

Center for Demography and Ecology

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Effects of Wives' Employment on Marital Quality

Lina Guzman

NSFH Working Paper No. 85



EFFECTS OF WIVES' EMPLOYMENT ON MARITAL QUALITY

Lina Guzman
Department of Sociology
Center for Demography and Ecology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1180 Observatory Drive
Madison, WI 53706
guzman@ssc.wisc.edu

October 2000

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, New York, NY, March 25-27, 1999.

Over the past decades there has been a rapid increase in the labor force participation of married women in the United States (Spain & Bianchi 1996; McLanahan & Casper 1995). Along with rising labor force rates, significant changes in the life course patterns of women's employment have occurred (Oppenheimer 1982; Sweet & Bumpass 1987). Traditionally women's entrance into and out of the labor force closely paralleled stages in family life. Typically, young women worked in the years immediately following the completion of their education. Once married most left the labor market to raise families; the few that remained did so until the birth of their first child. Beginning in the post war years, this pattern of employment began its transformation as women with school aged children began to reenter the labor market in large numbers. Soon women with young children followed. Today, two thirds of married mothers are in the labor force (Hayghe & Bianchi, 1994). Clearly, the "traditional marriage," in which the wife stays at home caring for the house and children while the husband provides economic support, is no longer the norm. Instead, the prevailing practice today is a dual earner household.

The implications of these changes for family life are both widespread and dramatic. As wives enter the labor market, both men and women have had to redefine their roles within their marriages. Women, for example, are increasingly taking on a larger chunk of the responsibility for the financial well-being of their families, contributing close to 30% of family income (Hayghe 1993). As such, the role of breadwinner no longer belongs exclusively to men. For some women, the role as provider is a welcomed experience, and central to their identity (see Potuchek 1992). For others, their paycheck provides family extras, while having little or no effect on their role within the family (Hiller & Philliber 1986). The large majority, however, view their new role with some ambivalence (Potuchek 1992; Bielby & Bielby 1989). While they recognize their contribution to their family's economic well-being and

enjoy their work, they see their economic contribution and work activity as being secondary to that of their husbands. Regardless of how married women identify with their role as economic provider, the majority worry about the effects that working outside the home may have on their family's well-being (Hochschild 1989; Rubin 1976). In order to accommodate their family responsibilities and increase the time they have to spend with their children and spouses many women have changed or gone into occupations that offer greater flexibility, passed on promotions, limited their work hours and schedules, and worked closer to home (Hochschild 1989; Presser 1984, 1995; Philliber & Hiller 1983; Spain & Bianchi 1996). Despite their increased labor force participation and earnings women continue to be more likely than men to make adjustments in their work life to fit their family life (Bielby & Bielby 1989).

As their wives have moved into the labor force, men have begun to respond by taking on more household and child care responsibilities (Gershuny & Robinson 1988; Goldschieder & Waite 1991; Peterson & Gerson 1992). However, it is important to point out that women continue to bear the bulk of responsibility for child care and household tasks (Goldschieder & Waite 1991; Marini & Shelton 1993; Presser 1994). In addition, increases in women's labor force participation have not been fully met with increases in the amount of time that husbands devote to family responsibilities; nor have women fully decreased the time they spend on household tasks commensurate with their increases in the labor force (see Spitze 1988). Thus, many married women are working longer days, putting in both a full shift at work and at home (Hochschild 1989).

The sometimes hectic demands and schedules of couples' work life have also limited the amount of time and energy they have to devote to family life, and consequently have impacted the quality of family life. Stress and work demands often have negative effects on family relationships, psychological well-being and marital satisfaction (Sears & Galambos 1992; Voydanoff 1988; Rook, Dooley &

Catalano 1991; Benin & Agostinelli 1988; Kessler & McRae 1982; White & Keith 1990). In addition, the increasing diversity of work schedules has also meant that couples have fewer opportunities to spend together as a couple or family (see Presser 1995). Close to 30% of dual earner couples consist of at least one spouse who does not work a standard day shift (Presser 1987). Engaging in nontraditional work shifts, however, also appears to offer benefits to couples. For fathers, it facilitates their participation in child rearing (Presser 1987, 1989) and appears to produce a more equitable division of household labor for women (Presser 1994).

All of these changes have led couples to redefine the “marriage contract” and as a result have impacted the psychological, emotional, social and financial benefits that couples derive from marriage. Using longitudinal data from the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) this paper will investigate the effects of women’s employment on marital quality. More specifically, this paper will examine the degree to which three factors—work preferences, division of household labor and job characteristics—help to explain the relationship between women’s employment and marital quality.

LINKAGES BETWEEN WOMEN’S EMPLOYMENT AND MARITAL QUALITY

Early research on the effects of women’s employment on marital quality suggested that wives’ employment lowered marital quality; especially among men (Burke & Wier 1976; Kessler & McRae 1982) and couples where the wife entered the workforce out of economic necessity (Orden & Bradburn 1969). Later studies, however, found little or no effect of women’s employment on either husbands’ or wives’ marital quality (Booth 1979; Locksley 1980; Roberts & O’Keefe 1981). More recent research has concentrated on identifying the pathways through which wives’ employment may affect marital quality (Vannoy & Philliber 1992; McHale & Crouter 1992; Ross, Mirowsky & Huber 1983; Kessler & McRae 1982; Philliber & Hiller 1983).

THE ROLE OF WORK PREFERENCES: Three prominent perspectives have emerged from

this body of research. The first, put forth by Ross et al. (1983) argues that couples' preferences toward wife's employment play a pivotal role in determining the effects of employment on marital well-being. While the researchers of this study were interested in examining the effects of wives' employment on the mental well-being of couples, their findings may also shed light on the role that wives' employment has on marital quality. A key finding of their study was that both husbands and wives experienced higher levels of mental well-being if their preferences matched wives' employment status. In contrast, spouses whose preferences were inconsistent with the employment activity of the wife experienced lower levels of mental health.

More recent work also speaks to the impact that discrepancies between attitudes and preferences on the one hand and behavior on the other may have on marital quality (McHale & Crouter 1992; Vannoy & Philliber 1992; Pina & Bengston 1993). McHale and Crouter (1992) find that husbands and wives tend to evaluate their marriage negatively when sex-role attitudes do not match household arrangements. In contrast, couples whose attitudes are consistent with their household's division of labor evaluate their marriage more positively. These findings suggest that as couples come to terms with the reality of today's dual earner economy and take steps toward building more equalitarian households, they benefit from wife's employment.

HOUSEHOLD LABOR: The second perspective argues that the strain of juggling both the workplace and home has taken a toll on the emotional and mental well-being of women. As such it focuses on the ways in which the division of household labor helps to explain the relationship between wives' employment and marital quality. Exchange theory suggests that individuals will have higher levels of marital satisfaction the less they participate in housework and the more their spouse shares in the division of household labor (see Lennon & Rosenfield 1994). Ross et al. (1983) find that wives who are primarily responsible for housework are more depressed than wives whose husbands participate in

housework. Other studies also find that employed wives experience greater satisfaction within their marriage the fairer the division of housework (Benin & Agostinelli 1988; Lennon & Rosenfield 1994). Although women continue to be responsible for the majority of housework, few perceive it as unfair. Critics of exchange theory argue that instead of focusing on the relationship between the division of household labor and marital satisfaction, it is more fruitful to examine couples' perceptions of fairness (Thompson 1991; Hochschild 1989). Pina & Bengston (1993), for example, find that wives perception of the amount of support and help they receive from their husband is more important in determining their marital happiness than the actual division of labor.

