have been found to have a cycling affect. When the husband's and wife's role cycles do not change together, conflict may arise. Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) contend that there are two sources of such conflict. One problem has to do with changing roles at work that affect the individuals separately and for the couple, collectively. The second problem arises when the couple's occupational spheres come into conflict, such as with hours and days worked (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969, 1971).

Some of the Rapoports' dilemmas are also found in family types where the wife works full-time, but not in a career. For example, overload may also occur when the wife works in a full-time job. Norm dilemmas may arise if the wife/mother
feels that she has to work or really wants to work and also feels that she should be at home. Similar norm dilemmas may occur for the husband whose wife has a job and for the husband whose wife has a career. Identity dilemmas are also just as likely in the job category as in the career. The demands of a career are more than a job and thus, the social network dilemmas may be less evident, since the job may be more flexible. Role cycling dilemmas may not be much of a problem because jobs and especially women's jobs are not as demanding as careers.

Previously it was noted that marital happiness is affected by many factors within the family. The presence of children and also the number of children have been found to have a negative effect on happiness in general and marital happiness, specifically (White, 1983; Glenn and McLanahan, 1982). White hypothesizes that children decrease the amount of spousal interaction, and, therefore, happiness also decreases. The relationship between number of children and marital happiness is not so simple. Happiness may vary by the employment status of the wife, and to a lesser degree by the husband. If a wife works, then a greater number of children is likely to be related to a lower level of happiness; but, this expectation may only hold for certain occupational types. These qualifications will be discussed in depth in
Bryson, Bryson, and Johnson (1978) suggest that as the number of children in a dual career family increases marital happiness decreases. This suggestion may have merit in that, as the number of children increase, the time and energy required to care for these children also increases. Child care responsibilities put more demands on the dual career couple who have already allocated a large amount of their time to the work world. Bryson, Bryson, and Johnson discuss the relationship between marital happiness and the number of children separately for the husband and the wife. They found that husbands were more likely to be satisfied with the marriage as the number of children increased. Wives, on the other hand, tended to be more satisfied when there were fewer children present (Bryson, Bryson and Johnson, 1978). This finding could be predicted by examining the traditional expectations concerning the sex-role behavior of mothers and fathers. The mother is supposed to provide more of the primary care for the child than the father; and, therefore, husbands would be less affected by the increased number of children because they tend not to be expected to provide much of the primary care. Wives, on the other hand, would be expected to provide this care.

As noted previously, large numbers of children nega-
tively affect the amount of marital happiness. Family types that are non-career oriented will be affected negatively by a large number of children, but to a lesser degree than the career oriented family types.

Marital happiness has been found to be greater among those who have higher occupational status (i.e. careers) higher income, and higher educational levels. Renne (1970) addressed dissatisfaction in marriage and found that socio-economic status is positively correlated with marital happiness. Those who had white collar occupations, higher status and prestige, and better education were less likely than others to report dissatisfaction with their marriage. These variables are all interrelated, with income being the most important one. Cutright (1971) discusses the placement of income in causal chain of marital stability. Income is the closest structural variable to marital stability, meaning that income is a better predictor of marital stability than occupational status or educational level. Occupation and education had little positive effect on marital stability when controlling for income (Cutright, 1971). The general hypothesis is that the greater the income the more stable and happier the marriage.

Houseknecht and Macke, (1981) have examined the income-marital satisfaction relationship for dual career families.
In dual career families, when total income is high, marital satisfaction also tends to be high. This relationship only holds true if the husband's income is significantly more than the wife's. If the wife earns more than the husband, marital satisfaction is decreased. Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) suggest that when both husband and wife are economically viable individuals, the marital relationship is strengthened and is likely to be satisfying.

The hypothesis that the wife's occupational superiority in a dual career family causes marital troubles for couples has been suggested by many researchers, but it has not been supported by recent research. Richardson (1979), using the NORC General Social Survey data, found that there was no relationship between wife's occupational superiority and marital happiness. Richardson's research (1979) did find some other interesting results. He found that wives who worked continuously and had higher prestige than the husbands were happier than wives who worked discontinuously, with higher prestige. Similarly, wives who are continuous in work and lower in prestige than their husbands were happier than wives whose work history was discontinuous and who were lower in prestige than the husbands.

In summary, marital happiness/satisfaction may be affected by numerous internal factors within the family unit.
Number of children, occupational status, education, employment type, and income have all been shown to have an affect upon the amount of marital happiness present in a particular family type. The subsequent analysis will examine how various husband-wife family types differ in terms of fertility, age at marriage, and income -- as well as how these factors may be related to differences in marital happiness for the various family types.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN, SAMPLE AND HYPOTHESES

Women working outside the home is not a new phenomenon. Women have always worked outside the home in some form. What is new is the frequency with which women are working in career occupations and the frequency with which women continue to work during their childbearing years. These new patterns of work are indicative of major changes in the conception of what are appropriate female roles in the family; and, the changes in employment outside the home have been the subject of much sociological research in recent years.

Much of the earlier research examined the effects of the working mother on the child (Maccoby, 1958). More recently, research has focused on one specific type of working mother family, the dual career family (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969). Sociological research has not examined to any significant extent the differences among career-wife families, job-wife
families, no job-wife families. However, some of the earlier research in the area of families suggests that relationships may exist between certain variables and specific family types. The propositions presented later in this chapter have been derived from these earlier studies. However, before discussion of the propositions, an explanation of the research design and methodology employed in this thesis will be presented.

Sample and Research Design

The sample used in this examination of family types was selected from the National Opinion Research Center's cumulative data file of the General Social Survey (Davis, 1984). Respondents from the 1980, 1982, 1983, and 1984 General Social Survey were included (no survey was administered in 1981). Each survey is a national probability sample of the non-institutionalized population of the United States, age eighteen older (Davis, 1984).

These four years were selected for two reasons. First, by combining the samples over a four year period, a large number of cases become available for analysis. Secondly, these years represent the latest years available, and enabled a description of the family types of the eighties. The combined number of respondents surveyed for those years was 6,046.
Since only currently married couples could be included, the sample was reduced to 4,271 (seventy-one percent of the total sample). The sample was further reduced to eliminate married couples in which the husband or the wife was retired. There were 639 such cases. Ninety-two respondents were not included because they were not classifiable into one of the twenty-five family types. Therefore, the final sample included 3,540 husband-wife cases. The frequency distribution of all family types in the United States is based on these 3,540 cases. Detailed analyses were confined to the following six family types: husband career-wife career (HC-WC), husband career-wife job (HC-WJ), husband career-wife no job (HC-WN), husband job-wife career (HJ-WC), husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ), and husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN).

It should be noted that the data in the General Social Survey do not contain information on couples, but rather consist of one individual in the couple, either the husband or the wife. The sample which comprises the six family types consists of 1,260 married male respondents and 1,415 female respondents. For some of the analyses, all respondents of the family type are used. Since, the size of the male and female sample are relatively equal, combining them does not introduce a bias due to a preponderance of either males or females. In several analyses, when sex is used as a control
variable, only male or female respondents are used.

The following procedure was used to generate the family type classifications. First, all currently married respondents were selected. Secondly, the married respondents were classified into three occupational status groups: those who had a career; those who had a job; and those who were unemployed or did not work. Also, the occupational status of the respondent's spouse was classified into those three groups. Respondents who were retired or whose spouse was retired were not included. These classifications were further broken down by employment type -- that is, full-time versus part-time employment.

The result is that there are five employment status possibilities for each respondent and his/her spouse. These are career full-time (CF); career part-time (CP); job full-time (JF); job part-time (JP); and no job (NJ). Combining each respondent's status with that of his/her spouse produce the twenty-five possible family types (See table 1, pg.42 for the list and frequency of each of the types).

**Operationalization of the Variables**

The variables used had to meet the condition of being asked in all four years of the General Social Survey. The responses to some variables were collapsed into categories which were more meaningful for the present analysis. Missing
data on a variable caused that respondent to be eliminated from all analyses involving that variable. Therefore, certain tables have totals less than the total sample size.

A career type of occupation is operationalized in this study as those occupations that are coded from 001 through 245 in the General Social Survey. Careers consist of those occupations that fall into the professional and managerial category. Such occupations meet the requirements of advanced education and strong commitments; and they usually have a developmental sequence (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969). Appendix A provides a list of career occupations.

A job is operationalized as all other occupations not considered to be a career. (See Appendix B for a list of occupations defined as jobs: codes 260 and higher).

