California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1995

Socioeconomic status and sex role values as determinants of divorce among women

Mary A. Dolan

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project



Part of the Gender and Sexuality Commons, and the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Dolan, Mary A., "Socioeconomic status and sex role values as determinants of divorce among women" (1995). Theses Digitization Project. 1001.

https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/1001

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX ROLE VALUES AS DETERMINANTS OF DIVORCE AMONG WOMEN

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

in

Psychology

by

Mary A. Dolan

March 1995

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX ROLE VALUES AS DETERMINANTS OF DIVORCE AMONG WOMEN

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

by

Mary A. Dolan
March 1995

Approved by:

Charles D. Hoffman, Chair, Psychology

Date

Gloria A. Cowan, Psychology

Joanna S. Worthley, Psychology

ABSTRACT

The present study was primarily conducted to examine the relationship between the unequal division of household labor and divorce among women. To add more breadth to the inquiry the reported causes of divorce presented in the extant literature including lack of emotional support. incompatibility, abuse, and financial problems were also examined. The reported causes of divorce were anticipated to differ according to the women's personal socioeconomic levels and sex role values. Divorced women provided retrospective reports of their first marriages by completing a 55-item questionnaire developed for this study. Multiple regression and correlational analyses revealed one significant finding to support the hypotheses; Women with nontraditional sex role values were more likely to report incompatibility as a critical determinant of their divorce in comparison to women with traditional sex role values. Other significant findings contradicted what was expected. Failure to support the hypotheses, and the previous research, is considered to be predominantly due to the methodological differences between the present study and the prior investigations. The importance of an emotionally rich marriage and agreement between spouses regarding sex roles is discussed. Further investigation into the relationship between the unequal division of household labor and emotional support is suggested.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The insightful comments of Dr. Gloria A. Cowan and Dr. Joanna S. Worthley are sincerely appreciated. To my trusted guide, and friend, Dr. Charles D. Hoffman, thank you for seeing my potential.

Without my family's persistent question, "Is it done yet?", it very well might not be done yet. Milton, I am grateful for your support.

Finally, I thank the Associated Students, Incorporated, for funding this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACTi	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLESv	ii
INTRODUCTION	.1
Divorce and Working Women	. 2
Traditional and Nontraditional Sex Roles	. 3
Work-Home Role Conflicts	. 5
Reasons for Inequality in Household Labor	.6
Wive's Coping Strategies	. 7
Marital Role Conflict and Divorce	. 8
Other Reported Causes of Divorce	10
Purpose of Study	12
METHOD	16
Participants	16
Materials	17
Procedure	19
RESULTS	21
Post-hoc Correlational Analyses	22
Scale Ratings	23
DISCUSSION	28
Findings Related to the Hypotheses	28
Post-hoc Findings	31
Amount of Time Spent Working Outside of the Home and Lack of Household Help	
Control Over Income as a Critical Predictor of the Causes of Divorce	33

Methodological Limitations	34
General Discussion	36
Implications for Future Research	36
APPENDIX A: Causes of Divorce Questionnaire	38
APPENDIX B: Attitudes Toward Women Scale	52
APPENDIX C: Divorce Questionnaire Item Categorization	55
REFERENCES	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table	
	Correlations Between Previous Education, Previous Income, and Previous Occupation and Emotional Support, Career Support, Housework, and Financial Problems25
Table	e 2
	Correlations Between Amount of Time Spent Working and Control Over Income and Housework, Career Support, Emotional Support, Child Care, Abuse, and Financial Problems
Table	e 3
	Mean Rating for Each Cause of Divorce Scale27

INTRODUCTION

While the divorce rate appears to have leveled off during recent years, it remains high, with approximately 49% of marriages failing (Glick, 1988). The demographic correlates describing who is most likely to experience divorce are well established. How the divorced themselves describe the events leading to their decision to divorce is not as well documented. The lack of information here can be partially attributed to the difficulty in measuring such personal experiences. This difficulty is increased by the tendency of individuals to report multiple, interacting reasons as having led to their divorce decision (Bloom, Niles, & Tatcher, 1985; Levinger, 1976). Investigation into the reasons that lead to divorce is minimal and a need for further research has been cited (Cleek & Pearson, 1985; Kitson, Babri, & Roach, 1985; Kitson & Sussman, 1982).

Studies that have examined marital relationships and divorce suggest women make more marital complaints than men, more wives than husbands think about divorce, women are more likely to initiate the divorce than are men, and women are more likely than men to blame their ex-spouse for the marital dissolution (Cleek & Pearson, 1985; Huber & Spitze, 1983; Kitson & Sussman, 1982).

Increased marital happiness for women and a decreased likelihood of divorce appear related to verbal interaction,

affection, and emotional support from their husbands (Kitson, Babri, & Roach, 1985; Rhyne, 1981; Spitze & South, 1985). Women indicate an egalitarian relationship is desired in which love, companionship, and self-fulfillment are emphasized (Basow, 1992).

One way in which married women gain personal satisfaction and self-fulfillment is through outside employment (Greenglass, 1985; Yogev, 1981). Employed wives appear to have higher levels of psychological and physical well-being than housewives. Specifically, the paycheck may symbolize personal competence and result in increased selfesteem, more self-confidence, and a greater sense of autonomy for women. In an examination of married professional women, Yogev (1981) found that a woman's career enhances marital happiness and satisfaction, and heightens the amount of shared experiences and enjoyment between spouses. While a sense of autonomy and self outside the marriage may be healthy, a growing emphasis on individualism, self-fulfillment, and personal satisfaction may lead to marital dissolution if a husband is believed to impede rather than support these needs (Kitson, Babri, & Roach, 1985).

Divorce and Working Women

Numerous studies have indicated the existence of a positive relationship between the rise in the divorce rate and the increase of women in the work force (Huber & Spitze,

1980; Schoen, Urton, Woodrow, & Baj, 1985; Trent & South, 1989). Although no specific rationale for this relationship can be said to exist for every married couple, certain effects have been examined. For example, when a married woman has a job or career she will experience increased financial independence from her husband (Booth, Johnson, White, & Edwards, 1985; Udry, 1981). An "independence" effect, in which working women develop resources and economic security apart from their husbands, was suggested by Mott and Moore (1979) as a cause of marital dissolution. This hypothesis has been supported by other researchers (Spitze & South, 1985; Trent & South, 1989) who found that greater economic opportunities for women resulted in an increased likelihood of dissolving unhappy marriages. Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) suggested that financially independent women expect more from a marriage than economic security and will seek divorce if these expectations are not being met. By contrast, unhappy wives without economic resources may remain in marriages simply because they are not financially independent of their husbands. In the extreme case, economic dependence is a main reason many battered wives remain with their husbands (Basow, 1992).

Traditional and Nontraditional Sex Roles

Recent economic demands have led to a larger number of working wives which, in turn, lends confusion to the traditional division of labor by sex. It has been suggested

by Schoen et al. (1985) that the traditional concept of marriage, one where the husband was the financial provider and the wife provided domestic and maternal services, is changing. The traditional "marriage bargain," which was based on these specialized role tasks, is no longer valid. Thus, a future "marital partnership," in which less sex role defined interdependence between spouses and greater egalitarianism may be common.

Nontraditional egalitarian beliefs are associated with decreased role specialization and greater sharing of tasks and decisions, both of which are associated with marital satisfaction for women (Krausz, 1986; Rhyne, 1981) and a happier marital climate overall (Hochschild, 1989; Wiersma & Van Den Berg, 1991). However, true egalitarianism does not seem to have been achieved as yet. Studies have shown men are more likely than women to believe in traditional types of marital sex roles. Among couples who disagree on appropriate marital sex roles, one spouse, usually the wife, must adopt the views of the other spouse (Basow, 1992; Mirowsky & Ross, 1987). While examining sex role attitudes and marital quality, Bowen and Orthner (1983) found the woman most likely to be unhappy in a marriage is one who holds modern ideals but is frustrated by her traditional role or married to a traditional man. Other studies in this area have found husbands in troubled marriages usually hold more traditional views than husbands in stable marriages

(Hochschild, 1989) and the more ambitious a wife, the more likely is the traditional husband to desire a divorce (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983). Among divorced individuals, nontraditional women are more likely to be divorced than are traditional women (Lueptow, Guss, & Hyden, 1989) and divorced men and women differ on sex role definitions more than do married men and women (Finlay, Starnes, & Alvarez, 1985).