Recent work has also suggested that, in addition to the division of household labor and perceptions of fairness, it is important to consider the types of tasks that men and women participate in. Benin & Agostinelli (1988) argue that even when men increase the number of hours they spend in household labor, women may continue to be dissatisfied if tasks are sex segregated. Traditional "female chores" (e.g., cleaning house, washing dishes etc.) tend to be more repetitive, time consuming and demanding than traditional "male tasks" (e.g., automobile repairs, mowing the lawn). Increases in the amount of time that husbands spend on household tasks may not result in increases in women's satisfaction over the division of household labor if men limit their participation to tasks that are less demanding and time consuming and leave women, in short, to do the "dirty work." The results of their study suggest that women are happiest with the division of household labor when their husbands participate in traditional "female tasks." The work of Brayfield (1992) also suggests that the gender division of household chores reflects the relative power of women within marriage. She finds that women who attain market positions that exceed that of their husbands participate in fewer "female tasks" than women whose occupational attainment is lower than their husbands.

WORK STRESS AND JOB CHARACTERISTICS: The third and final perspective focuses on

the ways in which the characteristics of women's jobs may impact marital quality. Wives' employment may lower the marital quality of both men and women by reducing the amount of time available for family roles (see Voydanoff 1988; Staines & Pleck 1983, Spitze 1988). Previous research has found that increases in work hours are associated with increased levels of family conflict and strain (Voydanoff 1988; Staines & Pleck 1983), in particular for women (Keith & Schafer 1980).

The relationship between shift work and family life has received more attention in recent years as it has become a reality for more and more couples. While the benefits of shift work for family life are numerous, most notably the increased participation on the part of men in child care and housework, so too are the disadvantages. In addition to the loss of regular sleep patterns, poor mental and emotional health, and reduction in social activities among shift workers (see White & Keith 1990), couples in which one or more partners engage in shift work have less time to spend together as a couple and family (Kingston & Nock 1987). White and Keith (1990) find that engaging in shift work (working non-day hours) is associated with decreased marital quality and increased marital instability. The authors hypothesize that the time that couples spent apart may foster greater independence thereby weakening the barriers to divorce. However, it is unclear whether individuals in already failing marriages are choosing shift work to avoid or reduce contact; or whether shift work creates conditions which increase the probability of divorce. It is also still unclear whether couples who engage in shift work spend less time together in actuality than couples who work overlapping schedules.

Several studies have also found evidence to link negative work conditions to increased levels of stress at home, less satisfying family relations, poorer mental well-being and lower levels of marital satisfaction (Sears & Galambos 1992; Rook, Dooley & Catalano 1991; Hughes, Galinsky & Morris 1992). Negative work conditions, such as low autonomy, poor supervision, and high stress are thought to adversely affect family interactions by increasing the levels of stress and psychological pressures

experienced by the worker. Hughes et al. (1992) found that workers in high stress and competitive jobs reported more frequent marital arguments. While it is clear that work related stress has a negative impact on the worker's sense of well-being, marital quality and family relations, it is less clear what effect, if any, such stress may have on the other family members. Crouter et al. (1989) found evidence to suggest that the work related stress of husbands is negatively associated with wives' emotional well-being. Sears and Galambos (1992) examined whether women's work stress impacts husbands' perceptions of marital adjustment (i.e., cross-over). While they find that wives' work stress lowers women's perceptions of marital adjustment (i.e., spill-over), they found little or no evidence to link women's work stress to husbands' marital adjustment (cross-over).

While there have been numerous studies that have investigated the effects of wives' employment on marital quality, most studies have been limited by: 1) the use of small unrepresentative samples (a notable exception is the University of Nebraska Study by Booth and associates); 2) the use of cross-sectional data; and 3) the lack of data from both spouses. The analyses presented below attempts to rectify some of these problems. First, the study is based on a large representative sample of U.S. households. Secondly, the use of longitudinal data allows us to address the issue of causal ordering. Past studies have not been able to address whether low levels of marital quality lead to women to enter the labor force or vice versa. By controlling for time 1 marital quality we are able to disentangle some of these effects. Lastly, unlike previous national studies, measures of marital quality were collected from both husbands and wives. The importance of including both husbands' and wives' reports of marital quality cannot be overstated given the vast literature that documents: 1) differences in the levels of marital quality experienced by men and women; 2) variances in perceptions of marital quality within couples; and, 3) differing processes that affect marital quality for men and women.

METHODS

Sample: The present study is based on the first and second wave of the National Survey of Family and Households (NSFH)—a nationally representative longitudinal survey of U.S. adults. The NSFH was first conducted in 1987-88 with 13,008 adults, including an oversampling of cohabiting and recently married couples, single parent families, African American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican households (Sweet, Bumpass & Call 1988). One adult per household was randomly selected to be personally interviewed (primary respondent). Spouses of the primary respondents were asked to complete a shorter version of the survey in the first wave of the study. In the second wave, conducted in 1992-94, both the primary and secondary respondents were given full-length personal interviews.

The analysis of this study is limited to couples in intact first marriages and for whom data was available from both primary and secondary respondents at both interviews. The sample is further restricted to couples with children under the age of 19 living in the household. The decision to limit the analysis to parents in first marriages was based on the findings of prior research which suggest that marital quality may vary over the family life cycle (Glenn 1991; Brubaker 1991; Ward 1993; White et al. 1986)¹ and across marriages (Booth & Edwards 1992; Amato & Booth 1991). In their longitudinal study, White, Booth and Edwards (1986) found evidence that presence of children lowered marital quality by reducing the couple's level of interaction, and increasing the number of arguments over money and the division of household labor. Remarriages also appear to suffer from lower levels of marital

¹ White and Booth (1985), however, find only minimal support that the arrival of children decreases marital quality of couples. Instead they argue that the selection into parenthood or non-parenthood may account for the observed differences between the two groups. They also find evidence to support the hypothesis that children act to delay divorces that would otherwise occur among couples with low levels of marital quality.

quality (Booth & Edwards 1992), most probably as a result of selection effects (Amato & Booth, 1991; Martin & Bumpass 1989) and the difficulties associated with the formation of “blended families.”

Together the sample restrictions resulted in a total sample size of 1,189 couples. Approximately 65% of wives in the sample participated in the labor force, the majority were employed either part-time or full-time (See table 1). The vast majority (92.2%) of husbands were also employed in the labor market. Couples in the sample were predominately white and college educated, and had a mean marital duration of 15.8 years. A little over 40% of the couples had children under the age of 6 living in the household. Average annual family income fell slightly below \$50,000; and, among dual earner couples, wives contributed close to 40% of the family income.

(Table 1 about here.)

Marital Quality: Two dimensions of marital quality (marital happiness and marital conflict) were measured. As a global indicator of marital happiness respondents were asked: “On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is very unhappy and 7 is very happy, taking all things together how would you describe your marriage?” In addition, all married respondents were asked: “How happy are you with the following aspects of your marriage?: a) the understanding you receive from your spouse; b) the love and affection you get from your spouse; c) the amount of time you spend with your spouse; d) the demands your spouse places on you; e) your sexual relationship; f) the way your spouse spends money; g) the work your spouse does around the house; and h) your spouse as a parent.” Responses ranged on a scale from 1 (very unhappy) to 7 (very happy). Preliminary factor analysis showed that, with the exception of two items (work spouse does around the house and spouse as a parent) these items loaded highly together. The two items that loaded separately on other factors were eliminated from the final scale.²

² The item “satisfaction with the work your spouse does around the house” is used as an indicator of perceived fairness in the division of household labor.

The final index contained 7 items: global happiness, understanding from spouse, love from spouse, time spent with spouse, demands placed by spouse, and money spouse spends. Mean scores were then computed for each respondent who answered at least 2 of the above items. Factor analyses and reliability tests were conducted for husbands and wives separately (Cronbach alphas =.88 and .89).