Number of children was analyzed in several different ways. The mean number of children per family type was used for certain analyses. A breakdown of the number of children into the following groups: none (12.7 percent of sample); one to two children (44.5 percent of sample); and three or more (forty-three percent of sample) was used in others. Lastly, the number of children in the family under six years old was used in other analyses.

Income reflects the total family income reported by the respondent. Income is divided by the GSS into twelve cate-
gories, with under $1,000 being the lowest category and $25,000 or more the highest. For the present purposes, income is grouped into two categories: income under $15,000 and income over $15,000. This dividing line resulted in the formation of two relatively equal sized income groups. The under $15,000 category represents 55.7 percent of the sample, and the remaining 44.3 percent are in the over $15,000 category. Since NORC coded the income categories from one to twelve, means calculated using these codes do not reflect true mean incomes. The codes represent the following income ranges: 1=under $1,000; 2=$1,000 to $2,999; 3=$3,000 to $3,999; 4=$4,000 to $4,999; 5=$5,000 to $5,999; 6=$6,000 to $6,999; 7=$7,000 to $7,999; 8=$8,000 to $9,999; 9=$10,000 to $14,999; 10=$15,000 to $19,999; 11=$20,000 to $24,999; 12=$25,000 and over. Therefore, a mean of 9.7 would indicate that the income was in the interval of $10,000 to $14,999.

The variable marital happiness was measured by responses to GSS question regarding marital happiness. The question, as asked by the GSS, had three possible responses: "very happy," "pretty happy," and "not too happy," with marriage. The "not too happy" category was infrequently selected by respondents; and therefore it was combined with the pretty happy category to form a dichotomous variable with "very happy" and "moderately happy" as the categories of the
The marital happiness variable.

The exact age at which respondents were married was recorded by the GSS. Age at marriage was collapsed into two categories both for males and for females. For males, the category of "young" represents those males that were less than twenty-two (51.3 percent) and the category "older" represents those twenty-two or over (47.7 percent). For the female respondents the "young" category represents those females that were less than twenty (46.8 percent) when they married and the "older" category represents those females twenty and over (54.2 percent).

The amount of education was originally coded into categories from no schooling to eight years of college or more. In the analysis here the variable was dichotomized into categories of "high school or less" and "college or more," thereby dividing the sample in percentages of 67.2 and 32.8, respectively. Further categorizations would have produced cells that were very low in frequency; and, therefore, comparisons would have been questionable.

The actual number of hours worked per week was recorded in the GSS, thereby permitting the calculation of means for each family type. A dichotomy was also created with "less than forty hours" as one category and "more then forty hours" as the second category. This dichotomy was utilized to
measure the difference between a regular work week and one where more than forty hours was worked.

**Propositions**

Many authors (Rice, 1983; Allen and Kalish, 1984; Ferber and Huber, 1979; Tickamyer, 1979; Bryson et al., 1978; Haygne, 1981; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971) have suggested that certain demographic and background differences exist among various family types. These variables include age at which couples get married, family size, and income.

Previous studies have shown that level of education of women is related to marital age (Ferber and Huber, 1979; Allen and Kalish, 1984; and Haygne, 1981). Ferber and Huber (1979) contend that highly educated women marry later than less educated women. Haygne (1981) discusses the relationship between careers and education also. He (Haygne, 1981) presents data which show that women in career occupations have more education than women in non-career occupations. However, the amount of education was not a significant factor in delaying marriage for men. Based upon the findings from previous research concerning marital age and level of education or occupational status, the following propositions are suggested:
Proposition 1:

Married women who are employed in a career are more likely to have married at a later age than married women who are employed in a job or married women who do not work.

Proposition 2:

Career men are no more likely to marry later than men who have jobs.

The relationship between fertility and employment status of the wife has been investigated in a number of studies (Bryson et al., 1978; Tickamyer, 1979; and Haygne, 1981). Research has compared fertility among family types in which the wife worked full-time, part-time or did not work outside the home. The pattern has been in the direction of a decreasing number of children as employment status became more full-time. The differences between careers and jobs suggest that career women should have fewer children than those with a job. Differences in fertility rates among family types is suggested by the writings of Bryson et al. (1978), Tickamyer (1979), and Haygne (1981) and it is from these writings that the following are derived:

Proposition 3:

Family types in which the wife works full-time are more likely to have fewer children and are less likely to have to children under the age of six than family types in which the wife does not work.
Proposition 4:

Family types involving career women will have the least number of children and fewer under six; and family types where the wife does not work are likely to have the largest number of children and larger number of children under six.

Marital happiness has been studied extensively and continues to be emphasized in research in the area of family sociology (White, 1983; Hardesty and Betz, 1980; Bailyn, 1970). Two factors have been identified as having an effect upon the amount of marital happiness. These factors are fertility rates and income. Education is seen as an intervening variable in relation to income. One of the writer's main purposes in this thesis is to determine whether marital happiness differs in relation to different educational and fertility levels for various family types.

Recently, a considerable amount of research has been focused upon marital happiness and one specific family type, the dual career family. Although this research (Booth, 1979; Burke and Wier, 1976; Bryson et al., 1978; Houseknecht and Macke, 1981; Richardson, 1979; Bailyn, 1970; and Hardesty and Betz, 1980) included a variety of factors presumed to be related to marital happiness, the same factors, fertility and income, have been identified as being most important for happiness in the dual career family type. The findings from the research on marital happiness in general and from the
extensive literature on marital happiness in the dual career family suggest the following several hypotheses.

Proposition 5a:

Family types in which the wife does not have a career are more likely to exhibit higher levels of marital happiness than family types in which the wife does have a career.

Proposition 5b:

Family types in which the wife has a job will have higher rates of marital happiness than family types in which the wife has a career or in family type in which the wife does not work.

The relationship between fertility and employment status of the wife has been clearly shown in previous research. The pattern has been in the direction of a decreasing number of children as employment status become more full-time, suggesting that the career women will have fewer children than non-career women. The relationship between number of children and marital happiness has also been investigated with the direction of the relationship being that of more marital happiness when fewer children are present. However, what has not been investigated is how the number of children and employment status of the wife is related to marital happiness in the various family types. From the writings of Bryson, Bryson and Johnson (1978) and Glenn and McLanahan (1982) the following propositions are derived:
Proposition 6a:

Family types in which the wife works (job or career) are more likely to have higher levels of marital happiness when there are fewer children than family types in which the wife works and has a larger number of children.

Proposition 6b:

Family types in which the wife does not work are more likely to have higher levels of marital happiness when there are a larger number of children than family types in which the wife does not work and has fewer number of children.

**Statistical Analyses**

Several basic statistical procedures were used in this thesis to test the propositions presented above. The analysis in the following chapter begins with frequency distributions which estimate the frequency of each family type in the American population. As was established previously, the sample for this research was derived from a national probability sample and thus is likely to be representative of the population at large.

To test the relationship between two variables in the cross-tabulated tables, the chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistic was used. The chi-square is a well known procedure which tests the hypothesis that there is no relationship between the variables in the population and tests whether any relationship in the sample is due only to chance. The level of
significance used is a probability of .05 or at the ninety five percent confidence level. Where means were calculated, the T test, a statistic used to test for differences between means, was used. The analysis of variance procedure was used to test for differences among several means.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS

One purpose of this research is to estimate the frequency of each family type specified in the typology which was discussed in chapter two. Table 1 presents the twenty-five family types along with the frequencies of each and the percentage distribution as revealed in the General Social Surveys of 1980, 1981, 1983, and 1984 combined. Since the General Social Survey (GSS) is a national probability sample, the frequencies of family types found here are likely to be representative of the general population.

The data in table 1 show that many of the family types specified by the typology are not types found very frequently in the American population. Even with the increase of women reported in the labor force, the most frequent husband and wife family types are those where the husband works full time, in a career or in a job, and the wife does not work at all. The data in table 1 show that, by far, the most frequently occurring husband-wife family type is the husband
working full time at a job and the wife not working (HFJ-WNJ) (34.9 percent). Second in occurrence is the husband working in a career and the wife not working (16.6 percent). Combined, these two family types account for slightly over fifty percent of the respondents sampled. Also, relatively high in frequency is the husband job full-time and the wife job full-time family type with 13.9 percent.