Work-Home Role Conflicts

One important area in which dissimilar sex role beliefs between spouses becomes evident is in the allocation of household labor. Researchers are in strong agreement that women continue to perform the majority of household labor and child care even when employed full-time (Atkinson & Huston, 1984; Hochschild, 1989; Huber & Spitze, 1980; Krausz, 1986). Women who perceive the division of household labor as unequal and unfair have been found to experience feelings of frustration, resentment, and dissatisfaction (Greenglass, 1985; Hochschild, 1989). Similarly, Pleck (1985) found that wives' desire for greater husband participation in housework was negatively related to satisfaction with family life. These negative feelings can result in marriages that are unstable and unhappy (Booth, Johnson, White, & Edwards, 1984; Yogev & Brett, 1985), and this increases the likelihood of divorce (Booth, Johnson, White & Edwards, 1986).

Reasons for Inequality in Household Labor

It has been suggested (Basow, 1992) that husbands are resisting equality in the division of household labor mainly due to a traditional view of marital gender roles, in which higher status and power is placed on the male role. As Hochschild (1989) found in her research, traditional husbands often oppose their wives' decision to be employed outside the home. These husbands are the least likely to perform household tasks, especially when they earn less money than their wives. It was suggested that these husbands' perceived loss of status is more pronounced when compared with nontraditional husbands. Thus, traditional husbands attempt to retain power lost by a wife's wages by not contributing to the housework. However, Hochschild speculated that husbands who earn more than their wives may buy their way out of housework with their higher salaries.

What does not appear to be related to the amount of household help a wife receives from her husband is the number of hours the husband works outside of the home. Furthermore, husbands do not necessarily do more at home in relation to an increase in wives' hours worked outside the home (Hochschild, 1989; Pleck, 1985). It does appear, however, that the more expressive a wife is and the better educated both spouses are, the more assistance the wife will receive from her husband (Hochschild; Pleck).

Other findings in this area also support the views that

husbands' negative attitudes toward household tasks stem from a need to retain status and power (Benin & Agostinelli, 1988; Biernat & Wortman, 1991). It has been speculated that for many husbands who work in white collar labor the household duties traditionally allocated to women seem more "onerous." Furthermore, many men consider household chores "demasculinizing" and believe work on a "woman's turf" is degrading (Greenglass, 1985). These beliefs become evident when observing how tasks are distributed between husbands and wives. More wives wash dishes, cook, and care for the children while husbands are more likely to be servicing the car or mowing the lawn (Krausz, 1986). The types of tasks women specialize in are required to be dealt with daily as opposed to the chores men must do weekly, or even less often. Thus, the time needed for these tasks is more demanding for women than for men.

Wives' Coping Strategies

Some researchers have suggested that this resistance of men to share housework is forcing women to basically make a choice between establishing equality of housework and child care or preserving the relationship (e.g., Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Gray, 1983; Philliber & Hiller, 1983). Gray found that many professional women face difficulty in trying to combine marriage and a career. As conflicts arise between home and professional responsibilities, women compromise in favor of home role demands. Once this compromise is made, a

husband's unwillingness to do his share around the house forces his wife to develop a variety of coping strategies. Reducing standards for certain roles and having family members share household tasks are strategies that appear related to positive marital relationships. Eliminating certain roles and attempting to meet the expectations of everyone else are negatively related to a satisfactory relationship between spouses.

Wives who are opposed to such compromises and changes in their lifestyle have been found to experience marital instability due to conflicts over the allocation, quality, and quantity of household labor and the lower rates of positive spousal interaction which may ensue (Starkey, 1991). Levinger (1976) theorized that if a wife feels exploited by her husband she will see divorce as the positive alternative even if it is not as financially rewarding as marriage. Other research (Huber & Spitze, 1983) has found that women think about divorce less often as the amount of housework their husbands do increases. Moreover, Hochschild (1989) surmised that reported causes of divorce such as lack of communication and incompatibility may actually be an expression of the more likely cause of the unequal division of household labor.

Marital Role Conflict and Divorce

While investigating the equality of marital sex roles across the life cycle, Schafer and Keith (1981) found the

perceived equality of marital roles increased over the life cycle. The researchers speculated that couples who perceived inequality in the marriage were more likely to divorce than couples who did not perceive inequality. Spitze and South (1985) supported this hypothesis by concluding from their study of women's employment and divorce that marital role conflict was associated with an increased incidence of divorce.

Role conflict was found to be directly related to divorce by Houseknecht, Vaughan, and Macke (1984). Married and divorced women with graduate degrees were questioned in an attempt to discover whether the timing of marriage and entry into graduate school was related to divorce. As the researchers hypothesized, women who married before completing their education were more likely to get divorced than women who had finished all levels of their education and began their careers before marrying. Houseknecht et al. speculated that women who married before returning to school would encounter more difficulty in negotiating the nontraditional family role necessary for their career success, as they would probably have established fairly traditional role arrangements before their career involvement began. Specifically, it was believed that the stress of a woman's career demands are strongly associated with marital disruption. This is especially true when the woman's career demands conflict with her marital role

definitions or, more importantly, when her career demands conflict with her husband's marital role definitions. If traditional marital roles have been established, husbands may oppose any renegotiation of roles, especially if the wife is seeking support for her career, and the disagreement between spouses may go unabated.

In support of this theory, Houseknecht et al. (1984) found that the unequal division of household labor, having a husband who did not support her career, and incompatibility were the three most likely self-described causes of divorce among the women in their study. Houseknecht et al. concluded from these findings that role conflict has serious negative implications for married professional women. Certain inferences can be made from these findings regarding role conflict and divorce for a population of well educated, professional women. However, the researchers cautioned against generalizing their findings to women of all educational levels. A need for further research in this area was cited in order to determine to what extent role conflict is related to divorce among a more generalized population of women from a wider range of educational levels.

Other Reported Causes of Divorce

During an investigation of marital dissatisfaction among divorce applicants, Levinger (1966) found that complaints differed according to gender and socioeconomic status. Middle class women were more likely to cite neglect

of home or children as a main cause of dissatisfaction.

Women of a lower socioeconomic status were likely to cite
mental cruelty or physical abuse as having caused them to
seek a divorce. Records of interviews conducted between
marriage counselors and divorce applicants were examined to
determine the various causes of divorce. By necessity, this
early study was of an exploratory nature.

While exploring possible causes of divorce among men and women, Kitson and Sussman (1982) also found that marital complaints differed by educational and socioeconomic level. By use of an open-ended questionnaire, Kitson and Sussman asked their subjects "What caused your marriage to breakup?" Women of a lower socioeconomic status and educational level cited physical or emotional abuse by their husbands, neglect, and financial problems as key causes of their divorce. Internal gender role conflict, defined as the need for independence, a life of one's own, and the desire for freedom, was likely to be a cause of divorce among women with a higher education and socioeconomic status. Incompatibility and lack of communication were also commonly cited by these women as causes of divorce.

Similar causes of divorce were reported by Bloom,
Niles, and Tatcher (1985). Personal incompatibility,
communication difficulties, value conflicts, and boredom
were the most commonly cited reasons for marital disruption
among women. Their sample was comprised of well-educated,

middle-class individuals who responded to an 18-item questionnaire.

Purpose of Study

This study was conducted mainly for two reasons. First, previous examinations of the relative contribution of socioeconomic status and sex role beliefs to the differential reasons women report for their divorces are limited. Second, previous research has been basically restricted to the use of an open-ended question or a brief questionnaire as a measure. This study improved upon the former investigations by examining causes of divorce with the use of a multiple-item questionnaire.

The questionnaire utilized was updated from a list developed by Levinger's (1966) exploratory investigation into causes of divorce. Levinger classified responses into twelve categories including neglect of home or children, financial problems, physical abuse, verbal abuse, infidelity, sexual incompatibility, drinking, in-law trouble, mental cruelty, lack of love, excessive demands, and miscellaneous responses.

The questionnaire developed for this study was comprised of ten categories with a total of 55 questions. Included among the ten categories were conflicts over the children, career support, abuse, emotional support, incompatibility, financial problems, sexual problems, housework, child care, and general discontent. Based on the

previous research (e. g., Kitson & Sussman, 1982; Levinger, 1966) predictions were made for the categories of career support, abuse, emotional support, incompatibility, financial problems, housework, and child care. No hypotheses have been formed for the remaining categories. Previous investigations (e. g., Bloom et al., 1985; Kitson & Sussman, 1982; Levinger, 1966) have shown multiple causes cited by women as related to their divorce. Thus, other reported causes of divorce have been included here to give further depth to this study. In order to evaluate the extent to which women hold traditional or nontraditional beliefs regarding sex roles, a short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was used.