To measure marital conflict I focused on a series of questions that dealt with various areas of possible conflict. Both husbands and wives were asked to report the frequency at which they had, in the past year, disagreed over the following issues: household tasks, money, spending time together, sex, in-laws, and (for parents) the children. The response options ranged from 1 (never) to 6 (almost every day). Factor analysis indicated that the items “disagree over in-laws and children” loaded on other factors and were, therefore, eliminated from the scale.³ The remaining four items—household tasks, money, spending time together and sex—loaded highly together on one factor and were used in the final index. As with marital happiness, a mean score was calculated for both husbands and wives (Cronbach alphas=.74 (wives) and .75 (husbands)).

Time 1 measures of marital quality were also included in order to address the issue of causal direction. Items included in the time 1 marital relationship section differed from those included at time 2. Thus, an exact replication of the scales created for time 2 was not possible. Of the seven items used to create the marital happiness scale at time 2, only the global happiness item appeared at time 1. However, the four items used to construct the marital conflict scale at time 2 were asked at time 1, allowing for an exact replication of the marital conflict scale.

Wives’ Employment: Wives’ employment at time 2, the main independent variable, was coded

³ Disagreement over in-laws and childrearing is quite low and may account for why these items did not load well with other areas of disagreement.

into four dummy variables: employed part-time (works less than 35 hours per week), employed full-time (works 35 to 40 hours a week), employed over-time (works 40+ hours a week) and the omitted category, non-employed.

Given the increasing demands of women's time and their competing roles, we expect that employed wives will have lower levels of marital quality than non-employed wives. In addition, we expect that work preferences, household labor, and women's job characteristics will help to account for the effects of wives' employment on marital quality. For husbands the effect that wives' employment may have on their marital quality is less clear cut. If women's employment is associated with increases in husband's family responsibilities, decreases in the amount of time that couples have together, or presents a threat to the husband's role as economic provider, wives' employment should be related to decreases in husbands' marital quality. Alternatively, women's employment may improve husbands' marital quality by providing additional income and reducing husband's financial responsibility.

Work Preferences: In their 1983 paper, Ross et al. argued for the inclusion of work preferences in the understanding of the effects of wives' employment on couples' mental well-being. Applying their theoretical model to the study of the relationship between wives' employment and marital quality would suggest that the effect of wives' employment is dependent upon spouses' preference towards her employment. According to their model, employment status will have a negative effect on marital quality if the wife's employment status is inconsistent with either spouses' preference.

Within the marital relationship section, respondents were asked how many hours they preferred that they and their spouse work. Thus, we are able to compare husbands' and wives' preference reports to the actual number of hours worked by wives. Preferences were considered to match actual behavior if they fell within five hours of the actual number of hours worked by the wife. If the preference report was five or more hours in either direction than the number of hours actually worked by the wife, the

respondent's preference was considered to be inconsistent with actual behavior. As a result there were six distinct categories: 1) husband's preferences and wife's work activity are consistent; 2) wife's preferences and her work activity are consistent; 3) husband prefers wife to work less hours than she is currently working; 4) wife prefers to work less hours than she is currently working; 5) husband prefers wife to work more hours than she is currently working; and 6) wife prefers to work more hours than she is currently working. Thus, we will be able examine the effect that individual and spouse's preferences have on marital quality, as well as the effects of couples' combined preferences. Lastly, tests for interaction effects between work preferences and wife's employment status will be conducted. Consistent with Ross et al. (1983), we expect that couples whose preferences are consistent with wife's employment status will experience higher levels of marital satisfaction than couples in which one or both spouse's preference is (are) inconsistent with wife's employment status. We also expect that individual preferences will have a stronger effect on marital quality than spouses' preferences.

Measures of Household Labor and Child Care: Previous researchers have found that various aspects of household labor, including the division of household labor, satisfaction with division of household labor and the gender division of household tasks, are important keys in understanding the relationship between wives' employment and marital quality. Each respondent was asked to report the number of hours that he or she spent on various household activities. The activities included: 1) preparing meals; 2) washing dishes and cleaning up after meals; 3) cleaning house; 4) doing outdoor and other household maintenance; 5) shopping for groceries and other household goods; 6) washing, ironing and mending; 7) paying bills and keeping financial records; and, 8) driving other household members to school, work or other activities. A measure of the division of household labor was constructed by taking the ratio of the number of hours that husbands reported working on household chores to the number of hours that wives reported. An indicator of the gender division of household labor was

developed by comparing both the proportion of men and women engaged in each task, as well as the number of hours spent on each chore. With the exception of washing and ironing, there was no task in which the majority of men did not participate in. However, when we look at the amount of time spent on various chores, four items appear to be predominately “women’s work.” They include preparing meals, cleaning up after meals, cleaning house, and washing and ironing. Each of these tasks were performed by over 95% of women in the sample; in contrast, men’s participation in these tasks ranged from 41% to 75%. Together these four tasks accounted for the majority of wives’ time in household tasks but accounted for less than half of husbands’ time. After identifying the “female tasks,” the total number of hours that husbands spent on these four tasks was computed.

As noted earlier, past research suggests that while the division of household labor may be important in determining couples’ marital quality, subjective evaluations and perceptions about fairness may play a more important role. In addition to questions concerning the amount of time spent on various household tasks, respondents were asked the following: “How happy are you with the work your spouse does around the house?”. Responses ranged on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being very unhappy and 7 being very happy.

Consistent with exchange theory we expect that increased levels of participation in household labor will result in lower levels of marital quality. Couples with more equitable household arrangements—those in which husbands participate in “female tasks”—are expected to experience higher levels of marital happiness. It is less clear, however, what effect husbands’ participation in “female” tasks will have on marital conflict. Benin & Agostinelli (1988) suggest that the struggle to integrate men into “female tasks” may initially lead to conflict as couples adjust to new and untraditional arrangements. In addition, it is expected that respondents’ satisfaction with their current arrangement will have a stronger explanatory effect on the relationship between wives’ employment and marital

quality than the actual division of household labor.

In order to estimate the relationship between children and marital quality three dummy variables were included: 1) presence of children under the age of 3; 2) presence of children between the ages of 3 and 6; and 3) the presence of children between the ages of 7 and 18 (omitted category). Previous research suggests that the demands of parenting are especially high during pre-school years, when children require the most amount of time, care and attention. Interaction terms between the children dummy variables and women's employment were also included to test for the effects of combining work and parenthood. Consistent with previous research, we expect to find that the effects of combining work and parenting on marital quality will be strongest for those couples with young children.

Wives' Job Characteristics and Work Stress "Spill-Over": Job characteristics are the third and final factor considered in this paper. To measure the characteristics of wives' employment two sets of variables were included. The first set captures characteristics of the wife's work schedule. Information was collected on respondents' work schedules, including whether the times or days they worked varied, and whether they worked some all or night shifts (between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m.). The research of Presser and others suggests that wives whose work schedules vary, or who work night hours, experience lower levels of marital quality.

The second set of characteristics captures wife's work related stress. Employed respondents were asked to report on the following: a) I am usually exhausted when I get home from work; and, b) I am usually tense and irritable when I get home from work. Responses ranged on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 was strongly agree and 5 was strongly disagree. Low scores were considered to indicate high levels of work related stress. Based on previous research we expect to find that wives who experience high levels of work related stress will have lower levels of marital quality (i.e., spill-over). It is unclear, however, what the effect, if any, wife's work stress will have on husband's marital quality (i.e., cross-

over). Sears & Galambos (1992) hypothesized that wives' work stress would "cross over" and impact husbands' marital adjustment. However, they found no evidence of this in their study.