Specifically, the distribution reveals that thirteen of the twenty-five husband wife family type combinations each have less than one percent of the total sample respondents. Additionally, over one half (60 percent) of the family types have a frequency of less than two percent. Included here are all family types where the husband works part time, in a career or a job, and all family types where the husband has no job, with the exception of the husband no job-wife no job family type (HNJ-WNJ). This family type has a high frequency of 5.4 percent. The range of frequencies is from a low of one (or .02 percent) in the husband no job-wife career part-time (HNJ-WCP) family type to a high of 1,236 (or 34.9 percent) in the husband job full-time wife no job (HJF-WNJ) family type. It is interesting to note that although it has received considerable attention in recent research, the dual-career family type (HCF-WCF) contains only 3.6 percent of the total families in the present sample.
### TABLE 1
**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HUSBAND-WIFE FAMILY TYPES IN DESCENDING ORDER OF FREQUENCY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HJF-WNJ</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HCF-WNJ</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HJF-WJF</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HJF-WJP</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HNJ-WNJ</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HCF-WJF</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HCF-WCF</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HJF-WCF</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. HCF-WJP</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. HNJ-WJF</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. HJP-WNJ</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. HCF-WCP</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. HJF-WCP</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. HNJ-WJP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. HNJ-WCF</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. HJP-WJF</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. HCP-WNJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. HJP-WJP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. HJP WCF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. HCP-WCF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. HCP-WJF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. HJP-WCP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. HCP-WJP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. HCP-WCP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. HNJ-WCP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3540</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Data consists of married couples who qualify to fit into one of the family types from the years 1980, 1981, 1983, and 1984 of the General Social Survey.

Table 2 groups the family types into five categories based on the employment status of the husband. The two largest categories consist of family types involving a husband with a job full-time (HJF) (58.7 percent) or a husband with a
career full-time (HCF) (28.0 percent). These categories have considerably higher frequencies than those where the husband works part-time or not at all. In both the career full-time and job full-time husband categories the most frequent employment status of the wife is not working at all outside the home. Almost thirty-five percent of all respondents were in the husband job full-time wife no job (HJF-WNJ) family type; and 16.6 percent were in the husband career full-time wife no job (HCF-WNJ) family type. In family types in which the wife does work, she is more frequently employed in a job full-or part-time (20.1 percent) than in a career full-or part-time (6.1 percent). Among family types in which the wife has a career, the husband more frequently has a career than a job (3.6 percent versus 2.8 percent). In fact, only 7.4 percent of the sample consisted of family types where the wife had a full-time career.

The husband career part-time, husband job part-time, and the husband no job family types are not frequently occurring ones. Family types in which the husband works part-time in a career or a job all represent less than one percent of the sample, with the exception of the husband job part-time wife no job (HJP-WNJ) family type. This latter family type constituted 1.9 percent of the sample.
### TABLE 2

**FAMILY TYPES GROUPED BY OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND EMPLOYMENT TYPE OF THE HUSBAND.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband Career</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Husband Job</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF-WCF</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>HJF-WCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF-WCP</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>HJF-WCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF-WJF</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>HJF-WJF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF-WJP</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>HJF-WJP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF-WNJ</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>(587)</td>
<td>HJF-WNJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>(987)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP-WCF</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>HJP-WCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP-WCP</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>HJP-WCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP-WJF</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>HJP-WJF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP-WJP</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>HJP-WJP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP-WNJ</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>HJP-WNJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband No Job</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HNJ-WCF</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNJ-WCP</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNJ-WJF</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>(74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNJ-WJP</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNJ-WNJ</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>(191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>(319)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The husband with no job grouping of family types has a surprisingly wide range of frequencies from one (.02 percent) in the husband no job-wife career part-time (HNJ-WCP) family
type to 191 (5.4 percent) in the husband no job-wife no job (HNJ-WNJ) family type. Nonetheless, family types in which the husband works part-time or is unemployed are not typical of families in the American population. Furthermore, these types may involve situations in which the husband is temporarily out of work rather than unemployed permanently.

Out of the total of twenty-five possible family types, six are selected for further examination and analysis. Since the focus of the subsequent analysis will be on differences between family types where the husband and wife are employed full-time and where the husband is employed full-time and the wife does not work outside the home, only those family types were selected for further study. Selecting these six family types of full-time workers eliminated one category of part-time workers, the husband job full-time wife job part-time (HJF-WJP). Literature has shown that full-time work is different from part-time work; thus, including them in our analysis would create difficulties in comparability. In the end, the analysis does cover six of the eight most frequent family types. Therefore, this analysis consists of an examination of the family types which are presented in table 3. Note that the symbol for full-time employment status is now abbreviated further. It is no longer necessary to indicate full-or part-time since all couples are employed full-time,
with the exception of the wife with no job (WN).

The focus of the subsequent analysis is upon the similarities and the differences among these six family types which appear in table 3. Of particular interest will be the relationships that various types and combinations of male and female employment have on marital happiness.

**TABLE 3**

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF SIX SELECTED FAMILY TYPES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Original Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC-WC</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC-WJ</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC-WN</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ-WC</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ-WJ</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ-WN</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2675</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents a summary of the following demographic, social and economic characteristics for each of the six sub-selected family types: sex, mean age, income, divorce status, educational level, number of hours worked last week, religious preference, and race. Note that for some of the variables in table 4, the total respondents are less than the total sample respondents, the result of some respondents not answering particular questions. The variable income was
affected most by no answers with 831 fewer responses. Given the amount of non-response the analysis of income differences is necessarily limited and the results which concern income must be interpreted with caution.

It was noted previously that this sample consisted of only one spouse in a family type not both. The distribution by sex reveals that in the sample males and females are relatively equally represented in all family types. The largest difference is between the males and females in the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) family type where the females represented 57.6 percent of the respondents and the males comprised only 42.4 percent.

The overall mean age for male respondents was 41.76 years and the mean for female respondents was 39.26 years. As can be seen in table 4, in all family types the male respondents' mean age was slightly higher than that of the female respondents. The mean age was the highest for both genders in the husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type. The youngest respondents, both male and female, were found in the husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type. The husbands and wives were the oldest in family types in which the wife had a career (HC-WC and HJ-WC).
TABLE 4  
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE RESPONDENTS IN THE SAMPLE OF SIX FAMILY TYPES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WJ</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>WN</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>HJ</th>
<th>WJ</th>
<th>HJ</th>
<th>WN</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(249)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(252)</td>
<td>(576)</td>
<td>(1260)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(338)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(240)</td>
<td>(660)</td>
<td>(1415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(249)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(252)</td>
<td>(576)</td>
<td>(1260)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(338)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(240)</td>
<td>(660)</td>
<td>(1415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income Level**</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93)*</td>
<td>(94)*</td>
<td>(411)*</td>
<td>(72)*</td>
<td>(352)*</td>
<td>(822)*</td>
<td>(1844)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>(569)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(401)</td>
<td>(1111)</td>
<td>(2409)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>(252)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Hours Worked Last Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)*</td>
<td>(44)*</td>
<td>(168)*</td>
<td>(33)*</td>
<td>(177)*</td>
<td>(371)*</td>
<td>(837)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)*</td>
<td>(50)*</td>
<td>(41)*</td>
<td>(187)*</td>
<td>(328)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WJ</td>
<td>WN</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WJ</td>
<td>WN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years School Completed</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>(585)*</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>(489)*</td>
<td>(1233)*</td>
<td>(2667)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(247)*</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(250)*</td>
<td>(574)*</td>
<td>(1254)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(338)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(239)*</td>
<td>(659)*</td>
<td>(1413)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Divorced</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(61)*</td>
<td>(12)*</td>
<td>(87)*</td>
<td>(160)*</td>
<td>(355)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Preference</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(341)</td>
<td>(784)</td>
<td>(1707)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>(359)</td>
<td>(718)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base less than total sample base due to no response on the question.

**Mean income is coded in a range as follows: 8=$8,000 to $9,999; 9=$10,000 to $14,999; and 10=$15,000 to $24,999.

***Data not applicable; wife no job category.
The mean total family income of the entire sample was a coded mean of 9.20 (S.D.=1.83) which is in the range of 10,000 to 14,999. Family types in which the wife worked in a career (HC-WC and HJ-WC) had higher income levels than the other family types; and the dual career family type (HC-WC) had the highest average income level. As expected, the husband job-wife no job family type (HJ-WN) reported the lowest income level. As was stated previously, only 1,844 couples reported income, that is, 831 couples did not answer the income question. This low response rate suggests that the income measure available in the GSS is not a particularly good one.