It is speculated that sex roles have been redefined in ways that allow married women to expect individual growth and fulfillment. If this involves a job or career which results in the wife's economic freedom from her husband, an unequal division of household labor will lead wives with nontraditional attitudes to perceive underlying inequality in the relationship. In turn, marital conflicts, instability, and divorce may develop. The resentment these nontraditional women may feel toward their husbands increases the likelihood of marital dissatisfaction and divorce.

In accordance with Houseknecht et al. (1984), it is expected for this study that divorced women who were of a

higher educational and socioeconomic level during their marriage will have expected their ex-husbands to share the household tasks equally and to support their careers. Women who perceived inequality in the division of household labor are more likely to interpret the inequality as a manifestation of lack of emotional support and communication from their ex-husbands. Furthermore, it is expected that these women hold nontraditional values regarding sex roles. Aided by their financial independence, these women interpret divorce as a positive alternative to an unsatisfactory marriage.

Married women whose personal incomes are not sufficient to lead to financial independence from their husbands may also perceive an unequal division of household labor as unfair. However, it is hypothesized that the perception of "unfairness" held by these women will not be as strong as the perception held by women of a higher socioeconomic status. Women of a lower socioeconomic status are more likely to have traditional expectancies of sex roles (Basow, 1992; Hochschild, 1989). The inability of women with low personal incomes to successfully support themselves and their children will have inhibited the idea of divorce as an alternative to the marital conflict which arises. These women will be more likely to report other compelling causes of divorce such as physical or emotional abuse or financial problems than the unequal division of household labor.

The specific hypotheses then are:

- 1. Women with a high personal socioeconomic level will be more likely to have higher scores on the scales of housework, career support, emotional support, incompatibility, and child care as compared to women of a low personal socioeconomic status.
- 2. Women of a low personal socioeconomic status are predicted to score higher on the scales of abuse and financial problems in comparison to women with a high personal socioeconomic status.
- 3. Women with nontraditional sex role values will be more likely to have higher scores on the housework, career support, emotional support, incompatibility, and child care scales than will women with traditional sex role values.

METHOD

<u>Participants</u>

The final sample was comprised of 130 divorced women. Two hundred and sixty questionnaires were distributed to one university and three organizations (Parents Without Partners, National Organization of Women, Inland Business and Professional Women's Network) in the Inland Southern California area. Out of 134 returned questionnaires (62% were from the university and 38% were from the organizations) four were eliminated due to incomplete data.

The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 74 with a median age of 40. On average, the women had been married for eight years and had been divorced for 10 years. Seventy five percent of the subjects were currently divorced, 22% were remarried, and 3% were widows who had been divorced. Seventy four percent of the participants described themselves as Caucasian, 13% as Latina, 9% as African American, 3% as Asian, and 1% as other. The subjects were basically welleducated with 99% having completed high school, 91% had one or more years of college, 21% had completed a four-year degree program, 6% had one or more years of gradate study, and 4% had a graduate-level-degree. In order to classify the subjects by occupational level, Hollingshead's (1975) occupational scales were used. While it is acknowledged that this scale is limited as a measure of women's socioeconomic status, no scale is more appropriate at this time. The

reported occupations were consistent with the subject's educational backgrounds. Twenty six percent were classified as housewives or students (score 0); 5% were classified in Menial Service, Unskilled, or Semiskilled categories (scores 1-3); 39% were classified in Small Business Owners, Clerical or Sales Workers, Technicians or Semiprofessional categories (scores 4-6); and 31% were in the Minor Professional, Lesser Professional, and Higher occupational categories (scores 7-9). The mean Hollingshead score was 4.

<u>Materials</u>

Each participant completed a questionnaire that included demographic items as well as causes-of-divorce items. In addition, participants completed the short version of the AWS (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Questions regarding the women's occupation, years of education, and income during their marriage were utilized to define their socioeconomic status. Each participant's income during the marriage was adjusted according to the formula given by the Council of Economic Advisers (1992) in order to be comparable to 1993 income. The women were also asked to list other available financial and personal resources, age and sex of each child, amount of child support received, age at marriage, age at divorce, years since the divorce was finalized, and whose decision it was to divorce. The complete questionnaire as distributed is included in Appendix A.

Divorce causes cited by Levinger (1966) were used as a basis for the questionnaire developed for this study. Further questions were generated from previous studies (Bloom et al., 1985; Houseknecht et al., 1984; Kitson & Sussman, 1982) in order to develop a multiple-item questionnaire that would expand upon the previous use of open-ended questions. The multiple-item measures will increase the reliability of the findings as related to each major category and yield as detailed an examination into general causes-of-divorce as possible. Items relating to housework and child care were adapted from a study that described the typical allocation of household responsibilities between husbands and wives (Nyquist, Slivken, Spence, & Helmreich, 1985). Causes-of-divorce were evaluated by statements that participants rated on 7-point scales with each scale ranging from "not a factor in the divorce" (1) to "a critical factor" (7). Space was provided for participants to cite any reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire that may have caused the divorce.

Initially a 55-item questionnaire with 10 categories was used. However, in order to improve the reliability of each scale, six items which no participants endorsed were discarded. The category of general discontent was completely eliminated due to lack of inter-item reliability. Nine scales were thus transformed from the remaining 49 items. The nine scales and their corresponding alpha levels are as

follows: Conflicts over the children, .82; career support, .75; abuse, .70; emotional support, .77; incompatibility, .72; financial problems, .72; sexual problems, .73; housework, .88; child care, .92. The specific items related to each of these scales are presented in Appendix C.

To determine the degree to which women could be considered traditional or nontraditional in regards to sex roles the short, 15-item version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale was used (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The AWS (see Appendix B) includes items concerning vocational, educational, marital, and dating role behaviors. Each item was evaluated on a 4-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Items were scored from 0 to 3 and recoded where appropriate so that high scores indicate a nontraditional attitude concerning women's roles. Possible total scores range from 0 to 45. Participants' scores ranged from 18 to 45 with a median of 36. The 15-item version of the AWS has a correlation of .91 with the original 55-item AWS. The Cronbach alpha of the 15-item form is .89 (Spence & Helmreich).

<u>Procedure</u>

Prospective participants were approached and asked for their help in completing questionnaires that examined issues related to possible causes of divorce and women's roles. Subjects were told their voluntary participation would remain anonymous, and envelopes were provided for the return

of the questionnaires. To avoid possible confusion or erroneous data from women who had been married more than once, each participant was instructed to refer to her first marital and divorce experience. Subjects were also instructed to ignore child care related issues if they had no children during the marriage being investigated. All subjects were treated in accordance with the Institutional Ethics Committee and the guidelines of the American Psychological Association (1982).

RESULTS

In order to examine the extent to which the participants' scores on the Attitudes Toward Women scale, their personal income, occupation, and level of education during the marriage were predictive of their scores on the scales of housework, career support, emotional support, incompatibility, child care, abuse, and financial problems, seven separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted. The scores on the Attitudes Toward Women scale were entered first in each analysis and the women's previous income, occupation, and education (socioeconomic status) were entered simultaneously on Step 2. Significant increments in R2 were obtained in only three of these analyses. The women's AWS ratings were predictive of their scores on the scale of incompatibility, $R^2 = .041$, (adjusted $\underline{R}^2 = .034$), $\underline{F}(1,122) = 5.27$, $\underline{p} < .05$. In addition, the womens' socioeconomic status was predictive of their scores on the scales of emotional support, $R^2 = .088$, (adjusted R^2 = .057), F(4, 117) = 2.82, p < .05 and incompatibility, $R^2 =$.076, (adjusted $\underline{R}^2 = .045$), $\underline{F}(4,119) = 2.45$, $\underline{p} < .05$.

A correlational analysis was also performed and the significant relationships are displayed in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, these relationships were opposite to those expected. Specifically, not being highly educated was related to higher scores on the scales of emotional support and housework; not having a high income was correlated to

higher scores on the scale of career support; and having a semiprofessional or professional occupation was related to higher scores on the scale of financial problems.

Post-hoc Correlational Analysis

A post-hoc hypothesis was formulated predicting women who spent a substantial amount of time working outside of the home during the marriage, and those who had control of their income, would be likely to score high on the scales measuring the importance of housework, career support, emotional support, incompatibility, and child care. Conversely, women who did not spend much time working outside of the home, and those who did not have control of their income, were expected to report abuse and financial problems as having led to their marital breakup. A correlational analysis was conducted to examine these relationships. While caution must be taken when conducting separate post-hoc analyses, the alpha levels here are not considered to have been exceptionally altered (A. Blanchard, personal communication, October 26, 1994). The significant findings only are presented in Table 2.

As evident in Table 2, the amount of time the women spent working outside of the home during the marriage was significantly correlated to the housework scale. This negative relationship indicates that the more time the women spent working outside of the home, the more likely they were to cite lack of household help as a determinant in the

divorce.