Control variables: Several control variables were also included in the model. Because couples tend to share many socio-demographic characteristics, the control variables were constructed to measure couple rather than individual characteristics. Among the characteristics likely to be shared among couples were: education, race, and religion. Dummy variables were constructed for race (1 = both or one partner non-white) and religion (1 = one or both partner non-catholic). A categorical education variable for couples was also constructed: a) one or both spouses have no high school degree; b) both spouses have a high school degree; c) one or both spouses have some college education or more (omitted). Marital duration was measured as the number of years the couple had been part of a union. Therefore, if the couple cohabited prior to marriage the clock began at the time they began to cohabit. Lastly, husband's employment status, and measures of couples' family income, including the proportion of income that wives contributed, were included.

Analyses and Results

Table 2 presents the bi-variate relationship between wives' employment status and couples' marital quality. Consistent with our expectations, women's employment is associated with lower levels of marital happiness and increased levels of marital conflict among wives. In addition, wives' level of participation in the labor force is also associated with women's marital quality. Women who work over-time appear to fare the worst, experiencing lower levels of marital quality and higher levels of marital conflict than other wives. Meanwhile, though husbands whose wives are in the labor force have lower levels of marital happiness and higher levels of marital conflict, the differences are not significant.

(Table 2 about here.)

The bi-variate relationship between couples' marital quality and their preferences towards wife's employment status is presented in table 3. Consistent with the findings of Ross et al. (1983), wives experience higher levels of marital happiness and lower levels of marital conflict if their preferences are consistent with their employment status. Wives who prefer to be working fewer hours experience lower levels of marital happiness and higher levels of marital conflict, suggesting the presence of work and family conflicts. Husbands' preferences are also associated with wives' marital conflict; however, the relationship between wives' marital happiness and husbands' work preferences are not significant. Neither wife's or husband's work preferences are associated with husband's marital happiness. Consistent with prior research, husbands experience lower levels of marital conflict when both spouses' preferences match employment behavior. The bi-variate analysis also indicates that the relationship between work preferences and wives' employment is strongest for marital conflict, suggesting that wife's employment status becomes a source of tension when spouses' preferences are inconsistent with wife's employment status. That both dimensions of marital quality do not respond similarly to couples' preferences speaks to the importance of measuring different dimensions of marital quality.

(Table 3 about here.)

Consistent with the findings of prior studies (see Marini & Shelton 1993), wives in the sample spend an average of 39.35 hours on housework compared to an average of 19.52 hours spent by husbands. In total women spend slightly more than twice as many hours performing housework than husbands. Men spend 40% (approximately 8 hours) of their total time on household labor performing traditionally "female" tasks (preparing meals, cleaning up after meals, cleaning house, and washing and ironing). In contrast, women spend 75% of their time on these tasks. Clearly, this suggests that the division of household tasks is gendered, with women taking the primary responsibility for tasks that tend to be more repetitive and time consuming. It is also interesting to note that the tasks that women

perform are more closely related to the day to day “upkeep” of families (e.g., preparing meals compared to outdoor tasks). This gender division of household tasks is consistent with women’s role as the primary family caretaker. (Descriptive statistics on the time spent on household tasks are available on request).

Correlations between the various measures of the division of household labor are presented in table 4. Contrary to our expectations, the actual division of household labor is not strongly correlated with couples’ marital quality. In contrast, the number of hours that husbands spend on traditional “female” tasks is significantly correlated with marital quality. However, the relationship is in the opposite direction from what was expected. Among wives, increases in husband’s participation in female tasks significantly lowers their levels of marital happiness and increases their levels of marital conflict. The effect on husbands is similar but not significant for marital happiness. Increases in husbands’ participation in female tasks should be associated with increases in wives’ marital quality if husbands’ participation leads to less demands on women’s time, increases “real” equality in the division of household labor and, as Hochschild (1989) suggests, provides a sense of being supported. However, greater participation of husbands in “female” tasks may signal increases in the demands of women (Presser 1994; Spain & Bianchi 1996) and therefore may be related to lower levels of marital quality among wives. Benin & Agostinelli (1988) also find that greater participation of husbands in women’s traditional household tasks is associated with increases in wives’ reports of arguments over the division of household labor. They hypothesize that as couples begin to share responsibility for tasks, arguments may arise as couples settle into their new roles. For example, as husbands and wives begin to share responsibility for washing dishes, arguments may arise over whose turn it is to do the dishes; presumably this would not be a problem when one person is exclusively responsible for the task. Brayfield’s (1992) findings also suggest that greater participation on behalf of husbands reflects increases in women’s

relative power within marriage—for example, her ability to “buy out” of certain tasks—and therefore, may be related to decreases in husbands’ marital quality. Consistent with the results of previous research (Pina & Bengston 1993; Lennon & Rosenfield 1994; Thompson 1991) we find that husbands’ and wives’ satisfaction with the division of household labor is strongly correlated with marital quality. Both husbands and wives experiences higher levels of marital happiness and lower levels of marital conflict the more satisfied they are with the division of household labor.

(Table 4 about here.)

Contrary to our expectation, wives’ work characteristics (i.e., work hours, work nights, work days) do not appear to be related to either wives’ or husbands’ marital quality (see table 5). However, women’s work related stress is significantly associated with both husbands’ and wives’ marital quality. Experiencing little or no work related stress is related to increases in couples’ marital happiness and decreases in marital conflict. While the relationship between the “carryover” of work related stress and marital quality is strongest for women, the results suggest that women’s work related stress does have a “spillover” effect on husbands’ marital well-being.

(Table 5 about here.)

Ordinary least square regression was used to estimate effects of wives’ employment on marital quality. As shown in tables 6 through 9, three models were estimated for each dependent variable, for husbands and wives separately. The baseline model tests the gross effect between wife’s employment status and marital quality. Model 2 controls for social structural correlates of employment and marital quality, including education, ethnicity, religion, marital duration, presence of children, and husband’s employment status. In addition, model 2 controls for marital quality at time 1; thereby addressing the issue of causal direction. Model 3 includes measures of the three factors thought to mediate the relationship between wives’ employment and marital quality. Because job characteristics and work

spillover pertain only to employed women, each of the models were estimated in two steps. In the first step, the models were estimated for the entire sample (including couples with non-employed and employed wives). As such, the third model, estimated for the entire sample, included only couples' work preferences and measures of household labor. In the second step, the models were estimated for couples in which the wife was employed. The third model for the reduced sample (couples with employed wives) included all three factors: work preferences, household labor, job characteristics and work stress spillover. The effects of wives' employment on marital quality will first be discussed for the entire sample (couples with employed and non-employed wives) and then for the reduced sample (couples with employed wives), in which the relationship of job characteristics and work spill-over are examined.

Tables 6 and 7 present the coefficients and standard errors for the effect of wives' employment on women's marital quality. For clarity of presentation, the tables do not include the results of couple's race, ethnicity or education. Complete tables presenting the coefficients for each model are available on request. Consistent with our hypothesis, wives' employment is significantly associated with women's marital quality. Women who are employed in the labor force experience lower levels of marital happiness and higher levels of marital conflict than women who are non-employed (see tables 6 and 7). As seen in the bi-variate analysis, the effect of employment is strongest among women who work overtime. In contrast, women's employment has no significant effect on either husbands' marital happiness or marital conflict (see tables 8 and 9). In short, husbands' marital quality neither benefits nor suffers as a result of wives' employment activity.

(Tables 6 and 7 about here.)

One of the problems in establishing a causal link between wives' employment status and marital quality is that changes in women's employment may be a result of marital quality. For example, women may enter the labor force if they perceive their marriage to be in trouble, either to secure financial

independence or to find an alternative channel for their time and energy. By controlling for marital quality at time 1 we are able to disentangle some of these effects. Controlling for marital quality at time 1 reduces, to some extent, the effect of wives' employment status on marital quality at time 2, but the direction of the effect and significance levels are similar to those seen in model 1.