As shown in table 4, the mean number years of school completed for the sample was 12.13 years. The husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type had the highest mean number of years of school completed (15.40). The other two husband career family types (HC-WJ and HC-WN) had relatively equal number of years of school completed, mean of 13.47 and mean of 13.85, respectively. In the husband job group of family types, the husband job-wife career (HJ-WC) family type had the highest mean years of school completed. In both groups, when wives had careers the educational level of the family tended to be higher.

Table 4 also shows the educational level for each family
type, by respondent's sex. Career females who are married to career husbands tend to have completed more school than career females who are married to job husbands. The wives who were unemployed had slightly more education than the wives who were working, irrespective of husband's employment status. The same pattern holds true for husbands. The husbands whose wives did work tended to have slightly more education than husbands whose wives worked in jobs. Husbands whose wives had careers had higher educational levels than other husbands. The husbands whose wives also had a career completed the highest number of years of school.

Years of education were also calculated for occupational types but are not shown in table 4. Career women in the sample had a mean of 14.31 years of school completed, job women had a mean of 11.41 years, and no job women had a mean of 11.82 years. Career men completed a mean of 15.00 years of school; and job men had a mean of 11.18 years.

When the mean number of hours worked by male respondents are compared, it can be seen in table 4 that career husbands with career wives work more hours than other career husbands or husbands who have jobs. The career wives in both husband categories (means of 42.60 and 42.68 hours, respectively) tend to work more hours than job wives (means of 39.17 and 39.09 hours, respectively).
Overall, career males work more hours than job males with an average of 47.46 hours and 43.98 hours, respectively. The same is true for career females who work an average of 42.64 hours and job females who work an average of 39.13 hours.

Thirteen percent (n=355) of the final sample had been previously divorced with the highest rate occurring among the husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ) family type (18 percent). The lowest rate was among the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) category (10.5 percent).

Approximately sixty-five percent (65.4 percent) of the sample were Protestant; 27.5 percent were Catholic; 3.2 percent were Jewish; 4.8 percent reported their religious preferences were none; and, 1.2 percent reported other religious preferences. The husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type had the highest percentage of Protestants (69.9 percent) and the husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) family type had the highest percentage of Catholics (29.1 percent). The husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) family type had the highest percentage Jewish respondents.

Ninety percent (n=2409) of the sample were white, nine percent (n=252) were black, and one percent (n=14) were of other races. Blacks in the sample were found less frequently in the husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type but they were found more frequently in the husband job-wife job
(HJ-WJ) family type. These data are shown in table 4.

In summary, table 4 indicates several differences among the six family types. Family types in which the wife has a career are slightly older than family types in which the wife does not work. As would be expected, the husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type had the highest total family income. The other wife career family type (HJ-WC) also had a high income. As would be expected, family types with one or both spouses in a career had higher levels of education. Career spouses typically work more hours per week than do non-career spouses. The husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ) family type had the highest previous divorce rate among the family types sampled.

Propositions 1 and 2 relate marital age of females and males to the employment status of spouses. Specifically, proposition one stated that married career women are more likely to marry later than women who work in a job or women who do not work. Proposition two predicted that career men are no more likely to marry later than men employed in a job. Table 5 presents the data on mean age at marriage for all respondents in each of the family types. Overall, the findings reported in table 5 reveal that the mean age at first marriage for female respondents was 20.53 years and 23.36 years for male respondents. The total sample had a mean
age at first marriage of 21.86 years.

TABLE 5

AGE AT MARRIAGE BY SEX AND FAMILY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>HC WC</th>
<th>HC WJ</th>
<th>HC WN</th>
<th>HJ WC</th>
<th>HJ WJ</th>
<th>HJ WN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean Age At Marriage</td>
<td>23.33 (126)</td>
<td>21.72 (132)*</td>
<td>22.40 (585)*</td>
<td>23.46 (101)</td>
<td>21.42 (489)*</td>
<td>21.52 (1232)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.96 (63)</td>
<td>23.04 (72)*</td>
<td>23.75 (247)*</td>
<td>24.56 (48)</td>
<td>22.88 (249)*</td>
<td>23.27 (574)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.68 (63)</td>
<td>20.16 (60)</td>
<td>21.04 (338)</td>
<td>22.45 (53)</td>
<td>19.91 (240)</td>
<td>19.98 (658)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base less than total sample base due to no response on the question.

Male respondents in all family types marry at an older age than their female counterparts. Overall, among family types, males exhibit little variation in the age at which they get married which is consistent with proposition 2. Females, on the other hand, show greater variability in age at marriage among the family types. As was predicted by proposition 1, working career women tend to marry later than women with a job or no job. Among the non career women, women who marry career husbands tend to marry later (means of 20.16 years versus 21.04 years) than women who marry job husbands (means of 19.91 years versus 19.98 years). The
findings provide consistent support for proposition 1, in that married career women are more likely to marry later than women who have jobs and women who are unemployed.

The findings reported in table 6 indicate that the mean age at marriage for career women was 22.57 years, compared to 19.95 years for the job women and an average of 20.46 years for those women who did not work. As shown in table 6, the results of T tests yielded statistically significant differences between the ages of which career women and women employed in jobs first married, as well as significant differences in age at marriage between career women and unemployed women. There was also a significant difference between unemployed women and women with jobs, in that, unemployed women marry later than women with jobs.

Proposition 2 predicted that career husbands and husbands with jobs would not differ in the age at which they first married. Findings reported in table 6 support this proposition. The difference between the mean age at first marriage of career males and males with jobs is small (23.65 years versus 23.23 years); the corresponding t-test indicated that this difference is not statistically significant.
### TABLE 6

AGE AT MARRIAGE FOR MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS
BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>No Job</th>
<th>t-tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>t=1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(382)</td>
<td>(871)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>C vs J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(116)</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>(996)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t=6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C vs NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t=5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J vs NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t=2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No job category for males is not applicable.*

Findings concerning the fertility of each of the family types are presented in table 7. Research has suggested that occupational activity especially of the wife, has an effect upon the number of children a family type has. Specifically, proposition 3 predicted that full-time working women would have fewer children than non-working women. An analysis of variance comparing the mean number of children in each family type indicated significant differences in the number of children among family types ($F=6.227$, $P<.05$). Those family types in which the wife does not work (HC-WN and HJ-WN) have a large number of children (mean of 2.40 children and 2.64 children, respectively) than those family types where the wife works full-time (means of 2.00, 2.14, 2.19 and 2.34
children).

Table 8 presents the results concerning the mean number of children under age six for each family type. An analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the number of children under six among the family types (F=22.24, p<.05). Again, the family types in which the wife did not work (HC-WN and HJ-WN) had a larger number of children under six (means of .61 and .68 children, respectively). The findings reported in table 8 indicate that the husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type has the lowest mean number of children under six years of age. The standard deviations among the non-working wife family types (HC-WN and HJ-WN) are quite large, suggesting that within group variations among respondents are large. These data support that
part of proposition 3 which predicted that working women families would have fewer children under age six than family types with unemployed wives.

### Table 8
MEAN OF NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER SIX BY FAMILY TYPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>HJ</th>
<th>HJ</th>
<th>HJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>(586)</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>(491)</td>
<td>(1236)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F=22.24, P<.01, D.F=5/2672)

Proposition 4 predicted that career women family types would have the fewest children and non working women family types the greatest number of children. This proposition was only partially supported by the results which appear in table 7. Career women with career husbands (HC-WC) had the fewest number of children of all family types (mean of 2.00 children). Career women with husbands in jobs had more children (mean of 2.19) than women in jobs who had husbands with jobs, as expected. However, the husband career-wife job family type (HC-WJ) had virtually the same mean number of
children (2.14) as the husband job-wife career (HJ-WC) family type (2.19). Findings concerning the mean of children under age six were similar.

Several T tests were employed to examine differences in the average number of children between the family types with working wives and the family types with unemployed wives. The results of these T tests are reported in table 9. The findings indicate that all types of couples in which wives work have significantly fewer children than couples with husbands who have jobs and wives who are unemployed. However, dual career families have significantly fewer children than couples with husbands who have careers and the wives who are unemployed. These results suggest that the type of occupation in which husbands are employed may be an important influence on the number of children a couple has.