Five significant relationships were obtained between the women's control of their income during the marriage and their scores on the scales of career support, emotional support, child care, abuse, and financial problems. These positive relationships indicate that women who reported not having had control over their income during the marriage cited these items as important factors in their divorce.

A final correlational analysis was conducted to determine the validity of Hochschild's (1989) claim that a wife's dissatisfaction with the amount of household help contributed by her husband may in truth be an expression of the incompatible nature of the relationship. There was indeed a significant correlation between the scales of housework and incompatibility, $\mathbf{r} = .43$, $\mathbf{p} < .001$. In further support of this relationship, a significant correlation was found between the scales of housework and emotional support, $\mathbf{r} = .37$, $\mathbf{p} < .001$.

Scale Ratings

Previous studies examining the causes of divorce (e.g., Cleek & Pearson, 1985; Kitson & Sussman, 1982; Levinger, 1966) have been primarily concerned with the most commonly cited reasons individuals report as having led to their divorce. Thus, it seemed appropriate to include such an analysis here in order to compare the findings. The means for each of the nine cause of divorce scales are listed in

Table 3. The most highly rated cause of divorce among the women in this investigation was incompatibility; child care was reported the least often as having been a factor in the divorce decision.

Table 1

Correlations Between Previous Education, Previous Income,
and Previous Occupation and Emotional Support, Career

Support, Housework, and Financial Problems

	Previous	Previous	Previous
	Education	Income	Occupation
Emotional Support	 25**	-,03	.03
Career Support	05	20*	07
Housework	18*	07	.04
Financial Problems	06	02	.18*

Note. Scale items were rated from 1 (Not a Factor) to 7 (A Critical Factor). Education, income, and occupation were also scored successively from low to high. Negative correlations indicate not being highly educated, not having a high income, and not having a highly rated occupation led to higher scores on the scales of emotional support, career support, and housework.

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

Table 2

<u>Correlations Between Amount of Time Spent Working and</u>

<u>Control Over Income and Housework, Career Support,</u>

<u>Emotional Support, Child Care, Abuse, and Financial Problems</u>

	Time Spent Worki	ng Control of]	Income
Housework	21*	.12	2
Career Support	.01	. 1945. – 1945. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946 Britania – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 1946. – 194)**
Emotional Support	.04	• 33	} * **
Child Care	.17	.2:	2*
Abuse	.05	-25	5**
Financial Problems	11	. 22	2*

Note. Scale items were rated from 1 (Not a Factor) to 7 (A Critical Factor). Amount of time spent working was coded from 1 (Frequent) to 5 (Seldom). Control of income was coded from 1 (Yes) to 2 (No).

^{*}p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 3

Mean Rating for Each Cause of Divorce Scale

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Incompatibility	4.23	1.44
Emotional support	3.60	1.19
Abuse	3.42	2.17
Sexual problems	3.08	1.78
Financial problems	2.88	1.35
Career support	2.38	1.27
Child conflict	2.29	2.05
Housework	2.23	1.26
Child care	1.49	1.53

Note. The higher the mean, the greater the importance of the scale as a cause of divorce.

DISCUSSION

Findings Related to the Hypotheses

Women with a high personal socioeconomic level were expected to report the areas of housework, career support, emotional support, incompatibility, and child care were important determinants of their divorce. On the other hand, women of a low personal socioeconomic status were predicted to cite abuse and financial problems as critical causes of their divorce. Women with nontraditional sex role values were expected to score higher on the scales of housework, career support, emotional support, incompatibility, and child care than were women with traditional sex role values.

One significant effect was found to support the hypotheses: Women who held nontraditional sex role values were more likely to report incompatibility was an important determinant of their divorce. The other significant relationships obtained in the present study directly related to the hypotheses were opposite to those anticipated.

Specifically, women who were not highly educated were more likely to have perceived a lack of emotional support, lack of household help, and incompatibility as leading to their divorce than were women who were highly educated.

Furthermore, women who did not have high incomes tended to cite lack of career support was a critical factor in their marital breakup in comparison to women who did have high incomes. Finally, women whose occupations were highly rated

on Hollingshead's (1975) index were more likely to report financial problems were an important cause of their divorce than were women who did not have a highly rated occupation.

Such an unexpected outcome is felt to be primarily due to the different methodological approaches employed by the present study and those conducted previously. A crucial distinction between this study and the one previous investigation designed to examine the unequal division of household labor as a cause of divorce (Houseknecht et al., 1984) was the underrepresentation of women with graduate degrees. All of the women in the Houseknecht et al. study had a graduate degree, while only 4% of the participants in this study had a graduate degree. Perhaps, then, finding the unequal division of household labor to be an important factor in divorce is generalizable to a population of women who are not as highly educated.

Some likely reasons for the failure to support previous research showing reported causes of divorce differ by socioeconomic status is that other studies (e.g., Bloom et al., 1985; Kitson & Sussman, 1982; Levinger, 1966) measured wive's socioeconomic status on the basis of their husband's or family incomes, whereas the women's personal incomes were measured in the present study. Furthermore, roles and expectancies in marriage have changed and those studies reporting class distinctions were conducted from nine years to nearly three decades ago.

Also, the exploratory study, open-ended questionnaires, and short-item measures used by the previous investigators differ from the extensive 49-item survey used in this study. This thorough questionnaire is considered to have given more breadth to an examination of such a personal and individual nature. In fact, few participants took advantage of the space allotted to list reasons not included in the questionnaire and several commented on the exhaustiveness of the measure.

In a further attempt to interpret the rationale behind this reversal of expected outcomes, two possible explanations become evident. First, Levinger (1976) proposed nearly two decades ago that even if financial hardship will occur, divorce will be considered a positive alternative among wives who feel exploited by their husbands. The present study as well as previous research (e.g., Bloom et al., 1985; Kitson & Sussman, 1982) suggests divorced women attribute great importance to such factors as lack of emotional support and incompatibility as having led to the marital disruption. These factors then may be the areas within a marital relationship where wives expect a "true" partnership to be apparent and, regardless of their personal income, will seek a divorce if the husband is not meeting their needs in these areas.

Second, previous researchers (Hochschild, 1989;
Houseknecht et al., 1984) have claimed marital distress

appears directly related to the disparity between spousal ideas regarding sex roles. The women comprising the current sample tended to be nontraditional; 75% scored 33 or higher on the Attitudes Toward Women scale (on a scale of 1-45, higher scores are considered to reflect nontraditional values). Perhaps the husbands' expectations were more traditional than their wives', as tends to be the case among married couples (Hochschild, 1989; Pleck, 1985). Taking this one step further, it is possible women who were highly educated had better opportunities (meeting men in college for example) to choose partners with attitudes more similar to their own than did women who were not highly educated. In turn, the dissimilarity between couples' sex role values may have been more striking when the women were not highly educated. It may actually have been this discrepancy between spousal attitudes rather than the wife's attitude alone or such factors as income and occupation that made emotional support and incompatibility so critical.

Post-hoc Findings

Two post-hoc analyses were conducted to further investigate what may actually have led the women who participated in the present study to divorce. From a purely exploratory perspective, yet keeping in line with the original thought, it was anticipated that the more time the women spent working outside of the home during the marriage and the greater the extent to which they actually had

control of their income would be predictive of high scores on the scales of housework, career support, emotional support, incompatibility, and child care. Women who did not spend a great deal of time working outside of the home and who did not have control of any income were anticipated to cite abuse and financial problems as important determinants of their marital breakup.

Amount of time spent working outside of the home and lack of household help.

The first significant post-hoc relationship appears to suggest that women who spent more time working outside of the home during the marriage were the most dissatisfied with the amount of household help they received from their partners. To be sure, this relationship would be expected based on the original hypotheses. It is assumed, for instance, that a wife would expect her husband to share the household responsibilities based on the amount of time she spent working outside of the home, and therefore, the amount of income she contributed.

If, as Greenglass (1985) and Hochschild (1989) have argued, women who perceive the unequal division of household labor as unfair become frustrated, resentful, and dissatisfied with the marriage, spending more time outside of the home working may be what actually exacerbates these feelings, not their education, income, or occupation. Furthermore, if husbands do not increase the amount of time they spend performing housework according to the amount of

time their wives spend working outside of the home (Hochschild, 1989; Pleck, 1985) the relationship between the unequal division of household labor and incompatibility may become more evident to these women. Divorce then, will become the positive alternative.

Control over income as a critical predictor of the causes of divorce.