In addition to controlling for marital quality at time 1, model 2 introduces several social and demographic characteristics. While the introduction of social, demographic and family structure characteristics⁴ increases the explained variance in women's marital quality, they have little effect on the association between wives' employment and marital quality. The one exception is the effect of part-time employment on wives' marital quality. The addition of these characteristics increases the effect of part-time employment on marital conflict to the level of significance, and lowers the effect on marital happiness. Once social-demographic and family structure characteristics are controlled for, part-time employed women do not significantly differ from non-employed women in their levels of marital happiness.

In contrast to wives, marital duration is significantly associated with husband's reports of marital quality. Husbands in marriages of longer duration experience significantly higher levels of marital happiness and lower levels of marital conflict. Couples' income is also significantly associated with lower levels of marital happiness among husbands and lower levels of marital conflict among wives. That couples' income is related to decreased levels of marital happiness among husbands is surprising since financial strains and concerns are normally associated with lower levels of marital quality. Part-time employment among husbands is associated with significant increases in wives' marital happiness and husbands' marital conflict, as well as decreased levels of marital happiness among husbands.

⁴ Interaction effects were tested between children's ages and wives' employment status. The effects of these tests were not significant in any of the models and were, therefore, dropped.

However, these effects are no longer significant for husbands' marital happiness and conflict when work preferences and measures of household labor are introduced in the third model.⁵

(Tables 8 and 9 about here.)

As expected, the introduction of work preferences and measures of household labor reduce the effect of wives' employment on wives' marital happiness. That is, couples' work preferences and, in particular, household labor help to account for the relationship between employment and marital quality. It is important to note, however, that the effects of employment on wives' marital happiness continue to exist after controlling for these two mediating factors. That is, net of these of factors women's employment is significantly associated with lower levels of marital happiness among women. In contrast, the introduction of work preferences and household labor increase the effects of women's employment on wives' marital conflict. This suggests that the effects of wives' employment on marital conflict were attenuated in the two earlier models. Once we controlled for household labor a clearer relationship between employment and wives' marital conflict could be observed.

While women who prefer to be working more hours have significantly higher levels of marital conflict than wives whose preferences are consistent with their employment activity, the effects of work preferences on husbands' and wives' marital quality are, for the most part, in the expected direction, but not significant.⁶ Satisfaction with the division of household labor significantly increases marital quality. Consistent with the bi-variate analysis, husbands' increased participation in traditionally "female" tasks

⁵ Neither couples' ethnicity nor education were related to husbands' and wives' marital happiness or husbands' marital conflict. Ethnicity and education, however, were associated with wives' perceived levels of marital conflict. Religion was not significantly associated with either husbands' or wives' marital quality.

⁶ The interaction between work preferences and employment status were tested, as well as the combined effects of couples' work preferences. The interaction terms did not significantly increase the explained variance in any of the models and were, therefore, dropped.

is significantly associated with decreased levels of marital happiness among wives and increased levels of marital conflict among husbands and wives. Earlier it was suggested that husbands' increased participation in "female" tasks reflected increased demands of women's time, and could therefore account for decreases in marital quality. However, even after controlling for wives' level of participation in the labor force, husbands' increased participation continues to be associated with lower levels of marital quality among wives.

We now turn to the models that include women's job characteristics and work stress spillover. In the earlier models (presented in tables 6 through 9) we were able to test both the effect of being in the labor force, as well as the effect of the level of participation (i.e., part-time vs. non-employed, full-time vs. non-employed etc.) in the labor force. As such, we were able to compare the marital quality of couples whose wives were in the labor force to the marital quality of couples whose wives were outside of the labor force. In the models estimated for couples whose wives are employed, we are only estimating the effects of wives' level of participation in the labor force on marital quality. Thus, we are comparing the effect on marital quality between wives' employed full-time or over-time to wives' employed part-time.

While wives who are employed full-time or over-time have lower levels of marital quality than wives who are employed part-time the effects are not significant in the full model (model 3). These results indicate that employed women, regardless of their level of participation, experience similar levels of marital quality. As suggested by the descriptive statistics and earlier models, wives' level of employment is not significantly associated with husbands' marital quality. The effects of the social, demographic and family structure variables are, for the most part, similar to those seen in the models estimated for the full sample. There is, however, one exception. Increases in wives' contribution to family income is significantly associated with decreased levels of marital happiness and marital conflict

among men.

(Tables 10 through 13 about here.)

As seen in the earlier models, the introduction of work preferences, measures of household labor and work stress spillover reduce the effect of level of employment on marital quality. (It is important to note that the effects of level of employment in these models were small to begin with.) The effects of household labor and work preferences are similar to those seen in the earlier models. As suggested by the bivariate analysis, wives' work characteristics did not increase the explained variance of marital quality and were, therefore, dropped from the full model. Consistent with Sears & Galambos (1992), we find evidence of work stress "spills over" on wives' marital quality, but no evidence that women's work related stress "crosses over" to husbands' marital quality.

Conclusions and Discussion

The analyses presented indicate that employment significantly lowers the marital quality of wives. Husbands, on the other hand, neither appear to benefit nor suffer as a result of their wife's employment status. In addition, household labor and wives' work related stress, and to a lesser extent couples' work preferences, help to account for the negative effect that employment has on women's marital quality. These findings are not completely consistent with those reported in earlier studies, since we find evidence that wives' employment lowers women's marital quality (See Spitze 1988). Our findings are, however, consistent with recent research which has found wives' employment to have little or no effect on husbands' marital quality (Booth 1979). For husbands, social and demographic characteristics appear to play a more important role in explaining their marital quality.

In addition to examining what effect, if any, women's employment may have on marital quality, a central focus of this study was to explore three possible pathways through which women's employment

may affect marital quality. Past research had suggested that couples' preferences toward wives' employment, the division of household labor and women's work related stress could help to account for the effect that women's employment has on marital quality. Consistent with explanations offered for the effects of employment on marital quality, we find that wives who are satisfied with the division of household labor, and who experience low levels of work related stress experience higher levels of marital quality. We find only minimal evidence to suggest that couples' work preferences play a mediating role in the relationship between wives' employment and marital quality.

As women have moved into the labor force the demands placed on their time and energy have increased dramatically. As seen in the analysis, women spend twice as much time on household tasks as men. Surprisingly, however, the actual division of household labor has little or no effect on the relationship between wives' employment and marital quality. In contrast, husbands' and wives' satisfaction with the division of household labor plays a pivotal role in the relationship between employment and marital satisfaction. Once couples' perceptions of fairness in the division of household labor are controlled for, the effect of wives' employment on marital quality is reduced, suggesting that employed women are suffering from what Arlie Hochschild has entitled the "second shift." A possible weakness of this study, however, is that measures of household satisfaction may also be indicators of marital quality, and therefore, would be expected to be associated with couples' perceptions of marital quality. Also important is husbands participation in traditional female tasks. Contrary to popular belief, increases in husbands participation in "female" tasks was negatively associated with wives' marital quality. Benin & Agostinelli (1988) have argued that increases in husband's participation in traditional "female" tasks will not lead to increases in women's marital quality in the short term. They assert that as couples begin to share responsibility for tasks, arguments will arise as they redefine their roles within the marriage. Others have suggested that the gendered division of household labor reinforces power

differentials among couples (Brayfield 1992) and traditional gender roles (see Spain & Bianchi 1996). Clearly this is an area of research that warrants further exploration.

The analysis also provides further support for the view that problems and stress experienced at work impact family life. Consistent with results of Sears & Galambos (1992) we find evidence that women's work stress "spills over" into women's marital quality, but no evidence that women's work related stress "crosses over" into husband's marital quality. However, contrary to the work of Presser and others, we find no evidence that women's work schedules impact the marital quality of either husbands or wives. Work related stress experienced by both husbands and wives is another area of research that should receive more attention in the future.