Table 10 presents findings concerning the percentage of very happy marriages for the total sample, and by sex of the respondent from each family type. Results indicate that there are statistically significant differences in the percentage of all respondents who report very happy marriages among the family types (chi-square=12.36, P<.05) and among female respondents in the various family types (chi-square=14.01, p<.05). However, the corresponding differences
are not statistically significant among male respondents (chi-square=3.80, p>.05). The results reported in table 10 indicate that the majority of all respondents, male and female, report very happy marriages. In all family types, nearly two-thirds or more of the respondents reported that they were very happy with their marriage. The husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type (74.7 percent), and the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) family type (74.3 percent) reported the highest rates of marital happiness. Lowest levels were reported in the husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type (64.9 percent) and in the husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ) family type (65.7 percent).

**TABLE 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Women Family Types</th>
<th>Non Working Wife Family Types</th>
<th>Working Women Family Types</th>
<th>Working Women Family Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC-WJ</td>
<td>N.S. (t=1.68)</td>
<td>HJ-WN</td>
<td>N.S. (t=.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC-WC</td>
<td>S (t=2.57)</td>
<td>HJ-WC</td>
<td>N.S (t=1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ-WC</td>
<td>N.S (t=1.06)</td>
<td>HJ-WJ</td>
<td>S (t=3.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ-WJ</td>
<td>N.S (t=1.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>S (t=4.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N.S=not significant; S=significant at p< .05.

Proposition 5a predicted that family types with non-career wives (HC-WJ, HC-WN, HJ-WJ, HJ-WN) would have higher levels
of marital happiness than family types with career wives (HC-WC, HJ-WC). The findings reported in table 10 provide partial support for this proposition. The exception is the husband job-wife career (HJ-WC) family type. This family type reported higher levels of marital happiness than both the husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ) family type and the husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) family type but not quite as high as the level of marital happiness reported in the husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type or the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) family type.

**TABLE 10**

PERCENT REPORTING VERY HAPPY MARRIAGES BY SEX AND FAMILY TYPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>HC WC</th>
<th>HC WJ</th>
<th>HC WN</th>
<th>HJ WC</th>
<th>HJ WJ</th>
<th>HJ WN</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Report Very Happy*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>=12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>(424)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(364)</td>
<td>(843)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>=3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(168)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(177)</td>
<td>(369)</td>
<td>N.S**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>=14.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(256)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(187)</td>
<td>(474)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In all categories, bases were less than total sample base due to no responses on the marital happiness question. Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of respondents in each category.

**N.S=not significant at p<.05.
Proposition 5b predicted that family types in which the wife has a job (HC-WJ and HJ-WJ) would have higher levels of marital happiness than the other family types. The results which appear in table 10 provide only partial support for this proposition. The difference between these two wife job family types is the husband's occupation. The higher level of marital happiness (74.7 percent) is seen in the family type where the husband has a career and the lower level of marital happiness (65.7 percent) is seen in the family type where the husband has a job. Whether or not women who have a job are happy may be a function of the husband's occupation.

When husbands have a career, the least amount of marital happiness, although still quite a substantial percentage of very happy, occurs when the wife also has a career (64.9 percent). However, when husbands have a job, the greatest marital happiness is recorded when the wife has a career (71.2 percent). These findings suggest that in family types in which the husband has a career, the wife's career tends to decrease the amount of marital happiness. However, when husbands have jobs the wife's career tends to increase happiness. The husband job-wife career (HJ-WC) family type reported more frequently that their marriage was very happy (71.2 percent) then the husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ) family type (65.7 percent) and the husband job -wife no job (HJ-WN)
family type (66.8 percent).

Although no proposition was proferred for marital happiness by sex within each family type, cross tabulations of family type and marital happiness by sex, as shown in table 10, revealed that the differences noted in marital happiness by family type were similar when broken down for males and females within each family type, but that marital happiness did not differ significantly by family type for the male respondents (chi-square=3.8, N.S).

When comparing the six family types, in only one family type was there a significant difference in the level of marital happiness reported by males and females. This was the husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) family type (t=2.156, P<.05) in which and the husbands were significantly more happy than the wives. In the husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type and in the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) family type, females were more likely to report very happy marriages than were the males. The males in the husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type reported very happy marriages more frequently than did the females, but the difference is small and not statistically significant. In the family types in which the female has a career (HC-WC and HJ-WC), the males were slightly more likely to report, very happy marriages. Family types where wives have jobs (HC-WJ
and HJ-WJ) reported very happy marriages more frequently than their male counterparts. In the husband job category, females with careers reported more marital happiness than women in jobs and the unemployed women. Males in this category that had career wives reported most frequently that their marriages were very happy followed closely by those males whose wives did not work.

Findings concerning marital happiness for each family type controlling for the number of children are presented in table 11. No statistically significant differences in marital happiness by number of children were found among the family types. These results suggest that there is no relationship between marital happiness, family type and the number of children a couple has. Findings show for all family types, the percentage of very happy marriages is highest when there are no children in the family. When considering only couples with no children, there are differences in the reported rates of very happy marriages. The husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type had the highest reported rate of very happy marriages when no children are present; and the husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ) family type had the lowest reported figures of very happy marriages. Nonetheless, all family types reported a very high level of very happy marriages.
TABLE 11

PERCENT VERY HAPPY WITH MARRIAGE IN EACH FAMILY TYPE
BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>HC WC</th>
<th>HC WJ</th>
<th>HC WN</th>
<th>HJ WC</th>
<th>HJ WJ</th>
<th>HJ WN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(160)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(246)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part, as the number of children increases the percentage of respondents who report a very happy marriage decreases. However, the husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type and the husband job-wife career (HJ-WC) family type do not follow this pattern. The husband job-wife career (HJ-WC) family type had a higher rate of very happy marriage when there were three or more children present than when only one or two children were present in the family. The husband job-wife career (HJ-WC) family type reported very similar rates of very happy marriages no matter how many children were present.

Proposition 6a predicted that working women family types are more likely to have higher levels of marital happiness.
when there are fewer children than when the wife works and has a larger number of children. This proposition was supported. This can be seen by comparing the percentage of very happy marriages when there are no children in the working women families to the percentage when there are three or more children in these families. In contrast, husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) and the husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) family types reported a lower percentage of very happy marriages when no children were present than when three or more children were present.

Proposition 6b predicted that family types with unemployed wives would report higher levels of marital happiness with three or more children present than the other family types. Between the two family types where the wife does not work, the husband career-wife no job (HJ-WN) family type reported more frequently very happy marriages. This may be due to the higher socioeconomic status of the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) family as compared to the husband job-wife career (HJ-WN) family type. The husband career-wife no job family type (HC-WN) may be more economically able to support a larger number of children. Proposition 6b was not consistently supported by the results reported in table 11.

Further analysis was conducted to ascertain if there were differences in marital happiness between male and female
respondents in each of the family types as the number of children present in each family type varied. Although there were no significant differences in marital happiness between males and females in general, such differences could exist when controlling for the number of children couples have.

Table 12 presents the findings concerning reported rates of very happy marriages by the number of children, when both the sex of respondent and the family type are taken into account. For females the same patterns of happiness as seen in the total sample, were replicated, with the exception of the husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type. In this family type only a little over fifty percent of the females with one or two children reported they were very happy with their marriage (caution need to be applied here due to the very small base sizes). However, the chi-square test results indicate no statistically significant differences in any of the children categories for females.

For males, there are no statistically meaningfull relationships between marital happiness and number of children in any of the family types. Males in the husband career-wife career (HC-WC) family type, the husband career-wife job (HC-WJ) family type and the husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) family type report similiar levels of marital happiness, irrespective of the number of children. In the husband career-wife job
(HC-WJ) family type the highest level of marital happiness reported by male respondents was with one or two children present. In the husband job-wife career family type, males reported the lowest level of marital happiness when there were one or two children present and much higher levels when either no children or when there were three or more children present. In the husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ) family type the pattern is one of increasing marital happiness as the number of children increases.

**TABLE 12**

PERCENT REPORTING VERY HAPPY MARRIAGES, BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN, SEX, AND FAMILY TYPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC WC</td>
<td>HC WJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

A major objective of this research has been to formulate a typology of family types and to determine the relative frequency of each among all American couples. The typology created categories of couples based upon occupational status and employment status of each spouse. Findings indicate that over one half of the family types specified in the typology constitute less than one percent of all couples. The most relevant family type in the present sample was the husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) family which comprised thirty-five percent of all family types. Also frequent was the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) family which comprised seventeen percent of all couples in the typology. These two family types combined to represent over fifty percent of the husband-wife family types in the sample.