Women who did not have control over their income tended to cite all of the variables except housework and incompatibility as more important factors in their divorce than women who did have control over their income. These relationships clearly are not easy to explain; they contradict what was anticipated when considering career support, emotional support, and child care. Specifically, women who did have control of their income were expected to have perceived their husbands as not providing career support, emotional support, and child care. These issues then would have been more likely to be determinants of their divorce than among women who did not have control of their income. The best explanation for these contradictory results once again points to the importance of whether a woman feels exploited by her husband. While only speculation, women who do not share equal financial power with their husbands, especially to the extreme of having no control over their personal income, may be strongly aware of this lack of a "true partnership." This perception of inequality may be diffused into many areas of dissatisfaction and may also

reflect a relationship in which husbands are not emotionally supportive of their wives.

In following the original rationale for this study, it would be expected that women who did not have control over their income would be more likely to report abuse and financial problems as having been an important factor in their divorce than would women who did have control of their income. Support for such a relationship was found. Certainly women who had no access to their own or their husband's income would be expected to remain in an unhappy marriage until abuse or financial problems were too overwhelming.

Methodological Limitations

The lack of support for the major hypotheses tested is considered to be predominately due to the methodology employed during this examination. Most critical was the difficulty in locating enough women who had a substantial personal income (e.g., above \$20,000) during the marriage. The problem here is considered to have stemmed from the fact that each woman was asked to respond to the questionnaire in regard to her first marriage. This was done to control for the likelihood of many respondents having had multiple marriage-divorce experiences, and in fact, many had. In hindsight, the participants should have been asked to keep their most recent marriage in mind when replying to the statements. Such a change perhaps would have generated a

larger number of financially independent women primarily because many of the women whose divorce occurred 15 or more years previously would have been excluded. More married women are currently entering the work force than in recent years (Bryant & Zick, 1994) and indeed, many of the participants in this study who had been divorced for 15 or more years worked only occasionally (49%).

"nontraditional" women regarding sex role attitudes also presented a problem. Most profound was the difficulty in measuring beliefs held six months to 30 years ago. Needless to say, the values an individual currently holds may not necessarily be a valid representation of those held many years, or even months, earlier. In fact, it seems reasonable to expect one's life experiences to change these attitudes. It is possible then that some of the women in this study may have actually been "traditional" women during the marriage in question but reevaluated their sex role attitudes after that life event.

In addition, the Attitudes Toward Women scale in itself seems a bit outdated. Several women made comments alluding to just that when claiming such statements as "darn socks" and "drive a locomotive" were "old fashioned." The problem with this measure becomes more obvious when noting only one significant relationship was found between the Attitudes

Toward Women Scale and the cause of divorce items, predictor

variables, and post-hoc correlational variables. Perhaps nontraditional women tended to cite incompatibility as a cause of divorce simply due to the fact that this scale included statements obviously related to sex roles.

General Discussion

The findings do agree with previous studies when looking at the general importance of the individual determinants of divorce. For example, Bloom et al. (1985) suggest that emotional aspects of marriage have become increasingly important. Others (Kitson et al., 1985; Rhyne, 1981; Spitze & South, 1985) have stated increased verbal interaction, affection, and emotional support in a marriage decrease the likelihood of divorce. Accordingly, these previous studies report emotional support and incompatibility were the most often cited causes of divorce among women. Perhaps this explains why no distinction was made in the current study between socioeconomic status and reported causes of divorce; emotional support and incompatibility are crucial components of a marital relationship among individuals of any socioeconomic status.

Implications for Future Research

Although little support was indicated for the hypotheses generated from the extant literature, the large amount of data gathered is considered to be rich with

information that will allow a deeper and more up to date insight into reported causes of divorce among women. Two examples which await analysis are possible differences among mothers and women who did not have children, and an investigation into the relationship between who initiated the divorce and the reported causes.

In conclusion, it appears the current interest in the investigation of why marriages fail has encountered a realm of factors associated with emotional support and incompatibility. Although a lack of household help was not a critical cause of divorce among the participants in the current study it was strongly correlated to lack of emotional support and incompatibility, a finding supportive of Hochschild's (1989) claim. One symptom then of lack of emotional support and incompatibility may be the lack of household help a wife receives from her husband. Further research is warranted in this relatively uninvestigated area. Finally, obtaining a clearer understanding of the marital sex role attitudes each spouse brings to the marriage, how they may differ, and the resulting implications for the relationship is also needed.

APPENDIX A

Causes of Divorce Questionnaire Cover Letter and Informed Consent

Dear Participant,

We are conducting a study to examine sources of women's dissatisfaction within a marriage that ultimately lead to divorce. While much is known about who is likely to get divorced, little is known about the specific causes of divorce and we would like your input. It will take approximately 25 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

If you choose to fill out this questionnaire, please answer each question as honestly as possible. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. Please understand that your responses will be kept confidential, as we are not focusing on the answers of any one person. Your returned questionnaire will remain completely anonymous. The goal of this study is to obtain information from a number of women who have experienced divorce and combine their replies to acquire a general understanding of divorce causes.

Your willingness to participate in this important study is appreciated. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Mary A. Dolan Master's Degree Candidate Department of Psychology

Chuck Hoffman, Chair

I have read and understand the above information.

Signature	22 / A. M		
Date			

CAUSES OF DIVORCE AMONG WOMEN QUESTIONNAIRE

d to yo ce, ple estion Circle tuation Indica ur deci	our divorce ease refer naire. For e "Yes" or n was a pro ate the ext	. If y to you each o "No" to blem dent to vorce	relate to so the country of the follow of the follow of the manner of the country of the manner of the manner of the country of th	en married riage the wing state whether described arriage. In statemen	d more that roughout t tements: or not the nt factore	in The
family	y •		uld not agr roblem duri			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Factor e Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit Fact	
husbai	nd's.		to be equa			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
W. C. S. J. J. W.	Factor e Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit Fact	
			lcohol/druc		arriage. Y	(es N
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2 to 4 to 50	Factor e Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit	
	sed alcohol situation w		roblem dur	ing the m	arriage. '	Yes 1
1	2	3	4	5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	6	7
	Factor e Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Fact	

39

5. I prepared the family meals more often than my ex-husband did.

This situation was a problem during the marriage. Yes No

Not a Fac	tor		Somewhat		A Cr	itica.
In the Di	vorce		A Factor		Fa	ctor
My ex-hus faith.	sband and	d I dic	l not share t	he sa	me religi	.ous
This situ	ation wa	as a pr	roblem during	the :	marriage.	Yes
1	2	3	4	5	6	
Not a Fac In the Di	一一点看,一点也没有有通信的。		Somewhat A Factor			Critic Tactor
I had an This situ			affair. roblem during	, the	marriage.	Yes
1	2	3	4	5	6	
Not a Fac	ctor		Somewhat		A Cı	ritica
In the Di	sband had		A Factor A ramarital a			ves
In the Di My ex-hus	sband had					
In the Di My ex-hus This situ 1	sband had lation was 2 ctor	as a pr	ktramarital a	, the	marriage. 6 A Cr	Yes
In the Di My ex-hus This situ Not a Fac In the Di Our sexua marriage	sband had lation was 2 ctor lvorce al relat	as a pr 3 ionship	stramarital a coblem during 4 Somewhat A Factor	r the 5 ate d	marriage. 6 A Cr Fr uring mos	Yes citica actor st of
In the Di My ex-hus This situ Not a Fac In the Di Our sexua marriage	sband had lation was 2 ctor lvorce al relat	as a pr 3 ionship	ctramarital a coblem during 4 Somewhat A Factor	r the 5 ate d	marriage. 6 A Cr Fr uring mos	Yes citica actor st of
In the Di My ex-hus This situ Not a Fac In the Di Our sexua marriage. This situ	sband had lation was 2 ctor lvorce al relat	as a pr 3 ionship	stramarital a coblem during 4 Somewhat A Factor	r the 5 ate d	marriage. 6 A Cr Fr uring mos	Yes citica actor st of
In the Di My ex-hus This situ Not a Fac In the Di Our sexua marriage This situ Not a Fac	sband had ation was 2 ctor at relation was 2 ctor	as a pr 3 ionshir as a pr 3	stramarital a coblem during 4 Somewhat A Factor	the 5 iate d the	marriage. 6 A Crimer of the control of the crimer of the	Yes citica actor st of
In the Di My ex-hus This situ Not a Fac In the Di Our sexua marriage This situ Not a Fac In the Di My ex-hus	sband had ation was 2 ctor worce sband key	ionshipas a pr	stramarital a roblem during 4 Somewhat A Factor was inadeque roblem during 4 Somewhat	the 5 nate d the	marriage. 6 A Crange moss marriage. 6 A Crange.	Yes citica actor Yes citica actor
In the Di My ex-hus This situ Not a Fac In the Di Our sexua marriage This situ Not a Fac In the Di My ex-hus	sband had ation was 2 ctor worce sband key	ionshipas a pr	stramarital a coblem during 4 Somewhat A Factor was inadeque coblem during 4 Somewhat A Factor	the 5 nate d the	marriage. 6 A Crange moss marriage. 6 A Crange.	Yes citica actor Yes citica actor
In the Di My ex-hus This situ Not a Fac In the Di Our sexua marriage. This situ Not a Fac In the Di My ex-hus This situ	sband had ation was 2 ctor worce sband key ation was 2 ctor was 2 ctor was 2 ctor was 2 ctor worce sband key ation was 2 ctor ctor ctor ctor ctor ctor ctor ctor	as a prince of a p	Somewhat A Factor Somewhat A Factor A Somewhat Coblem during A Factor Cotton means	the 5 late d the 5	marriage. 6 A Crift uring mos marriage. 6 A Crift Fa marriage. 6 A Crift Fa	Yes itica actor Yes ritica actor