In contrast to many earlier studies, the present study benefitted from the use of a large national sample of couples. In addition, the use of panel data allowed us to disentangle the causal processes underlying the association between wives' employment and marital quality. This study provides evidence that employment places women at risk of experiencing low levels of marital quality. Future studies should continue to focus on why this occurs, as well as how employed women attempt to ameliorate this effect.

REFERENCES

- Amato, Paul & Alan Booth. 1991. "The Consequences of Divorce for Attitudes Towards Divorce and Gender Roles." *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 12:306-322.
- Benin, Mary Holland & Joan Agostinelli. 1988. "Husbands' and Wives' Satisfaction with the Division of Labor." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 50:349-361.
- Bielby, William T. & Denise D. Bielby. 1989. "Family Ties: Balancing Commitments to Work and Family in Dual Earners Households." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 54:776-89.
- Booth, Alan. 1979. "Does Wives' Employment Cause Stress For Husbands?" *Family Coordinator*, Vol. 28:445-50.
- Booth, Alan & John N. Edwards. 1992. "Starting Over: Why Remarriages Are More Unstable." *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 13:179-194.
- Brayfield, April. 1992. "Employment Resources and Housework in Canada." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 54:19-30.
- Brubaker, T. 1991. "Families in Later Life: A Burgeoning Research Area." in A. Booth (ed.). *Contemporary Families: Looking Forward, Looking Back*. Minneapolis: National Council on Family Relations.
- Burke, Ronald J. and Tamara Weir. 1976. "Relationship of Wives' Employment Status to Husband, Wife and Pair Satisfaction." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 38(2):279-284.
- Crouter, A.C., Perry-Jenkins, M., Huston, T.L., & Crawford, D.W. 1989. "The Influence of Work-Induced Psychological States on Behavior at Home." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 10:273-292.
- Gershuny, Jonathan & John R. Robinson. 1988. "Historical Changes in the Household Division of Labor." *Demography*, Vol. 25:537-552.
- Glenn, Norval D. 1991. "Quantitative Research on Marital Quality in the 1980's: A Critical Review." in A. Booth (eds.). *Contemporary Families: Looking Forward, Looking Back*. Minneapolis: National Council on Family Relations.
- Goldschieder, Frances K. & Linda J. Waite. 1991. *New Families, No Families? The Transformation of the American Home*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hayge, Howard V. 1993. "Working Wives' Contributions to Family Incomes." *Monthly Labor Review*, August: 39-43.
- Hayge, Howard V. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 1994. "Married Mothers' Work Patterns: The Job-Family

- Compromise." *Monthly Labor Review*, June: 24-30.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking Penguin, Inc.
- Hiller, Dana V. and William W. Philliber. 1986. "The Division of Labor in Contemporary Marriage: Expectations, Perception and Performance." *Social Problems*, 33:191-201.
- Hughes, Diane, Ellen Galinsky & Anne Morris. 1992. "The Effects of Job Characteristics on Marital Quality: Specifying Linking Mechanisms." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54:31-42.
- Keith, Pat M. & Robert B. Schafer. 1980. "Role Strain and Depression in Two Job Families." *Family Relations*, Vol. 29: 483-488.
- Kessler, Ronald C. & James A. McRae. 1982. "The Effects of Wives' Employment on the Mental Health of Married Men and Women." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 47:216-227.
- Kingston, Paul W. & Steven L. Nock. 1987. "Time Together Among Dual Earner Couples." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 52: 391-400.
- Lennon, Mary Clare & Sarah Rosenfield. 1994. "Relative Fairness and the Division of Housework: The Importance of Options." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 100:506-31.
- Locksley, Anne. 1980. "On the Effects of Wives' Employment on Marital Adjustment and Companionship." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 42: 337-346.
- Marini, Margaret Mooney & Beth Anne Shelton. 1993. "Measuring Household Work: Recent Experience in the United States." *Social Science Research*, Vol. 22: 361-382.
- Martin, Teresa Castro & Larry Bumpass. 1989. "Recent Trends in Marital Disruption." *Demography*, Vol. 26:37-51.
- McHale, Susan M. & Ann C. Crouter. 1992. "You Can't Always Get What You Want: Incongruence Between Sex-Role Attitudes and Family Work Roles and Its Implications for Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 54: 537-547.
- McLanahan, Sarah & Lynne Casper. 1995. "Growing Diversity and Inequality in the American Family." in *State of the Union*, ed. Reynolds Farley. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade. 1982. *Work and the Family: A Study of Social Demography*. New York: Academic Press.
- Orden, Susan R. & Norman M. Bradburn. 1969. "Working Wives and Marital Happiness." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 74: 392-407.

- Peterson, Bernard R. & Kathleen Gerson. 1992. "Determinants of Responsibility for Child Care Arrangements Among Dual-Earner Couples." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 54:527-536.
- Philliber, William W. & Dana V. Hiller. 1983. "Changes in Marriage and Wife's Career as a Result of the Relative Occupational Attainments of Spouses." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 53:323-329.
- Pina, Darlene L. and Vern L. Bengston. 1993. "The Division of Household Labor and Wives' Happiness: Ideology, Employment and Perceptions of Support." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 55:901-912.
- Potuchek, Jean L. 1992. "Employed Wives' Orientation to Breadwinning: A Gender Theory Analysis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 54:548-558
- Presser, Harriet B. 1984. "Job Characteristics of Spouses and Their Work Shifts." *Demography*, Vol. 21:575-589.
- _____. 1987. "Work Shifts of Full-time Dual Earner Couples: Patterns and Contrast by Sex of Spouse." *Demography*, Vol 24:99-112.
- _____. 1989. "Can We Make Time for Children? The Economy, Work Schedules, and Child Care." *Demography*, Vol. 26:523-43.
- _____. 1994. "Employment Schedules Among Dual Earner Spouses and the Division of Household Labor by Gender." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 59:348-64.
- _____. 1995. "Job, Family and Gender: Determinants of Nonstandard Work Schedules Among Employed Americans in 1991." *Demography*, Vol. 32:577-598.
- Roberts, Robert E. & Stephen J. O'Keefe. 1981. "Sex Differences in Depression Reexamined." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 22:394-400.
- Ross, Catherine E., John Mirowsky, and Joan Huber. 1983. "Dividing Work, Sharing Work, and In Between: Marriage Patterns and Depression." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48:809-823.
- Rook, Karen, David Dooley, & Ralph Catalano. 1991. "Stress Transmission: The Effects of Husbands' Job Stressors on the Emotional Health of Their Wives." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 53:165-177.
- Rubin, Lillian Breslow. 1976. *Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-Class Family*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Sears, Heather A. & Nancy Galambos. 1992. "Women's Work Condition and Marital Adjustment in Two Earner Couples: A Structural Model." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 54:789-797

- Spain, Daphne & Suzanne M. Bianchi. 1996. *Balancing Act: Motherhood, Marriage and Employment Among American Women*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Spitze, Glenna. 1988. "Women's Employment and Family Relations: A Review." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 50:595-618.
- Staines, Graham L. & Joseph H. Pleck. 1983. *The Impact of Work Schedules on the Family*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Sweet, Jim and Larry Bumpass. 1987. *American Families and Households*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sweet, Jim, Larry Bumpass & Vaughn Call. 1988. "The Design and Content of the National Study of Families and Households." NSFH Working Paper No. 1. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Center for Demography and Ecology.
- Thompson, Linda. 1991. "Family Work: Women's Sense of Fairness." *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 12:181-96.
- Vannoy, Dana and William W. Philliber. 1992. "Wife Employment and Quality of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 54:387-398.
- Voydanoff, Patricia. 1988. "Work Role Characteristics, Family Structure Demands, and Work/Family Conflict." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 50:749-761.
- Ward, Russell. 1993. "Marital Happiness and Household Equity in Later Life." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 55:427-438.
- White, Lynn K. & Alan Booth. 1985. "Transition to parenthood and Marital Quality." *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 6:435-450.
- White, Lynn & Bruce Keith. 1990. "The Effect of Shift Work on the Quality and Stability of Marital Relations." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 52:453-462.
- White, Lynn K., Alan Booth & John N. Edwards. 1986. "Children and Marital Happiness: Why the Negative Correlation?" *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 7:131-147.