In past research these two family types are defined as the "traditional family." The results of several studies have concluded that the traditional family is decreasing
rapidly in the American population. Hayghe (1981), for example, presents figures from 1978 which indicate that the dual-earner family (both spouses working-career or job) constitutes approximately fifty percent of the white population, while the traditional-earner family type constitutes only thirty-four percent. In comparison to Hayghe's data, the traditional-earner type in the present research has included the husband career-wife no job (HC-WN) family type and the husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN) which represent over half of all couples studied here. The dual-earner couple, as defined in this research, includes family types in which both spouses work full-time: husband career-wife career (HC-WC), husband career-wife job (HC-WJ), husband job-wife career (HJ-WC), and husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ). These four family types in the present research represent only 24.4 percent of the couples. Thus, the results obtained in this thesis suggest that the traditional earner family types is still more prevalent than the dual earner types. One possible explanation for the higher percentage for traditional family types and the lower percentage of the dual working family types found in this thesis may be the fact that working women still tend to interrupt their careers or their jobs in order to care for young children. Since the present data are not longitudinal there was no way of testing this possibility.
The results of this thesis have identified several differences among the six family types that were examined in the final analysis. These six types were husband career-wife career (HC-WC), husband career-wife job (HC-WJ), husband career-wife no job (HC-WN), husband job-wife career (HJ-WC), husband job-wife job (HJ-WJ), and husband job-wife no job (HJ-WN).

The mean age of the sample of men was approximately 40 years, and family types in which the wife had a career tended to be slightly older than the other family types. As would be expected, the dual career family type (husband career-wife career) had the highest income of all family types. Those family types in which one or both spouses had a career tended to have higher levels of education. This finding is also expected because higher education is a factor in the definition of a career occupation. Other differences found were that career spouses work more hours and have lower divorce rates. The highest divorce rate found was in the husband job-wife job family type.

The results obtained in this thesis did provide support for proposition 1, that career women tend to marry later than non-career women. These findings are consistent with the results of previous studies (Allen and Kalish, 1984; Ferber and Huber, 1979; and Rice, 1983). One explanation for the
results obtained in this thesis is that women who anticipate having a career tend to pursue advanced educational levels. The finding on the level of education of the career women reveal that such women do have more education than women who have jobs or the women who do not work. Education, therefore, has a delaying effect on marital age for women who anticipate and enter careers. There was also support for the proposition that career men and non-career men would not differ in marital age. All men, on the average, tend to marry later than women; and, therefore, they tend to be farther into careers before they marry. Results confirm the expectation that age at marriage for men does not vary by type of occupation.

Women's employment outside the home has been shown to decrease fertility rates, especially among women who have careers (Bryson et al, 1978; Tickamyer, 1979; and Hayghe, 1981). The present findings also show that fertility among family types with wives who have careers was the lowest among the family types studied. Among women in jobs, fertility was lower than among family types where the women does not work. The portion of proposition three which predicted that family types with working wives will have fewer children was therefore supported consistently by the findings. Further analyses determined that there were statistically significant
differences not only between family types, but also between working wife and non-working wife family types. Working wife family types had significantly fewer children than non-working wives with husbands with jobs. But, non-working women with career husbands did not have significantly more children than working women wife family types. The only exception was the dual career family type where the non-working wife with a career husband had significantly more children.

This thesis also compared marital happiness across the six most prevalent family types. It was proposed that non-career family types would exhibit higher levels of marital happiness (proposition 5a) and that family types in which wives have jobs would have the highest reports of marital happiness (proposition 5b). The data show that across all family types, marital happiness is generally very high. These results suggest that wives' employment status may not be the major factor in determining the level of marital happiness. One possible explanation as to why there were such high reports of happiness may be the type of questioning that was used in the General Social Survey. The GSS asked one question, "How happy are you with your marriage?" The response set was very happy, pretty happy, and not too happy at all. As was mentioned in Chapter Two, this is a
popular way to ask marital happiness; but is also a built in bias that people overall tend not to choose the negative end of a scale, the case was the same with the not too happy category. Few respondents reported being not too happy. A more sophisticated multidimensional index might have yielded differences between the family types which have been studied in this thesis.

Overall, the data show that the husband career-wife job family type and the husband career-wife no job family type reported the highest levels of marital happiness and that the husband career-wife career family type reported the lowest. Both proposition 5a and proposition 5b were partially supported by the results. The exception to proposition 5a was that the husband job-wife career family type reported a higher level of marital happiness then was expected. The exception to proposition 5b, was that the husband job-wife job family type was expected to report a high level of marital happiness, but did not. One possible explanation is that the nature of husband's occupation may be influential in the level of marital happiness. Couples in which the husband has a job and the wife has a career are more likely to report a higher level of marital happiness than couples in which both spouses have jobs. On the other hand, couples in which both spouses have careers report a lower level of marital
happiness than couples in which husband has a career and the wife has a job. Thus, among dual working families, one career-one job family types tend to report higher levels of marital happiness. Among the non-working wife family types more happiness is likely if the husband has a career rather than a job. The latter findings are likely to be due to the increased socioeconomic status of the family in which the husband has a higher paying career. The explanation for the lower level of happiness reported by two career couples must involve factors other than their higher income. The increased role conflict and role strain associated with dual careers is a likely possibility.

In the dual career family type there was a sharp drop in reported level of marital happiness as the number of children increased. A similar trend was observed in the husband career-wife no job family type. The husband career-wife job family type tended to report greater marital happiness with either no children or with three or more children levels. These findings suggest that couples in which spouses have careers may experience greater conflicts with children than couples in which wives have jobs. Some of the latter couples may simply desire larger families.

Previous research has suggested that a family type combination in which level of income is high, the educational
levels are high, and the number of children present is small will report a higher level of marital happiness. Present results, however, show that the husband career-wife career family type had the highest level of income, the highest levels of education, and the fewest children, but that such couples reported a relatively low level of marital happiness. The Rapoports' research (1969, 1971, 1976) on the stresses and strains of dual career marriage is a possible explanation for the observed lower frequency of marital happiness in this family type. Dual career families appear to face conflicts which involve childcare, household responsibilities, social and personal norms, and work roles (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969, 1971, 1976) Hunt and Hunt (1982) suggest that the wife in a dual career family channels her energies toward the development of her career thereby reducing the amount of time and energy she invests in the home. Consequently, when both spouses pursue careers the increased benefits of high income and occupational status maybe offset to some degree by the problems of operating a dual career household.

Using available data such as those which were used in this thesis places several limitations on the analyses that are possible. One limitation is that not all questions are asked in the best format. For example, income in the GSS is asked in categories, rather than in terms of exact income.
Exact income values would have permitted more precise
determination of income levels within each family type.
Another limitation of using the GSS data is that not all the
respondents answered all the questions, which in some cases
greatly reduced the sample size and presented problems in
drawing valid conclusions from the results. Other limita-
tions of the present study involve the family types which
were sub-selected for detailed analysis. Larger samples of
more family types would have enabled a fuller analysis of the
dynamics of American family types.

Another characteristic of the sample that may have
affected the results is the fact that the mean age was 40.5
years. It is clear that many respondents are well into or
beyond the child bearing years. It will be important for
future research to compare younger married career couples
with older married career couples in order to determine if
the dynamics of family type in the United States are
changing. The trend of women pursuing careers is increasing
and important differences between the family lives of the
youngest married women and their older counterparts may be
emerging. Some of the pressures associated with dual career
marriages may be lessened for the young couples, many more of
whom may be deciding to have no children.

A final necessity in future research on family types
will be to study the family types identified in the typology which could not be studied because of the limitations of the present sample.
Appendix A

Career Occupational Classifications

001 Accountants
002 Architects

Computer specialists
003 Computer programmers
004 Computer systems analysts
005 Computer specialists, n.e.c.

Engineers
006 Aeronautical and astronautical engineers
010 Chemical engineers
011 Civil engineers
012 Electrical and electronic engineers
013 Industrial engineers
014 Mechanical engineers
015 Metallurgical and materials engineers
020 Mining engineers
021 Petroleum engineers
022 Sales engineers
023 Engineers, n.e.c.