11.				roblem duri			Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7.
	Not a Fa	actor		Somewhat		A Cri	tical
	In the I			A Factor			tor
		32.02.00	Programme Andrews Control of the State	11 1 40 00 1		140	
12.				supportive roblem duri			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not a Fa	actor		Somewhat		A Cri	tical
	In the I	Divorce		A Factor		Fac	tor
13.				ly abused m roblem duri		marriage.	Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not a Fa	actor	······································	Somewhat	h'	A Cri	tical
	In the l			A Factor			tor
				mmunicate w roblem duri 4			
	Not a Fa			Somewhat A Factor			tical tor
15.	needs.			d different roblem duri			~.·
	1	2	3	4	5	6	. 7
	Not a Fa		er i vere e	Somewhat A Factor	eli an ann aite an airte i ann airte ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann an	and the second s	tical tor
16	confide	e in my ex	-husba	rsonal or p nd. roblem duri			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not a Fa	actor		Somewhat		2 0201	tical
•							tor
	In the 1	rvocce		A Factor		rac	COL

17.	money	•		ould not agi		_ · · _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
,	This	situation	was a	problem dur	ing the	marriage.	Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor	and the second s	A Cri Facto	
18.				tionally or problem duri			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		Factor Divorce	hambaha ifata unugunun hikuma kemi	Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	
19	laund	ry.	-	one to do mo		· •	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor	-	A Cri Facto	
20				x-husband. roblem duri	ng the r	marriage.	Yes No
	1 .	2	3	4	5	6	.7
		Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor	·	A Cri Facto	
21		-husband situation		d me. problem dur	ing the	marriage.	Yes No
	1	2	, 3 ,	4	5	6	7
		Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	
22				o an inadeq problem dur			Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor	V	A Cri Facto	

23	. Unemp This	loyment wa situation	s a p was a	roblem for moblem dum	my ex-hus ring the	sband. marriage.	Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not a In the	Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cr Facto	itical or
24				nterests and problem du			Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not a In the	Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	The second secon
25				we got mar problem du		marriage.	Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not a In the	Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
26	. I wan This	ted equal situation	power was a	in decision problem du	n making ring the	marriage.	Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor	and the second second	A Cri Facto	
27	. My ex This	-husband v situation	was ov was a	er committe problem du	d to his ring the	work. marriage.	Yes No
	1	2	3	4	5	.6	7
	Not a In the	Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	
28				not help wa problem du			Yes No
	and the state of t						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a Fact			Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	tical
. My ex-hus This sit	sband a uation	and I w was a	ere basicall problem duri	ly incomp ing the m	atible. arriage.	Yes]
	2	.	4	-5	6	7
Not a Fact In the Div	The Control of the Co		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	tical or
			requently arproblem duri			
	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a Fac	and the second of the second		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	tical
In the Di	vorce		A TUCCOL			
. My ex-hu	sband w		a good fina problem duri		ovider.	
. My ex-hu This sit	sband w		a good fina		ovider.	
. My ex-hu This sit	sband wuation 2 tor	was a	a good fina		ovider. arriage. 6	Yes 7 tical
. My ex-human site of the second seco	sband wuation 2 tor vorce sband c	was a 3 did not	a good fina problem duri 4 Somewhat	ing the m 5 relof the	ovider. arriage. 6 A Cri Facto yard wo	Yes 7 tical or
. My ex-human site of the second seco	sband wuation 2 tor vorce sband c	was a 3 did not	a good fina problem duri 4 Somewhat A Factor	ing the m 5 relof the	ovider. arriage. 6 A Cri Facto yard wo	Yes 7 Itical or Ork. Yes
. My ex-human site of the second seco	sband wation 2 tor vorce sband countion 2	was a 3 lid not was a	a good fina problem duri 4 Somewhat A Factor	ing the m 5 re of the m	ovider. larriage. 6 A Cri Facto yard wo larriage.	Yes 7 tical or Yes 7
. My ex-human situation of a Factor of the Discourage of the Disco	sband wation 2 tor vorce sband duation 2 tor vorce sband r	was a did not was a 3	a good fina problem duri 4 Somewhat A Factor do his shar problem duri 4 Somewhat	ing the mean of the ing the mean of the me	ovider. arriage. 6 A Cri Facto arriage. 6 A Cri Facto sexual o	Yes 7 Itical ork. Yes 7 Itical or
. My ex-humants situated in the Division of a Factor in the Division of the Di	sband wation 2 tor vorce sband duation 2 tor vorce sband r	was a did not was a 3	a good fina problem duri 4 Somewhat A Factor do his shar problem duri 4 Somewhat A Factor zarre or ung	ing the mean of the ing the mean of the me	ovider. arriage. 6 A Cri Facto arriage. 6 A Cri Facto sexual o	Yes 7 Itical ork. Yes 7 Itical or

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a F In the	actor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit Facto	
contir	ue/begin	my edu	support my cation. problem duri	e silve, il il il il il		Yes 1
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a F In the	actor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit Factor	
dīd.			vacuum the			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a F In the	actor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit	
			problems dur problem duri			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a F In the	actor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit Factor	
			lectful towa problem duri		arriage.	Yes
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a F In the	actor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Crit Factor	
			not emotiona problem duri			Yes
	2	3	4	5	6	7
1						

my ca	reer.		illing to mo			
			problem dur			Yes N
1		3	4	5	6	7
Not a	Factor		Somewhat		A Cri	tical
In the	Divorce		A Factor		Facto	and the second second
dutie	s.		onsible for			
This	situation	was a	problem duri	ing the	marriage.	Yes N
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a	Factor		Somewhat		A Cri	tical
In the	Divorce		A Factor		Facto	
2 Mar ou	-buchand d	10 nat	want me to	ha amal		
			problem duri			Ves N
	7104401011	was a	proprem dur	ing ene	mar rrage.	165 1
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		i, and see	· ·			
1.1.1	Factor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	tical
		rgin i digitariya 7 Tilganiya Sabiyara	problem duri			
. L	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a	Factor		Somewhat		A Cri	tical
In the	Divorce		A Factor		Facto	r
did.			band that I problem duri			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a	Factor				70 00-20	
The state of the s	Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	
THE CITE	DIVOLUE		A PUCCOL		racco	1
. I oft	en did hou	sework	while my ex	-husband	d relaxed	
			problem đuri			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not a	Factor		Somewhat		A Cri	4. 3 1
INUL d	ractul	and the second second	31 1101-4M/TIAL			
In the	Divorce		A Factor		Facto	