Table 1: Summary Characteristics of Couples in the Sample

Variable	Proportion/Mean	Valid Cases
Wives' Employment Status:		
Non-employed	34.0	(1179)
Part-time	22.3	(1179)
Full-time	33.3	(1179)
Over-time	10.3	(1179)
Husbands' Employment Status:		
Non-employed	7.8	(1184)
Part-time	2.5	(1184)
Full-time	38.8	(1184)
Over-time	50.8	(1184)
Proportion of Couples With Youngest Child Aged:		
Under three years	15.6	(1189)
Three to six years	26.5	(1189)
Seven to eighteen years	57.9	(1189)
Couples' Education:		
Both or one spouse no H.S. Degree	14.9	(1184)
Both H.S. Degree	19.8	(1184)
One or both College	65.3	(1184)
Non-white	24.0	(1189)
Non-catholic	78.2	(1189)
Marital Duration	15.8 (6.9)	(1188)
Mean Income (Wages and Salary)	48,255 (19,608)	(1172)
Proportion of Wife's Income to Couples' Income	.37 (.23)	(775)

1. Source: National Survey of Families and Households, Wave II

2. Sample: Married couples in a first marriage with children under the age of 18 living in the household who participated in first and second waves of NSFH.

Table 2: Wives' and Husbands' Mean Marital Quality by Wives' Employment Status

Wives Employment Status	Wives		Husbands	
	Marital Happiness*	Marital Conflict*	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict
Non-employed	5.52 (1.9)	2.10 (.94)	5.37 (1.2)	2.13 (.84)
Part-time	5.25 (1.2)	2.17 (.81)	5.27 (1.2)	2.22 (.84)
Full-time	5.17 (1.3)	2.24 (.85)	5.30 (1.2)	2.23 (.86)
Over-time	4.99 (1.2)	2.33 (.88)	5.16 (1.1)	2.25 (.79)
Column Means	5.29 (1.2)	2.19 (.88)	5.30 (1.2)	2.19 (.84)
Column Valid Cases	1166	1157	1158	1152

1. Source: National Survey of Families and Households, Wave II

2. Sample: Married couples in a first marriage with children under the age of 18 in living in the household who participated in first and second waves of NSFH.

3. Difference between groups is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 3: Wives' and Husbands' Mean Marital Quality by Preferences Towards Wives' Employment

Wives' Work Preferences:	Wives		Husbands	
	Marital Happiness*	Marital Conflict*	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict
Prefers to work more hours	5.36 (1.3)	2.24 (.98)	5.32 (1.2)	2.23 (.91)
Prefers to work less hours	5.12 (1.3)	2.26 (.84)	5.28 (1.2)	2.24 (.84)
Prefers to work same hours	5.43 (1.7)	2.06 (.81)	5.32 (1.2)	2.09 (.78)
Husbands' Work Preferences:	Wives		Husbands	
	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict*	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict*
Prefers wife to work more hours	5.32 (1.3)	2.28 (1.0)	5.30 (1.2)	2.27 (.93)
Prefers wife to work less hours	5.24 (1.2)	2.20 (.85)	5.29 (1.1)	2.22 (.78)
Prefers wife to work same hours	5.33 (1.2)	2.10 (.80)	5.32 (1.2)	2.10 (.84)
Column Means	5.29 (1.2)	2.19 (.88)	5.30 (1.2)	2.19 (.84)
Column Valid Cases	1166	1157	1158	1152

1. Source: National Survey of Families and Households, Wave II

2. Sample: Married couples in a first marriage with children under the age of 18 living in the household who participated in the first and second waves of NSFH.

3. Difference between groups is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 4: Correlations between Marital Quality and Characteristics of the Division of Household Labor and Wives' Work Stress

Variables	Wives		Husbands	
	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict
Work Stress	.19*** (N= 746)	-.26*** (N=744)	.07* (N=736)	-.08** (N=732)
Division of Housework	-.01 (N=1148)	.01 (N=1140)	-.01 (N=1139)	.05* (N=1134)
Number of hours Husband Spends in "Female" HH Tasks	-.07** (N=1152)	.09** (N=1143)	-.03 (N=1146)	.09** (N=1141)
Satisfaction With Work Spouse Does Around the House	.58*** (N=1171)	-.28*** (N=1162)	.58*** (N=1166)	-.21*** (N=1160)

1. Source: National Survey of Families and Households, Wave II

2. Sample: Married couples in a first marriage with children under the age of 18 living in the household who participated in the first and second waves of NSFH.

3. * indicates significance at < .10 level; ** at < .05 level; *** < .001, two tailed.

Table 5: Mean Marital Quality Among Couples in Which the Wife is Employed by Wives' Work Characteristics

Work Characteristics:	Wives		Husbands	
	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict	Marital Happiness	Marital Conflict
Work Hours Vary:				
Yes	5.09 (1.3)	2.20 (.84)	5.29 (1.0)	2.17 (.74)
No	5.19 (1.2)	2.24 (.84)	5.26 (1.2)	2.24 (.86)
Work Evenings or Nights:				
Yes	5.12 (1.3)	2.20 (.80)	5.26 (1.1)	2.27 (.86)
No	5.20 (1.3)	2.25 (.86)	5.28 (1.2)	2.20 (.83)
Work Days Vary:				
Yes	5.17 (1.3)	2.25 (.83)	5.34 (1.1)	2.28 (.78)
No	5.17 (1.3)	2.23 (.84)	5.26 (1.8)	2.22 (.85)
Column Means	5.17 (1.3)	2.24 (.84)	5.27 (1.2)	2.23 (.84)

1. Source: National Survey of Families and Households, Wave II

2. Sample: Married couples in a first marriage with children under the age of 18 living in the household who participated in first and second waves of NSFH and wife is employed at time 2.

Table 6: OLS Regression of Wives' Marital Happiness On Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, FULL SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Non-employed (omitted)						
Part-time	-.18*	(.10)	-.13	(.10)	-.06	(.09)
Full-time	-.29***	(.09)	-.28***	(.09)	-.25**	(.11)
Over-time	-.48***	(.13)	-.45***	(.12)	-.31**	(.15)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.45***	(.03)	.30***	(.03)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			-.001	(.006)	-.01	(.005)
Children under 3 years ^a			-.10	(.11)	-.07	(.10)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			-.06	(.09)	.02	(.08)
Husband employed part-time ^b			.74**	(.26)	.38*	(.23)
Husband employed full-time ^b			.18	(.14)	.07	(.12)
Husband employed over-time ^b			.13	(.14)	.05	(.12)
Couples' Income (logged)			.09	(.07)	.03	(.06)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					-.11	(.09)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					-.04	(.09)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					-.07	(.08)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					.05	(.08)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					.01	(.03)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					-.02***	(.003)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					.35***	(.02)
R2	.02		.21		.43	

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Table 7: OLS Regression of Wives' Marital Conflict On Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, FULL SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Non-employed (omitted)						
Part-time	.09	(.07)	.17**	(.07)	.22***	(.08)
Full-time	.15**	(.06)	.13**	(.06)	.25***	(.09)
Over-time	.26**	(.09)	.22**	(.08)	.32***	(.11)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.45***	(.03)	.40***	(.03)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			-.005	(.004)	-.003	(.004)
Children under 3 years ^a			.06	(.08)	.08	(.07)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			.06	(.06)	.05	(.06)
Husband employed part-time ^b			-.14	(.18)	-.01	(.17)
Husband employed full-time ^b			.01	(.10)	.05	(.10)
Husband employed over-time ^b			.01	(.10)	.04	(.10)
Couples' Income (logged)			-.11**	(.05)	-.08	(.05)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					.15**	(.07)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					.01	(.07)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					.10	(.06)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					-.06	(.06)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					-.005	(.02)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					.006**	(.003)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					-.11***	(.01)
R2	.01		.25		.30	