024 Farm management advisers
025 Foresters and conservationists
026 Home management advisers

Lawyers and judges
030 Judges
031 Lawyers

Librarians, archivists, and curators
032 Librarians
033 Archivists and curators

Mathematical specialists
034 Actuaries
035 Mathematicians
036 Statisticians

Life and Physical scientists
042 Agricultural scientists
043 Atmospheric and space scientists
044 Biological scientists  
045 Chemists  
051 Geologists  
052 Marine scientists  
053 Physicists and astronomers  
054 Life and Physical scientists, n.e.c.  
055 Operations and systems researchers and analysts  
056 Personnel and labor relation workers  

Physicians, dentists, and related practitioners  
061 Chiropractors  
062 Dentists  
063 Optometrists  
064 Pharmacists  
065 Physicians, including osteopaths  
071 Podiatrists  
072 Veterinarians  
073 Health practitioners, n.e.c.  

Nurses, dieticians, and therapists  
074 Dieticians  
075 Registered nurses  
076 Therapists  

Health technologists and technicians  
080 Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians  
081 Dental hygienists  
082 Health record technologists and technicians  
083 Radiologic technologists and technicians  
084 Therapy assistants  
085 Health technologists and technicians, n.e.c.  

Religious workers  
086 Clergymen  
090 Religious workers, n.e.c.  

Social scientists  
091 Economists  
092 Political scientists  
093 Psychologists  
094 Sociologists  
095 Urban and regional planners  
096 Social scientists, n.e.c.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Social workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Recreation workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Agriculture teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Atmospheric, earth, marine, and space teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Biology teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Chemistry teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Physics teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Engineering teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Mathematics teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Health specialists teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Psychology teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Business and commerce teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Economics teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>History teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Sociology teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Social science teachers, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Art, drama, and music teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Coaches and physical education teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Education teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>English teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Foreign language teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Home economics teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Law teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Theology teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Trade, industrial, and technical teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Miscellaneous teachers, college and university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Teachers, college and university, subject not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Adult education teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Elementary school teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Teachers, except college and university, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Agriculture and biological technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Chemical technicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draftsmen
153 Electrical and electronic engineering technicians
154 Industrial engineering technicians
155 Mechanical engineering technicians
156 Mathematical technicians
161 Surveyors
162 Engineering and science technicians, n.e.c.

Technicians, except health, engineering, and science
163 Airplane pilots
164 Air traffic controllers
165 Embalmers
170 Flight engineers
171 Radio operators
172 Tool programmers, numerical control
173 Technicians, n.e.c.

174 Vocational and educational counselors

Writers, artists, and entertainers
175 Actors
180 Athletes and kindred workers
181 Authors
182 Dancers
183 Designers
184 Editors and reporters
185 Musicians and composers
190 Painters and sculptors
191 Photographers
192 Public relations men and publicity writers
193 Radio and television announcers
194 Writers, artists, and entertainers, n.e.c.
195 Research workers, not specified
196 Professional, technical, and kindred workers--allocated

MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, EXCEPT FARM
201 Assessors, controllers, and treasurers, local public administration
202 Bank officers and financial managers
203 Buyers and shippers, farm products
205 Buyers, wholesale and retail trade
210 Credit Men
211 Funeral directors
212 Health administrators
213 Construction inspectors, public administration
215 Inspectors, except construction, public administration
216 Managers and superintendents, building
220 Office managers, n.e.c.
221 Officers, pilots, and pursers; ship
222 Officials and administrators; public administration, n.e.c.
223 Officials of lodges, societies, and unions
224 Postmasters and mail superintendents
225 Purchasing agents and buyers, n.e.c.
226 Railroad conductors
230 Restaurant, cafeteria and bar managers
231 Sales managers and department heads, retail trade
233 Sales managers, except retail trade
235 School administrators, college
240 School administrators, elementary and secondary
245 Managers and administrators, n.e.c.
246 Managers and administrators, except farm--allocated
### Appendix B

**Job Occupational Classifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Advertising agents and salesmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Auctioneers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Demonstrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Hucksters and peddlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Insurance agents, brokers, and underwriters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Newsboys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Real estate agents and brokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Stock and bond salesmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Salesmen and sales clerks, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Sales representatives, manufacturing industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Sales representatives, wholesale trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Sales clerks, retail trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Salesmen, retail trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Salesmen of services and construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sales workers--allocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SALES WORKERS**

**CLERICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Bank tellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Billing clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Bookkeepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Cashiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Clerical assistants, social welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Clerical supervisors, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Collectors, bill and account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Counter clerks, except food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Dispatchers and starters, vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Enumerators and interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Estimators and investigators, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Expeditors and production controllers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>File clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Insurance adjusters, examiners, and investigators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Library attendants and assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Mail carriers, post office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Mailhandlers, except post office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Messengers and office boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Meter readers, utilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Office machine operators**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Bookkeeping and billing machine operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Calculating machine operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Computer and peripheral equipment operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Duplicating machine operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Keypunch operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Tabulating machine operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Office machine operators, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Payroll and timekeeping clerks**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Payroll and timekeeping clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Postal clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Proofreaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Real estate appraisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Receptionists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secretaries**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Secretaries, legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Secretaries, medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Secretaries, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Shipping and receiving clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Statistical clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Stenographers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Stock clerks and storekeepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Teacher aides, except school monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Telegraph messengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Telegraph operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Telephone operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Ticket, station, and express agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Typists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Weighers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Miscellaneous clerical workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Not specified clerical workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers--allocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRAFTSMEN AND KINDRED WORKERS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Automobile accessories installers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Bakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Boilermakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Bookbinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Brickmasons and stonemasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brickmasons and stonemasons, apprentices
Bulldozer operators
Cabinetmakers
Carpenters
Carpenter apprentices
Cement and concrete finishers
Compositors and typesetters
Printing trades apprentices, except pressmen
Cranemen, derrickmen, and hoistmen
Decorators and window dressers
Dental laboratory technicians
Electricians
Electrician apprentices
Electric power linemen and cablemen
Electrotypers and stereotypers
Engravers, except photoengravers
Excavating, grading and road machine operators, except bulldozer
Floor layers, except tile setters
Foremen, n.e.c.
Forgemen and hammermen
Furniture and wood finishers
Furriers
Glaziers
Heat treaters, annealers, and temperers
Inspectors, scalers, and graders: log and lumber
Inspectors, n.e.c.
Jewelers and watchmakers
Job and die setters, metal
Locomotive engineers
Locomotive firemen
Machinists
Machinist apprentices
Mechanics and repairmen
Air conditioning, heating, and refrigeration
Aircraft
Automobile body repairmen
Automobile mechanics
Automobile mechanic apprentices
Data processing machine repairmen
Farm implements
Heavy equipment mechanics, including diesel
482 Household appliance and accessory installers and mechanics
483 Loom fixers
484 Office machines
485 Radio and television
486 Railroad and car shop
491 Mechanic, except auto, apprentices
492 Miscellaneous mechanics and repairmen
495 Not specified mechanics and repairmen
501 Millers; grain, flour, and feed
502 Millwrights
503 Molders, metal
504 Molder, apprentices
505 Motion picture projectionists
506 Opticians, and lens grinders and polishers
510 Painters, construction and maintenance
511 Painter apprentices
512 Paperhangers
514 Pattern and model makers, except paper
515 Photoengravers and lithographers
516 Piano and organ tuners and repairmen
520 Plasterers
521 Plasterer apprentices
522 Plumber and pipe fitters
523 Plumber and pipe fitter apprentices
525 Power station operators
530 Pressmen and plate printers, printing
531 Pressmen apprentices
533 Rollers and finishers, metal
534 Roofers and slaters
535 Sheetmetal workers and tin smiths
536 Sheetmetal apprentices
540 Shipfitters
542 Shoe repairmen
543 Sign painters and letterers
545 Stationary engineers
546 Stone cutters and stone carvers
550 Structural metal craftsmen
551 Tailors
552 Telephone installers and repairmen
554 Telephone linemen and splicers
560 Tile setters
561 Tool and die makers
562 Tool and die maker apprentices
563 Upholsterers
571 Specified craft apprentices, n.e.c.
572 Not specified apprentices
Craftsmen and kindred workers, n.e.c.
Former members of the Armed Forces
Craftsmen and kindred workers--allocated
Current members of the Armed Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIVES, EXCEPT TRANSPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601 Asbestos and insulation workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602 Assemblers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 Blasters and powdermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604 Bottling and canning operatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 Chainmen, rodmen, and axmen; surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610 Checkers, examiners, and inspectors; manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611 Clothing ironers and pressers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612 Cutting operatives, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613 Dressmakers and seamstresses, except factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614 Drillers, earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 Dry wall installers and lathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620 Dyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Filers, polishers, sanders, and buffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622 Furnacemen, smeltermen, and pourers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 Garage workers and gas station attendants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 Graders and sorters, manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625 Produce graders and packers, except factory and farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626 Heaters, metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 Laundry and dry cleaning operatives, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 Meat cutters and butchers, except manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632 Meat cutters and butchers, manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634 Meat wrappers, retail trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635 Metal platers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636 Milliners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640 Mine operatives, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641 Mixing operatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642 Oilers and greasers, except auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643 Packers and wrappers, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 Painters, manufactured articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645 Photographic process workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The code for current members of the Armed Forces, not normally included in the U.S. Census definition of the civilian population labor force.
Precision machine operatives
650 Drill press operatives
651 Grinding machine operatives
652 Lathe and milling machine operatives
653 Precision machine operatives, n.e.c.
656 Punch and stamping press operatives
660 Riveters and fasteners
661 Sailors and deckhands
662 Sawyers
663 Sewers and stitchers
664 Shoemaking machine operatives
665 Solderers
666 Stationary firemen