	easily This si			e. roblem duri:	ng the m	arriage.	Yes No
1		2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not a F In the	actor Divorce		Somewhat A Factor		A Cri Facto	tical
our Sele	first:	ex-husb	and had	lowing state children l -child rela	iving in	your hon	ne.
	The	childre	n were	mine from a	previou	s relatio	onship
		childre ationshi		my ex-husbai	nd's fro	m a previ	Lous
		ex-husba ents	nd and	I were the (children	's biolog	gical
	Oth	er, plea	se expl	ain			
	a, a== a #, =					CALL THE CALL	IIUUUUII
1 1 22 1				dress more or			
1 1 N	This si l Not a F	tuation 2	was a p	roblem duri	ng the m	arriage. 6	Yes No 7
1 1	This si Not a F In the My ex-h Childre	tuation 2 actor Divorce usband w	was a p	roblem duri 4 Somewhat	ng the m 5 hase sup	arriage. 6 A Cri Facto plies for	Yes No 7 itical or r the
T I I I I I I I	This si Not a F In the My ex-h Childre	tuation 2 actor Divorce usband w	was a p	Footlem during 4 Somewhat A Factor of help purch	ng the m 5 hase sup	arriage. 6 A Cri Facto plies for	Yes No 7 itical or r the
T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	This si Not a F In the My ex-h childre This si Not a F	tuation 2 actor Divorce usband w n. tuation	was a pould nowas a p	Somewhat A Factor t help purch	ng the m 5 hase sup	arriage. 6 A Cri Facto plies for arriage. 6	Yes Notical or the Yes Notical
T I I I I I I I I I I I I I	This si Not a F In the My ex-h Childre This si Not a F In the My ex-h discipl	tuation 2 actor Divorce usband w n. 2 actor Divorce usband a ine meth	was a pould nowas a pould nowa	Somewhat A Factor t help purch roblem during	ng the m 5 hase sup ng the m 5	arriage. A Cri Facto plies for arriage. 6 A Cri Facto ild rear	Yes No 7 itical or the Yes No 7 itical or
T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	This si Not a F In the My ex-h Childre This si Not a F In the My ex-h discipl	tuation 2 actor Divorce usband w n. 2 actor Divorce usband a ine meth	was a pould nowas a pould nowa	Somewhat A Factor The help purch The help purch The help by the he	ng the m 5 hase sup ng the m 5	arriage. A Cri Facto plies for arriage. 6 A Cri Facto ild rear	Yes No 7 itical or the Yes No 7 itical or
1	This si Not a F In the My ex-h Childre This si Not a F In the My ex-h discipl This si	tuation 2 actor Divorce usband w tuation 2 actor Divorce usband a ine meth tuation 2 actor	was a p ould no was a p 3 nd I co ods. was a p	Somewhat A Factor The purchase of the point	ng the m 5 hase sup 5 ee on ch	arriage. A Criplies for arriage.	Yes No 7 itical r the Yes No itical or ing and Yes No 7
T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	This si Not a F In the My ex-h Childre This si Not a F In the My ex-h discipl This si	tuation 2 actor Divorce usband w n. tuation 2 actor Divorce usband a ine meth tuation 2	was a p ould no was a p 3 nd I co ods. was a p	Somewhat A Factor t help purch roblem durin 4 Somewhat A Factor ould not agree roblem durin	ng the m 5 hase sup 5 ee on ch	arriage. A Cri Facto plies for arriage. 6 A Cri Facto ild rear	Yes No 7 itical or itical or ing and Yes No 7 itical

1	2	3	4		5	6	
	Factor Divorce		Some A Fa			A Ci Fact	ritical tor
on the	ghting and children	a.	- T. T				
1	2	3	4		5	6	7
	Factor Divorce		Some A Fa				ritical tor
My ex-	-husband v	was iea	alous of	or di		the chi	
	situation			during	g the ma	arriage	. Yes l
					g the ma	arriage 6	. Yes 1 7
This s 1 Not a	situation	wasa	problem	what		6	7 ritical
This s 1 Not a In the	2 Factor	was a 3 rarely	problem 4 Some A Factorial	what ctor bathe	5 the chi	A Cr Fact	7 ritical tor
This s 1 Not a In the	Factor Divorce	was a 3 rarely	problem 4 Some A Factorial	what ctor bathe during	5 the chi	A Cr Fact	7 ritical tor
This s 1 Not a In the My ex- This s 1	Factor Divorce husband	was a 3 rarely was a	Some A Factorial Some A	what ctor bathe during	5 the chi g the m	A Cr Fact ldren. arriage	ritical tor Yes I
This s 1 Not a In the My ex- This s 1 Not a In the My ex- respon	Factor Divorce husband situation 2	was a rarely was a 3 did notes equa	some A Factorial Society A	what ctor bathe during what ctor the ch	the chi g the ma 5	A Cracke	ritical tor Yes l

At this point please list any other reasons not indicated above that may have been a factor in the disruption of your marriage.

Please Tell Us About Yourself:

1.	Age	
2.	What is your ethnicity?	
	Caucasian	<u> </u>
	African American	AsianOther
3.	What is your current marita	al status?
	What is your occupation?	
5.	Do you receive: Unemploymen	nt? Yes No
	AFDC?	Yes No
6.	What was the highest level	of school you completed?
	less than high school	BA/BS degree
und de Grif	completed high school	some graduate education
. V 15	some college	graduate education
	two year college and de	
	Are you currently attending	
8.	If yes, what is your goal?	
9.	income?	ey earned only by you) yearly
	Below \$10,000\$10,00	00-\$20,000\$20,000-\$30,000
	\$30,000-\$40,000\$40,	000-\$50,000\$50,000-above
	그리스 사이는 기관하였습니다. 스크리스 바다	원인하는 사람들으로 하는 일이라는 목을 보냈다.
	married more than once, ple	
ma:	rriage for the remainder of	the questionnaire.
	 What was your highest level divorce? less than high school completed high school some college two year college and do What was your occupation level 	BA/BS degree some graduate education graduate education egree
12	. What amount of time did youtside the home during you is always worked full I always worked part	our first marriage? -time -time
	I never worked outside	art-time, sometimes full-time de the home during my first
	I worked during part work during part of	of the marriage, and did not
13	. Did you attend school dur	
	. What was your personal ye	
	marriage?	
	Below \$10.000 \$10.	000-\$20,000\$20,000-\$30,000
		,000-\$50,000\$50,000-above
15	. Was this money under your	
	. If you had no personal in	
	resources readily availab	
	Please explain	<u> </u>
17	. Were other personal resour	rces such as family and/or
	friends available for you	

	Do you have children from the marriage? Yes No If yes, please list the age of each child at the time of divorce, beginning with the eldest, and each child's sex.
	Age Sex
	Do you now , or did you in the past, receive child support from your ex-husband? Yes No Amount per month
22. 23.	How old were you when you married? How old were you when you divorced? How long were you married?
	How long has it been since this divorce was finalized? Who made the decision to divorce?Completely my decisionCompletely my ex-husband's decision
	Mostly my decisionMostly my ex-husband's decisionIt was a mutual decision
Ple	ase answer the following questions about your ex-husband.
2	His age at the time of your divorce Ethnicity?
3.	Caucasian Hispanic African American Asian Other Occupation?
4.	Highest level of education less than high schoolBA/BS degree completed high schoolsome graduate educationsome collegegraduate education
5.	two year college and degree Ex-husband's approximate yearly salary before the divorce?
	Below \$10,000\$10,000-\$20,000\$20,000-\$30,000\$30,000-\$40,000\$40,000-\$50,000\$50,000-above
	This ends the questionnaire. Thank you for your help.

Thank you for participating in this study of the examination of divorce causes among women. This research is being conducted to obtain a clearer idea of problems within a marriage that may lead to divorce. More specifically, we are trying to determine if these reasons differ among women who are of various socioeconomic statuses and among women who hold different expectations regarding the typical marital roles performed by husbands and wives.

Any questions that may arise regarding this study can be answered by contacting Mary Dolan or Chuck Hoffman through the Department of Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino. The phone number to the department is (909) 880-5570. Also, the results of this study are anticipated to be completed during the spring of 1994 and may be obtained by contacting the same individuals.

APPENDIX B

Attitudes Toward Women

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the roles of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly.

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.

A	B	С	D	
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly	

 Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.

A	В	С	D
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly

3. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.

A	В	C	\mathbf{D}
			<u> </u>
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly

4. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.

A	В	С	D
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly

5. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.

Α	В	C	D
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly

6.	ould assume to professions			in business and
	Α	В	c	D
	Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly
7.	should not ex r to have qu			y the same of action as a
	A	В	C	D
	Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly
8.	diculous for darn socks.	a woman t	o run a loc	comotive and for
	A	В	C	D
	Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly
9.	llectual lead in the hands		a communit	y should be
	A	В	C	D
	Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly
10	nould be give iceship in t			with men for
	A , 17, 1	В	c	D
	Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly
11	arning as mu ense when th			ould bear equally
	A	B	C	D
	Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly

12.	Sons	in	a	fami	ly s	hould	be	given	more	enco	ırag	emer	nt	to
	go to	o co	1]	Lege	than	daugl	nte	rs.						

A	В	C	D	
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly	

13. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.

A	В	С	D
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly

14. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.

A	В	С	D	
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	
Strongl	y Mildly	Mildly	Strongly	

15. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

A	B	C	D
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly

APPENDIX C

Divorce Questionnaire Item Categorization

Conflicts over the children.

My ex-husband and I could not agree on child rearing and discipline methods.

Our fighting and unhappiness was having a negative effect on the children.

My ex-husband was jealous of or disliked the children.