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Table 8: OLS Regression of Husbands' Marital Happiness On Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, FULL SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Non-employed (omitted)						
Part-time	-.10	(.10)	.001	(.10)	-.12	(.09)
Full-time	-.08	(.09)	-.001	(.09)	-.15	(.11)
Over-time	-.16	(.13)	-.02	(.12)	-.23	(.14)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.31***	(.03)	.23***	(.03)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			.02***	(.01)	.02***	(.005)
Children under 3 years ^a			.08	(.11)	.04	(.10)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			.04	(.09)	.002	(.08)
Husband employed part-time ^b			-.67**	(.25)	-.30	(.21)
Husband employed full-time ^b			-.20	(.14)	-.08	(.12)
Husband employed over-time ^b			-.24*	(.15)	-.12	(.12)
Couples' Income (logged)			-.16**	(.07)	-.14**	(.06)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					-.06	(.09)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					-.001	(.08)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					-.07	(.08)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					.03	(.08)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					.01	(.03)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					.002	(.004)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					.46***	(.02)
R2	.002		.12		.40	

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Table 9: OLS Regression of Husbands' Marital Conflict on Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, FULL SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Non-employed (omitted)						
Part-time	.04	(.07)	.05	(.06)	.09	(.07)
Full-time	.09	(.06)	.06	(.06)	.10	(.09)
Over-time	.11	(.09)	.09	(.08)	.13	(.11)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.39***	(.03)	.37**	(.03)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			-.01***	(.004)	-.01***	(.004)
Children under 3 years ^a			.01	(.08)	.02	(.07)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			-.02	(.06)	-.01	(.06)
Husband employed part-time ^b			.28*	(.17)	.24	(.17)
Husband employed full-time ^b			.05	(.10)	.05	(.10)
Husband employed over-time ^b			.06	(.10)	.07	(.10)
Couples' Income (logged)			-.03	(.05)	-.03	(.05)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					.06	(.06)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					.01	(.06)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					.06	(.06)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					.03	(.06)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					.02	(.02)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					.004***	(.003)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					-.12***	(.02)
R2	.002		.21		.26	

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Table 10: OLS Regression of Wives' Marital Happiness On Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, REDUCED SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Part-time (omitted)						
Full-time	-.07	(.10)	-.10	(.11)	-.10	(.11)
Over-time	-.26*	(.14)	-.26*	(.14)	-.17	(.13)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.43***	(.04)	.29***	(.03)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			-.004	(.01)	-.001	(.01)
Children under 3 years ^a			-.21	(.15)	-.17	(.12)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			-.01	(.12)	.01	(.10)
Husband employed part-time ^b			.94**	(.35)	.51*	(.30)
Husband employed full-time ^b			.45**	(.21)	.23	(.18)
Husband employed over-time ^b			.47**	(.21)	.20	(.18)
Couples' Income (logged)			.02	(.12)	-.05	(.10)
Wife's proportion of couple's income			-.15	(.22)	.01	(.19)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					.08	(.07)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					.03	(.01)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					-.07	(.02)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					.06	(.09)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					-.08	(.07)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					-.01**	(.005)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					.35***	(.02)
Work Stress					.13*	(.04)
R2	.01		.20		.43	

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Table 11: OLS Regression of Wives' Marital Conflict On Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, REDUCED SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Part-time (omitted)						
Full-time	.03	.07	-.04	(.07)	-.08	(.08)
Over-time	.15	.10	.06	(.09)	.03	(.10)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.42***	(.04)	.35***	(.04)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			-.01	(.01)	-.01	(.01)
Children under 3 years ^a			.11	(.10)	.10	(.10)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			.03	(.08)	.02	(.08)
Husband employed part-time ^b			-.19	(.23)	-.08	(.22)
Husband employed full-time ^b			-.13	(.14)	-.07	(.14)
Husband employed over-time ^b			-.15	(.14)	-.05	(.14)
Couples' Income (logged)			-.06	(.08)	-.01	(.08)
Wife's proportion of couple's income			-.12	(.15)	-.21	(.15)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					.09	(.11)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					-.02	(.07)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					.05	(.09)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					.03	(.01)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					.04	(.05)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					.008**	(.004)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					-.09***	(.01)
Work Stress					-.16***	(.04)
R2	.001		.22		.29	

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Table 12: OLS Regression of Husbands' Marital Happiness On Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, REDUCED SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Part-time (omitted)						
Full-time	.02	(.10)	.06	(.11)	.12	(.10)
Over-time	-.05	(.14)	.05	(.14)	.02	(.13)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.30***	(.04)	.20***	(.03)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			.02**	(.01)	.02**	(.01)
Children under 3 years ^a			.02	(.15)	.02	(.13)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			.11	(.12)	.03	(.10)
Husband employed part-time ^b			-.77**	(.35)	-.42	(.29)
Husband employed full-time ^b			-.29	(.21)	-.10	(.17)
Husband employed over-time ^b			-.30	(.21)	-.15	(.17)
Couples' Income (logged)			-.19	(.12)	-.12	(.09)
Wife proportion of couple's income			-.33	(.22)	-.37**	(.19)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					.01	(.15)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					.04	(.09)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					-.02	(.13)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					.03	(.08)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					.02	(.06)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					.003	(.01)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					.49***	(.03)
Work Stress					.05	(.04)
R2		.001		.12		.42

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Table 13: OLS Regression of Husbands' Marital Conflict On Wives' Employment and Selected Independent Variables, REDUCED SAMPLE

Variable name	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Wives Employment Status:						
Part-time (omitted)						
Full-time	.02	(.07)	.02	(.07)	.02	(.08)
Over-time	.04	(.09)	.07	(.09)	.08	(.10)
Marital Quality, Time 1:			.36***	(.03)	.34***	(.03)
Couple Characteristics (Controls):						
Marital Duration			-.02***	(.005)	-.02***	(.005)
Children under 3 years ^a			.05	(.10)	.06	(.10)
Children between 3 and 6 years ^a			-.03	(.08)	-.01	(.08)
Husband employed part-time ^b			.09	(.25)	.13	(.24)
Husband employed full-time ^b			-.03	(.14)	-.04	(.13)
Husband employed over-time ^b			-.07	(.14)	-.07	(.14)
Couples' Income (logged)			.07	(.08)	.07	(.08)
Wife proportion of couple's income			-.25*	(.14)	-.32**	(.14)
Work Preferences:						
Wife prefers to work more hours ^c					-.01	(.11)
Wife prefers to work less hours ^c					.12	(.06)
Husband prefers wife to work more hours ^d					.19	(.10)
Husband prefers wife to work less hours ^d					.03	(.06)
Household Labor:						
Division of HH labor					.15***	(.05)
# of hrs husband spends in 'female' tasks					.001	(.003)
Satisfaction w/ division of hh labor					-.11***	(.02)
Work Stress					-.02	(.04)
R2	.01		.21		.28	

1. Models 2 and 3 also control for couples' race/ethnicity, religion, and education.

^a Youngest child between the ages of 7 and 18, omitted category.

^b Husband non-employed, omitted category.

^c Wife's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

^d Husband's preferences are consistent with her employment status, omitted category.

Center for Demography and Ecology
University of Wisconsin
1180 Observatory Drive, Rm. 4412
Madison, WI 53706-1393
U.S.A.
608/262-2182
FAX 608/262-8400
comments to: guzman@ssc.wisc.edu
requests to: cdepubs@ssc.wisc.edu