Textile operatives
670 Carding, lapping, and combing operatives
671 Knitters, loopers, and toppers
672 Spinners, twisters, and winders
673 Weavers
674 Textile operatives, n.e.c.
680 Welders and flame-cutters
681 Winding operatives, n.e.c.
690 Machine operatives, miscellaneous specified
692 Machine operatives, not specified
694 Miscellaneous operatives
695 Not specified operatives
696 Operatives, except transport--allocated

TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPERATIVES
701 Boatmen and canalmen
703 Bus drivers
704 Conductors and motormen, urban rail transit
705 Deliverymen and routemen
706 Fork lift and tow motor operatives
710 Motormen; mine, factory, logging camp, etc.
711 Parking attendants
712 Railroad brakemen
713 Railroad switchmen
714 Taxicab drivers and chauffeurs
715 Truck drivers
726 Transport equipment operatives--allocated
LABORERS, EXCEPT FARM

740 Animal caretakers, except farm
750 Carpenters' helpers
751 Construction laborers, except carpenters' helpers
752 Fishermen and oystermen
753 Freight and material handlers
754 Garbage collectors
755 Gardeners and groundkeepers, except farm
760 Longshoremen and stevedores
761 Lumbermen, raftsmen, and woodchoppers
762 Stockhandlers
763 Teamsters
764 Vehicle washers and equipment cleaners
770 Warehousemen, n.e.c.
780 Miscellaneous laborers
785 Not specified laborers
796 Laborers, except farm--allocated

FARMERS AND FARM MANAGERS

801 Farmers (owners and tenants)
802 Farm managers
806 Farmers and farm managers--allocated

FARMERS LABORERS AND FARM FOREMEN

821 Farm foremen
822 Farm laborers, wage workers
823 Farm laborers, unpaid family workers
824 Farm service laborers, self-employed
846 Farm laborers, farm foremen, and kindred workers--allocated

SERVICE WORKERS, EXCEPT PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD

Cleaning service workers
901 Chambermaids and maids, except private household
902 Cleaners and charwomen
903 Janitors and sextons

Food service workers
910 Bartenders
911 Busboys
912 Cooks, except private household
913 Dishwashers
914 Food counters and fountain workers
915 Waiters
916 Food service workers, n.e.c.
    except private household

Health service workers
921 Dental assistants
922 Health aides, except nursing
923 Health trainees
924 Midwives
925 Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants
926 Practical nurses

Personal service workers
931 Airline stewardesses
932 Attendants, recreation and amusement
933 Attendants, personal service, n.e.c.
934 Baggage porters and bell hops
935 Barbers
940 Boarding and lodging housekeepers
941 Bootblacks
942 Child care workers, except private households
943 Elevator operators
944 Hairdressers and cosmetologists
945 Personal service apprentices
950 Housekeepers, except private households
952 School monitors
953 Ushers, recreation and amusement
954 Welfare service aides

Protective service workers
960 Crossing guards and bridge tenders
961 Firemen, fire protection
962 Guards and watchmen
963 Marshals and constables
964 Policemen and detectives
965 Sheriffs and bailiffs
976 Service workers, except private household--allocated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>Child care workers, private household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td>Cooks, private household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982</td>
<td>Housekeepers, private household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>983</td>
<td>Laundresses, private household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984</td>
<td>Maids and servants, private household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>Private household workers--allocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Questions used from the General Social Survey

Q. 1 (Var: WRKSTAT) - Last week were you working full-time, part-time, going to school, keeping house, or what?
RESPONSE:
Working full time
Working part time
With a job, but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, strike
Unemployed, laid off, looking for work
Retired
In school
Keeping house
Other

Q.1a (Var-HRS1) - IF WORKING, FULL OR PART TIME: How many hours did you work last week, at all jobs? Exact hours recorded.

Q.2 (Var-OCC) What kind of work do you (did you) normally do? That is, what (is/was) you job called? See appendix A for a list of all occupations.

Q.3 (Var-MARITAL) - Are you currently -- married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married?

Q.3a (Var-AGEWED) - IF EVER MARRIED: How old were you when you first married? Exact age recorded.

Q.3b (Var-DIVORCE) - IF CURRENTLY MARRIED OR WIDOWED: Have you ever been divorced or legally separated?

Q.4 (Var-SPWRKSTA) - IF RESPONDENT IS CURRENTLY MARRIED: Last week was you (wife/husband) working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what? Response set same as Q.1 above.

Q.4a (Var-SPHRS1) - IF WORKING, FULL OR PART TIME: How many hours did (she/he) work last week, at all jobs? Exact hours recorded.

Q.5a (Var-SPOCC) - What kind of work (does/did) your [spouse] normally do? That is, what (is/was) (his/her) job called? See appendix A for a list of all occupations.
Q.8 (Var-CHILDS) - How many children have you ever had? Please count all that were born alive at any time (including any you had from a previous marriage). Coded exact 1 through 7; 8 or more coded as 8.

Q.9 (Var-AGE) - Respondent's Age. Date of birth has been recoded into actual age.

Q.12a (Var-EDUC) - What is the highest grade in elementary school or high school that you finished and go credit for?

Q.12b (Var-EDUC) - IF FINISHED 9TH-12TH GRADE OR D.K.: Did you ever get a high school diploma or a GED certificate?

Q.12c. (Var-EDUC) - Did you complete one or more years of college for credit -- not including schooling such as business college, technical or vocational school? IF YES: How many years did you complete?

Q.12d. (Var-EDUC) - Do you have any college degrees? (IF YES: What degree or degrees?) CODE HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED

Q.16 (Var-DEGREE) - Coded from education questions.

Q.15a-d (Var-SPEDUC) - Same set of questions as for EDUC.

Q.19 (Var-SPDEG) - Coded from spouse education questions.

Q.21 (Var-RACE) - What race do you consider yourself? RECORD VERBATIM AND CODE.

RESPONSE

White
Black
Other (Specify)

Q.36 (Var-INCOME) - In which of these groups did your total family income, from all sources, fall last year before taxes, that is? Just tell me the letter.

Response

Under $1,000 $8,000 to $9,999
$1,000 to $2,999 $10,000 to $14,999
$3,000 to $3,999 $15,000 to $19,999
$4,000 to $4,999 $20,000 to $24,999
$5,000 to $5,999 $25,000 or over
$6,000 to $6,999
$7,000 to $7,999

Q.37 (Var-RINCOME) - Did you earn any income from (OCCUPATION DESCRIBED IN Q.2) in [1973/74/75/76/77/79/80/82]?

Q.37a (Var-RINCOME) - IF YES: In which of these groups did your earnings from (OCCUPATION IN Q.2) for last year fall? That is, before taxes or other deductions. Just tell me the letter.

Q.94 (Var-RELIG) - What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?

Q.94a (Var-DENOM) - IF PROTESTANT: What specific denomination is that, if any?

Response
Baptist
Methodist
Lutheran
Presbyterian
Episcopalian
Other (SPECIFY)

No denomination given or non denominational church
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