Career support.

My ex-husband and I could not agree on when to start a family.

I considered my career to be equally important as my exhusband's.

My ex-husband was not supportive of my career decisions.

My ex-husband did not support me decision to continue/begin my education.

My ex-husband was unwilling to move in order to benefit my career.

My ex-husband did not want me to be employed.

Abuse.

My ex-husband physically abused me.

My ex-husband was emotionally or verbally abusive.

Emotional support.

My ex-husband abused alcohol/drugs.

My ex-husband had an extramarital affair.

My ex-husband kept secrets from me.

There were in-law problems during the marriage.

It was difficult to communicate with my ex-husband.

I could not discuss personal or private matters with or confide in my ex-husband.

I could not trust my ex-husband.

My ex-husband deserted me.

I wanted equal power in decision making.

My ex-husband was over committed to his work.

My ex-husband was neglectful towards me.

Our relationship was not emotionally intimate.

Incompatibility.

We grew apart, our interests and values changed.

I was too young when we got married.

There was a lack of love in our relationship.

My ex-husband and I were basically incompatible.

My ex-husband and I frequently argued or disagreed.

My ex-husband and I had different ideas concerning the roles of husband and wife.

Financial problems.

My ex-husband and I could not agree on how to spend money. Unemployment was a problem for my ex-husband.

My ex-husband was not a good financial provider.

There were financial problems during the marriage.

It bothered my ex-husband that I made more money than he did.

No financial resources, my own or my ex-husband's, were easily accessible to me.

Sexual problems.

Our sexual relationship was inadequate during most of the marriage.

My ex-husband and I had different sexual frequency needs.

Housework.

I prepared the family meals more often than my ex-husband did.

I resented being the one to do most of the family laundry. My ex-husband would not help wash the dishes.

My ex-husband did not do his share of the yard work.

My ex-husband did not vacuum the house as often as I did.

I resented being responsible for most of the household duties.

I often did housework while my ex-husband relaxed.

Child care.

I helped the children dress more often than my ex-husband did.

My ex-husband would not help purchase supplies for the children.

I spent more time helping the children with their homework than their father did.

My ex-husband rarely helped bathe the children.

My ex-husband did not share the child care responsibilities equally with me.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J., & Huston, T. L. (1984). Sex role orientation and division of labor early in marriage. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 46(2), 330-345.
- American Psychological Association. (1982). Ethical principals in the conduct of research with human participants. Washington, D.C: Author.
- Basow, S. A. (1992). <u>Gender stereotypes and roles</u>. (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Benin, M. H., & Agostinelli, J. (1988). Husbands' and wives' satisfaction with the division of labor. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>50</u>, 349-361.
- Biernat, M., & Wortman, C. (1991). Sharing of home responsibilities between professionally employed women and their husbands. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 60(6), 844-860.
- Bloom, B. L., Niles, R. L., & Tatcher, A. M. (1985).
 Sources of marital dissatisfaction among newly
 separated persons. <u>Journal of Family Issues</u>, <u>6</u>(3),
 359-373.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). <u>American couples</u>, New York: William Morrow.
- Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., White, L. K., & Edwards, J. N. (1984). Women, outside employment, and marital instability. <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, 90(3), 567-583.
- Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., White, L., & Edwards, J. N. (1985). Predicting divorce and permanent separation. <u>Journal of Family Issues</u>, <u>6</u>(3), 331-346.
- Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., White, L., & Edwards, J. N. (1986). Divorce and marital instability over the life course. <u>Journal of Family Issues</u>, 7, 421-442.
- Bowen, G. L., & Orthner, D. K. (1983). Sex-role congruency and marital quality. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>45</u>, 223-228.

- Bryant, W. K., & Zick, C. D. (1994). The economics of housespousery: An essay on household work. <u>Journal of Family and Economic Issues</u>, <u>15</u>(2), 137-168.
- Cleek, M. G., & Pearson, T. A. (1985). Perceived causes of divorce: An analysis of interrelationships.

 Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47, 179-183.
- Council of Economic Advisers, <u>Economic Report of the</u>

 <u>President</u>, <u>1992</u>. Washington: United States Government
 Printing Office.
- Finlay, B., Starnes, C. E., & Alvarez, F. B. (1985).

 Recent changes in sex-role ideology among divorced men and women: Some possible causes and implications. Sex Roles, 12(5/6), 637-653.
- Glick, P. C. (1988). The role of divorce in the changing family structure: Trends and variations. In S. A. Wolchik & P. Karoly (Eds.), <u>Children of divorce:</u>

 <u>Empirical perspectives on adjustment</u> (pp. 3-34). New York: Gardner.
- Gray, J. D. (1983) The married professional woman: An examination of her role conflicts and coping strategies. <u>Psychology of Women Quarterly</u>, 7(3), 235-243.
- Greenglass, E. R. (1985). A social psychological view of marriage for women. <u>International Journal of Women's Studies</u>, 8(1), 24-31.
- Hochschild, A. (1989). <u>The second shift</u>. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1975). <u>Four factor index of social</u> <u>status</u>. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University.
- Houseknecht, S. K., Vaughan, S., & Macke, A. S. (1984).

 Marital disruption among professional women: The timing of career and family events. <u>Social Problems</u>, <u>31</u>(3), 273-284.
- Huber, J., & Spitze, G. (1980). Considering divorce: An expansion of Becker's theory of marital instability. <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, <u>86(1)</u>, 74-89.
- Huber, J., & Spitze, G. (1983). <u>Sex stratification: Children, housework, and jobs</u>. New York: Academic Press.
- Kitson, G. C., Babri, K. B., & Roach, M. J. (1985). Who divorces and why: A review. <u>Journal of Family Issues</u>, <u>6</u>(3), 255-293.

- Kitson, G. C., & Sussman, M. B. (1982). Marital complaints, demographic characteristics, and symptoms of mental distress in divorce. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 44, 87-101.
- Krausz, S. L. (1986). Sex roles within marriage. <u>Social Work</u>, 31(6), 456-463.
- Levinger, G. (1966). Sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce. <u>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</u>, 36, 803-807.
- Levinger, G. (1976). A social psychological perspective on marital dissolution. <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, <u>32(1)</u>, 21-47.
- Lueptow, L. B., Guss, M. B., & Hyden, L. (1989). Sex role ideology, marital status, and happiness. <u>Journal of Family Issues</u>, <u>10</u>(3), 383-400.
- Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C. E. (1987). Belief in innate sex roles: Sex stratification versus interpersonal influence in marriage. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>19</u>, 527-540.
- Mott, F. L., & Moore, S. F. (1979). The causes of marital disruption among young American women: An interdisciplinary perspective. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 41, 335-366.
- Nyquist, L., Slivken, K., Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1985). Household responsibilities in middle-class couples: The contribution of demographic and personality variables. <u>Sex Roles</u>, <u>12</u>(1/2), 15-34.
- Philliber, W. W., & Hiller, D. V. (1983). Relative occupational attainments of spouses and later changes in marriage and wife's work experience. <u>Journal of Marriage</u> and the Family, 45, 161-170.
- Pleck, J. H. (1985). <u>Working wives</u>, <u>working husbands</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Rhyne, D. (1981). Bases of marital satisfaction among men and women. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>43</u>, 941-955.
- Schafer, R. B., & Keith, P. M. (1981). Equity in marital roles across the family life cycle. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 43, 359-367.

- Schoen, R., Urton, W., Woodrow, K., & Baj, J. (1985). Marriage and divorce in 20th century American cohorts. <u>Demography</u>, <u>22</u>(1), 281-304.
- Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. C. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spitze, G., & South, S. J. (1985). Women's employment, time expenditure, and divorce. <u>Journal of Family Issues</u>, <u>6</u>(3), 307-329.
- Starkey, J. L. (1991). Wive's earnings and marital instability: Another look at the independence effect. The Social Science Journal, 28(4), 501-521.
- Trent, K., & South, S. J. (1989). Structural determinants of the divorce rate: A cross societal analysis. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>51</u>(2), 391-404.
- Udry, J. R. (1981). Marital alternatives and marital disruption. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>43</u>, 889-897.
- White, L. K. (1990). Determinants of divorce: A review of research in the eighties. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>52</u>, 904-912.
- Wiersma, U. J., & Van Den Berg, P. V. (1991). Work-home role conflict, family climate, and domestic responsibilities among men and women in dual earner families. <u>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</u>, 21, 1207-1217.
- Yogev, S. (1981). Do professional women have egalitarian marital relationships? <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 43, 865-871.
- Yogev, S., & Brett, J. (1985). Perceptions of the division of housework and child care and marital satisfaction.

 <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 47, 609-617.